

Chapter 55

Culturally Gendered: The Institutionalization of Men and Masculinities in Society and Corporations

Ben Tran

Alliant International University, USA

ABSTRACT

The social differentiation between males and females is a relational concept: masculinity exists and has meaning only as it contrasts with femininity, and vice versa (Connell, 1995, p. 43). Western culture, especially, prides itself on the successful integration of feminism into modern society—though some still question how successfully integrated feminism truly is while others ponder whether or not cultural power in society has been reversed. As masculinity studies developed, according to Simpson (2004), so too did the concept of multiple masculinities, the idea that men respond to and embrace masculinity in a variety of ways because the expression of masculinity can “change according to time, the event, and the perspectives” of a group or community (Imms, 2000, p. 156), as demonstrated by Heasley (2005), and men who are in female dominated occupations. Nevertheless, multiple masculinities are commonly segregated into the following categories: hegemonic, complicit, subordinated, and marginalized.

INTRODUCTION

Equality between women and men has been a doctrine well recognized in international law since the adoption of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1958), and as a principle it enjoys popular support in many countries. The idea of gender equal rights has provided the formal basis for the international discussion of the position of women since the 1975-1985 UN Decade for Women, which has been a key element in the story of global feminism (Bulbeck, 1988). The widespread adoption of a Gender and Development (GAD) perspective by international development agencies in the 1980s signaled a theoretical shift in development discourse and practice away from essentialized notions and sex-related divisions of gender roles, towards a more relational concept of gender. The moving force behind this shift was the perceived failure of previous theoretical frameworks for gender analysis in development such as Women in Development (WID) in the early 1970s, and later Women and Devel-

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-1933-1.ch055

opment (WAD) in the late 1970s, to effectively challenge existing gender inequalities. GAD presented itself as an alternative *gender analysis framework* for the study of development-related aspects of social life such as intra-household relations, divisions of labor, control over and access to land and resources (Visvanathan, Duggan, Nisonoff, & Wiegersma, 1997, p. 20). It emphasized gender *relations* rather than *women* as a category of analysis. From a GAD perspective, gender de-naturalized, understood as a social construct, the meanings of which were fluid and changing.

Hence, research on gender-related attitudes has disassociated attitudes toward masculinity, and attitudes about women as conceptually and empirically independent (Levant & Richmond, 2007; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1994; Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Attitudes about *masculinity* refer to beliefs about the importance of males adhering to traditional norms for male behavior, assessed with items concerning *men only* (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Nevertheless, many heterosexual men experience and demonstrate *queer masculinity*, defined here as ways of being masculine outside hetero-normative constructions of masculinity that disrupt, or have the potential to disrupt, traditional images of hegemonic heterosexual masculine (Heasley, 2005). The hegemonic hetero-masculine is presented culturally in the icons of religion, sports, historical figures, economic and political leaders, and the entertainment industry. In these arenas, males are presumed to be straight and hold stereotypically masculine beliefs, attitudes, and values unless and until they present themselves as other. Hence, the purpose of this chapter is to analyze and understand the existence of inequality among men of various cultures, specifically in the U.S., based on culturally gendered and institutionalized masculinities. In so doing, this chapter will cover the historical perspective of masculinities, different types of masculinities in the U.S. culture, different types of masculinities in the U.S. corporate culture, and recommendations on survival strategies to achieve equality.

BACKGROUND OF GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT (GAD)

More recently, GAD has faced criticism from gender theorists (Chant, 2000; Jackson, 2001), among others, who are unconvinced that GAD has provided any alternative to the shortcomings of WID. One major critique has problematized the marginalization of men from GAD policy and practice and the continued, almost exclusive, focus on women rather than on gender. Still today, in the literature and reports of development agencies and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) throughout the world, the terms *gender* and *women* are often used interchangeably as if one were synonymous with the other (Kaufman, 2003). The perceived failure of GAD to adopt a truly *relational* and integrated approach has meant that development agencies are becoming increasingly interested to *bring men in* to work on gender (White, 2000, p. 33). The various debates provoked by this suggestion and the relevance of such debates for re-thinking current approaches to gender and development will serve as the focus of this chapter.

According to Hearn, placing men and the associated concept of masculinity on political and policy agendas is of course not really new, for it is just that policy makers and development practitioners are now naming men and masculinities as an object of concern (Hearn, 1998). One of the main reasons for the absence of men as a recognized constituency in GAD so far has been, according to Chant, the historical legacy of WID. Many GAD practitioners are those who were previously active in feminist struggles for the advancement of women and for whom bringing about gender equality and equality means bringing women up to the levels of well-being enjoyed by men in their households and communities before men can lay claim to limited GAD resources (Chant & Gutmann, 2000). A further factor behind the exclusion

26 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/culturally-gendered/182136

Related Content

Community of Inquiry: Research-Based Learning for Inclusive Practice

Benjamin Brassand Heike de Boer (2018). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 45-59).

www.irma-international.org/article/community-of-inquiry/204614

Workplace Ostracism and Subjective Well-Being: A Reflection on Understanding the Experiences of Syrian Asylum Seekers in Turkey

Basak Ucanok Tanand Fatma Nur Bayr (2023). *Developing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Policies for Promoting Employee Sustainability and Well-Being* (pp. 134-152).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/workplace-ostracism-and-subjective-well-being/321297

Composing Lives Alongside: Narrative Meaning Making and Life Making in Relation

Derek A. Hutchinsonand M. Shaun Murphy (2021). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/composing-lives-alongside/282068

Role of AI in the Prevention of Cybercrime and Abuse of the Female Gender in Society

Aditi Panda (2024). *AI Tools and Applications for Women's Safety* (pp. 262-274).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/role-of-ai-in-the-prevention-of-cybercrime-and-abuse-of-the-female-gender-in-society/337767

Perspectives on Diversity and Inclusion in Education

Cyd W. Nzyoka Yongo (2023). *Handbook of Research on Race, Culture, and Student Achievement* (pp. 340-358).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/perspectives-on-diversity-and-inclusion-in-education/316341