Received: 12 May 2020 | Revised: 20 August 2020 | Accepted: 12 October 2020

DOI: 10.1111/gwao.12573

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

FEMINIST FRONTIERS

WILEY

What are men's roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism?

Ajnesh Prasad[1,2] | Alejandro Centeno[1] | Carl Rhodes[3] | Muhammad Azfar Nisar[4] | Scott Taylor[5] | Janne Tienari[6] | Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar[7]

[1]EGADE Business School, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico City, Mexico

[2]School of Business, Royal Roads University, Victoria, Canada

[3]UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo, Australia

[4]Suleman Dawood School of Business, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan

[5]Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

[6]Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland

[7]School of Governance, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Ajnesh Prasad, School of Business, Royal Roads University, 2005 Sooke Road, Victoria, BC V9B 5Y2, Canada.

Email: ajnesh_prasad@yahoo.ca

Abstract

The #MeToo and the Time's Up movements have captured the urgency to address systemic manifestations of sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny in all aspects of society. Among the myriad discourses that have been catalyzed by these contemporaneous movements includes one related to the role of men in achieving gender egalitarianism. Men are allocated unearned privilege associated with being a man in a culture that is inherently phallogocentric. This fact alone charges men with the responsibility to account for the discursive and the institutional systems that afford them unearned privilege at certain relational costs that must be borne by women and, concomitantly, the feminine. The #MeToo and the Time's Up movements—which have initiated greater cultural recognition of the problems associated with establishing a society that is predicated on androcentric values—mark a pressing need, one that is much overdue, for men to interrogate the inequitable ways in which gender configures contemporary social relations. As a contribution to this effort, this article draws on reflexive accounts from men academics broadly invested in the study of gender and organizations and who are at different stages of their careers and from dispersed geographical areas, to respond to the question: *What are men's roles and responsibilities in the*

feminist project for gender egalitarianism? In answering this question, these academics, individually and collectively, identify paths for allyship moving forward.

KEYWORDS
academia, allyship, feminism, gender egalitarianism, masculinity, men

When our lived experience of theorizing is fundamentally linked to the processes of self-recovery, of collective liberation, no gap exists between theory and practice. (hooks, 1994, p. 61)

1 | PREAMBLE

This article draws on reflexive accounts from men academics broadly invested in the study of gender and organizations, and who are at different stages of their careers and from dispersed geographical areas, to respond to the question: *What are men's roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism?* In answering this question, these academics, individually and collectively, identify paths for allyship moving forward. While what specifically ought to be men's roles and responsibilities within the feminist project for gender egalitarianism will remain up for debate, it is unequivocal that men have important work to do in realizing a society that is bereft of sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny. A society that is removed of these cultural ills will not only benefit women, but will ensure that the flourishing of humanity is made more tenable for everyone.

2 | AJNESH PRASAD

The #MeToo and the Time's Up movements have raised the urgency to address systemic manifestations of sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny in all aspects of society, including, perhaps especially, the workplace (Auster & Prasad, 2016; Bell, Merilainen, Taylor, & Tienari, 2019; Ozkazanc-Pan, 2019). Even organizations with "progressive" and "enlightened" workers are not immune from fostering environments that function on androcentric norms, which systematically marginalize women. For example, recent empirical studies on the culture of contemporary business schools have illuminated that the power dynamics embedded within such organizations—although their perceived meritocratic system may purport otherwise—render them being highly gendered spaces that privilege men (Fernando & Prasad, 2019; Fotaki, 2011).[1] These studies suggest that such gendered organizations are characterized by some manifestation of toxicity associated with, what Raewyn Connell (2005) has popularized as, hegemonic masculinity.

Among the myriad discourses that have been catalyzed by the contemporaneous movements of #MeToo and Time's Up is one related to the need for groups who have benefited from the existing constitution of social relations to reflect on their privilege and, as necessary, to disavow it. On this point, for example, Eda Ulus (2018) and Liela Jamjoom (2020) have problematized the privilege embodied by women adopting neoliberal, white feminist perspectives that do not sufficiently consider the experiences of "other" women (also see Mohanty, 1984). Extending this debate further would logically lead to the need to make sense of the role of men in achieving gender egalitarianism (Tienari & Taylor, 2019). Men are allocated unearned privilege associated with being a man in a society that is inherently phallogocentric; that is, a society that advantages the masculine. This fact alone charges men with the responsibility to account for the discursive and the institutional systems that afford them unearned privilege at

certain relational costs that must be borne by women—and, concomitantly, the feminine. Equally, it calls upon men to identify trajectories by which to undo their unearned privilege. Yet, while conscientious men ought to engage with gender egalitarianism, it is equally important that the corollary of such efforts does not culminate in *speaking for*—as opposed to *speaking with*—women (on this point, see Spivak, 1988). Any act of men *speaking for* women risks displacing women from the center of the movement (Prasad & Zulfiqar, in press) and, if this were to occur, it would only reinscribe the cultural ethos of what Luce Irigaray (1977) decried in her reading of the phallogocentric economy. Under the covenants of the phallogocentric economy men *speaking for* women would be tantamount to the latter's bodies becoming, once more, commoditized as peripheral objects to be consumed or governed by masculine prerogative.[2]

The #MeToo and the Time's Up movements—which have sparked greater cultural recognition of the problems associated with establishing a society that is predicated on androcentric values—mark a pressing need, one that is much overdue, for men to interrogate the inequitable ways in which gender configures contemporary social relations. As a contribution to this effort, this article draws on reflexive accounts from men academics broadly invested in the study of organizations and who are at different stages of their careers and from dispersed geographical areas, to respond to the question: *What are men's roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism?*

This question has not been substantively considered, with only rare exceptions appearing in the extant literature (e.g., Tienari & Taylor, 2019). Inspired by recent arguments in the field by scholars calling for the practice of some form of writing differently (Gilmore, Harding, Helin, & Pullen, 2019; Grey & Sinclair, 2006)—what Hélène Cixous (1976) termed écriture féminine (or feminine writing) (Phillips, Pullen, & Rhodes, 2014; Vachhani, 2019; also see Kiriakos & Tienari, 2018; Pullen, 2018) or what Donna Haraway labeled cyborg writing (Mandalaki & Daou, in press; Muhr & Rehn, 2015; Prasad, 2016)—and extending what one of the collaborators on this article has called "democratic scriptology" (Rhodes, 2019), I posed the question to several colleagues who are socially read as men.

My selection of these colleagues was motivated by who I thought—based on their past scholarship, my interactions with them, or a combination thereof—would have something meaningful to say in response to the question. I requested from each of them a short narrative to answer this question and encouraged them to remain unapologetically reflexive in their narrative accounts. I thought being reflexive is essential not only because theorizing—making sense of what we see in the world—is constructed through social and embodied experiences (Mandalaki, in press; Phillips et al., 2014; Ulus, in press), but also for its subversive, culturally transformative potential (Shadnam, Bykov, & Prasad, in press; Zulfiqar & Prasad, in press). On the latter point, as Alison Pullen (2006) and Heather Hopfl (2000) have observed, reflexively gendered positions that are attentive to discursive and institutional power dynamics transcend the rigid parameters of what constitutes as legitimate scholarship and, therein, challenges the orthodoxy of knowledge construction as it is traditionally defined. Moreover, in an effort to remain ontologically consistent with écriture feminine, I was mindful to not circumscribe stylistic parameters on the mode of writing to be adopted—that is, each author could approach the question through their narrative however they deemed most appropriate for the content they were choosing to offer. My consultations with the authors during the process only went so far as to identify the broad themes they expected to cover; and this was only done to reduce potential redundancies that might emerge across the narratives. In sum, given its collaborative approach and the undergirding question that it addresses, this article represents an example of "writing resistance together" (Ahonen et al., 2020; for an account of doing resistance together, see Maher, 2019).

In being purposeful in the selection of potential collaborators for this article, I wanted to follow feminist principles of gender inclusivity and equity. This led me to consider two complementary issues. The first issue related to *empirical substance*. Namely, I asked those men academics in the field whose scholarly works are palpably inflected by the principles of gender inclusivity and equity. Whether or not they have engaged with feminist theorizing (Prasad, 2012; Pullen & Rhodes, 2014) or specifically considered the position of men and masculinity within feminist movements (Lund, Merilainen, & Tienari, 2019; Tienari & Taylor, 2019), their work, broadly speaking, has encapsulated the spirit of gender inclusivity and equity (e.g., Alamgir & Alakavuklar, 2020;

Nisar, 2018). The second issue related to the *practice* of inclusivity and equity. I wanted to ensure that the co-authors of this article would represent different career stages, ranging from a doctoral student to chaired professors. Doctoral students and early career researchers often occupy vulnerable spaces within the academy (Bristow, Robinson, & Ratle, 2017; Ratle, Robinson, Bristow, & Kerr, 2020), though it remains critical for their voices to be heard (Prasad, 2013, 2015; Raineri, 2015). Likewise, I wanted to have geographical diversity by including scholars from both the Global South and the Global North. Scholars (and knowledges) from the Global South are routinely relegated to the periphery of the field's journals (Alcadipani & Faria, 2014; Alcadipani, Khan, Gantman, & Nkomo, 2012), a phenomenon needing redress. Ultimately, in adopting this criterion, I invited (alphabetically listed) Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar, Alejandro Centeno, Muhammad Azfar Nisar, Carl Rhodes, Scott Taylor, and Janne Tienari to join this article as co-authors. It was exciting to have these individuals accept the invitation—thus, yielding an affirmative response to collaborate from every colleague approached—which only reaffirmed, for me, the significance of an article of this scope.

Before proceeding, a caveat merits note. This article is ostensibly from "men" academics writing about "men's" roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism. Invoking such gendered/sexed language has the potential to, however unintended, reify the dangerous ethos of biological determinism. Feminists have long theorized how gendered-/sexed-based dichotomies, undergirded in assumptions of ontological sex differences, (re) produce the pervasive cultural belief of the *naturalized* bifurcation between women/men and female/male (see, e.g., Butler, 1990; Haraway, 1997). Carole Pateman (1988) went so far as to argue that the sexual contract between women and men that is foregrounded in the cultural belief of ontological sex differences, in fact, precedes even the social contract—the tacit covenants that govern civilization. Dallas Cullen (1997, 2002) has adopted a feminist perspective to illustrate the problematic implications that emerge when theories of organization are predicated on essentialist assumptions of ontological sex differences. I very much concur with this line of feminist critique and do not wish to invoke the concept of "men" to discursively assert the veracity of ontological sex differences. Instead, for the purposes of this article, I use the concept of "men" only to the extent that it acknowledges the unearned material and immaterial privileges that are allocated to certain culturally classified bodies located within a phallogocentric culture.

What follows are the narrative responses offered by each of the remaining authors of this article. Alejandro Centeno uses some of his own experiences growing up in Mexico to problematize the mother–son dynamic. He contends that a disruption in this dynamic is necessary for catalyzing social change on gender relations as it is this relationship that is much too often invoked by men to pattern "parasitic" bonds, borrowing terminology from Marilyn Frye (1997), which they establish with women throughout their lives. Carl Rhodes draws on a case from Australia to critique the ways in which men leaders in politics and industry are exalted as champions of feminism. This critique leads him to revisit the question of where men ought to be located in relation to women in initiatives that seek to achieve gender egalitarianism. Working in Pakistan, Muhammad Azfar Nisar points to the hypocrisy undergirding men who preach the need to advance the feminist project, yet to not practice it in their own personal lives. He offers some simple, though powerful, actions through which men can pursue a more genuine feminist praxis moving forward. Writing together, Scott Taylor and Janne Tienari extend the conversation on the need for a more robust feminist praxis. Working from their own state contexts of England and Finland, respectively, they discuss the idiosyncratic ways through which they practice feminism in their day-to-day lives. Finally, Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar reflects on his formidable years in Turkey to explain the significance of allyship in the pursuit for gender egalitarianism. He raises the critical point that many men embody myriad "othered" subjectivities—whether they be based on race, culture, nationality, language, etc.—which, potentially, create sites of allyship with women in the quest for (gender) equality. Given the importance of invoking creative modes of writing to subvert conventional systems of power, it seems especially apropos to conclude this piece with the lyrics that Ozan quotes at the end of his narrative.

Whether considered individually, or taken collectively, these narratives proffer compelling accounts on men's roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism. One important theme that I found palpable across the narratives is the caution with which the authors approached the posed question. That is, the

authors were mindful of not misappropriating a space to which they are not entitled. However, in acknowledging the unearned privilege that they embody and, to varying degrees, contextualizing themselves within their narratives, the authors exhibit a form of corporeal ethics (Prasad, 2014; Pullen & Rhodes, 2014), which placates the risk of *speaking for* women while, at the same time, underscoring the need for social change. Moreover, the awareness among the co-authors of potentially misappropriating feminist space only reinforced, to me, the fact that I selected the right collaborators for this article.

I hope that with the compelling narratives that follow in the remaining pages, this article invigorates new vistas of what is possible for a more just and compassionate tomorrow through men's participation in gender egalitarianism.

3 | ALEJANDRO CENTENO

To answer this question, I will share a story that is corporeally informed (Segarra & Prasad, 2018, 2020), though I think it has wider implications to which others can relate.

My mother gave birth to three sons in Morelia, a city in the Mexican state of Michocan. It has been an open secret—and a source of lighthearted family banter around the dinner table during holidays—that her first born, my eldest brother Armando (a pseudonym), is special. That is perhaps a nicer way of saying that he is her favorite. We all know it. She does too.

Around the time that I was invited to write this narrative, I had a conversation with my mother in which my brother's "prodigal son" status came up. During our conversation she shared with me how she was always so protective of him as a young mother. "I didn't even want the sun to hit him" were her words to encapsulate her memories of her first born. When my brother was a baby, my mother recalls being awake all through the night, "I had to touch him every hour or so. I didn't want him to be wet at any time." She found herself immersed in a never-ending exercise of changing cloth diapers (yes, cloth diapers) to keep him dry and comfortable. A mountain of pee-soaked diapers was waiting for her (to wash by hand) in the morning.

At 25, Armando left home for his first job in another state after completing his university studies. However, he would return home regularly, every 3 or 4 weeks or so. It was on during one of these visits that he asked my mom to enroll in cooking classes as he wanted to try different types of cuisine. My mom wasted no time in indulging his request, and I distinctly remember her spending every Saturday on such lessons for nearly a year. When he made plans to return home, he used to call in advance to let our mom know what he wanted to eat upon his arrival and my mom was always sure to have his requested meal ready for him. And, when he arrived, he did so with enormous loads of dirty laundry in tow. During his weekend visits, our mom did nothing but cook what his heart desired, washed his dirty clothes (most of them still by hand!), and, then, immaculately ironed and folded them. After all of this was done, I recall seeing mom waving goodbye to my brother with tears in her eyes. She would long for his next visit.

Reflecting on the dynamic my mother and brother have is relevant for answering the question at the heart of this article. What I see today is that my brother used the dynamic he created with our mom to pattern the relationships he established with other women in his life. Now in his 40s, he continues to be in relationships with women who treat him in ways that are eerily similar to how our mom treats him. While I recall a number of examples in which this has occurred, his relationship with his current girlfriend is particularly revelatory.

> "I don't know how to cook what you're asking for" Armando's girlfriend said to him.
>
> "Do your research!" he responded dismissively.

Before they met, my brother's girlfriend did not even know how to boil an egg or wash dishes. Now, some 7 years into their relationship, she has gained skills she did not possess or think she would ever possess. She, like my mother did before her, signed up for professional cooking lessons, asked her aunts for culinary tips, and many, many

times called my mom asking her for help during various "crises" with my brother. These calls where constant due to Armando's incessant demands about various domestic matters. For example, although they still do not live together, doing his laundry became one of her regular duties, and see would call to seek my mom's advice on how to launder his clothes in ways that he approves. At one point his girlfriend did raise the idea of hiring someone that could help them both with house chores (hiring domestic help is very common in Mexico). He categorically refused, saying that he did not want anyone else but her touching his things. She acquiesced to his decision and continues to function as both his girlfriend and his maid.

"When I get asked why do I do these things for him I answer that I do it because I want to. It's my decision and I'm glad to do it." These are her words. I have heard her rationalize their relationship in such terms on numerous occasions. At present, their relationship has evolved (devolved?) to the point that she now seeks his approval on the most mundane of matters, such as the perfume she wears.

I am sure that my mom thought that she raised Armando as any caring mother should. Unwittingly, however, she has contributed to perpetuating an asymmetrical relationship between them, wherein the mother disproportionately gives and the son disproportionately takes. As evidenced by his relationship with his girlfriend, he has used this relationship to pattern other relationships with women in his life.

In reading their relationship through the lens of the late feminist philosopher Sara Ruddick's (1980) ideas of "maternal thought," our mother seems to have developed an inauthentic dynamic with my brother. She has fulfilled the values of the dominant, patriarchal society while not accounting for the implications that her rearing approach would have on the lives of other women and potential children (Ruddick, 1980). Her approach to mothering instilled a pernicious gender identity into Armando, which may be best captured by the concept of machismo. This concept, popularized as Latin America's variant of (toxic) masculinity, is commonly characterized by narcissism, aggression, a strong sense of courage, an overt, active, and generally unquestioned heterosexuality, and a vivid fantasy of social domination (see Hardin, 2002; Vigoya, 2001). My brother embodies machismo as it was (and is) socially nurtured by various women in his life, starting from our mother.

This is, of course, not to suggest that my mother has the sole—or even primary—responsibility of transforming the mother–son dynamic. While conventional expectations of maternal practice, to return once more to Ruddick (1980), functions to reify pre-existing cultural arrangements of gendered roles in society, sons are not without agency to disrupt this dynamic. Indeed, Armando has responsibility to recognize his own actions in maintaining the type of dynamic that he has established with our mother. He is equally accountable for how he has structured relationships with other women in his life, including his girlfriend. After all, mothers are not merely attendants to the needs of their sons' various needs and sons should not confuse their mothers' love and dedication with their inner-child narcissism and enslaving predilections (Tomkins & Ulus, 2015).

So, it seems to me that among the most critical things that must be changed to achieve gender egalitarianism is a fundamental shift in the relationship between mothers and sons. On the one hand, mothers should avoid preserving gendered inequalities by engaging in authentic maternal thinking. This means (re)constructing a healthy (feminist-inflected) mother–son dynamic; one that is based on more equitable relations between men and women (Ruddick, 1980). On the other hand, sons need to redefine what being a man ought to mean in a society that would allow individuals to flourish regardless of gender. This would require disassociating old, gendered beliefs with social life, at the crux of which is how we related to other mothers. Transgressing from existing cultural paradigms is understandably scary and uncomfortable, but it is also necessary if a meaningful move towards gender egalitarianism is to be made.

4 | CARL RHODES

When Ash first approached me about contributing to this article, his question resonated with an issue that has been on my mind for many years concerning whether men can or should be feminists. This concern arises in the context of working in a discipline where feminists have long tried to rewrite knowledge about management and

organization through feminist scholarship (from at least Calás & Smircich, 1989 to Sinclair, 2019), and where this has been an inspiration to my own work since its inception (Rhodes, 2000, 2019).

Recently it has become politically popular for men to assert feminist identity. For example, British Labour party leader Ed Milliband was photographed sporting a "This is what a feminist looks like" T-shirt. Elsewhere, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau asserted that, "I am going to keep saying loud and clear that I am a feminist" (quoted in Malo, 2016, n.p.).

Despite what appear to be good intentions, when men declare themselves as feminists it always makes me wince. This is not so much a rational response as much as an embodied reaction of discomfort that is worth unpacking.

Blatant misogyny and anti-feminist reactionary masculinism elicit a much stronger response, of course. When, just before his election to the United States' presidency, Donald Trump shamelessly declared that his celebrity allowed him to grope women's genitals without reproach, it was horrifying. The horror was not just because he was a man, but because someone with such power would endorse rape culture (see Maas, McCauley, Bonomi, & Leija, 2018).

Does that mean that men who find Trump's sexism and misogyny abhorrent should stand up and declare themselves feminists? For male feminists like Trudeau, "a feminist is someone who believes men and women should be equal" (cited in Carpenter, 2018, n.p.). On face value it is hard to find fault with this sentiment, but on closer inspection it does serve to diminish feminism both by depoliticizing it and by making men the reference point for women's equality.

Cultural critic and feminist theorist bell hooks (2000) provides a more political definition: "feminism is a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression" (p. 117). This speaks to the real experiences of women who have suffered pain and injustice for no reason other than being women in a patriarchal society. It also speaks to the practice of feminism as a political struggle rather than a feel-good pro-equality moral position.

hooks is not engaging a simple men versus women rhetoric, accepting fully that her definition "did not imply that men were the enemy" (p. 1) and that while sexism can be perpetuated by both men and women, feminism is for everybody. hooks went on to say, "to understand feminism it implies one has to necessarily understand sexism" (p. 1). The consequence is clear: no man can experience the sexist exploitation and oppression that defines feminism. So how can a man call himself a feminist?

It gets worse. No matter how much a man might feel aligned to feminism as a political cause, it remains true that men are advantaged materially from patriarchy. This is not by wish or will, and whether or not men deliberately exploit their position in patriarchy for their own benefit, we profit passively as if by birthright.

A short example might better help tease out the issues. In Australia, there is an institute called the "Male Champions of Change." This is a group of men in positions of formal authority—CEOs, company directors, senior public servants, and the like—who commit to take action on gender inequality.

All well and good that men might contribute, and if we truly believe in the values of equality and justice, it is incumbent on all of us to make these contributions in whatever way we can. However, when the male champions get airtime in conversation and the media, the attention seems to always be on the do-gooding men as the agents of change.

While women feminists might be commonly bestowed with negative stereotypes as man-haters and ball-breakers, when men step in they are called, officially and institutionally, "champions." That the male champions might somehow be heroes is a problem.

The institution of the male champions was created by women and is run largely by women. It has the stated aim of "men of power and influence forming a high profile coalition to achieve change on gender equality issues in organizations and communities" (Male Champions of Change, 2019, n.p.). With this deference to "men of power," however, masculinity, in its traditional or "hegemonic" (Connell, 2005) form, is never far away.

If rivalry, competition, and the desire to win at the expense of others' loss defines a certain form of masculinity, the naming of these proto-male-feminists is a case in point. The word champion is traceable back to the Latin *campus*, in reference to a battlefield, later developing into *camion* meaning fighter.

Champion was used in Middle English to specifically denote a fighting man. This meaning is retained today with a champion being a person who is victorious in a contest or competition.

The question then is whether the actions of the male champions, in pursuing an agenda of equality, are failing entirely to address the sexist patriarchal system that creates and perpetuates inequality? In other words, is this about addressing the symptom rather than the disease?

When you click "meet the champions" on the Male Champions website, the already obvious fact that men in power are almost exclusively middle-aged white men is visually palpable. Will these men, champions as they are, change a system that is not only socially and historically entrenched, but also one that they have benefited from and that has actually enabled them to become "men of power"?

The system remains stacked against women. Research from the Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC, 2018) shows that in Australia the average full-time weekly wage for women is 15.3% less than it is for men, and that retirement age women have about half as much superannuation (read: pension) as men.

Further, only 8.3% of corporate board members are women, half of all women report having experienced sexual harassment in their lifetimes, women do twice as much unpaid care work as men, and one in two mothers report experience of workplace discrimination because they were pregnant. None of this disadvantage accrues to men, certainly not to professional middle-aged white champions.

It is in discussion with my colleague Nareen Young, Professor of Indigenous Policy at University of Technology Sydney, that my views on the male champions were formed. Nareen recently went on record criticizing the male champions for their self-aggrandizing and limited focus on women who aspire to achieve the same class privilege as them. It is as if the champions see themselves as role models for women—irrespective of gender, we can all be "men of power"! Nareen also pointed out that "I'm not sure it's anything more than window dressing, and elevating men for the sake of it, in a discussion that should be led by women" (in Maley, 2019, n.p.).

That men have a responsibility for gender egalitarianism surely it is not for us to aggrandize ourselves as champions or saviors. To do so reproduces the images of heroic masculinity that are a central part of the very problem. Masculine appropriation of feminism and the positioning oneself as a heroic champion bears the real danger of masculinizing feminism, prioritizing men, and bolstering the system of patriarchal power. As Nareen says, the leadership belongs with women.

So, what are men's responsibilities? With the term "responsibility" the question enters into an ethico-political terrain. In discussing the political dimensions of care, political scientist Joan Tronto (2009) explains that, the notion of responsibility implies something different to an obligation that one feels the need to conform to out of duty.

Responsibility, Tronto argues, is about caring for others as part of a cultural practice within a community. Why then should men care about equality, especially when we have profited so much from inequality? Responding to this question positively requires the support of a practice of justice that emerges from caring for other people.

To accept this responsibility, men need to resist the tendency to think of themselves as either change agents for women, their heroic protectors, or their role models. Should men wish to take responsibility for, in Ash's terms, "gender egalitarianism," then the responsibility, however it is actioned, would come from putting oneself second against caring for the needs of others.

Any weak temptation to self-satisfying politically correct moral righteousness is eschewed in favor of a personal politics be committed recognizing, calling out, and addressing the wrong of sexism wherever it arises. This not so much about men identifying as feminists. It is about caring about a just society rather than perpetuating a patriarchal and sexist one.

As hooks put it, feminism is for everybody, so long as our goal is "to create beloved community, to live together, realizing our dreams of freedom and justice, living the truth that we are all 'created equal'" (p. x). It is contributing to this goal in whatever ways they are able that men might, in the spirit of caring for others, find our responsibility.

5 | MUHAMMAD AZFAR NISAR

5.1 | Stop!

Yes! I think that is the first responsibility men have in the feminist project. Too many of us have this delusional self-belief that we can speak for and take over issues—including the feminist project—even when we have neither the relevant knowledge nor the expertise. More importantly, no one is asking us to do so either. In many ways, our masculinity depends on this misguided notion of "taking over." After all, what kind of a man does not take charge or help the women around him (as long as it is not the household chores!). If you do not believe me, ask any man privately and he can tell you for at least an hour all that is wrong with the feminist project and, if the feminists would just listen, he could guide them in bringing a global feminist revolution. That is the crux of what is wrong with the role of men in the feminist project; we feel we know what *real feminism* is and how to achieve it better than women themselves. Everyone knows it: most young men are bold enough to say it; most people of my age are now smart enough to keep it to ourselves or to our close friends; the remaining few lie.

The degree of association between our conception of masculinity and telling women what to do is frightening, at least in the cultural context to which I belong. Men like me grow up watching other men deciding the life course of the women around them. In tribal days, it was a group of men deciding such things. Now we have become more "enlightened," and every man has his own tribe of which he is the master. We are culturally conditioned with the notion that we are supposed to "take charge" and "decide" the fate of our tribe. That is our instinctive response to almost every issue we face, especially when it comes to women around us, who we see as passive others always in need of our help. That is why, the first thing we need to start doing is to stop; stop telling women how to go about the feminist project, how it will ruin the (man's) world, and all our great ideas about gender egalitarianism that are acceptable to men. In general, just stop talking, because while we continue to talk, we won't listen. So, the next time you have an urge to tell a woman supervisor, peer, or student your next great idea to *make feminism great again*, do everyone a favor and stop.

5.2 | Listen!

Yes! I am full of clichés because they are platitudes for a reason. Every man knows that after you tell us to stop talking, we will also stop listening. Any conversation that does not involve us talking is meaningless from our standpoint. This is the second fundamental problem we face and it is partly the reason for why it is so difficult to sell us on all the "crazy" feminist ideas. This is the deal; either we speak, and women listen, or we would rather not have that conversation. No one listens to others in general, but when it comes to the feminist discourse, we have this great ability to become temporarily deaf in a very peculiar manner; our ears will pick up all the ways in which the feminist ideas could threaten the masculine civilization while drowning out all its merits. This selective deafness is a part of the larger pattern of male–female interaction at the workplace. We are often quick to embrace new ideas and controversial opinions of our male colleagues while ignoring or silencing those of our female colleagues. There are complex multiple reasons for this selective deafness, but most have origins in the temple of male ego, which is in perpetual danger of collapse, none more so than a strong independent woman with original ideas. That is why, we often simply refuse to entertain the possibility of women being capable of original thinking.

As someone who is married to a great researcher, I can attest to this fact through personal experience. Whenever I try to tell my colleagues that my wife could give them better advice on a particular topic than I, it seems that I am talking to a wall. Some colleagues are kind enough to remind me on such occasions, "Doctor sahib! You praise your wife a lot." Others pretend that the part of our conversation where I mentioned my wife as an expert simply did not happen. It often seems to me that my mention of her hits an automatic masculine mental defense system that refuses to let through any part of the sentence other than "his wife." It would be hypocritical of me to

only blame my colleagues for doing so. I am equally guilty of entertaining similar thoughts when it comes to my women colleagues. Is that wrong of me to think that? Of course, it is. Though accepting our failings may be the first step in the path towards a more egalitarian workplace. To be honest, I do not have a solution here beyond the superficial recommendation of trying to actively listen while withholding judgment and being cognizant of your responses (verbal, physical, and emotional) to whatever is being said. I am trying to do so. Maybe others could as well.

5.3 | Learn!

Routine conversations, workshops, and presentations often do not allow enough time to properly educate us about the complexities and heterogeneities of the feminist project. Too often, we create a simple homogenized caricature of feminism in our mind which acts as an anchor through which all new information about gender egalitarianism is interpreted. That is why, it is critical that our knowledge about feminism and gender egalitarianism extends beyond listening to a few talks, videos, and reading brochures. This is especially the case for men who want to talk to other men about gender egalitarianism. You are going to be questioned, critiqued, and second-guessed all the way. If you have not taken the time to educate yourself, the shallowness of your knowledge will manifest quickly. Importantly, this will further reinforce the perception among your men colleagues that they somehow "won" and can go about their lives as usual telling others the story of their heroic victory. Therefore, take the time to read excellent works written by women and other non-binary gender group members for audiences of all types. If you need clarity or if something does not make sense, ask a colleague who knows more. It is pretty easy to differentiate a question asked to learn something from one focused on retaliation. Chances are that if you do so, you will understand feminism as an ongoing evolving project and not a preconceived, set-in-stone dogma. The position of advocacy is a difficult one. Do not take it if you are not committed to learning more about it.

5.4 | Act not ACT!

There is an *eros* of knowing something new and meaningful. Ask any researcher or academic the last time they found a fascinating result or learned an interesting new theory. We can't stop telling others about it; we want to shout it from the rooftops, stop people on the sideways and tell them what we found, and broadcast it on national television. That is why, it is critical that once we listen and learn more about feminism, we do not forget the "stop talking" bit. Leave talking about feminism to the women, at least for now. Any self-help book worth its name will tell you that you do not really learn anything till you practice it. That is why, it is important to practice before you preach. Try changing yourself first and see how hard it is before you judge others. If you are not willing to give up your privileges—all of which are accorded to you simply because you were born with a different set of genitalia—expecting others to do the same is not only futile but also disingenuous.

I feel this is the stage where most academics fail. We have listened and we have learnt but we cannot practice. We can tell you all about the nuances of feminist theory but when it comes to our personal or professional lives, we do not want to meaningfully change ourselves. How many of us can say with confidence that we have made the requisite changes in our personal lives by contesting stereotypical gender roles in our family? Will our friends and family laugh at the irony when they hear someone tell them about our speeches and articles about advancing gender egalitarianism? If my own failings and of those colleagues that I know well are any indication, not many. Why? Because it is easier to talk about change than the painful, and often slow, process of actually changing oneself. More importantly, this lazy activism, one that is devoid of any meaningful foundation rooted in personal action, leads to a society in which social causes on which there is broad consensus are inexplicably never achieved. That is why, it bears repeating; practice before you preach.

It goes without saying that the kind of personal action being recommended here includes actively trying to facilitate people, actions, and initiatives focused on gender egalitarianism. However, this action must not place men at the center stage. If you feel it is important to educate a certain group about feminism and gender egalitarianism, ask a woman colleague with more knowledge on the subject to do so. To be clear, I am not advocating a perpetual state of self-doubt. If you want to contribute to an issue related to gender egalitarianism in the meantime, by all means do so; vote, donate money, help change the rules, reaffirm your support to those working for it, and guide others to relevant sources of credible information. In general, be a good role model for gender egalitarianism for your friends, family, and colleagues. But I have seen too many men preaching gender egalitarianism to others while their personal and professional lives are diametrically opposite to the same ideals. That is why, I remain skeptical of advising men to go into the ACTION mode too soon.

Mirroring our significant others is one of the fundamental parts of the mental architecture of humans. We mirror others' actions and words all our lives. It is no wonder that we find more men who are eager to talk about gender egalitarianism and very few who practice it themselves. That is why, I think understanding and doing *action* with a small "*a*" is the most desirable state for men who want to participate in the gender egalitarianism project. I understand the temptation to do more, but I think the world needs more men who are trying to change themselves than they are trying to change others.

At the end, I must clarify two important things about this brief narrative. First, this narrative is more introspective than prescriptive. I struggle with all these issues and this narrative is me trying to think through some of my familiar failings. I do not claim to be in any position to judge or advise others. Second, my thoughts and failings are naturally informed by my unique personal, organizational, and cultural context. They may not be relevant to people from other backgrounds. They might, however, benefit from similar introspective endeavors.

6 | SCOTT TAYLOR AND JANNE TIENARI

In an earlier joint piece of writing (Tienari & Taylor, 2019), we analyzed our different intellectual and embodied positions towards feminism, as men and as scholars. The first position, embodied by Scott in the UK, is to advocate and support feminism as an intellectual and a political project. This also involves skepticism about men adopting the term feminist as an identity marker. The second position, practiced by Janne in Finland, approaches feminism as an inclusive movement and body of knowledge available for men as well as women. This position treats feminism as an important source of social identity for all. We sought throughout to recognize the position of particular privilege from which we write, speak, and act.

We did not attempt to reconcile these different positions and find some form of consensus; we did, however, agree that the specific actions we take become understandable in the light of the conditions that give rise to our different experiences of being (feminist) men. As such, we agreed that the societal and sociocultural contexts where we grow up and live our lives matters, a lot. They are also contextual in another sense—academic publishing is infused with gendered power relations, especially in peer-reviewed journals. Publishing is, as a reviewer for this piece pointed out, a political act which involves exercising voice. This brings specific ironies and dangers when we find men (like us) exercising voice about feminism (like here). As Stephen Heath (1987) argued many years ago, men speaking and writing about feminism raises complex practical–theoretical–political–ethical concerns, haunted by the specter of us engaging in yet another imposition. Silence is an option, but we prefer to try to address what Heath recommends—asking who we are as men, including the sexual determinations of heteronormative masculinity.

This in turn means that any positions presented here should engender (pun intended) a degree of lived, articulated ambivalence, rather than concealment. We often fail in our efforts, as perhaps all men should in relation to feminism for as long as this world continues to reproduce sexism and misogyny through patriarchal structures and cultures. Feminist colleagues let us know when we fail, so that we can try again differently—and

maybe also in better ways. This short essay is an account of some of those attempts, with success and failure written into them.

Different positions and views notwithstanding, and recognizing the problematics of men's relationship to this particular form of activism/theory, we feel very clear about one other aspect of feminism that we did not explore in detail in our previous piece of writing: that we have practical, or practice, responsibilities and roles to play as men in the feminist project. In other words, we both commit to acting as feminist, however problematic that may be in the eyes of others. We have experienced many moments of (self-)doubt. Moving beyond our different subject positions, there are strong similarities in how we aim to do this. We both feel that we can try to work towards feminist goals in research and teaching activities, in our efforts to influence practices in our universities, and in engagement with other actors in society such as business practitioners, NGO (nongovernmental organization) activists, political decision makers, and the media. Importantly, we can also try to work towards feminist goals in the domestic sphere, at home. We think it is worth taking a moment to describe these ideals in action, because that is the space where the intersection of "man" and "feminism" becomes very interesting, as the political–ethical realities of feminism become enmeshed with the knowledge of oneself-as-a-man.

First, we try to respect feminist principles in how we produce knowledge with others. This includes being mindful of whose work we build on, how we cite others' work, and how we treat our research "subjects." We are also mindful of how we write, and how we put together collaborations. We think we have developed ways to collaborate with feminist scholars that help us learn what it means to do feminist research. We also try to respect feminist principles in our editorial work and when we review others' research. We try to be supportive of different voices and alternative ways of writing. None of these actions are straightforward "good things," but we think they provide a start in terms of professional practice.

Second, we try to make a feminist difference in and through our teaching and when we work with doctoral researchers. In Finland, Janne runs a dedicated course on gender, management, and organization (a rare thing to find in the UK), and constantly aims to find ways to engage students in taking gender-related questions seriously. He encourages men as well as women to join in and to learn what working for gender equality in their own lives can mean. Often, Janne avoids confronting students with the term feminism early on, and only gradually lets them figure out for themselves what it can mean and why it may matter to everyone. Janne also supervises master's thesis students and doctoral researchers on gender-related topics, sometimes drawing from feminist theory.

Third, we try to work for more gender equality in our universities. We attempt to engage with everyday practices of recruitment and promotion, for example, challenging dominant discriminatory ways of evaluating and rewarding people's work. We try to intervene when we believe people are being mistreated. For Scott, in particular, this involves engaging in "academic housework," the kind of work activity that tends not to gather professional or institutional recognition—internally oriented commitments such as serving as head of department for a period of time or student-facing work such as degree program management. The fact that we often characterize this kind of work dismissively as "admin" is suggestive of its gendered status; it is, however, crucial in maintaining our professional communities.

Fourth, we try to "act feminist" when we interact with people working in the organizations we study. For Janne, this means collaboration. He uses a different language, translating theoretical ideas to be more accessible for practitioners, and collaborates with an equality and diversity consultant who specializes in such "translation" work. Dealing with the variety of responses to issues related to gender equality has taught Janne to tread lightly at first and to find a way to gradually engage as many people as possible. In his experience, while people in organizations in Finland are often quite open to issues related to gender equality, discussing intersectionalities of gender and race, for example, tends to be much harder.

Fifth, while academic work is curiously similar whatever the context, there are significant differences in the private or domestic spheres of our lives. These have, to state the obvious, a considerable effect on our professional lives. As such, we try to work towards feminist goals at home, as a means of making a feminist difference at work. What this means exactly depends on what we mean by feminist as well as the context where it

takes place. Janne lives in Finland, which enjoys a reputation (relatively speaking) as a gender egalitarian country. Perhaps we could even go as far as to argue that the ethos of gender equality has materialized in a kind of "state feminism." In Finland, women and men tend to be equally, and highly, educated. There is a strong tradition of full-time work for both sexes, with legislation to support it as a right rather than a privilege. The single most crucial element in this is the public day care system for children, subsidized by the state. This makes it possible, at least in principle, for both men and women to combine care and career. To put it another way, welfare state policies such as subsidized day care provision support a dual earner family model, and men's engagement with care responsibilities and fathering is also enabled through parental leave policies. Janne lives in such a family. His wife also works long hours and he, therefore, tries to contribute equally to domestic chores and childcare. According to comparative statistics Finnish men contribute the most at home out of all European countries; however, there is also clear evidence to show that women still do more, taking on what is known as the "double shift" at home.

Scott's approach to this is very similar, in intent, and simultaneously very different, in practice. The UK is one of the least progressive or supportive European countries in terms of state legislation with the aim of encouraging gender equality; it has also seen considerable, sustained, high-profile resistance to the most recent iteration of feminism. The lack of legislation means that parental leave, for example, is premised on the assumption that women will be the primary carers for children, and as the cost of childcare is mostly borne by parents, the result is that men (tending to be paid more) do less of that labor. Resistance to feminism is manifest partly in continuing, sometimes brutal, hostility to women in high-profile, high-status professions, such as politics; and partly in conversations about what constitutes equality, in fora as disparate as the *London Review of Books* and *Twitter*.

Perhaps partly as a result of these contexts, Scott decided some years ago to concentrate on acting feminist through housework—academic housework and domestic housework. He finds both of these activities enjoyable and tedious—there is something satisfying about completing academic housework well if it has a positive outcome for colleagues or students, and domestic labor can bring a sense of contentment in inhabiting a tidy space, or providing tasty food prepared from scratch.

There is an odd underlying puzzle to this particular intersection of feminism and men. The gendering of specific kinds of labor has, in a practical sense, no meaningful foundation—anyone can cook, wash dishes, organize departmental seminars, or negotiate academic workload allocations. Nonetheless, it is still unusual for household labor to be divided equally, and the majority of academic housework continues to fall to women. The only explanation can be status, or assumed status—the possibility that, as Ursula le Guin put it in her novel *Tehanu*, a man's dignity can be so fragile that it hangs by a dishcloth if he picks it up.

This then is a list of spheres of life that we think offer spaces where we, and all men, can act for and with feminism. It is also something that has been difficult to write—it is self-exposing in a way that much great feminist writing is, but men rarely engage in, and it involves the danger of reducing feminism to something problematic *for men*. It might also be interpreted as us presenting evidence of our goodness, in a competitive way, even—exercising our voices to indicate virtue. Those readings would mean a complete failure to communicate on our part. In all spheres, we seek to avoid performing an individualistic and aggressively competitive masculinity when we interact with others. We have seen a great deal of this in our professional lives, including among male colleagues who engage with critical scholarship, gender studies, and feminist theory. We sometimes fail in our efforts, but we are always, increasingly, conscious of the position from which we speak and act. We try to understand how we contribute to and practice masculinist discourses, and we try to learn how we can work for change in our local communities and beyond. We try to be cautious of speaking too loudly, too frequently, or with assumed author-ity. Above all, we try to understand, enact, and embody feminism as its object and subject. It is simultaneously complex and simple, easy, and impossible. There are no simple answers to the questions asked in the introduction of this piece, but it is important to try to think, listen, learn, and act, irrespective of the context where we find ourselves.

7 | OZAN NADIR ALAKAVUKLAR

7.1 | Who am I to talk about gender inequality and feminism as a "man"?

It is not an easy task to write about gender inequality and feminism as a man. As I start this narrative, I have feelings of insecurity due to entering a territory in which I am not sure where to stand/I stand. While I feel aligned with the feminist mission of challenging patriarchy and problematizing inequalities, I am, at the end of the day, a "man" who is favored and privileged by the prevailing economic, symbolic, and political structures of society. Although I may argue that I am not one of the members of the "boys club" writing the rules of the game (Alvesson & Billing, 1992), inevitably I am perceived as the embodied representation of the phallocentric discourse, which *naturally* makes things easier for me as a "man" (Fotaki, 2011). Nevertheless, thanks to feminism(s) and their intervention into daily practices and knowledge production as not only an intellectual/theoretical initiative but as a project for social change, I am able to see how society is organized in ways that favor men and the masculine, and I am also imparted with the language and the tools to problematize my own socially constructed gender identity (see Bell et al., 2019).

My uneasiness still remains. When I talk about anything related to feminism(s), feminist struggle, and gender inequality, it feels like I involuntarily appropriate the term which does not belong to me and to which I am not entitled. Therefore, I will refrain from calling myself a feminist. However, would arguing that I am one of the "othered" in the academy legitimize my self to speak about such matters as gender inequality and the role of men to eradicate it? Indeed, juxtaposed against the dominant subject position of the masculine, competitive, middle-aged European/American academic, as a non-Western, non-native English-speaking, and emerging critical scholar (Alakavuklar, 2017), can I support and collaborate in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism? Would the subjectivities that cut across my "masculinity" allow me to write/talk about gender inequality?

I am a son of a trade unionist and a feminist (now retired) high school teacher who has always believed in the power of organizing people. Her daily practices and interactions taught me to share the responsibilities at home, be sensitive to and receptive of gender inequalities in society, and live/work alongside women as equals (despite the patriarchal norms in Turkish society, from where I come).

However, this is not a perfect story. Through my mom, I have also witnessed the endless struggle of being a feminist in a traditional society, which inevitably imposes specific gender roles and responsibilities upon women. These are mostly based on unpaid domestic labor including, but not limited to, tending to children, cooking regularly, and coordinating household activities generally. I could sense how traditional gender-based expectations informed by a phallocentric discourse infiltrated through various structural mechanisms/institutions including work, the profession, and a large family, which inevitably created tensions for family members of both genders at home.

For more than 10 years, I have been married to a determinate and justice-oriented woman. Despite our best intentions as a couple, it is unknown to me to what extent we are able to challenge and transform the established status quo that defines the relationship between men and women and the roles expected of each. I cannot help but ask, whether as a son or a husband, I have done enough to help support my mom and partner/wife to fulfill their dreams, aspirations, and ambitions? If I am for gender egalitarianism, what kind of equality can we speak of in a capitalist economy that relentlessly demands of us a form of "social reproduction" that mandates significant unrecognized labor from women? Can partnership/marriage ever be emancipatory in a world where gender inequality is widespread and reinforced by patriarchy and neoliberal capitalism?

As a scholar, I have been working with women whom I consider friends, colleagues, and leaders since 2005. Through their collegiality and leadership, but more importantly, being feminists, I have learned a lot. From them I have learned the importance of speaking out against gendered injustices, being radical, critical and direct, denaturalizing gendered relations, and unmasking power relations whenever/wherever possible. The more I work with women, the more I have become aware of the gender-related challenges they experience with(in) current power systems. Navigating these challenges requires them to commit significant amounts of physical, emotional, and affective labor (something men are far less likely to encounter). This has led me to ask: How can I confront and

challenge the hegemonic, competitive, and masculine academic culture creating a toxic and abusive culture not only for women, but also for other "others"? Do I engage enough with gender inequality in the class? Or, do I cite women researchers enough in my studies?

As the above discussion has suggested, I am the product of various political structures/struggles replete with tensions that have shaped my own relation with masculinity, femininity, and gender relations in different realms/stages of life—being a son and a husband; having lived in different countries with a common problem of gender inequality; and working in the academy, which is dominated by racialized and masculinist values. While acknowledging my own gender-related privileges as well as my marginalization (in relation to certain assumptions of hegemonic masculinity [Connell, 2005]), in my remaining space, I will consider the role of "comradeship" for men to move towards gender egalitarianism.

7.2 | Comradeship as feminist praxis

Gender inequality is everyone's problem and everyone's responsibility to dismantle. Building a comradeship with feminist struggle is a tangible move that I have been committed to in my own life—acting/fighting together against the oppression(s), speaking out against gendered (and other) injustices, and opening up space together for feminist praxis in different spheres of life.

Comradeship begins at home. Traditional gender roles are hardly present at the home my wife and I have made. My wife and I act together so as to negate the gendered inequalities found outside of the home. This materializes in what we consider to be a fair distribution of labor: both of us spend quality time with our son, share cooking responsibilities, clean the house, coordinate household activities, and maintain personal space and time.

In the academy, I also work towards building comradeship with my women colleagues. Through all the opportunities that I have (in the various teaching, research, and service roles I occupy), not only do I try to promote feminist praxis and defend its gains, but I also aim to be vocal about gender inequalities as much as I can in courses, committee meetings, conferences, and daily interactions. In the courses, for instance, while we study organizational issues, I am sure to ask how the case would be different if the gender of the protagonist changes from a man to a woman, or vice versa; or, I invite students to reflect on gendered inequality in organizations to raise this issue to the level of consciousness. At work, I pay attention to how my women colleagues feel about the tasks they assume or are allocated, department decisions that are made, and how their research is received by others. Such consideration not only helps me learn how gender inequality affects daily experience, but it also leads me to take action alongside them as an academic-activist concerned about social justice. In this vein, I am involved in various actions with my women colleagues to establish official mechanisms for prevention and/or report of sexual harassment in different academic platforms; prioritize gender balance of speakers/participants in the events I/we organize; problematize and speak out together about sexist, racist, and discriminative practices through research and/or other mediums.

I believe that comradeship is critical because it establishes an important alliance from where *we*, I alongside women comrades, can fight together in favor of a common goal. I see this as an opportunity to work towards a fair and just world as a collective in solidarity (to echo the call of Pullen, Lewis, & Ozkazanc-Pan, 2019)—however challenging, though, the task may be. In short, for me, as a man, I seek to create more spaces for comradeship between men and women. This will challenge not only structures of patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity, but also neoliberal capitalism through different practices of resistance and struggle.

I finish my reflection with a Turkish song called "olur/olmaz"[3] which is the product of a feminist collective political act (Öğüt, 2018) performed by Bandsista from Turkey. Dare I invite my men friends/colleagues join me singing this song alongside women to contribute to their praxis and build comradeship?

Olur/olmaz	Lets/not
Gelsin baba gelsin koca gelsin	Be it the father, be it the husband
Polisiniz devletiniz gelsin	Be it their police, be it their state
Bakanınız haklarımı versin	Your minister giving me rights
Aman istemem üzeri kalsın	No thanks, keep the change
Ev işlerini marslılar yapsın	Martians can do the housework
Cadıysam süpürge bana kalsın	Since I'm a witch, I'll keep the broom
Olursa çocuk yaparım olsun	I'll give birth, if I want
İstemezsem soyları kurusun	And if I don't, let the human race become extinct!
Çitmişim ben çekirdek aileyi	I nick the family unit
Kırmışım kendi testimi	I live by my own sword
Bundan böyle ne bacı ne bayan	From now on neither madam nor lady
Hayatta olmam ben adam	Don't look at me to find decency
Cinayetinize sessiz kalmaz	She won't stay silent to your murders
Yastık değildir, köşede durmaz	You can't just sweep her under the rug
Kol kırılsa yen içinde kalmaz	You can't just wish it away
Tarih yazar figüran olmaz	She'll write history not be its spectator
Çevir dünyayı tersine dönsün	Turn the world in upside-down
Seni dövemez dizini dövsün	He'll beat himself not you
Kızkardeşlerin sesini duysun	Let your sisters hear your voice
Kadınlar sokaklara dökülsün	Women, let's hit the streets
Bundan böyle duramam ben evde	No longer can I stay at home
Sokağa özgürleşmeye	To the streets, to become free
Bundan böyle ne bacı ne bayan	Neither madam nor lady
Hayatta olmam ben adam	Don't look at me to find decency
Lyrics: Bandsista	Translation: Aylin Kuryel

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Banu Ozkazanc-Pan, Alison Pullen, and the reviewers for their thoughtful guidance and encouragement of this article. This article was a collaborative effort and the ordering of authorship reflects only the order in which the narratives appear.

ORCID

Ajnesh Prasad https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4368-1796
Carl Rhodes https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6571-2872
Muhammad Azfar Nisar https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7201-3829
Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9515-5237

ENDNOTES

[1] Certain unexpected crises, such as COVID-19, have exposed myriad pre-existing social inequalities that are exacerbated by the crises (Alcadipani, 2020; Prasad, 2020; Wasdani & Prasad, 2020). In the case of academia, preliminary findings suggest that COVID-19 has only compounded the pre-existing gendered division of domestic and affective labor and, thereby, generated differential outcomes for women and men in terms of research productivity. This is evident by the fact that while in "normal times" women scholars are cited far less than men scholars even when controlling for journal "quality" (Ferber & Brun, 2011; Maliniak, Powers, & Walter, 2013), with the emergence of COVID-19 submissions of manuscripts to journals in the social sciences and humanities by women have plummeted, submissions of manuscripts by men have risen (Flaherty, 2020).

[2] Feminist scholars have long identified how women's bodies are silenced or otherwise objectified in discourses that paradoxically focus on their bodies yet are engaged in by men. Spivak (1988) captured this point in presenting her argument that the voice of the *sati*—the self-immolated widow—was silenced during the 19th-centruy debates related to the practice between two groups of men: British imperialists and Indian bourgeois nationalists. Following a similar narrative, Abu-Lughod (2002) explains how the post-9/11 war on Afghanistan was cloaked in a masculinist discourse on the urgency to save Afghani women from the barbarities of their culture. In both cases, the narrative that emerged as Spivak captured it, is: "*White men saving brown women from brown men*." Many of these ideas were recently engaged with thoughtfully by Jamjoom (2020).

[3] "Inspired by one of the slogans coined at the end of the 1990s by the feminist movement in Turkey, this song is a mischievous rebellion against the male dominance that infuses everyday practices; against sexism and the 'household work' it imposes; against the 'nuclear family' as the site of oppression, sexism, moralism, violence and exploitation. It is a call to organizing and struggle; a call to the street and the square towards writing our own histories" (Bandsista, 2012). The song is available on the official web page of Bandsista under the album *sokak, meydan, gece*: https://bandista.org/albumz/

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, L. (2002). Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others. *American Anthropologists*, *104*(3), 783–790.

Ahonen, P., Blomberg, A., Doerr, K., Einola, K., Elkina, A., Gao, G., … Zhang, L. E. (2020). Writing resistance together. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *27*(4), 447–470.

AHRC. (2018). *Face the facts: Gender equality 2018*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission.

Alakavuklar, O. N. (2017). Labour of becoming a (critical) management scholar: Ambivalences, tensions and possibilities. *Ephemera*, *17*(3), 641–651.

Alamgir, F., & Alakavuklar, O. N. (2020). Compliance codes and women workers' (mis)representation and (non)recognition in the apparel industry of Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *165*(2), 295–310.

Alcadipani, R. (2020). Pandemic and macho organizations: Wake-up call or business as usual? *Gender, Work and Organization*, *27*(5), 734–746.

Alcadipani, R., & Faria, A. (2014). Fighting Latin American marginality in "international business." *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, *10*(1–2), 107–117.

Alcadipani, R., Khan, F. R., Gantman, E., & Nkomo, S. (2012). Southern voices in management and organization knowledge. *Organization*, *19*(2), 131–143.

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (1992). Gender and organization: Towards a differentiated understanding. *Organization Studies*, *13*(1), 73–103.

Auster, E. R., & Prasad, A. (2016). Why do women still not make it to the top? Dominant organizational ideologies and biases by promotion committees limit opportunities to destination positions. *Sex Roles*, *75*(5–6), 177–196.

Bandsista. (2012). *Sokak, meydan, gece*. Istanbul, Turkey: Author.

Bell, E., Merilainen, S., Taylor, S., & Tienari, J. (2019). Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. *Human Relations*, *72*(1), 4–22.

Bristow, A., Robinson, S., & Ratle, O. (2017). Being an early-career CMS academic in the context of insecurity and "excellence": The dialectics of resistance and compliance. *Organization Studies*, *38*(9), 1185–1207.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1989). Using the F word: Feminist theories and the social consequences of organizational research. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *1989*(1), 355–359.

Carpenter, J. (2018, November 12). Justin Trudeau is a feminist. For him, that's a given. *CNN Business*. Retrieved from https://edition.cnn.com/2018/11/12/success/justin-trudeau-feminism/index.html

Cixous, H. (1976). The laugh of the Medusa. *Signs*, *1*(4), 875–893.

Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Cullen, D. (1997). Maslow, monkeys and motivation theory. *Organization*, *4*(3), 355–373.
Cullen, D. (2002). From orgasms to organizations: Maslow, women's sexuality and the gendered foundations of the needs hierarchy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *9*(5), 537–555.
Ferber, M. A., & Brun, M. (2011). The gender gap in citations: Does it persist. *Feminist Economics*, *17*(1), 151–158.
Fernando, D., & Prasad, A. (2019). Sex-based harassment and organizational silencing: How women are led to reluctant acquiescence in academia. *Human Relations*, *72*(10), 1565–1594.
Flaherty, C. (2020, April 21). No room of one's own. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/21/early-journal-submission-data-suggest-covid-19-tanking-womens-research-productivity
Fotaki, M. (2011). The sublime object of desire (and knowledge): Sexuality at work in business and management schools in England. *British Journal of Management*, *22*(1), 42–53.
Frye, M. (1997). Some reflections on separation and power. In D. T. Meyers (Ed.), *Feminist social thought: A reader* (pp. 407–414). New York, NY: Routledge.
Gilmore, S., Harding, N., Helin, J., & Pullen, A. (2019). Writing differently. *Management Learning*, *50*(1), 3–10.
Grey, C., & Sinclair, A. (2006). Writing differently. *Organization*, *13*(3), 443–453.
Haraway, D. (1997). A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s. In D. T. Meyers (Ed.), *Feminist social thought: A reader* (pp. 502–531). New York, NY: Routledge.
Hardin, M. (2002). Altering masculinities: The Spanish conquest and the evolution of the Latin American machismo. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies*, *7*(1), 1–22.
Heath, S. (1987). Men in feminism: Men and feminist theory. In A. Jardine & P. Smith (Eds.), *Men in feminism* (pp. 41–46). London, UK: Routledge.
hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
Hopfl, H. (2000). The suffering mother and the miserable son: Organizing women and organizing women's writing. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *7*(2), 98–105.
Irigaray, L. (1977). *This sex which is not one*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Jamjoom, L. A. (2020). *The narratives of Saudi women leaders in the workplace: A postcolonial feminist study* (PhD dissertation). St Mary's University, Halifax, Canada.
Kiriakos, C. M., & Tiernari, J. (2018). Academic writing as love. *Management Learning*, *49*(3), 263–277.
Lund, R., Merilainen, S., & Tienari, J. (2019). New masculinities in universities: Discourses, ambivalence and potential change. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *26*(10), 1376–1397.
Maas, M. K., McCauley, H. L., Bonomi, A. E., & Leija, S. G. (2018). "I was grabbed by my pussy and its #NotOkay": A Twitter backlash against Donald Trump's degrading commentary. *Violence Against Women*, *24*(14), 1739–1750.
Maher, R. (2019). Pragmatic community resistance within new indigenous ruralities: Lessons from a failed hydropower dam in Chile. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *68*, 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.03.009
Male Champions of Change. (2019). About us. *Male Champions of Change*. Retrieved from https://malechampionsofchange.com/about-us/
Maley, J. (2019). How Elizabeth Broderick is taking soft-power feminism to the world. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from https://www.smh.com.au/national/how-elizabeth-broderick-is-taking-soft-power-feminism-to-the-world-20190204-p50vko.html
Maliniak, D., Powers, R., & Walter, B. F. (2013). The gender citation gap in the social sciences. *International Organization*, *67*(4), 889–922.
Malo, S. (2016, March 17). Trudeau defends focus on gender equality at U.N. women summit. *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-canada-women-trudeau/trudeau-defends-focus-on-gender-equality-at-u-n-women-summit-idUSKCN0WI2R0
Mandalaki, E. (in press). Searching for "home," writing to find it: A reflexive account on experiences of othering in life and academia in times of generalized crises. *Gender, Work and Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12570
Mandalaki, E., & Daou, E. (in press). (Dis)embodied encounters between art and academic writing amid a pandemic. *Gender, Work and Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12499
Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *boundary 2*, *12*(3), 333–358.
Muhr, S. L., & Rehn, A. (2015). On gendered technologies and cyborg writing. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *22*(2), 129–138.
Nisar, M. A. (2018). (Un)Becoming a man: Legal consciousness of the third gender category in Pakistan. *Gender & Society*, *32*(1), 59–81.
Öğüt, E. H. (2018). Cultural production as a political act: Two feminist songs from Istanbul. In A. Dillane, M. J. Power, E. Devereux, & A. Haynes (Eds.), *Songs of social protest: International perspectives* (pp. 271–287). London, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2019). On agency and empowerment in a #MeToo world. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *26*(8), 1212–1220.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Phillips, M., Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. (2014). Writing organization as gendered practice: Interrupting the libidinal economy. *Organization Studies*, *35*(3), 313–333.

Prasad, A. (2013). Playing the game and trying not to lose myself: A doctoral student's perspective on the institutional pressures for research output. *Organization*, *20*(6), 936–948.

Prasad, A. (2012). Beyond analytical dichotomies. *Human Relations*, *65*(5), 567–595.

Prasad, A. (2014). Corporeal ethics in an ethnographic encounter: A tale of embodiment from the occupied Palestinian territories. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *30*(4), 525–531.

Prasad, A. (2015). Liminal transgressions, or where should the critical academy go from here? Reimagining the future of doctoral education to engender research sustainability. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *26*, 108–116.

Prasad, A. (2016). Cyborg writing as a political act: Reading Donna Haraway in organization studies. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *23*(4), 431–446.

Prasad, A. (2020). The organization of ideological discourse in times of unexpected crisis: Explaining how COVID-19 is exploited by populist leaders. *Leadership*, *16*(3), 294–302.

Prasad, A., & Zulfiqar, G. (in press). Resistance and praxis in the making of feminist solidarity: A conversation with Cynthia Enloe. *Gender, Work and Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12521

Pullen, A. (2006). Gendering the research self: Social practice and corporeal multiplicity in the writing of organizational research. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *13*(3), 277–298.

Pullen, A. (2018). Writing as labiaplasty. *Organization*, *25*(1), 123–130.

Pullen, A., Lewis, P., & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2019). A critical moment: 25 years of gender, work and organization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *26*(1), 1–8.

Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. (2014). Corporeal ethics and the politics of resistance in organizations. *Organization*, *21*(6), 782–796.

Raineri, N. (2015). Business doctoral education as a liminal period of transition: Comparing theory and practice. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *26*, 99–107.

Ratle, O., Robinson, S., Bristow, A., & Kerr, R. (2020). Mechanisms of micro-terror: Early career CMS academics' experiences of "targets of terror" in contemporary business schools. *Management Learning*, *51*(4), 452–471.

Rhodes, C. (2000). Reading and writing organizational lives. *Organization*, *7*(1), 7–29.

Rhodes, C. (2019). Sense-ational organization theory! Practices of democratic scriptology. *Management Learning*, *50*(1), 24–37.

Ruddick, S. (1980). Maternal thinking. *Feminist Studies*, *6*(2), 342–367.

Segarra, P., & Prasad, A. (2018). How does corporeality inform theorizing? Revisiting Hannah Arendt and the banality of evil. *Human Studies*, *41*(4), 545–563.

Segarra, P., & Prasad, A. (2020). Colonization, migration, and right-wing extremism: The constitution of embodied life of a dispossessed immigrant woman. *Organization*, *27*(1), 174–187.

Shadnam, M., Bykov, A., & Prasad, A. (in press). Opening constructive dialogues between business ethics research and the sociology of morality. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04638-7

Sinclair, A. (2019). Five movements in an embodied feminism: A memoir. *Human Relations*, *72*(1), 144–158.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Tienari, J., & Taylor, S. (2019). Feminism and men: Ambivalent space for acting up. *Organization*, *26*(6), 948–960.

Tomkins, L., & Ulus, E. (2015). Is narcissism undermining critical reflection in business schools? *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *14*(4), 595–606.

Tronto, J. C. (2009). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethics of care*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ulus, E. (in press). Transferential loss: Unconscious dynamics of love, learning, and grieving. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0404

Ulus, E. (2018). White fantasy, white betrayals: On neoliberal "feminism" in the US presidential election process. *Ephemera*, *18*(1), 161–181.

Vachhani, S. (2019). Rethinking the politics of writing differently through écriture feminine. *Management Learning*, *50*(1), 11–23.

Vigoya, M. V. (2001). Contemporary Latin American perspectives on masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, *3*(3), 237–260.

Wasdani, K. P., & Prasad, A. (2020). The impossibility of social distancing among the urban poor: The case of an Indian slum in the times of COVID-19. *Local Environment*, *25*(5), 414–418.

Zulfiqar, G., & Prasad, A. (in press). Challenging social inequality in the Global South: Class, privilege, and consciousness-raising through critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2019.0294

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Ajnesh Prasad earned his PhD in Organization Studies from York University's Schulich School of Business. His research interests broadly focus on social inequality, gender and diversity issues in organizations, and interpretive methods. His most recent book is entitled *Autoethnography and Organization Research: Reflections from Fieldwork in Palestine* (2019). Among his editorial roles include being Associate Editor at Human Relations and *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Research Integrity Editor at *Jounral of Business Ethics*, and Reviews Editor at *Organization*. He is currently serving in the final year of a 5-year term as co-chair of the Critical Management Studies division at the Academy of Management. His current research is supported by an Insight Development Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Canada Research Chairs program (email: ajnesh_prasad@yahoo.ca).

Alejandro Centeno is a doctoral candidate at EGADE Business School, Tecnologico de Monterrey in Mexico City. He is currently working on his dissertation focused on the work experiences of men in the modeling industry (email: arcenteno@outlook.com).

Carl Rhodes is Professor of Organization Studies at UTS Business School in Sydney, Australia. His research critically investigates ethico-political dimensions of organizations and working life, with a special focus on justice, equality, resistance, dissent, and democracy. This work endeavors to contribute to the rigorous and critical questioning and reformulation of what the purpose of work organizations in the context of persistent neoliberal and populist attacks on democracy. His most recent books are *Disturbing Business Ethics: Emmanuel Levinas and the Politics of Organization* (Routledge, 2019) and *CEO Society: The Corporate Takeover of Everyday Life* (Zed, 2018, with Peter Bloom). Carl sits on the editorial boards of the journals *Gender, Work and Organization*, *Human Relations*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Organization*, and *Organization Studies* (email: carl.rhodes@uts.edu.au).

Muhammad Azfar Nisar is Assistant Professor at the Suleman Dawood School of Business at Lahore University of Management Sciences. He was a medical doctor and then a civil servant before finding refuge in the academy. He is primarily interested in questions related to social marginalization, street-level bureaucracy, gender identity, and policy implementation. His research has been published in *Gender & Society*, *Gender, Work and Organization*, *Organization*, *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *Public Administration Review*, *Administration & Society*, *International Journal of Public Administration*, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *International Journal of Administrative Sciences*, and *Public Administration & Development*, among others (email: azfar.nisar@lums.edu.pk).

Scott Taylor is Reader in Leadership & Organization Studies at Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham, UK. His current research focuses on resistance to positive discrimination interventions, and the intersection of feminism with established fields such as business history or corporate social responsibility. His teaching is mostly with undergraduate groups, often in leadership studies. He is a Section Editor at the *Journal of Business Ethics*, and has published research in a range of journals and edited collections (email: s.taylor@bham.ac.uk).

Janne Tienari is Professor of Management and Organization at Hanken School of Economics, Finland. His research and teaching interests include gender studies, feminist theory, strategy work, managing multinational

corporations, mergers and acquisitions, branding and media, and changing academia from a critical perspective. He is Senior Editor of *Organization Studies*. His work has been published in leading journals such as *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Science*, *Organization Studies*, *Organization*, *Human Relations*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of World Business*, and *Gender, Work and Organization* (email: jtienari@hanken.fi).

Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar is Associate Professor in the School of Governance at Utrecht University, The Netherlands. He is interested in alternative organizing, activism, and social change. His research, which is usually a product of collegial and collective scholarship, has been published in *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Gender, Work and Organization*, *Culture and Organization*, and *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*. He is a member of the editorial collective of *ephemera* and the Academy of Management CMS division executive team (email: o.n.alakavuklar@uu.nl).

How to cite this article: Prasad A, Centeno A, Rhodes C, et al. What are men's roles and responsibilities in the feminist project for gender egalitarianism? *Gender Work Organ*. 2021;28:1579–1599. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12573