

Dangerous knowledge

Bell, Emma; Meriläinen, Susan ; Taylor, Scott; Tienari, Janne

DOI:

[10.1111/ijmr.12221](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12221)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Bell, E, Meriläinen, S, Taylor, S & Tienari, J 2020, 'Dangerous knowledge: the political, personal, and epistemological promise of feminist research in management and organization studies', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12221>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Bell, E., Meriläinen, S., Taylor, S. and Tienari, J. (2020), Dangerous Knowledge: The Political, Personal, and Epistemological Promise of Feminist Research in Management and Organization Studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22: 177-192. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12221, which has been published in final form at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12221>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Dangerous knowledge: The political, personal, and epistemological promise of feminist research in management and organization studies

Accepted for publication in International Journal of Management Reviews, 16/01/2020

Emma Bell, Open University, UK

Susan Meriläinen, University of Lapland, Finland

Scott Taylor, University of Birmingham, UK

Janne Tienari, Hanken School of Economics, Finland

Abstract

Feminism is a theoretical perspective and a social movement that seek to reduce, and ultimately eradicate, sexist inequality and oppression. Yet feminist research remains marginal in the most prestigious management and organization studies (MOS) journals, as defined by the Financial Times 50 (FT50) list. Based on a review of how feminism is framed in these journals (1990-2018) we identify three overlapping categories of how feminism is represented: (i) as a conceptual resource which is used to address specific topics; (ii) as an empirical category associated with the study of specific types of organization or organizing practice; and, rarely, (iii) as a methodology for producing knowledge. While feminist knowledge exists beyond these parameters, such as in the journal *Gender, Work & Organization*, we suggest that the relative absence of explicitly feminist scholarship in the most prestigious MOS journals reflects an epistemic oppression which arises from the threat that feminism presents to established ways of knowing. We use the ‘sweaty concept’ of dangerous knowledge to show how feminism positions knowledge as personal, introducing a radical form of researcher subjectivity which relies on the acknowledgment of uncertainty. We conclude by calling for the epistemic oppression of feminist scholarship to be recognized and redressed so the potential of feminism as a way of knowing about organizations and management can be realized. This we argue, would enable feminist research praxis in MOS to develop as an alternative location of healing that challenges the main/malestream.

Keywords: Feminism; politics of knowledge production; epistemic oppression; management and organization studies; dangerous knowledge.

Acknowledgements: we would like to thank Associate Editor, Alison Pullen, and the three reviewers, for their support in developing this manuscript. The arguments presented here also benefitted from thoughtful comments from participants in the 10th International Critical Management Studies Conference ‘The Future of Feminisms’ sub-theme.

Introduction

Feminism offers a way of understanding, responding to, challenging and changing the marginalization, exclusion and oppression of women in political, economic, organizational and social life (hooks 1984; Walby 2011). Feminist scholarship is characterized by an inherent commitment to social change, critiquing and challenging established power relations, including androcentric intellectual rationalizations of exclusion and violence which are misogynistic and patriarchal (Manne 2018). It envisions unique theoretical and practical possibilities to engage in activism in order to try to realize radical change (Enloe 2017; Simpson 2006; Snitow 2015). Feminism thereby goes beyond seeking to establish and maintain the rights of women, to benefit all who suffer from sexist oppression, regardless of biological sex or socially constructed gender roles (Rose 2014).

While feminism has a presence in management and organization studies (MOS), its position remains marginal, despite the ‘riches’ (Fotaki and Harding 2018, p. 12) offered by feminist theory as a way of understanding organizations and management. In seeking to explain this paradox, scholars note the dominant mainstream or ‘malestream’ (O’Brien 1981) approach to scholarship (Pullen and Rhodes 2015) that creates a masculinized libidinal knowledge economy (Phillips *et al.* 2014) in MOS. The marginalization of feminism in MOS is also associated with the privileging of masculine perspectives and men’s experiences. Consequently, much MOS theory is founded on incorrect generalizations based on studies of men, which are assumed to be applicable to women and women’s experiences (Wilson 2003). The contemporary rise of (Western) ‘fourth-wave’ feminism, in response to the persistent gendered and racialized structuring of society appears to have had limited impact within MOS (Bell *et al.* 2019), . This article seeks to understand the reasons for the continued marginalization of feminism in MOS by reflecting on dominant practices of knowledge production and the threat that feminism poses to these.

We begin by reviewing explicitly feminist research published in MOS journals listed in the *Financial Times 50*¹ (FT50) list between 1990 and 2018. The FT50 is important in defining the boundaries of the dominant epistemic community of MOS because the theories, methodologies and empirical contexts represented in these journals provide the basis for understanding what is legitimate and appreciated within the discipline. Rankings like the FT50 provide temporally specific markers of socio-historical and geo-political power relations that shape judgements about what is considered ‘excellent’ knowledge and the extent to which it is seen as theoretically and practically useful (Mingers and Willmott 2013; Butler and Spoelstra 2014). Journal rankings are a key aspect

of the ‘conditions through which we do our work’ as knowledge producers (Fotaki and Harding 2018, p. 12), illustrating the specific disciplinary and performative effects of audit cultures and professional metrics. They thus play a key role in shaping established norms of knowledge production in MOS, and positioning work which does not conform to these normative practices as deviant, abnormal or other.

We focus on articles published in prestigious MOS journals that engage explicitly with feminism and show how feminism has been constrained in this field. We compare and contrast this with a review of feminist scholarship in *Gender, Work & Organization* (GWO), a journal that has consistently engaged with feminism. We use the term ‘dangerous knowledge’ to explore the political (Stanley 1990), personal (Ahmed 2017) and uncertain (Snitow 2015) nature of knowledge production, and to show how dangerous feminist knowledge threatens to undermine the epistemological resilience (Dotson 2014) of dominant ways of knowing that serve a minority at the expense of the majority. Through this we argue for a feminist research praxis in MOS that provides an alternative that can help to heal a main/malestream which is damaging to epistemological diversity and the potential of MOS.

Feminist ways of knowing and epistemic oppression

Philosophically and politically, feminism provides a way of asking difficult questions that no other way of thinking can imagine need to be asked, in order to bring ‘the permanent scandal of a shamefully unequal world to our attention’ (Rose 2014, p. 191). Feminism’s challenge to MOS extends beyond issues of equity or equality of recognition and reaches into the epistemological and ontological core of knowledge production processes. Epistemologically, this involves critiquing scientific norms that are constructed as value neutral (Harding 1991) and are inherently supportive of the gendered status quo. By challenging prevailing methodological norms, feminism enables the pursuit of a more transformative research agenda (Lather 1991). Feminist critiques of the ‘epistemological monoculture’ that characterizes Western scientific practice draw attention to the partiality of our ways of seeing how knowledge is made (Code 2006). The post-positivist tradition of feminist inquiry emphasizes the inevitable embeddedness of knowledge and the impossibility of using the ‘correct’, scientific method to obtain unbiased, ‘true results’ (Lather 1991, p. 51). Understanding feminism as an approach to knowing extends beyond female-feminist concerns and invites engagement with issues of social justice and the politics of knowledge production (Code 2006). In this way, feminism offers a way of confronting ‘science as usual’ (Harding 1991) as

maintained through epistemic oppression (Dotson 2014) in order to enable practices of knowledge production to be better understood and challenged.

Based on the review of how feminism is characterized in prestigious MOS journals that follows, we suggest that the dominant epistemic community of MOS is resistant to feminist ways of knowing. To explain this, we introduce the idea of ‘dangerous knowledge’. Dotson (2014) shows how challenging testimonies may be rejected as ‘nonsensical’ by members of a dominant epistemic community. This relies on designating the one who testifies ‘as a deceiver with *dangerous ideas*’ (p. 130, emphasis added). Dangerous knowledge is a ‘sweaty concept’ (Ahmed 2017) that is embedded in the description of a situation and offers a response to it that is oriented towards action and change, rather than an abstract notion derived from philosophical debate. As Ahmed (2017, p13) explains:

A concept is worldly, but it is also a reorientation to a world, a way of turning things around, a different slant on the same thing. More specifically, a sweaty concept is one that comes out of a description of a body that is not at home in the world. By this I mean description as an angle or point of view: a description of how it feels not to be at home in the world from the point of view of not being at home in it.

The sweaty concept of dangerous knowledge shows how feminist research is made to feel not ‘at home’ in prestigious journals in our field. We suggest that the silencing and marginalization of feminism in MOS is related to its disruptive potential in destabilizing the established social order of knowledge production that relies on publication in prestigious journals and privileges a small yet powerful minority. Bringing this pattern of exclusion into view encourages a questioning of what is normal within MOS, by queering mainstream or dominant norms (Rumens *et al.* 2019). We begin in the next section by reviewing the position of feminist knowledge in mainstream MOS.

Feminism in main/malestream MOS journals

The FT50 journal list is used in business schools globally as a proxy for high quality MOS research. Definitions of what counts as ‘excellent’ knowledge are increasingly linked to the ranking of the journal in which scholarship is published (Mingers and Willmott 2013; Butler and Spoelstra 2014). Our review focuses on the 15 journals² in this list categorized as ‘management’ or ‘organization studies’. We searched for articles published between 1990 and 2018 with ‘feminis~’ in title, abstract or keywords³. A limitation of this approach is that it does not account for articles which do not

explicitly refer to feminism, yet draw on and contribute to feminist scholarship (e.g. Fondas 1997; Godfrey *et al.* 2012). Publishing feminist research without flagging it through title, abstract, or keywords is, we suggest, indicative of implicit feminist scholarship. Implicit feminism can arise in hostile environments, as a strategic response to a situation where the dominant group positions feminism as marginal, illegitimate, and politically problematic (Giffort 2011). The practice of implicit feminist scholarship in MOS potentially reflects specific disciplinary effects of peer review processes on feminist scholarship, where work that differs from the mainstream is likely to be desk rejected or watered down in multiple rounds of revision, becoming ‘faint shadows’ of the original submission (Özkazanc-Pan 2012a, p. 210). Here, however, we are interested in the use of feminism as an explicit label in main/malestream MOS journals.

We identified 74 published articles⁴ (see tables and appendices online). This represents less than three articles per annum across the 15 journals during a 28-year period, published in only seven of the 15 journals. The remaining eight FT50 MOS journals published no articles that engage explicitly with feminism: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Harvard Business Review*, *Human Resource Management*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Management*, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Strategic Management Journal*.

We read the articles chronologically, looking for changes over time in theory and argument, empirical focus, and development of debates within and across journals. Tables 1 to 3 (see online tables and appendix) categorize these articles according to whether they are conceptual, empirical, or methodological. The tables also indicate whether feminism is the primary focus, the specific form of feminist approach, and the methodology, in the case of empirical articles. Three observations arise from this. First, there is just one methodological article; this is surprising, given the significant methodological contribution of feminism and the depth of epistemological debate it has provoked. Second, three of the empirical articles are quantitative. Feminism is often characterized as opposed to quantitative methods, but other fields such as sociology are much more open to feminist quantitative analysis (Cohen *et al.* 2011). This is surprising considering the strong presence of quantitative analysis in these journals and may be interpreted as a function of the political nature of publishing in MOS (Grey 2010). Finally, articles tend to focus on women’s or feminist organizations, aspects of MOS sometimes categorized as ‘soft’ (e.g. business ethics, diversity), and a positioning of feminism alongside other analytical approaches. In summary, these

articles indicates that feminism is confined in prestigious MOS journals to specific forms that do not threaten mainstream empirical, conceptual, or methodological norms.

The most prominent journal by volume is *Journal of Business Ethics*⁵. Most of these 33 articles fall into two categories: first, applications of feminist ethics in relation to business ethics. This literature is dominated by the feminist ethic of care (Gilligan 1982) applied to stakeholder theory, corporate governance, sustainable business practice, corporate social performance, and moral courage (e.g. Lampe 2001; Machold *et al.* 2008; Simola 2014). Second, analyses apply feminist perspectives or frameworks to a given topic or phenomenon, such as women workers, leadership style, or knowledge economy (e.g. Burke and McKeen 1990; Maier 1997; Oakley 2000). Two articles invoke the terms ‘feminist’ and ‘feminism’ in a way which is at odds with established definitions of feminism, by using it interchangeably with the notion of femininity (Lin 2008; Lin and Yeh 2009). Finally, two articles in *Journal of Business Ethics* take an explicitly critical stance towards feminist theory (Buchholz and Rosenthal 2005; Walker *et al.* 2004), challenging the conceptual and empirical validity of feminism for economics and stakeholder theory.

The next most frequently represented journal is *Human Relations* (16 articles, not including the 2019 special issue on feminist organization studies). These articles draw on feminist theory as a way of contributing to core topics in MOS (e.g. Collins and Wray-Bliss 2003; Fotaki *et al.* 2014; Linstead and Pullen 2006). The journal has also published feminist analyses of knowledge production in MOS which demonstrate the empirical and theoretical neglect of gender in the field (e.g. Kirton and Healy 2012; Mescher *et al.* 2010; Runté and Mills 2006). A further focus is on feminist organizations and organizing (e.g. D’Enbeau and Buzzanell 2014; Gatrell 2013). While beyond the temporal scope of this review, the January 2019 special issue on feminism - the first in a FT50 journal - provides a further space for feminist work. This includes studies of social media and the Internet as a vehicle for feminist mobilization and the importance of acknowledging the diversity of women’s experiences that cut across race and social class distinctions and sexual orientations. These articles discuss an embodied ethics of feminist activism and encourage consideration of the interplay between individual actions and collective responsibility by reflecting on contemporary examples of feminist solidarity (see e.g. Tyler 2019; Vachhani and Pullen 2019).

Each of the ten articles published in *Organization Studies* engages with a specific strand of feminism, such as postmodern, anti-racist, or psychoanalytic feminism (e.g. Mirchandani 2003; Trethewey 1999; Vachhani 2012), presented as a way of developing mainstream organization

theory. The remaining 13 articles are spread across four journals: *Academy of Management Review* (six), *Organization Science* (three), *Academy of Management Journal* (two) and *Journal of Management Studies* (two). These articles include theoretical elaborations of feminist thought in reviewing a subfield (e.g. Calás and Smircich 1999; Ely and Padavic 2007) and analyses of the presence of feminism and experiences of feminists at work in organizations (Ashcraft 2001; Meyerson 1998).

This last group also contains a review article of research in MOS that addresses gender. Ely and Padavic (2007) map articles published in four journals, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, between 1984 and 2003. Their review concentrates mainly on studies of sex difference. However, the authors also draw on concepts from feminist theory to link to the conceptual lenses of gender, identity, and power. They argue for greater attention to the links between gender identity, organizational structures and practices as the basis for meso-level theorizing. This opens up a significant conceptual space for researchers to look beyond biology in the form of attributed or innate sex differences, and in particular challenges the common elision that denies biological essentialism while using biological sex as a proxy for gender. Ely and Padavic (2007) draw on constructionist understandings of how organizations can be gendered, and their effects on women in particular. However, their review does not consider the radical political implications of (lack of) feminism for the MOS epistemic community. In this respect it exemplifies how feminism can be partially silenced, through being nominally present, but in a way that does not challenge dominant norms of knowledge production.

To summarize, our reading of explicitly feminist articles published in influential main/malestream MOS journals suggests that feminist research takes three distinct, overlapping forms. First, feminism is applied as a conceptual frame to address specific topics, such as business ethics, that may be read as somewhat marginal to more masculinized debates in MOS (on for example strategy). Second, feminism is treated empirically as a specific type of organization or organizing practice. Again, this positions feminism in a specific, subordinate, way to the wider field, limiting its implications for 'normal' organizations. Third and rarely, feminism informs research methodology. The majority of articles approach feminism as a theoretical framework or conceptual resource (e.g. Calas *et al.*'s 2009 reading of entrepreneurship studies) and there is an emphasis on theory development, perhaps because feminism is often used as an 'alternative' lens through which to critique established fields and theories. Of the empirical articles, we observe a strong tendency

towards qualitative data generation, especially ethnography and participant observation, and abduction or grounded theory. All articles focus on women's experiences; analysis of masculinity and men is entirely absent except by implication. There is a tendency to research women's or feminist organizations, such as Ashcraft's (2001) analysis of a women's shelter and advocacy nonprofit organization or Zilber's (2002) account of a rape crisis center, and to adopt the position that gender is socially or discursively constructed.

This last point is contentious. Gender is often treated as binary in an empirical sense, analyzing women or women's experiences as a separate category. A small number of conceptual articles propose a non-essentialist or relational perspective, understanding gender as non-dichotomous (Prasad 2012) or multiplicitous (Linstead and Pullen 2006). Few articles analyse feminism as social movement (see D'Enbeau and Buzzanell 2013 for an exception), and even fewer frame it as praxis (Bartunek *et al.* 2000 is a notable exception). This is significant because both of these approaches to feminism are more methodologically complex than introducing it into MOS as a conceptual resource. Finally, a significant number of articles lack clarity as to what feminism is in the context of the research reported.

Articles often combine multiple levels of analysis, drawing connections between structured social relations, interactions, activities, practices, and discourses, on the one hand, and subjectivities and identities on the other. Making theoretical and empirical connections or noting intersections is characteristic of feminist inquiry. This challenges established monological ways of doing and reporting research (Calás and Smircich 1996, 2006). However, these articles also illuminate the marginal position of feminism in main/malestream MOS knowledge production: proportionately few articles have been published relative to the immense significance of feminism as social theory, practice, and movement, as well as proportionately to the overall volume of articles published in these 15 journals over a 28-year period. This raises the possibility that knowledge production is itself framed by patriarchal conditions, in the sense that there may be 'a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women' (Walby 1989, p. 214) that has contributed to the exclusion of feminist research in MOS.

It may also be that the practice of feminist scholarship in main/malestream MOS is a potentially dangerous career strategy. Publication in prestigious journals is increasingly important as a signifier of legitimacy and credibility for researchers and particular epistemic communities (Mingers and Willmott 2013; Butler and Spoelstra 2014). This has become a zero-sum game where the 'skewed

few' make a name for themselves while the majority labour on the margins (Macdonald and Kam 2011). Success or failure is to a significant extent determined by how one is located within hierarchical and geopolitical structures that underlie academic knowledge production (Grey 2010), while papers submitted from prominent universities and by well-known authors have better chances of being accepted for publication (Macdonald 2015, p. 265). These structural conditions are crucial to understanding the production of feminist research, especially in terms of place of publication or reception by the dominant epistemic community, and therefore what is understood as legitimate knowledge in MOS. The rest of this article considers the reasons why feminism is considered 'dangerous' in MOS in more detail. We begin by reviewing feminist research published in MOS beyond these 15 journals, focusing on GWO which we use to demonstrate the radical potential of feminism - intrinsically and for our field.

Feminist knowledge beyond the FT50

Between 1994 and 2018, GWO published 95 articles that engaged explicitly with feminism (see Table 4 and Appendix 2 online), 35% more than the 15 journals in the FT50 list combined. The scope of these articles is significantly broader. Nine are based on quantitative analysis; 19 are conceptual, in more varied ways than in the FT50 group; and a wider range of feminist theory is represented. While gender is the central focus, there remains a lack of consideration of men and masculinities, as has been observed in the journal more generally (Rubery 2019). This potentially encourages an erroneous assumption that feminism is only relevant to/for women. If feminist debates lose sight of the importance of masculinities in gendered discrimination, and the significance of men as a social category formed by power relations in the gender system, it loses the ability to analyse significant hegemonic individuals and collectives (Hearn 2004). However, the recent introduction of a new section in the journal, *Feminist Frontiers*, signals recognition of feminism as a means of analyzing gender in all forms and configurations as central to MOS knowledge. This is confirmed by the number of feminist articles and their broad scope published since 2018 (25 in press or published in early view online).

Previous reviews of feminism in MOS provide further evidence of marginalization, including in journals that embrace critical thought. Harding *et al.*'s (2012) review focuses on articles published in the journal, *Organization*, between 1994 and 2012. Despite a relatively strong proportional presence, this points to missed opportunities. Ashcraft (2016) observes a similar pattern across five edited volumes and six self-defined critical journals in her analysis. She concludes that 'feminism remains peripheral' (p. 97) and proposes a reframing of the relationship between feminism and

Critical Management Studies (CMS). Ashcraft (2016) also considers how the relative exclusion of feminism within CMS may be challenged, proposing a less masculinized, more heterarchical, multivocal, and reflexive understanding of what constitutes relevant theory and analysis. She argues that feminism appears in ‘highly circumscribed ways or not at all’ in ‘canonized’ CMS works (p. 97). Intellectual homage is paid to ‘great men’, but only very rarely to women, let alone feminist women. This leads to what Ashcraft (2016) calls ‘exclusionary narrations of history’ where discussions of how CMS came about are rarely linked to gender struggle, feminist activism, or feminist theoretical developments (p. 99).

Ashcraft (2016) concludes that ‘feminist scholarship is often absent from the critical discussions where it is most relevant and that this absence takes at least two forms: failing to adequately consider feminist contributions to the pivotal theoretical debates of CMS and failing to sufficiently credit feminism when its contributions are appropriated’ (p. 101). Such exclusion is characteristic of citation practices in the field of MOS more generally where contributions by women tend to be marginalised, ignored or ‘forgotten’ (Bell *et al.* 2019; Czarniawska and Sévon 2018). The work that researchers are socialized into citing provides a key mechanism for constructing and reinforcing patriarchal practices of knowledge production (Ahmed 2017). Handbook reviews of feminism in MOS (e.g. Calás and Smircich 1996, 2006) follow a similar observational pattern and make similar arguments, showing how feminist theoretical developments in the wider social sciences and humanities have been ignored within MOS, and proposing changes in the way MOS scholars behave as an epistemic community.

Our review here now builds on and extends the work of these scholars by further exploring the reasons for the marginalization of feminism in MOS and the exclusionary gender regime (Connell 2002) that enables epistemic oppression (Dotson 2014). We have shown how feminist research is marginalized in prestigious MOS journals that determine the boundaries of legitimate knowledge in our field. This marginalization is made more evident by comparing with the more varied presence of feminism in GWO. In the next section we consider the possibilities for the epistemic community of MOS to embrace the dangerous knowledge enabled by feminism.

Reform and transformation: The promise of feminist knowledge in MOS

Feminist MOS scholars argue that there is a need for feminism to be taken seriously on its own terms as theory and as practice, rather than being treated as an adjunct to existing ways of knowing (Benschop and Verloo 2016; Calás and Smircich 1996, 2006, 2014; Harding *et al.* 2014; Jones *et al.*

2018; Lewis and Simpson 2012; Tatli and Özbilgin 2012). Calás and Smircich (2014) in their analysis of feminism in MOS, argue that the politics of gender in society and the conventions of professions and institutions combine to ensure that feminism is associated more with advocacy than as a means of knowledge production. It is also positioned as primarily of importance to women, rather than a central concern for both women and men. Researchers in other sub-fields of management and business studies have observed similar patterns of marginalization⁶.

Following the example of Benschop and Verloo's (2016) philosophical review, we propose that feminism offers a means of exploring and rethinking practices of knowledge production in MOS. This provides a generative basis for dialogue and exchange of knowledge between feminist theory and praxis and MOS. Benschop and Verloo (2016) focus on finding cross-disciplinary inspiration, encouraging cross-epistemological collaboration, and promoting transnational work as ways of encouraging dialogue that are readily available. Our aim here is to explore how the 'othering' of feminist research in MOS may be challenged, using three key aspects of feminist knowledge production in relation to the politics of MOS as a field. This allows us to consider how feminism is positioned as dangerous within existing epistemic regimes and to consider what a more feminist MOS might look like. Through this we develop an understanding of feminist research praxis as an alternative location of healing in relation to what we read as the dominant, damaging, main/malestream.

Politics of knowledge production

A key strength of feminist theory is that it problematizes claims to value neutrality and objectivity in knowledge production (Harding 1991), often through reflexivity focused on social and political positioning (Benschop and Verloo 2016; Pullen 2006). As Harding (1991) explains, 'though scientific methods are selected, we are told, exactly in order to eliminate all social values from inquiry, they are actually operationalized to eliminate only those values that differ... [from] the standard, narrowly conceived conception of scientific method' (Harding 1991, p. 41). Drawing on Haraway's (1988) notion of 'situated knowledges', Code (2006) calls for greater imaginative creativity in confronting the epistemic contestability of 'factuality' which is founded on imperialistic and power-infused practices. Epistemologists, she suggests, need methods and methodologies that enable them to reflect on a social order that relies on certain epistemic assumptions as the basis for sustaining its enactments. Situatedness then 'is not just a place *from which to know*' but a place of negotiation about 'which pieces of evidence to count and which to leave aside' (Code 2006, p. 100, emphasis in original).

Yet the dominant epistemic culture in MOS obscures ‘the important contributions of women in all classes and races to the production of whatever cultures count as their best kind of knowledge’ (Harding 1991, p. 27) in favour of a depoliticized, ‘scientific’, unthreatening common-sense know-how (Willmott 2013). Once inquiry shifts to a focus on situated knowledges, it is no longer feasible to ‘assume before the fact which aspects of situatedness will be significant for the production, evaluation, and circulation of knowledge’ (Code 2014, p. 10). As such, inquiry opens out into ‘analyses of multiple intersecting specificities of subjectivity and positionality in their social, political and thence epistemological implications for the production of knowledge and knowers: and into questions about credibility, marginality, epistemic responsibility and the politics of testimony’ (p. 10). Different strands of feminist theory share the ‘sometimes tacit, sometimes explicit rejection of the very possibility of dislocated knowledge, epistemic individualism, perspective-less a-political knowing’ (p. 12). Importantly, feminist inquiry centers on located knowing where theory and practice are reciprocally constitutive (Code 2014). Feminist critiques also extend to dominant masculine forms and styles of academic writing as they address what is typically left unsaid when writers learn to assume the normalcy of masculine notions of ‘rigor’, ‘hardness’, and ‘penetrating conclusiveness’ (Phillips *et al.* 2014, p. 316) through adherence to a ‘logic of trajectory, strategy and purpose’ (Höpfl 2011, p. 32). Feminist critique therefore begins by rendering gendered writing open for discussion, and then turns attention to enabling a multitude of affectual voices and texts by creating spaces where different forms of expression are explored and appreciated (Pullen and Rhodes 2015).

Within the politics of knowledge production, feminist scholars often position themselves as reflexive actors within structures and practices of inequality and oppression, rather than as neutral observers. Many embody their scholarship, and thereby expose themselves to criticism in patriarchal academic settings (Benschop and Verloo 2016; Jones *et al.* 2018; Özkazanc-Pan 2012a). Such embodied theoretical activism is based on a clear realization that ‘[n]o longer is ‘the knower’ imaginable as a self-contained, infinitely replicable ‘individual’ making universally valid knowledge claims from a ‘god’s eye’ position removed from the incidental features and the power and privilege structures of the physical-social world’ (Code 2014, p. 10).

Feminist insistence on the reflexive, ethical and political dimensions of knowledge production has developed further by questioning the limits of Western or Global North perspectives in the face of global, transnational, social and organizational change with its multilayered nexus of knowledge

interconnections (see Benschop and Verloo 2016; Calás and Smircich 2006; Metcalfe and Woodhams 2012). This recognition is informed by postcolonial feminist scholarship and transnational feminism (Mohanty 1988; Spivak 1988), which have been fruitfully applied in MOS (e.g. Calás and Smircich 1999; Özkazanc-Pan 2012b). Similarly, intersectional feminist approaches, based on Black feminist critiques of ‘the tendency to treat race and gender as mutually exclusive categories of experience and analysis’ (Crenshaw 1989, p. 139) to encourage multidimensional understandings of discrimination, have also developed in MOS (e.g. Acker 2012; Holvino 2010). Feminist theory thus offers conceptual openings to transform MOS by making explicit how knowledge is produced in ways that are considered self-evidently neutral, but in truth serve the vested interests of some and not others. Interrogating the whiteness of knowledge production (hooks 1990; Grimes 2001) shows how situated knowledges do not merely refer to concrete geographical spaces but to a politics of location and specificity of difference (Mohanty 2003).

As feminist and civil rights activist Audre Lorde (2007, p. 138) observes, ‘there is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives’. Intersectional feminist theory offers an example of the potential for change in scholarly communities, in its use to question how privileged white feminists generalize their experience to the experience of women as a whole. By highlighting multiple sources and forms of oppression, intersectional feminism has led to a rethinking of what feminism is, and can be. It also serves to remind us that in MOS it is not only women and ‘their’ knowledges that are marginalized and excluded, but also the knowledges of those who lie outside the ‘mostly white, Western, Northern, male and/or masculine and heterosexual’ elite (Ashcraft 2016, p. 103). Talking of the CMS community in particular, Ashcraft (2016) claims that ‘whereas others have criticized the limited ‘objects’ or ‘subjects’ of CMS (i.e. who it is about and who does it, respectively), I seek dialogue about their apparent alignment – the ways in which the subjects allegedly served by CMS reflect the interests of who does it’ (p. 103).

Following this argument, we (Bell *et al.* 2019) sought to engage in (self)critical reflection on the processes and practices of knowledge production and their consequences in guest editing a special issue for *Human Relations* on feminism and MOS. We conclude that many histories of feminism are ‘whitewashed’ narratives that simplify tensions and ignore multiple voices in different places and spaces at different times. While intersectional feminist theory offers ways to question the hegemony of white men in MOS, it has almost exclusively been used to criticize white feminism and to open up feminist agendas with relation to (the study of) different kinds of women. Extending intersectional feminism would enable us to address (dis)connections between MOS researchers and

the corporate elites (and others) that they study. While much MOS research is grounded in masculine perspectives and men's experiences (Wilson 2003), this also applies to race and ethnicity in the sense that much research is written by white people, about white people, and for white people (Nkomo 1992; Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014). The politics of knowledge production are not only gendered but also racialized. The 'whiteness' of knowledge and its production in fields such as MOS has been subject to critique (Grimes 2001). The vast literature on identities in organizations is a case in point: it has been all but silent about race and whiteness (Greedharry *et al.* 2019). The 'invisible presence of whiteness' is however starting to be interrogated in, for example, leadership studies (Liu and Baker 2016).

In writing this, we are confronted with the 'privileged act of naming' (hooks 1991), in that by citing certain sources and not citing others we participate in the politics of knowledge production (Czarniawska & Sévon 2018). As the black American feminist bell hooks reminds us: 'feminist theory is complex ... it is less the individual practice that we often think and usually emerges from engagement with collective sources' (1991, p. 3). We are thus complicit in attributing ideas to some scholars and sources whereas we unwittingly ignore others worthy of recognition. hooks' (1991) ideas, for example, are based on the work of Katie King, who in turn draws from Chela Sandoval, the Chicana theorist. This recognition demonstrates the personal nature of politicized knowledge production, to which we now turn.

Knowledge as personal

Let me begin by saying that I came to theory because I was hurting – the pain within me was so intense that I could not go on living. I came to theory desperate, wanting to comprehend – to grasp what was happening around and within me. Most importantly, I wanted to make the hurt go away. I saw in theory then a location for healing. (hooks 1991, p. 1.)

hooks (1991) urges us to see the importance of intellectual work and production of theory as a social practice that can be liberatory. She argues against abstract and elitist academic writing, including feminist jargon (of which we, unfortunately, are also guilty), and asks us to pay attention to the gaps between theories and practice. In order to make production of theory liberatory, hooks argues, we must find ways to link our lived experience of theorizing to processes of self-recovery and collective liberation, and find connections between them. As such, hooks encourages us to create theory from our efforts to locate pain and struggle. Thus theory can be liberatory because it 'not only enables us to remember and recover ourselves, it charges and challenges us to renew our commitment to an active, inclusive feminist struggle' (p. 11).

hooks thereby shows that knowledge is personal as well as social. Her insistence on using theory to ‘heal’ also demonstrates how feminists shift the focus from what is researched to our practices and experiences. Feminism’s orientation towards knowledge production as an aspect of the person/personal is manifest in MOS in a number of ways. For example, feminist scholarship draws our attention to the value of studying everyday practices in organizations and in people’s lives more generally. Masculine conventions of writing can also be challenged, in critiques of the separation of the subject (writer) and object (reader) (Czarniawska-Joerges 1995; Townley 1994) and in accounts of what is left unsaid when research is written, and writing is talked about (Helin 2019). ‘Writing differently’ in ways that are informed by feminism is a growing practice in MOS (Grey and Sinclair 2006; Gilmore *et al.* 2019), including ‘dirty writing’ (Pullen and Rhodes 2008) that challenges the conventions of tidy, singular, disembodied, linear analysis, and ‘writing with love’ as an expression of the embodied, affective struggle of making knowledge (Kiriakos and Tienari 2018). However, hooks (1991) reminds us that if theory is written in a manner that renders it accessible to broad audiences, even if that work enables and promotes feminist practice, it is dangerous. Knowledge that is accessible is often de-legitimized in academic settings.

Such a focus on theory and writing may be read as oriented towards changing norms within the epistemic community of MOS. It is however much more significant than that. When ‘writing differently’ is viewed in the light of feminist research and activism (Gilmore *et al.* 2019), it takes on political and emancipatory meanings, as calls to engage in writing ‘from the body’ demonstrate (Bell and Sinclair 2014; Höpfl 2011; Pullen 2006; Pullen and Rhodes 2015). Women’s or feminine writing (Pullen 2006) and ‘bisexual’ writing (Phillips *et al.* 2014) render masculine mastery unstable, such that ‘embodied writing practices, feminine styles, playful genres and subversive practices sing and dance on the page’ (Pullen and Rhodes 2015, p. 89). These practices challenge the writing norms associated with publishing in the prestigious journals that provide the base for the first part of our review, with implications for what is accepted as knowledge and disseminated as such through, for example, media reporting or the textbooks that frame much of our educational work.

The emphasis on forms of knowledge production that challenge scientific norms of distanced observation can also be seen in other forms of feminist writing, such as those written for non-academic audiences. An example is the work of Laura Bates, who set up ‘a very simple website’ (2014, p. 16) to allow women to share stories of ‘everyday sexism’ – behaviours, speech acts, and

writing that women experience in being positioned as inferior objects. Bates publicized her website through social media, hoping to collect a hundred stories. Within 18 months she had received 50,000, and the idea behind the website went on to become an independent social phenomenon. Bates' account of this work is powerful as an empirical illustration of the continuing presence of sexism in many women's lives, with work and workplaces a key site for its expression, and as an example of contemporary feminist organizing based on collective affective solidarity. As Vachhani and Pullen (2019) highlight, the 'everyday sexism' project shows the potential of feminist activism as a resource for change that is of direct relevance to MOS.

Another example of knowledge production with radical implications that arise from the personal is Sara Ahmed (2017), whose work and working life demonstrates the unique 'moral impulse... different register and quality of the heart' (Rose 2014, p. 65) that feminism can bring to our understanding of organizations. Ahmed worked to become an established feminist theorist employed in a university, but then decided on 'resigning in feminist protest' (Ahmed 2017, p. 199) to pursue a life working outside formal academic organizational structures. As with much feminist activism, Ahmed's decision was provoked by repeated experiences of patriarchy, sexism, racism and injustice. Although there was a 'snap', similar to Bates' (2014) 'tipping point', there was no single event or moment of epiphany - Ahmed makes clear that the momentary action is situated within long, consistent experience. Bates (2014) and Ahmed (2017) illustrate academic activism based on feminist action that has an external orientation founded on a personal, moral and political approach to knowledge production.

Overall, viewing theory and knowledge as personal enables us to challenge the well-recognised separation between theory and practice that characterizes much main/malestream MOS scholarship. Feminism encourages us to pay attention to our lived experience of theorizing as a way of making sense of what is happening around, and to, us (hooks 1991). We have sought to respect this approach here by developing the notion of dangerous knowledge, as a 'sweaty concept' (Ahmed 2017). However, there are many other ways to do this, such as writing differently; each carries an element of danger, in that they are non- or anti-normative, and therefore provide an easy way for research to be rejected and silenced. We suggest that MOS could be significantly enriched by their recognition as legitimate ways of creating knowledge.

Acknowledging uncertainty

Researchers and educators working with feminism as a set of ideas and practices are also open to uncertainty as a fundamental principle of social science. As feminism moved into the academy during its second (Western) spiral in the 1960s and 1970s, method, methodology, epistemology and ontology provoked questions that led to challenging conclusions (Kemp and Squires 1997). Methodological critique was the starting point, but feminists rapidly developed uniquely generative ways of thinking and researching (Stanley and Wise 1979). In particular, theory construction and ways of making knowledge claims became the focus of very different forms of praxis (Stanley and Wise 1990), thereby raising the possibility of uncertainty as a valid conclusion to an argument or debate.

In contrast, main/malestream academic knowledge production in MOS is oriented towards a final destination of achieving certainty (Willmott 2013). Feminist scholars have challenged this in a number of ways, for example through ‘dirty writing’ (Pullen and Rhodes 2008) described above – a process that is messy and uncertain, especially in relation to achieving a modernist ideal of rational progress. However, this does not rule out idealistic thinking. Snitow (2015), for example, writes of her utopian commitment to feminist theory and activism, but notes that such idealistic praxis is usually accompanied by ironic skepticism as to the likelihood of the better world. Academic writing works from the convention that people move from innocence to experience and from ignorance to knowledge. However, this is not inevitable. As Snitow argues, the ‘initial thrilling illusion... [and] ignorant excitement’ (p. 5) of knowledge production can be retained as both practice and destination.

In this respect, Snitow’s (2015) argument that uncertainty is the ‘best goad, both for acting, and for imagining a future’ (p. 5), is instructive. Uncertainties are mostly manifest as self-doubt, including as to the nature of activism in relation to theory: ‘When the activist and theorist are the same person, as they often are, these differences [uncertainties] abide within. And, of course, these individual subjectivities are not stable or unitary – a common insight among theorists, but one that doesn’t always carry over into the space they (we) give each other for ambivalence or self-contradiction.’ (p. 12). Snitow’s work, in common with other feminists, is helpful in thinking through how academic and activist lives can unite the moral, political and personal in an uncertain project.

Acceptance of uncertainty, in knowledge production and in researcher subjectivity, is then the final dangerous position we are suggesting MOS would benefit from accepting as an integral aspect of its

epistemic community norms. However, we note that those who insist that knowledge production is uncertain render themselves vulnerable in academic work. All those who research or teach gender studies and engage with feminism become vulnerable because they are seen to question something that many hold dear, whether it is certainty, meritocracy or male dominance in society. In speaking out, women are often accused of bias, bitterness, or hysteria (Morley 1994), and their views and actions trigger emotional and sometimes brutal reactions (Wahl *et al.* 2008). Many avoid displaying vulnerability at work altogether (Gill, 2009). However, feminist theory also looks at vulnerability as an opening and as an opportunity. Meriläinen *et al.* (2020), for example, describe practices of knowledge production that manifest an ‘affectively charged ethics’ (Pullen and Rhodes 2014) and ethics of vulnerability (Gilson, 2014; Mackenzie *et al.* 2014). Vulnerability plays out as being open to the world and to producing knowledge differently. In contrast to abstract, rationalist and disembodied values and ideals, this form of material ethics turns attention to our situated and evolving practices of producing knowledge (Alaimo and Hekman 2008). Gilson (2014, p. 37) distinguishes between ontological and context-specific forms of vulnerability, describing the former as an ‘unavoidable receptivity, openness, and the ability to affect and to be affected’ and the latter as ‘specific forms that vulnerability take in the social world of which we have a differential experience because we are differentially situated’. Vulnerability, then, enables us to mobilize and it is first and foremost an experience of openness.

Issues of differential situatedness lead us to questions of feminism and men. Two of us have argued recently (Tienari and Taylor 2019) that it is essential for men to engage with feminism as activists and in theory - we see very little of that in MOS. Practising feminism presents risks for men as well as women subjectively, professionally and interpersonally. Notwithstanding, we think that feminism may become more popular with men as it becomes more prominent in academic circles again, and not always for positive reasons. It can, for example, become subject to ‘appropriative gestures’ in which feminism ‘in its academic inceptions is... subject to correction by authoritative men’ (Spivak 1982, p. 276). Men might engage with feminism through appropriation as intellectual convenience - clearly an unsatisfactory position. We would therefore argue in favour of men taking the subjective and professional risks to engage in dangerous (pro-)feminist action of some kind, perhaps by self-identifying as (pro-)feminist or by taking practical action to support feminism, with the aim of reducing the effects of misogyny, patriarchy, and sexism on all. This may entail looking at uncertainty and vulnerability of the researcher’s self in new ways.

Conclusion: The generative potential of feminist praxis

Evidence of the continuing need for feminism as a disruptive lens through which to understand and address sexist oppression and exclusion and gender-based inequalities in organizations is all around us. This includes persistent gender segregation of occupations and organizational positions, gender pay gaps, symbolic and physical violence in the workplace and home (de Jonge 2018), and the continuing exclusion of women from ‘between-men’ cultures (Irigaray 2007). Feminism can be seen in recent high-profile social media campaigns, popular texts, grassroots movements and a wide range of projects and forms of organization, including macro-political intersectional alliances and coalitions enabled by global feminism (Walby 2011). Contemporary feminist thought and activism is thus distinctive in part through being situated *within* powerful institutions and policy frameworks, as well as public representation bodies such as trade unions. Feminism’s purpose may be understood as continually shifting, focusing sometimes on the socioeconomic effects of sexism within political-economic structures (Gibson-Graham 1996, 2006), sometimes emphasizing the importance of ‘questioning the dominant ways of governing society through business models and organizations... [to] enable the reimagining of alternatives that are life affirming, emancipatory, and have the power to oppose the neoliberal hegemonic patriarchal onslaught on life’ (Fotaki and Harding 2018, p. 189).

We have argued here that feminism has the potential to contribute significantly more to knowledge production in MOS than has been credited. We have argued for feminist research praxis to be acknowledged as an alternative location of healing (hooks, 1991) in relation to the damaging, damaged main/malestream MOS. We have shown that the inclusion of feminism into the knowledge base of main/malestream research in our field has been partial and marginal, and that in more than half of the most prestigious MOS journals feminism has been entirely excluded. Our argument has focused on understanding the epistemological bases of this marginalization that serve to maintain the status quo. Through this, we have raised the possibility that partial inclusion has sought to render feminist research *safe* within MOS, and that its potential as a dangerous means of considering the moral political nature and effects of knowledge production has thereby been marginalized.

This relatively closed system of recognition in MOS is based on privileging place of publication. The marginal presence and relative absence of explicitly feminist research in these journals is therefore a significant issue, as it demonstrates the attempted exclusion of feminism as a legitimate approach to research in MOS. Our field has a long way to go in becoming feminist, or even in recognizing the potential of feminism, while the conditions that characterize mainstream knowledge

production remain resolutely coercive and resistant to non-normative contributions (Rumens *et al.* 2019). We have argued that this epistemological oppression occurs because feminist research constitutes *dangerous* knowledge, developing this as a ‘sweaty concept’ (Ahmed 2017) that emerges from our analysis of 28 years of FT50 journal publishing, through feminist knowledge production’s key characteristics of being political, personal and uncertain.

Aspects of feminism that emphasize its moral political potential, and its challenge to the dominant epistemic community’s beliefs and practices, both show its promise and explain why its relation to the accepted knowledge base of MOS remains limited. Feminism in its most dangerous forms involves revision of what constitutes knowledge and why. Feminism is ‘*not* another discourse (let alone in a poststructuralist array), not another voice to be added, an approach to be remembered and catered for... it radically affects and shifts everything... and that radical shift is not negotiable... the point is to live in it, including *in* theory, in writing, teaching, and so on’ (Heath 1987, p. 44, emphasis in original).

Through feminist inquiry, fundamental questions in MOS can be studied in new ways, and the field can be reshaped, as some of the work reviewed here shows (e.g. Ashcraft 2001; D’Enbeau and Buzzanell 2013; Mirchandani 2003). This aligns with the potential of queer theory, especially if the conceptual frame is itself queered in a reflexive way (Rumens *et al.* 2019), or if the feminism is lived as an ongoing commitment (Ahmed 2017). Achieving this is, however, dependent on recognizing the partial epistemic exclusion of feminism from MOS as irreducible (Dotson 2014) and thinking through how this might be addressed. Exclusion cannot be explained through reduction to something else, such as contingent social or historical conditions. MOS has existed for a shorter period of time than feminism as a field of thought. The current moment could be seen as the most inclusive yet for feminism, and still journals such as those currently on the FT50 list continue to marginalize or ignore feminist thought altogether. This suggests that feminism’s epistemic exclusion is unlikely to be addressed through practical initiatives such as changing editorial boards or creating isolated themed special issues, useful as that kind of action is.

We also recognize that calls for greater inclusion of feminism within the main/malestream in MOS must be considered with caution because inclusion can take many forms, including convenient co-optation to maintain marginality (Jones *et al.* 2018). Feminism can be nominally ‘included’ as an addition to other theoretical traditions, such as Critical Theory or Marxism, that are represented as more significant (Ashcraft 2016). Hence there is a danger that feminism is appropriated or invoked

simply as an example of radical critique, and thereby obscured as an independent analytical perspective with its own ontological or epistemological implications. At the same time, constructing separate spaces for feminist inquiry is also problematic. In their review of feminism in the critical journal *Organization*, Harding *et al.* (2012) ask if the fact that ‘feminist theory is used overwhelmingly by female authors, suggest[s] “feminism” may be something of a ghetto in which (essentialized) women can be safely contained?’ (p. 53). Such ‘ghettos’ can also develop through specialist journals for gender studies and feminist theory (Ashcraft 2016). Articles in specialist journals are unlikely to attract the same level of citation as male/mainstream journals, and this work, and those who produce it, are therefore destined to remain marginalized.

If exclusion is understood as a form of irreducible epistemic oppression, as Dotson (2014) suggests, we need to question the features of the epistemological systems that underpin knowledge production in MOS. Epistemic oppression can only be addressed by recognizing the limits associated with dominant epistemological frameworks because the ‘epistemic resources and the epistemological system within which those resources prevail may be wholly inadequate to the task of addressing the persisting epistemic exclusions that are causing epistemic oppression’ (Dotson 2014, p.116). This has implications for MOS that extend well beyond recognizing and incorporating feminism and instead involves radically questioning how knowledge is produced, and the interests that these practices serve.

References

- Acker, J. (2012). 'Gendered organizations and intersectionality: Problems and possibilities'. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, **31**, 214-224.
- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Aitchison, C. (2001). Gender and leisure research: The 'codification of knowledge'. *Leisure Sciences*, **23**: 1-19.
- Alaimo, S. & Hekman, S. (2008) (eds.) *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Ashcraft, K. (2001). Organized dissonance: Feminist bureaucracy as hybrid form. *Academy of Management Journal*, **44**, 1301-1322.
- Ashcraft, K. (2016). Revisi(ti)ng the relationship between feminism and Critical Management Studies. In Prasad, A., Prasad, P., Mills, A. and Helms Mills, J. (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Barretti, M.A. (2011). Women, feminism, and social work journals 10 years later: 1998-2007. *Affilia – Journal of Women and Social Work*, **26**, 264-277.
- Bartunek, J., Walsh, K. and Lacey, C. (2000). Dynamics and dilemmas of women leading women. *Organization Science*, **11**, 589-610.
- Bates, L. (2014). *Everyday sexism*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Bell, E. and Sinclair, A. (2014) Reclaiming eroticism in the academy. *Organization* **21**, 268-280.
- Bell, E., Meriläinen, S., Taylor, S. & Tienari, J. (2019) Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. *Human Relations* **72**, 4-22.
- Benschop, Y. and Verloo, M. (2016) Feminist organization theories: Islands of treasure. In Mir, R., Wilmott, H. and Greenwood, M. (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies*, pp. 100-112. London: Routledge.
- Buchholz, R. and Rosenthal, S. (2005). Toward a contemporary conceptual framework for stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **58**, 137-148.
- Burke, R. and McKeen, C. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **9**, 317-332.
- Butler, N. and Spoelstra, S. (2014). The regime of excellence and the erosion of ethos in critical management studies. *British Journal of Management* **25**, 538-550.
- Calás, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1996 and 2006). From 'The Woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In Clegg, S., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. (eds) *Handbook of Organization Studies*, first and second editions. London: Sage.

- Calás, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review*, **24**, 649-671.
- Calás, M.B. and Smircich, L. (2014). Engendering the organizational: Feminist theorizing and organization studies. In P. Adler, P. du Gay, G. Morgan and M. Reed (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory, and Organization Studies: Contemporary Currents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calás, M., Smircich, L., and Bourne, K. (2009). Extending the boundaries: Reframing 'entrepreneurship as social change' through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, **34**, 552-569.
- Code, L. (2006). *Ecological Thinking: The politics of epistemic location*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Code, L. (2014). Feminist epistemology and the politics of knowledge: Questions of marginality. In M. Evans, C. Hemmings, M. Henry, H. Johnstone, S. Madhok, A. Plomien and S. Wea (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Feminist Theory*, pp. 9-25. London: Sage.
- Cohen, R., C. Hughes and R. Lampard (2011). The methodological impact of feminism: A troubling issue for sociology? *Sociology*, **45**, 570-586.
- Collins, H. and Wray-Bliss, E. (2005). Discriminating ethics. *Human Relations*, **58**, 799-824.
- Connell, R. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Crenshaw K (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracial politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, **1**, 139-167.
- Czarniawska, B. & Sévon, G. (2018) Gendered references in organization studies. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, **13**, 196-200.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1995) Narration or science? Collapsing the division in organization studies. *Organization*, **2**, 11-33.
- de Jonge, A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility through a feminist lens: Domestic violence and the workplace in the 21st century. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **148**, 471-487.
- D'Enbeau, S. and Buzzanell, P. (2013). Constructing a feminist organization's identity in a competitive marketplace: The intersection of ideology, image, and culture. *Human Relations*, **66**, 1447-1470.
- Dotson, K. (2014). Conceptualizing epistemic oppression. *Social Epistemology*, **28**, 115-138.
- Ely, R. and Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, **32**, 1121-1143.

- Enloe, C. (2017). *The Big Push: Exposing and challenging the persistence of patriarchy*. Oxford: Myriad Editions.
- Figuerola-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Perez, M., Morgan, N., Villace-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **52**: 87-103.
- Fondas, N. (1997). Feminization unveiled: Management qualities in contemporary writings. *Academy of Management Review*, **22**, 257-283.
- Fotaki, M. and Harding, N. (2018). *Gender and the Organization: Women at work in the 21st century*. London: Routledge.
- Fotaki, M., Metcalfe, B. and Harding, N. (2014). Writing materiality into management and organization studies through and with Luce Irigaray. *Human Relations*, **67**, 1239-1263.
- Gatrell, C. (2013). Maternal body work: How women managers and professionals negotiate pregnancy and new motherhood at work. *Human Relations*, **66**, 621-644.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (1996) *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *A postcapitalist politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giffort, D. (2011). Show or tell? Feminist dilemmas and implicit feminism at Girls' Rock Camp. *Gender & Society*, **25**, 568-588.
- Gill, R. (2009) 'Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia'. In R. Flood & R. Gill (eds) *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections*. London: Routledge, 228-244.
- Gilligan, C. (1982[1993]). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gilmore S., Harding, N., Helin, J. and Pullen, A. (2019). Writing differently. *Management Learning* **50**, 3-10.
- Gilson, E. (2014) *The Ethics of Vulnerability: A Feminist Analysis of Social Life and Practice*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Godfrey, R., Lilley, S. and Brewis, J. (2012). Biceps, bitches, and borgs: Reading *Jarhead's* representation of the construction of the (masculine) military body. *Organization Studies*, **33**, 541-562.
- Greedharry, M., Ahonen, P. Tienari, J. (2019). Race and identity in organizations. In *The Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organizations*, Ed. Andrew Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grey, C. (2010). Organizing studies: Publications, politics and polemic. *Organization Studies* **31**, 677-694.
- Grey, C. and Sinclair, A. (2006). Writing differently. *Organization*, **13**, 443-453.

- Grimes, D. (2001). Putting our own house in order: Whiteness, change and organization studies. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **14**, 132-149.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, **14**, 575-599.
- Harding, N., Ford, J. and Fotaki, M. (2012). Is the 'F'-word still dirty? A past, present and future of/for feminist and gender studies in *Organization*. *Organization*, **20**, 51-65.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, **5**, 49-72.
- Heath, S. (1987). Men in feminism: Men and feminist theory. In Jardine, A. and Smith, P. (eds) *Men in feminism*, pp. 41-46. London: Routledge.
- Helin, J (2019). Dialogical writing: Co-inquiring between the written and the spoken word. *Culture and Organization*, **25**, 1-15.
- Henry, C., Foss, L. and Ahl, H. (2016). Gender and entrepreneurship research: A review of methodological approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, **34**, 217-241.
- Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **17**, 248–277.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1991). Theory as liberatory practice. *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism*, **4**, 1-12.
- Höpfl, H. (2011) Women's writing. In E.L. Jeanes, D. Knights and P. Yancey Martin (eds), *Handbook of Gender, Work and Organization*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 25-36.
- Irigaray, L. (2007[1990]) *Je, tu, nous*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Johnson, C. (2015). Women, gender and feminism in the Australian Journal of Political Science: A review. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, **50**, 695-706.
- Jones, S., Dy, A. and Vershinina, N. (2018). 'We were fighting for our place': Resisting gender knowledge regimes through feminist knowledge network formation. *Gender, Work & Organization*. DOI: 10.1111/gwao.12288.
- Kemp, S. and Squires, J. (eds) (1997). *Feminisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiriakos, C. and Tienari, J. (2018). Academic writing as love. *Management Learning*, **49**, 263-277.
- Kirton, G. and Healy, G. (2012). 'Lift as you rise': Union women's leadership talk. *Human Relations*, **65**, 979-999.
- Lampe, M. (2001). Mediation as an ethical adjunct of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **31**, 165-173.

- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, P. and Simpson, R. (2012). Kanter revisited: Gender, power and (in)visibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **14**, 141-158.
- Lin, C. (2008). Sexual issues: The analysis of female role portrayal preferences in Taiwanese print ads. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **83**, 409-418.
- Lin, C. and Yeh, J. (2009). Comparing society's awareness of women: Media-portrayed idealized images and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **90**, 61-79.
- Linstead, S. and Pullen, A. (2006). Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion. *Human Relations*, **59**, 1287-1310.
- Liu, H. and Baker, C. (2016). White knights: Leadership as the heroicisation of whiteness. *Leadership*, **12**, 420-448.
- Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister Outsider: Essays and speeches*. Berkeley CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Macdonald, S. (2015). Emperor's new clothes: The reinvention of peer review as myth. *Journal of Management Inquiry* **24**, 264-279.
- Macdonald, S. and Kam, J. (2011). The skewed few: People and papers of quality in management studies. *Organization* **18**, 467-475.
- Machold, S., Ahmed, P. and Farquhar, S. (2008). Corporate governance and ethics: A feminist perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **81**, 665-678.
- Mackenzie, C., Rogers, W. & Dodds, S. (2014) (eds.) *Vulnerability. New Essays in Ethics and Feminist Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maier, M. (1997). Gender equity, organizational transformation and challenger. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **16**, 943-962.
- Manne, K. (2018). *Down girl: The logic of misogyny*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Manne, K. (2018). *Down Girl: The logic of misogyny*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mescher, S., Benschop, Y. and Doorewaard, H. (2010). Representations of work-life balance support. *Human Relations*, **63**, 21-39.
- Meriläinen, S., Salmela, T. and Valtonen, A. (2020) Doing it differently: Collaborative knowledge production on the floor, in wilderness, and sauna. Forthcoming in *Routledge Companion to Gender, Work & Organization*. London: Routledge.
- Mescher, S., Benschop, Y. and Doorewaard, H. (2010). Representations of work-life balance support. *Human Relations*, **63**, pp. 21-39.
- Metcalf, B. and Linstead, A. (2003). Gendering teamwork: Rewriting the feminine. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **10**, 94-119.

- Metcalf, B. and Woodhams, C. (2012). Introduction: New directions in gender, diversity and organization theorizing – Re-imagining feminist post-colonialism, transnationalism and geographies of power. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **14**, 123-140.
- Meyerson, D. (1998). Feeling stressed and burned out: A feminist reading and re-visioning of stress based emotions within medicine and organization science. *Organization Science*, **9**, 103-118.
- Mingers, J. and Willmott, H. (2013) Taylorizing business school research: On the 'one best way' performative effects of journal ranking lists. *Human Relations*, **66**, 1051-1073.
- Mirchandani, K. (2003). Challenging racial silences in studies of emotion work: Contributions from anti-racist feminist theory. *Organization Studies*, **24**, 721-742.
- Mohanty, CT. (1988) Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, **30**, 61-88.
- Mohanty, CT. (2003). "Under Western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs*, **28**, 499-535.
- Morley, L. (1994) Glass ceiling or iron cage: Women in UK academia. *Gender, Work and Organization* **1**, 194-204.
- Nkomo, S. M. (1992). The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting 'race' in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, **17**, 487-513.
- Nkomo, S. M. and Al Ariss, A. (2014). The historical origins of ethnic (white) privilege in US organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, **29**, 389-404.
- O'Brien, M. (1981). *The Politics of Reproduction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- O'Brien, M. (1981). *The Politics of Reproduction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Oakley, J. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **27**, 321-334.
- Özkazanc-Pan, B. (2012a). Publishing without betrayal: Critical scholarship meets mainstream journals. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **28**, 209-217.
- Özkazanc-Pan, B. (2012b). Postcolonial feminist research: challenges and complexities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, **31**, 573-591.
- Phillips, M., Pullen, A. and Rhodes, C. (2014) Writing organization as gendered practice: Interrupting the libidinal economy. *Organization Studies*, **35**, 313-333.
- Prasad, A. (2012). Beyond analytical dichotomies. *Human Relations*, **65**, 567-595.
- Pullen, A. & Rhodes, C. (2014). Corporeal ethics and the politics of resistance in organizations. *Organization*, **21**, 782-796.
- Pullen, A. (2006). Gendering the research self: Social practice and corporeal multiplicity in the writing of organizational research. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **13**, 277-298.

- Pullen, A. and Rhodes, C. (2008). Dirty writing. *Culture and Organization*, **14**, 241-259.
- Pullen, A. and Rhodes, C. (2015) Writing, the feminine and organization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **22**, 87-93.
- Rose, J. (2014). *Women in Dark Times*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rubery, J. (2019). The founding of the *Gender, Work & Organization* journal: Reflections 25 years on. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **26**, 9-17.
- Rumens, N., de Souza, E. and Brewis, J. (2019). Queering queer theory in management and organization studies: Notes towards queering homosexuality. *Organization Studies*, **40**, 593-612.
- Runté, M. and Mills, A. (2006). Cold War, chilly climate: Exploring the roots of gendered discourse in organization and management theory. *Human Relations*, **59**, 695-720.
- Simola, S. (2015). Understanding moral courage through a feminist and developmental ethic of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **130**, 29-44.
- Simpson, R. (2006) Masculinity and management education: Feminizing the MBA. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **5**, 182-193.
- Snitow, A. (2015). *The feminism of uncertainty: A gender diary*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Spivak, G. (1982). The politics of interpretations. *Critical Inquiry*, **9**: 259-278.
- Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In Nelson, C. and Grossberg, L. (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, pp. 271-313. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Stanley, L. (1990). Feminism and the academic mode. In Stanley, L. (ed) *Feminist Praxis: Research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1979). Feminist research, feminist consciousness and experiences of sexism. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, **2**, 359-374.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1990). Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes. In Stanley, L. (ed) *Feminist praxis: Research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Tatli, A. and Özbilgin, M. (2012). An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: A Bourdieuan framing. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **14**, 180-200.
- Thompson, I. (1999). Women and feminism in technical communication - A qualitative content analysis of journal articles published in 1989 through 1997. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, **13**, 154-178.
- Thompson, L. and Walker, A. (1995). The place of feminism in family studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, **57**, 847-865.

- Tienari, J. and Taylor, S. (2019) Feminism and men: Ambivalent space for acting up. *Organization*, **26**, 948-960.
- Townley, B. (1994). Writing in friendship. *Organization* **1**, 24-28.
- Trethewey, A. (1999). Disciplined bodies: Women's embodied identities at work. *Organization Studies*, **20**, 423-450.
- Tyler, M. (2019). Reassembling difference? Rethinking inclusion through/as embodied ethics. *Human Relations*, **72**, 48-68.
- Vachhani, S. (2012). The subordination of the feminine? Developing a critical feminist approach to the psychoanalysis of organizations. *Organization Studies*, **33**, 1237-1255.
- Vachhani, S. and Pullen, A. (2019). Ethics, politics and feminist organizing: Writing feminist infrapolitics and affective solidarity into everyday sexism. *Human Relations*, **72**, 23-47.
- Wahl, A., Eduards, M., Holgersson, C., Höök, P., Linghag, S. & Rönnblad, M. (2008) *Motstånd & fantasi: historien om F [Resistance & fantasy: The history of F.]*. Stockholm: Studentlitteratur.
- Walby (1989). Theorizing patriarchy. *Sociology*, **23**, 213-234.
- Walby, S. (2011). *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Walker, D., Dauterive, J., Schultz, E. and Block, W. (2004). The feminist competition/cooperation dichotomy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **55**, 243-254.
- Willmott, H. (2013). Reflections on the darker side of power analytics' *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **27**, 281-286.
- Wilson, F. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour and Gender*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Zilber, T. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal*, **45**, 234-254.

Tables 1-3: Papers published in FT50 journals 1990-2018, by category

Table 1: Conceptual orientation addressing a specific MOS topic

| Paper | Central topic or problematic | Feminism only or primary conceptual frame; focus of contribution | Perspective on feminism | Methods, methodologies |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Buchholz and Rosenthal (2005) | Stakeholder theory | No; stakeholder theory | Theory | None |
| 2. Burke and McKeen (1990) | Mentoring | No; mentoring | Theory | Narrative review |
| 3. Calás and Smircich (1999) | Postmodernism | No; post- frameworks in organization theory | Theory | Narrative review |
| 4. Calás, Smircich and Bourne (2009) | Entrepreneurship | Yes, in two forms: realist [liberal, psychoanalytic, radical], and social constructionist [socialist, poststructuralist, transnational]; entrepreneurship | Theory | Narrative review |
| 5. Crittenden (2000) | Capitalism | Yes; capitalism | Belief system | None |
| 6. Cudd (2015) | Capitalism and gender equality | Yes; capitalism as economic and social system | Unclear | None |
| 7. Ely and Padavic (2007) | Literature on sex differences, | Yes; gender | Theory | Systematic review – 1984-2003, 131 papers published in AMJ, ASQ, JAP, |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------|-------|
| | organizations as shaping sociocultural contexts [i.e. organization-individual relations] | | | OBHDP |
| 8. Fotaki, Metcalfe, and Harding (2014) | Interpretation of materiality and discourse in organization studies | Yes; materiality and discourse | Theory | None |
| 9. Frosh (1997) | Gender and sex in psychoanalytic thinking, especially sexuality | No; psychoanalysis | Theory | None |
| 10. Frosh (2003) | Psychology and psychosocial perspectives | No; the psychosocial | Theory | None |
| 11. Jacques (1992) | Theory building | Yes; theory building | Theory and practice | None |
| 12. Karam and Jamali (2017) | CSR | Yes, as one part of a synthesis with cross cultural management | Theory | None |
| 13. Knights (1997) | Organization theory, structure/agency | No; organization theory | Theory | None |
| 14. Lampe (2001) | Stakeholder theory, mediation | No; stakeholder theory | Theory | None |
| 15. Lane and Crane (2002) | Gender stereotypes in sales | No; gender stereotypes and sales work | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------|--|
| 16. Lawrence and Maitlis (2012) | Compassion in organizations | Yes; organization studies | Theory | Thematic review |
| 17. Liff and Wajcman (1996) | Equal opportunity initiatives and diversity | Yes; diversity | Theory | None |
| 18. Linstead and Pullen (2006) | Gender | No; gender studies and social theory | Theory | None |
| 19. Machold, Ahmed and Farquhar (2008) | Corporate governance | Yes; business ethics and corporate governance | Theory | None |
| 20. Maier (1997) | Corporate masculinity, organizational performance | Yes; masculinity | Theory | Reading of published accounts of Challenger space shuttle disaster |
| 21. Martin (1990) | Gender | Yes; discrimination | Theory, practice | Deconstructionist reading of organizational story |
| 22. Metcalfe (2008) | Women and globalisation | No; globalisation | Theory | Secondary case study, UN dataset analysis |
| 23. Mumby and Putnam (1992) | Rationality and emotion | No; emotion | Theory | None |
| 24. Newton (1998) | Foucault and subjectivity | No; organization theory | Theory | None |
| 25. Oakley (2000) | Women's under-representation at executive level as an ethical issue | Yes; discrimination | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| 26. Paetzold and Shaw (1994) | Sexual harassment | No; legal studies | Theory | None |
| 27. Paul and Mukhopadhyay (2010) | Knowledge and intellectual property rights | No; globalization | Theory | Case study using secondary data |
| 28. Payne (2000) | Ethics in business and education | No; management education and ethics | Theory | None |
| 29. Prasad (2012) | Difference, binary thinking, dualist thinking, [strategic] essentialism | Yes; organization theory | Theory | None |
| 30. Prieto-Carrón (2008) | CSR and codes of conduct and their effects on women | Yes; CSR | Theory | None |
| 31. Rabouin (1997) | Pedagogy | Yes; business ethics | Theory, pedagogy | Experiential |
| 32. Sayers (2012) | Wage gap | Yes; pay | Theory | Critical review |
| 33. Simola (2012) | Sustainable business practice | Yes; sustainability | Theory | Three descriptive cases based on secondary data |
| 34. Simola (2015) | Moral courage | Yes; organization theory | Theory | None |
| 35. Simpson and Lewis (2005) | Gender and organization | Yes; organization theory | Theory | Narrative review |
| 36. Stoll (2008) | CSR initiatives and backlash against them | No; CSR | Social movement | None |
| 37. Ulshofer (2000) | International trade | No; ethics | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|------|
| 38. Vachhani (2012) | Psychoanalysis of organizations | Yes; organization theory | Theory | None |
| 39. Walker, Dauterive, Schultz and Block (2004) | Competition and co-operation | No; organization theory | Theory | None |

Table 2: Empirical, focused on feminist organizations and organizing

| Paper | Central topic or problematic | Feminism only or primary conceptual frame; focus of contribution | Perspective on feminism | Methods, methodologies |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Angus (1993) | Empirical; organizational culture, especially gender | No; culture | Theory | Ethnography |
| 2. Aryee (1992) | Empirical; work-family conflict | No; role stress and conflict | Theory | Quantitative: questionnaire survey, Likert scales, factor and regression analysis |
| 3. Bartunek, Walsh and Lacey (2000) | Empirical; leadership | No; leadership studies | Practice, social movement | Longitudinal participant observation, interview, focus group; content analysis |
| 4. Boulouta (2013) | Empirical; board diversity | No; social role theory | Ethic | Quantitative: performance metrics for large companies; descriptive and correlational statistics |
| 5. Collins and Wray-Bliss (2005) | Empirical; sex discrimination and ethical action in organizations | No; the ethics of critique, methodology | Theory, practice | Participant observation, standpoint epistemology, autoethnography |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 6. D'Enbeau and Buzzanell (2013) | Empirical; feminist organizations, specifically image, identity and culture | No; organizational identity | Social movement | Multi-method case study – participant observation, documents, interview; thematic inductive NVivo coding |
| 7. de Jonge (2018) | Empirical; domestic violence initiatives | Yes; CSR | Ethics | Qualitative case study |
| 8. Desivilya and Yassour-Borochowitz (2008) | Empirical; organizational development, organization structure in social movements | Yes; organizational development | Practice and ideology, that analysis of then influences theory. Unusually, both authors self-identify as feminist | Participant observation, interviews, documents; grounded theory |
| 9. Essers, Doorewaard and Benschop (2013) | Empirical; identity and small business | No; identity work, entrepreneurship | Practice | Life history and narrative analysis; inductive thematic analysis, presented as short stories |
| 10. Farrell (1994) | Empirical; organization structure | Yes; organization structure | Theory, practice | Interviews, archive |
| 11. Fotaki (2013) | Empirical; under-representation of women at senior levels in business schools | Yes; professional and academic work | Theory | Working life stories and biographies, psychosocial abductive narrative analysis |
| 12. Gatrell (2013) | Empirical; feminist practice within organizations, maternity at work | Yes; maternity in organizations | Practice, ethic | Interview, 27 respondents; inductive interpretivism, thematic |
| 13. Griffin et al. (2017) | Empirical; communication of | No; gender norms | Temporal marker | Cultural studies, film analysis |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| | socio-cultural expectations about work through children's films | | | |
| 14. Furman (1990) | Empirical; teaching through textbooks, principle based ethics | No; management education and business ethics | Theory | None |
| 15. Grosser (2016) | Empirical; women's NGOs as actors in governance and CSR | No; CSR and governance | Practice | Interviews, 10 respondents; grounded theory |
| 16. Kelan (2008) | Empirical; gendered implications of 'new worker' discourse, damage that post-feminism can do | Yes; inequality | Theory | Discourse analysis of six management guru texts; thematic coding |
| 17. Kirton and Healy (2012) | Empirical; leadership, trade union organization | No; leadership studies | Social movement, theory | Interview and focus group, 130 respondents in US and UK; NVivo coding, discourse analysis and thematic analysis |
| 18. Lauwo (2018) | Empirical; silencing of women's voices in CSR | Yes; CSR | Theory | Interpretive ethnographic case study |
| 19. Lin (2008) This paper is almost identical to the one following – the terms feminine, feminist, and feministic are used interchangeably, as a way of referring to femininity. There's no meaningful engagement with any sort of feminist theory or activism as usually understood | | | | |
| 20. Lin and Yeh (2009) | Empirical; representations of women in advertising | No – in fact, not present at all. They use the term 'feminism' in the | None | Categorisation of images in advertising; interview |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------|---|
| | | abstract, to refer to a new form of femininity | | |
| 21. Mescher, Benschop and Doorewaard (2010) | Empirical; corporate representations of work-life balance; gender and HRM | Yes; HRM | Theory | Webpage text analysis; content and thematic analysis |
| 22. Meyerson (1998) | Empirical; medical and managerial discourses of stress and burnout | Yes; stress and burnout | Theory | Reinterprets previous ethnographic work |
| 23. Mirchandani (2003) | Empirical; race and emotion at work | No; race in organizations | Theory | 30 interviews with self-employed women; grounded theory and open coding |
| 24. Morgen (1994) | Empirical; organizational structure | Yes; gender and emotion | Theory, practice | Interview, archive, non-participant observation |
| 25. Nath, Holder- Webb and Cohen (2013) | Empirical; CSR and the value of CSR information to markets | No; CSR | Theory | Quantitative: factor and multivariate analysis |
| 26. Orser, Elliott and Leck (2013) | Empirical; entrepreneurship | Yes; entrepreneurship | Theory | 15 women 'entrepreneurial feminists' interviewed; NVivo coding, thematic analysis |
| 27. Reinelt (1994) | Empirical; feminist organization | Yes; feminist organization, empowerment | Theory, practice | Case study, non-participant observation |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 28. Runté and Mills (2006) | Empirical; organization and management thought | Yes; organization theory | Theory | Historical; discourse analysis of texts on management and work |
| 29. Schwartz (1996) | Empirical | No; psychoanalysis | Theory | Psychoanalytic method |
| 30. Sullivan and Delaney (2017) | Empirical; entrepreneurship and gender | No; femininity, entrepreneurship, neoliberalism | Discourse | Narrative analysis |
| 31. Trethewey (1999) | Empirical; women's bodies and embodied identities | Yes; organization theory | Theory | Limited participant observation, nineteen interviews, thematic analysis |
| 32. Van den Brink and Benschop (2014) | Empirical; networking | Yes; networking | Theory, practice | 64 interviews; abductive coding, thematic |
| 33. Zilber (2002) | Empirical; rape crisis centre | No; organization theory | Practice | Ethnography. Grounded theory, informed by narrative, conversation and script analysis |

Table 3: Feminist methodology

| Paper | Central topic or problematic | Feminism only or primary conceptual frame; focus of contribution | Perspective on feminism | Methods, methodologies |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Gilmore and Kenny (2015) | Methodological; reflexivity | No; methodology | Theory | Interview, thematic analysis |
| Of the papers that take feminism as a primary frame, we read the following trends into their engagement with feminism: | | | | |

Angus; Ashcraft; Bartunek et al; D'Enbeau and Buzzanell; Desivilya and Yassour-Borochowitz; Essers et al.; Farrell; Furman; Knights; Lampe; Meyerson; Mumby and Putnam; Reinelt; Simola; Simpson and Lewis; Trethewey; Ulshofer; Vachhani; and Silber argue that feminist theory and practice provides a coherent and practical alternative to established management and organizational theory;

Boulouta; Buchholz and Rosenthal; Burke and McKeen; Calas and Smircich; Calas et al.; Crittenden; de Jonge; Ely and Padavic; Fotaki et al.; Jacques; Karam and Jamali; Lawrence and Maitlis; Liff and Wajcman; Machold et al.; Maier; Mescher et al.; Nath et al.; Orser et al.; Paul and Mukhopadhyay; Payne; Rabouin; Runte and Mills; Sayers; Simola, both papers; Ven den Brink and Benschop; and Walker et al. argue that feminist theory can be used to reinterpret existing management or organization practice;

Aryee; Collins and Wray-Bliss; Cudd; Fotaki; Gatrell; Kelan; Kirton and Healy; Lane and Crane; Lauwo; Martin; Metcalfe; Mirchandani; Morgen; Oakley; Paetzold and Shaw; Prieto-Carron; and Stoll approach feminism as a means of analysing women's experiences of management and organization;

Prasad; Gilmore and Kenny; Linstead and Pullen; and Newton argue that feminist thinking can help overcome fundamental ontological or epistemological issues in MOS;

and five, in our reading, show no meaningful engagement with feminism beyond using the term (Frosh [both papers], Lin, Lin and Yeh; Schwartz).

Finally, at the time of writing at the end of 2018, nine papers had been accepted for publication and were in press, all in either *Human Relations* or *Journal of Business Ethics*:

Baker, D. and Kelan, E. (2018). Splitting and blaming: The psychic life of neoliberal women. *Human Relations*.

Ghazal, M. and Khan, M. (2018). NGO-led organizing and Pakistan's homeworkers: A materialist feminist analysis of collective agency. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Huopalainen, A. and Satama, S. (2018). Mothers and researchers in the making: Negotiating 'new' motherhood within the 'new' academia. *Human Relations*.

Jack, G., Riach, K. and Bariola, E. (2018) Temporality and gendered agency: Menopausal subjectivities in women's work. *Human Relations*.

Moosmayer, D., Waddock, S., Wang, L., Hühn, M, Dierksmeier, C. and Gohl, C. (2018). Leaving the road to Abilene: Addressing the normative paradox of responsible management education. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2018). CSR as gendered neocoloniality in the Global South. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Sinclair, A. (2018) Five movements in embodied feminism: A memoir. *Human Relations*.

Tyler, M. (2018). Reassembling difference? Rethinking inclusion through/as embodied ethics. *Human Relations*.

Vachhani. S. and Pullen, A. (2018). Ethics, politics and feminist organizing: Writing feminist infrapolitics and affective solidarity into everyday sexism. *Human Relations*.

Table 4: Papers published in GWO 1990-2018

| Paper | Paper type (conceptual, empirical, methodological); empirical or analytical focus | Feminism only or primary conceptual frame; focus of contribution | Perspective on feminism | Methods, methodologies |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Acker (2008) | Conceptual; double strangeness and gender | No; gender | Intersectional feminism | Limited narrative analysis of career biographies of four women pioneers in academia |
| 2. Balka (1997) | Empirical; gender and participatory design | No; extends analysis of gender as a factor in participatory design | Practice | Quantitative: mail surveys; statistical analysis |
| 3. Berguland, Ahl, Petterson & Tillmar (2018) | Empirical; entrepreneurship | Yes; collective feminist action | Theory, practice | Discourse analysis |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|---|
| 4. Benschop (2009) | Empirical; gender as practice of social network theory | No; argues networking does not necessarily reinforce gender inequality | Practice | Qualitative: male/female accounts of management work in semi-structured interviews; micro-level Critical Discourse Analysis |
| 5. Benschop, Halsema, & Schreurs (2001) | Conceptual; inequality in the banking and policing sector | Yes; the assumptions and strategies that respondents (in the study) use to account for inequalities | Theory | Secondary data: banking sector and police force as case examples |
| 6. Biehl-Missal (2014) | Conceptual; feminine writing | No; feminine writing | Theory | None |
| 7. Biesecker & Winterfeld (2018) | Conceptual; sustainability | No; sustainability | Theory | Secondary data: discussion of German example of a 'Social Contract for Sustainability' |
| 8. Billing (1994) | Empirical; organization theory | No; gender, organization theory | Theory | Qualitative case studies |
| 9. Blackmore (2011) | Empirical; gender equity in education | No; governance/gender equity in education | Theory | Reports on empirical and policy studies undertaken by author and colleagues |
| 10. Brewis & Grey (1994) | Conceptual; re-eroticizing organization theory | Yes; modernist-feminist | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|------------------|--|
| 11. Brewis & Linstead (2000) | Conceptual; gender, embodiment, and prostitution | No; prostitution, embodiment | Practice | Qualitative: secondary data from a previous research project, and analysis of accounts of sex work published by prostitutes in Australia |
| 12. Bulbeck (2005) | Empirical; analysis of vocabulary on issues surrounding men participating in house work | No; gender | Practice | Quantitative: questionnaires, surveys, cluster sampling |
| 13. Chen (2018) | Empirical; male bodywork | No; bodywork and gender | Practice | Qualitative: 34 interviews |
| 14. Colgan & Ledwith (2000) | Empirical; diversity of women who are active in trade unions | No; social identity | Theory | Mixed methods: documents, observation, interviews, questionnaires, surveys |
| 15. Conley (2005) | Empirical; trade union organizing of part-time women workers | Yes; feminism as an analytical framework for service-sector work | Practice, theory | Qualitative: case study, interview and fieldnotes |
| 16. Conley & Page (2017) | Empirical; equal opportunity policies | Yes; equality | Theory | Qualitative: 5 case studies |
| 17. Craddock (2017) | Empirical; austerity and feminism | Yes; feminist responses to austerity | Theory | Qualitative: semi-structured interviews, text analysis, participant observations; thematic analysis |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------|--|
| 18. Crompton (1997) | Empirical; employment and domestic life experiences of women bankers and doctors in Czech Republic | Yes; post-Communist Feminism and masculinities | Theory | Qualitative: biographical interviews; additional data from International Social Survey Programme |
| 19. Cullen (1994) | Conceptual; gender and management | Yes; gender | Theory, practice | None |
| 20. Cullen & Murphy (2017) | Empirical; feminist organizations and gender | Yes; feminist agency and gender equality | Theory | Qualitative: four case studies; secondary sources and primary data collected from public sources (media websites), and 12 interviews |
| 21. Cullen & Murphy (2018) | Empirical; gender equality | No; BCGE (Business Case for Gender Equality) | Practice | Qualitative: 3 case studies |
| 22. Davidson (1995) | Empirical; prostitution, control and consent | Yes | Theory | Ethnography |
| 23. Davies, Browne, Gannon, Honan, & Sommerville (2005) | Empirical; gender embodiment in academic work | No; neoliberalism | Practice | Collective biography workshops |
| 24. Duffy, Hancock, & Tyler (2017) | Empirical; gender subjectivity | Yes; gender inequality and post-feminism | Theory | Qualitative; secondary data |
| 25. Ergene, Calas & Smircich (2018) | Conceptual; sustainability | No; ecological sustainability | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|
| 26. Essers & Tedmanson (2014) | Empirical; entrepreneurship (women migrants) | No; identity and Other | Theory | Qualitative: interview |
| 27. Eveline, Bacchi, & Binns (2009) | Empirical; case study of Indigenous policy strategy in Australia | No; intersectional feminism and oppression | Theory, practice | Mixed methods: case study, participatory action research, statistical analysis |
| 28. Flores & Hondagneu-Sotelo (2014) | Empirical; workplace inequities | Yes; critiques feminist analysis of gender and race inequality | Theory | Qualitative: interviews |
| 29. Fournier & Kelemen (2001) | Empirical; gender and community | No; community | Practice | Qualitative: observation |
| 30. Gardiner & Fulfer (2017) | Conceptual; organization of families | Yes; diversity and inequality | Theory | None |
| 31. Gatrell (2011) | Empirical; pregnancy, embodiment | No; embodiment | Practice | Qualitative: netnography |
| 32. Gill, Kelan, & Scharff (2017) | Empirical; sexism and gender fatigue | Yes; post-feminism | Theory | Qualitative: interview, discourse analysis |
| 33. Glucksmann (1995) | Conceptual; work and labour | Yes; deconstructionist feminism | Theory | None |
| 34. Green & Cassell (1996) | Conceptual; management | Yes; gender and organization | Theory | None |
| 35. Gress & Paek (2014) | Empirical; female managers in South Korea | No; gender inequality | Theory | Quantitative: survey |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------|---|
| 36. Halford, Kukarenko, Lotherington, & Obstdelfer, (2015) | Empirical; age inequality | Yes; intersectional feminism and Science & Technology Studies | Theory | Qualitative: case study, interview, thematic analysis |
| 37. Hari (2017) | Empirical; gender | No; work-life balance | Practise | Qualitative: interview, website analysis |
| 38. Hart (2002) | Empirical; cooperative collective bargaining | No; looking for patterns of cooperation and conflict in pay bargaining processes | Practice | Qualitative: case study, with secondary data from previous study, and documentary policy analysis |
| 39. Hatcher (2003) | Conceptual; gender | No; gender and management | Theory | None |
| 40. Heiskanen, Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, Leinonen & Ylostalo (2018) | Empirical; gender inequality | No; intersectional feminism | Practice | Mixed methods: case study, fieldnotes, participant accounts |
| 41. Henttonen, LaPointe, Pesonen, Vanhala, (2013) | Conceptual; gender and media | No; discursive construction professions | Practise, theory | Media data |
| 42. Hopfl (2000) | Conceptual; gender and organization | No; gender, embodiment | Theory | None |
| 43. Husso & Hirvonen (2012) | Conceptual; gendered effects of the intensification of work | Yes; develops a conceptual frame based on Bourdieu and feminism | Practise, theory | Qualitative: policy, interview, thematic analysis |
| 44. Hoeber (2007) | Empirical; gender equity | No; meaning of gender equity | Theory | Qualitative: interview, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------|--|
| | | | | observations, documents, thematic analysis |
| 45. Holvino (2010) | Conceptual; intersectional feminism | Yes; identity, feminist organization studies | Theory | None |
| 46. Irving & Helin (2018) | Conceptual; gender | No; sustainable development | Theory | Secondary data; discourse analysis |
| 47. Jansson, Mortberg & Berg (2007) | Empirical; gender and technology | No; technological change | Practice | Qualitative: focus group, interview with stimulus material |
| 48. Jones & Clifton (2018) | Empirical; entrepreneurship | Yes; gender and identity work | Theory | Qualitative: interview, narrative analysis |
| 49. Kensbock, Bailey, Jennings, & Patiar (2015) | Empirical; sexual harassment | No; sexual harassment | Theory | Qualitative: interview, constructivist grounded theory |
| 50. Kirton (1999) | Empirical; women and trade unions | Yes; trade unions and gender | Practice | Qualitative: interview, documents |
| 51. Krefting (2003) | Conceptual; merit and gender | Yes | Theory, practice | Quantitative |
| 52. Knights & Kerfoot (2004) | Conceptual; essentialism, binaries, hierarchy | Yes; Foucauldian and non-Foucauldian feminism | Theory | None |
| 53. Knoppers (2011) | Empirical; male managers and sport | No; sport, skill | Theory, practice | Qualitative: interview, discourse analysis |
| 54. Kong (2006) | Empirical; female prostitution | Yes | Theory, practice | Qualitative: interview, oral history method, |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | grounded theory, feminist discourse analysis |
| 55. Lee (2018) | Conceptual; embodiment, intimacy at work, breastfeeding | Yes; embodiment | Theory | None |
| 56. Lewis & Simpson (2017) | Conceptual; preference theory | Yes; preference theory, postfeminism | Theory | None |
| 57. Lombardo (2017) | Conceptual; gender and redomestication | Yes | Theory | Qualitative: content analysis of policy documents, secondary policy sources |
| 58. Mauthner & Edwards (2010) | Empirical – feminist management | Yes – feminist research management needs to recognise and accept the differences and inequalities among feminists | Feminist research management | Qualitative: reflexive critical analysis of experiences of contract and research management |
| 59. Metcalfe & Linstead (2003) | Empirical – gendered process of teams | No – teamwork/gendered process of teamwork | Theory | Qualitative: interview, literary/textual analysis, case study |
| 60. Mills (2002) | Conceptual – organizational culture | Yes -outlines a feminist study of organizational culture | Theory | Qualitative: case study, secondary data |
| 61. Mirchandani (1999) | Conceptual; female entrepreneurship | Yes – female entrepreneurship and feminist gendered theory on gendered work | Theory | None |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 62. Munro (2001) | Empirical; women working as cleaners in the NHS | No – argues the study demonstrates the wide range of social divisions present | Refers to the context of a feminist trade union | Mixed methods: interview, observation, questionnaire, documentary material |
| 63. Nentwich (2006) | Empirical – how equal opportunity officers deal with gender issues | Yes – how sameness and difference feminism impacts change projects | Sameness and difference feminism | Qualitative: interview, discourse analysis |
| 64. Nilsson (2013) | Empirical; masculinity and hierarchy | No – analyses micro-practise of masculinity | Masculinity and feminist theory | Qualitative: secondary data, 15 episodes of reality TV |
| 65. Ozkazanc-Pan & Muntean (2018) | Empirical – technology entrepreneurship and gender inequality | No, entrepreneurship | Theory, practice | Qualitative: interview, participant observation |
| 66. Page (2011) | Empirical – gender inequality | Yes – feminist and critical leadership research | Feminist and critical leadership research | Qualitative: research workshops, interview |
| 67. Palmer & Eveline (2012) | Empirical – equality (pay) in care work | Yes – build on large body of feminist research that analyses why care work is devalued | Practise | Qualitative: interview, discourse analysis. |
| 68. Parsons & Priola (2013) | Empirical – women academics | No – identity and change | Practise | Qualitative: interview, thematic analysis |
| 69. Rippin (2015) | Empirical – feminine writing | Yes – feminist critique of organizing this method is considered | Feminine writing | Qualitative: case study of feminine writing, ‘fictional’ interviews |
| 70. Ronen (2018) | Empirical – Gender Theory | Yes, gender typing/ post-feminist ideology | Post-feminism | Qualitative: interview |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 71. Ross-Smith & Kornberger (2004) | Conceptual – critical gender studies | Yes – rationality and masculinity | Feminist organization theory | None |
| 72. Rousseau (2015) | Empirical: gender and homosexuality | No – case study used is a feminist group | Marxist-feminist group used as a case study | Qualitative: historical case study |
| 73. Rumens (2008) | Empirical – sexuality in the workplace | No – highlights the heterosexist content of research on gender and emotion | Engages with feminist and queer theory | Qualitative: interview |
| 74. Rumens (2017) | Conceptual – Gender and Organizations | Yes – develops postmodernism as a sensibility by considering it in relation to contemporary meaning and masculinities | Post-feminism | None |
| 75. Ross-Smith & Huppertz (2010) | Empirical – women in senior management | Yes – feminist interpretation using Bourdieu | Contemporary feminism | Qualitative: ethnographic interviews, thematic analysis, NVivo analysis |
| 76. Saraswati (2017) | Empirical – Waste studies (Indonesian women migrant care workers in Japan) | Yes, feminist waste studies – intersects feminist and waste studies in the analysis | Feminist waste studies | Qualitative: interviews, open-coding, thematic analysis |
| 77. Sangster & Smith (2016) | Empirical; gender (inequality and embodiment) | No – adopts a materialist-feminist approach to examine union grievances of the body | Materialist-feminist | Qualitative: secondary data; union records, media |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| 78. Stanworth (2000) | Empirical – information age | Yes – suggests a feminist framework to aid future research | Considers; ecofeminist; liberal; and post-feminist views | Quantitative: secondary |
| 79. Sayers & Jones (2014) | Empirical – women’s menstruation | No – argues menstruation should be a required topic for organization studies | Uses feminist accounts writing on menstruation | Qualitative: secondary |
| 80. Sinclair (2005) | Empirical; bodily experience and observation in management teaching | No – body/gender | Theory (draws on feminist scholarship) | Autoethnography |
| 81. Smithson & Stokoe (2005) | Empirical – flexible working/work-life balance | Yes – discusses the implication of work-life balance on policymakers and feminist researchers | Practice | Qualitative: focus group, interview, ethnomethodology |
| 82. Sørensen (2017) | Empirical – double entanglement (women combining career and motherhood) | Yes – neoliberalism and post-feminism | Post-feminism | Qualitative: media analysis, inspired by discourse analysis |
| 83. Stewart-Thomas (2010) | Empirical – women as leader of a congregation meeting | No – gendered organization and the relationship between the percentage of women on a congregation governing body and the probability of participant in the services | Practice (clergywomen, congregations) | Quantitative: secondary, binary logistics model |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 84. Swan (2017a) | Conceptual – diversity | No, white diversity research | Theory (mentions white feminism) | None |
| 85. Swan (2017b) | Empirical – post-feminist representation | Yes, post-feminism | Practise (coaching website), Theory (post-feminism) | Qualitative: case study, multi-modal analysis |
| 86. Tancred (1995) | Conceptual – sociology of work | Yes – argues feminist research has contributed to rethinking of men and women in the workplace. | Theory | None |
| 87. Taylor (2006) | Empirical – women’s labour role in Japanese owned enterprises | No – just in time/lean production and Japanization | Practice | Ethnography |
| 88. Thanem (2010) | Empirical – sexuality in contemporary Swedish sex education | No – sexuality and gender stereotypes | Organization and feminist theory | Qualitative: secondary documentary data |
| 89. Thomas & Davies (2002) | Empirical – new public management (NPM) | Yes – explores gendered nature of NPM using Foucauldian feminist framework | Foucauldian feminist framework | Qualitative: interview, social constructionist analysis |
| 90. Tyler & Taylor (1998) | Empirical – women’s work in contemporary western society | Yes – uses feminist work for wider implications for studying gender and work arguing feminist work has neglected Mauss’s work on the gift | Post-structuralist feminism | Qualitative: case study, interviews, participant observations, content analysis |
| 91. Watts (2009) | Empirical – work/life balance (women working as engineers) | No – feminist post-structuralist framework used to analyse how | Feminist post-structuralist framework | Qualitative: interview, thematic analysis |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | women negotiate work-life balance | | |
| 92. Webb (1997) | Empirical – equal opportunities (reviews changes) | Yes – argues radical feminist agendas have been adapted to the concerns of liberal feminism | Liberal and radical feminism | Case analysis |
| 93. Wilson & Thompson (2001) | Conceptual – sexual harassment lies with the issues of power | Yes – shows how radical post-structuralist feminism overlaps with Luke’s third dimension of power | Radical post-structuralist feminism | None |
| 94. Yates, Riach, & Johansson (2018) | Empirical – Gendered embodiment of female police officers | No; gendered embodiment at work | Practise, theory | Qualitative: interview, interpretative phenomenological analysis |
| 95. Young (2018) | Conceptual – gender | Yes; ecofeminism | Ecofeminism | None |
| In addition, at the end of 2018 we found twenty-five papers in press or accepted for publication: | | | | |
| Paper | Paper type (empirical or conceptual); empirical or analytical focus | Feminism only or primary conceptual frame; focus of contribution | Perspective on feminism | Methods, methodologies |
| a) Adkins (2018) | Conceptual; materialist feminist sociology | Yes; feminist sociology | Materialist feminist sociology | None |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---|
| b) Baines & Armstrong (2018) | Empirical; operation of gender and industrial relations in long term care work | Yes; extends feminist political economy by analysing links between policies and front line care work | Feminist political economy | Qualitative: rapid ethnography, 7 case studies, hand coding for patterns and themes |
| c) Bridges & Messerschmidt (2017) | Conceptual | No; tribute to Joan Acker's work | Overview, tribute to Joan Acker | None |
| d) Clarke & Knights (2018) | Empirical; ethnography of veterinary surgery | No; challenges gendered notions of anthropocentric organization | Post-humanist feminism | Qualitative: ethnography, thematic and discourse analysis, NVivo analysis |
| e) Colley & White (2018) | Empirical; neoliberal feminism | Yes; analysis of gendered effects of neoliberal feminism | Neoliberal feminism | Qualitative: secondary, ideographic analysis |
| f) Coulter & Fitzgerald (2018) | Empirical; animal cruelty | No; explores the gendered nature of species interconnections | Feminist political economy | Mixed methods: survey, interview, focus group |
| g) Davies & Riach (2018) | Empirical; ethnography of bee-work | No; androcentrism | Feminist materialism | Ethnography |
| h) Finkel & Danby (2018) | Empirical; human-equine relations | No; gendered nature of human-equine relations | Post-humanism | Qualitative: interview, diary, ethnography, thematic analysis |
| i) Fodor, Glass & Nagy (2018) | Empirical; processes of dissemination and translation of business feminism | Yes; interaction of global business and business feminism | Business feminism | Qualitative: interview |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| j) Grosser & McCarthy (2018) | Conceptual; CSR and neoliberal feminism | Yes; feminist social movement theory | Neoliberal feminism, feminist social movements | None |
| k) Johnson-Ross (2018) | Empirical; professional feminism | No; gender equality | Professional feminism | Qualitative: secondary data |
| l) Jones, Martinez & Vershinina (2018) | Empirical; gendered knowledge regimes | Yes; argues gendered knowledge regime marginalises feminist scholarship | Feminist knowledge production, entrepreneurship | Autoethnography |
| m) Lin & Besten (2018) | Empirical; masculine work cultures | No; masculine work cultures | Practice | Qualitative: case study |
| n) Martin (2018) | Conceptual | Yes; history and present of feminism | Overview/ tribute to Joan Acker | None |
| o) Mavin, Elliot, Stead & Williams (2018) | Empirical; multi-modal analysis | Yes; potential of multi-modal analysis in dialogue with feminism | Moderate feminism | Qualitative: secondary |
| p) Mavin & Grandy (2018) | Conceptual; gendered body work of women leaders | Yes; post-feminism as a bodily practice | Post-feminism | None |
| q) McGregor & Davies (2018) | Conceptual; substantive equality, pay and equity settlements | No; pay equity, substantive equity | Activism | None |
| r) Ozkazanc-Pan (2018) | Conceptual; consideration of responses to #MeToo | Yes; forms of feminism that enable societal and organizational change | Intersectional, decolonial, post-colonial, transnational feminisms | None |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| s) Rottenberg (2018) | Empirical; emergence of neoliberal feminism | Yes; news permutations of neoliberal feminism | Neoliberal feminism | Qualitative: secondary |
| t) Rubery (2018) | Conceptual; tribute to Joan Acker | No; gender and pay | Overview/tribute to Joan Acker | None |
| u) Satama & Huopalainen (2018) | Empirical; affective relations with animals | No; canine-human companionship | Feminist writing | Qualitative: autoethnography |
| v) Sayce (2018) | Conceptual; Joan Acker tribute | Yes; history and present of feminism | Overview/tribute to Joan Acker | None |
| w) Stojmenovska (2018) | Empirical; pay and equality | No; gender and pay | Activism | Quantitative: Workplace Employment Relations Study |
| x) Taylor & Fraser (2018) | Empirical; valuation of work of women and animals | No; potential of visual methodologies to give voice to women and animals | Post-humanist | Qualitative: secondary |
| y) Zippell & Marx-Ferree (2018) | Empirical; gender equity | No – gender equity | Theory | Qualitative: participant observation |

Appendix 1

FT50 papers – 74

- Angus, L. (1993). Masculinity and women teachers at Christian Brothers College. *Organization Studies*, **14**, 235-260.
- Aryee, S. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: Evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations*, **45**, 813-837.
- Ashcraft, K. (2001). Organized dissonance: Feminist bureaucracy as hybrid form. *Academy of Management Journal*, **44**, 1301-1322.
- Bartunek, J., Walsh, K. and Lacey, C. (2000). Dynamics and dilemmas of women leading women. *Organization Science*, **11**, 589-610.
- Boulouta, I. (2013). Hidden connections: The link between board gender diversity and corporate social performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **113**, 185-197.
- Buchholz, R. and Rosenthal, S. (2005). Toward a contemporary conceptual framework for stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **58**, 137-148.
- Burke, R. and McKeen, C. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **9**, 317-332.
- Calás, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review*, **24**, 649-671.
- Calás, M.B., Smircich, L., and Bourne, K. (2009). Extending the boundaries: Reframing 'entrepreneurship as social change' through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, **34**, 552-569.
- Collins, H. and Wray-Bliss, E. (2005). Discriminating ethics. *Human Relations*, **58**, 799-824.
- Crittenden, C. (2000). Ecofeminism meets business: A comparison of ecofeminist, corporate, and free market ideologies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **24**, 51-63.
- Cudd, A. (2015). Is capitalism good for women? *Journal of Business Ethics*, **127**, 761-770.
- D'Enbeau, S. and Buzzanell, P. (2013). Constructing a feminist organization's identity in a competitive marketplace: The intersection of ideology, image, and culture. *Human Relations*, **66**, 1447-1470.
- de Jonge, A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility through a feminist lens: Domestic violence and the workplace in the 21st century. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **148**, 471-487.
- Desivilya, H. and Yassour-Borochowitz, D. (2008). The case of CheckpointWatch: A study of organizational practices in a women's human rights organization. *Organization Studies*, **29**, 887-908.

- Ely, R. and Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, **32**, 1121-1143.
- Essers, C., Doorewaard, H. and Benschop, Y. (2013). Family ties: Migrant female business owners doing identity work on the public-private divide. *Human Relations*, **66**, 1645-1665.
- Farrell, A. (1994). A social experiment in publishing: *Ms. Magazine*, 1972-1989. *Human Relations*, **47**, 707-730.
- Fotaki, M. (2013). No woman is like a man (in academia): The masculine symbolic order and the unwanted female body. *Organization Studies*, **34**, 1251-1275.
- Fotaki, M., Metcalfe, B. and Harding, N. (2014). Writing materiality into management and organization studies through and with Luce Irigaray. *Human Relations*, **67**, 1239-1263.
- Frosh, S. (1997). Psychoanalytic challenges: A contribution to the new sexual agenda. *Human Relations*, **50**, 229-239.
- Frosh, S. (2003). Psychosocial studies and psychology: Is a critical approach emerging? *Human Relations*, **56**, 1545-1567.
- Furman, F. (1990). Teaching business ethics: Questioning the assumptions, seeking new directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **9**, 31-38.
- Gatrell, C. (2013). Maternal body work: How women managers and professionals negotiate pregnancy and new motherhood at work. *Human Relations*, **66**, 621-644.
- Gilmore, S. and Kenny, K. (2015). Work-worlds colliding: Self reflexivity, power and emotion in organizational ethnography. *Human Relations*, **68**, 55-78.
- Griffin, M., Hardy, N. and Learmonth, M. (2017). Whistle while you work? Disney animation, organizational readiness and gendered subjugation. *Organization Studies*, **38**, 869-894.
- Grosser, K. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and multi-stakeholder governance: Pluralism, feminist perspectives, and women's NGOs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **137**, 65-81.
- Jacques, R. (1992). Critique and theory building: Producing knowledge "from the kitchen". *Academy of Management Review*, **17**, 582-606.
- Karam, C. and Jamali, D. (2017). A cross-cultural and feminist perspective on CSR in developing countries: Uncovering latent power dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **142**, 461-477.
- Kelan, E. (2008). The discursive construction of gender in contemporary management literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **81**, 427-445.
- Kirton, G. and Healy, G. (2012). 'Lift as you rise': Union women's leadership talk. *Human Relations*, **65**, 979-999.
- Knights, D. (1997). Organization theory in the age of deconstruction: Dualism, gender and postmodernism revisited. *Organization Studies*, **18**, 1-19.

- Lampe, M. (2001). Mediation as an ethical adjunct of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **31**, 165-173.
- Lane, N. and Crane, A. (2002). Revisiting gender role stereotyping in the sales profession. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **40**, 121-132.
- Lauwo, S. (2018). Challenging masculinity in CSR discourses: Silencing of women's voices in Tanzania's mining industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **149**, 689-706.
- Lawrence, T. and Maitlis, S. (2012). Care and possibility: Enacting an ethic of care through narrative practice. *Academy of Management Review*, **37**, 641-663.
- Liff, S. and Wajcman, J. (1996). 'Sameness' and 'difference' revisited: Which way forward for equal opportunity initiatives? *Journal of Management Studies*, **33**, 79-94.
- Lin, C. (2008). Sexual issues: The analysis of female role portrayal preferences in Taiwanese print ads. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **83**, 409-418.
- Lin, C. and Yeh, J. (2009). Comparing society's awareness of women: Media-portrayed idealized images and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **90**, 61-79.
- Linstead, S. and Pullen, A. (2006). Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion. *Human Relations*, **59**, 1287-1310.
- Machold, S., Ahmed, P. and Farquhar, S. (2008). Corporate governance and ethics: A feminist perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **81**, 665-678.
- Maier, M. (1997). Gender equity, organizational transformation and challenger. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **16**, 943-962.
- Martin, P. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organization Science*, **1**, 339-359.
- Mescher, S., Benschop, Y. and Doorewaard, H. (2010). Representations of work-life balance support. *Human Relations*, **63**, pp. 21-39.
- Metcalf, B. (2008). Women, management and globalization in the Middle East. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **83**, pp. 85-100.
- Meyerson, D. (1998). Feeling stressed and burned out: A feminist reading and re-visioning of stress based emotions within medicine and organization science. *Organization Science*, **9**, 103-118.
- Mirchandani, K. (2003). Challenging racial silences in studies of emotion work: Contributions from anti-racist feminist theory. *Organization Studies*, **24**, 721-742.
- Morgen, S. (1994). Personalizing personnel decisions in feminist organizational theory and practice. *Human Relations*, **47**, 665-684.
- Mumby, D. and Putnam, L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality' *Academy of Management Review*, **17**, 465-486.

Nath, L., Holder- Webb, L. and Cohen, J. (2013). Will women lead the way? Differences in demand for corporate social responsibility information for investment decisions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **118**, 85-102.

Newton, T. (1998). Theorizing subjectivity in organizations: The failure of Foucauldian studies? *Organization Studies*, **19**, 415- 447.

Oakley, J. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **27**, 321-334.

Orser, B., Elliott, C. and Leck, J. (2013). Entrepreneurial feminists: Perspectives about opportunity recognition and governance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **115**, 241-257.

Paetzold, R. and Shaw, B. (1994). A postmodern feminist view of ‘reasonableness’ in hostile environment sexual harassment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **13**, 681-691.

Paul, P. and Mukhopadhyay, K. (2010). Growth via intellectual property rights versus gendered inequity in emerging economies: An ethical dilemma for international business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **91**, 359-378.

Payne, S. (2000). Challenges for research ethics and sciences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **26**, 307-318.

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

Prieto-Carrón, M. (2008). Women workers, industrialization, global supply chains and corporate codes of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **83**, 5-17.

Rabouin, M. (1997). Lyin’ t(*)gers and “cares”, oh my: The case for feminist integration of business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **16**, 247-261.

Reinelt, C. (1994). Fostering empowerment, building community: The challenge for state-funded feminist organizations. *Human Relations*, **47**, 685-705.

Runté, M. and Mills, A. (2006). Cold War, chilly climate: Exploring the roots of gendered discourse in organization and management theory. *Human Relations*, **59**, 695-720.

Sayers, R. (2012). The cost of being female: Critical comment on Block. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **106**, 519-524.

Schwartz, H. (1996). The sin of the father: Reflections on the roles of the corporation man, the suburban housewife, their son, and their daughter in the deconstruction of the patriarch. *Human Relations*, **49**, 1013-1040.

Simola, S. (2012). Exploring ‘embodied care’ in relation to social sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **107**, 473-484.

Simola, S. (2015). Understanding moral courage through a feminist and developmental ethic of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **130**, 29-44.

- Simpson, R. and Lewis, P. (2005). An investigation of silence and a scrutiny of transparency: Re-examining gender in organization literature through the concepts of voice and visibility. *Human Relations*, **58**, 1253-1275.
- Stoll, M. (2008). Backlash hits business ethics: Finding effective strategies for communicating the importance of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **78**, 17-24.
- Sullivan, K. and Delaney, H. (2017). A femininity that ‘giveth and taketh away’: The prosperity gospel and postfeminism in the neoliberal economy. *Human Relations*, **70**, 836-859.
- Trethewey, A. (1999). Disciplined bodies: Women’s embodied identities at work. *Organization Studies*, **20**, 423-450.
- Ulshofer, G. (2000). A Whiteheadian business ethics and the Western hemisphere. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **23**, 67-71.
- Vachhani, S. (2012). The subordination of the feminine? Developing a critical feminist approach to the psychoanalysis of organizations. *Organization Studies*, **33**, 1237-1255.
- Van den Brink, M. and Benschop, Y. (2014). Gender in academic networking: The role of gatekeepers in professorial recruitment. *Journal of Management Studies*, **51**, 460-492.
- Walker, D., Dauterive, J., Schultz, E. and Block, W. (2004). The feminist competition/cooperation dichotomy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **55**, 243-254.
- Zilber, T. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal*, **45**, 234-254.

Appendix 2

GWO papers – 95

- Acker, J., (2008) ‘Helpful Men and Feminist Support: More than Double Strangeness,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(3), 288-293.
- Balka, E., (1997) ‘Participatory Design in Women’s Organizations: The Social World of Organizational Structure and the Gendered Nature of Expertise,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(2), 99-115.
- Berglund, K., Ahl, H., Pettersson, K., & Tillmar, M., (2018) ‘Women’s entrepreneurship, neoliberalism and economic justice in the postfeminist era: A discourse analysis of policy change in Sweden,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(5), 531-556
- Benschop, Y., (2009) ‘The Micro-politics of Gendering in Networking,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(2), 217-237.
- Benschop, Y., Halsem, L., & Schreurs, P., (2001) ‘The Division of Labour and Inequalities Between the Sexes: An Ideological Dilemma,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(1), 1-18.

- Biehel-Missal, B., (2015) ‘I Write Like a Painter’: Feminine Creation with Arts-Based Methods in Organizational Research,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(2), 179-196.
- Biesecker, A., & von Winterfeld, U., (2018) ‘Notions of multiple crisis and feminist perspectives on social contract,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(3), 279-293
- Billings, Y.D., (1994) ‘Gender and Bureaucracies —A Critique of Ferguson's ‘The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy,’’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1(4), 179-193.
- Blackmore, J., (2011) ‘Bureaucratic, Corporate/market and Network Governance: Shifting Spaces for Gender Equity in Education,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(5), 443-466.
- Brewis, J., & Grey, C., (1994) ‘Re-Eroticizing the Organization: An Exegesis and Critique,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1(2), 67-82.
- Brewis, J., & Linstead, S., (2000) ‘‘The Worst Thing is the Screwing’ (2): Context and Career in Sex Work,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 7 (3), 168-180.
- Bulbeck, C., (2005) ‘‘The Mighty Pillar of the Family’: Young People's Vocabularies on Household Gender Arrangements in the Asia-Pacific Region,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(1), 14-31.
- Chen, B.W., (2018) ‘Touching intimacy: Bodywork, affect and the caring ethic in erotic gay massage in Taiwan,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(6), 637-652.
- Craddock, E., (2017) ‘Caring about and for the cuts: a case study of the gendered dimension of austerity and anti-austerity activism,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(1), 69-82.
- Crompton, R., (1997) ‘Women, Employment and Feminism in the Czech Republic,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(3), 137-148.
- Colgan, F., & Ledwith, S., (2000) ‘Diversity, Identities and Strategies of Women Trade Union Activists,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 7(4), 242-257.
- Conley, H., (2005) ‘Front Line or All Fronts? Women's Trade Union Activism in Retail Services,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(5), 479-496.
- Conley, H., & Page, M., (2017) ‘Revisiting Jewson and Mason: The politics of gender equality in UK local government in a cold climate,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(1), 7-19.
- Cullen, D., (1994) ‘Feminism, Management and Self-Actualization,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1(3), 127-137.
- Cullen, P., & Murphy, M.P., (2017) ‘Gendered mobilizations against austerity in Ireland’, *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(1), 83-97
- Cullen, P., & Murphy, M.P., (2018) ‘Leading the debate for the business case for gender equality, perilous for whom?’, *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(2), 110-126
- Davidson, J.O.C., (1995) ‘The Anatomy of ‘Free Choice’ Prostitution,’ *Gender, Work & Organization*, 2(1), 1-10.

- Davies, B., Browne, J., Gannon, S., Honan, E., & Somerville, M., (2005) 'Embodied Women at Work in Neoliberal Times and Places,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(4), 343-362.
- Duffy, K., Hancock, P., & Tyler, M., (2016) 'Still red hot? Postfeminism and gender subjectivities in the airline industry,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(2), 110-126
- Ergene, S., Calas, M.B., & Smircich, L., (2018) 'Ecologies of sustainable concerns: Organization theorizing for the Anthropocene,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 260-273.
- Essers, C., & Tedmanson, D., (2014) 'Upsetting 'Others' in the Netherlands: Narratives of Muslim Turkish Migrant Businesswomen at the Crossroads of Ethnicity, Gender and Religion,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(4), 353-367.
- Eveline, J., Bacchi, C., & Binns, J., (2009) 'Gender Mainstreaming versus Diversity Mainstreaming: Methodology as Emancipatory Politics,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(2), 198-216.
- Flores, G.M., & Hondagneu-Sotelo, P., (2014) 'The Social Dynamics Channelling Latina College Graduates into the Teaching Profession,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(6), 491-515.
- Fournier, V., & Kelemen, M., (2001) 'The Crafting of Community: Recoupling Discourses of Management and Womanhood,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(3), 267-290.
- Gatrell, C., (2011) 'Policy and the Pregnant Body at Work: Strategies of Secrecy, Silence and Supra-performance,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(2), 158-181.
- Gardiner, R., & Fulfer, K., (2017) 'Family matters: an Arendtian critique of organizational structures,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(5), 506-518.
- Gill, R., Kelan, E.K., & Scharff, C.M., (2016) 'A postfeminist sensibility at work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 226-244.
- Girton, K., (1999) 'Sustaining and Developing Women's Trade Union Activism: A Gendered Project?,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 6(4), 213-223.
- Glucksmann, M.A., (1995) 'Why 'Work'? Gender and the 'Total Social Organization of Labour,'' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 2(2), 63-75.
- Green, E., & Cassell, C., (1996) 'Women Managers, Gendered Cultural Processes and Organizational Change,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 3(3), 168-178.
- Gress, D.R., & Paek, J., (2014) 'Differential Spaces in Korean Places? Feminist Geography and Female Managers in South Korea,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(2), 165-186.
- Halford, S., Kukarenko, H., Lotherington, A.T., & Obsterfelder, A., (2015) 'Technical Change and the Un/Troubling of Gendered Ageing in Healthcare Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(5), 495-509.

- Hari, A., (2016) 'Who gets to 'work hard, play hard'? Gendering the work-life balance rhetoric in Canadian Tech Companies,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(2), 99-114.
- Hart, S.M., (2002) 'The Pay Equity Bargaining Process in Newfoundland: Understanding Cooperation and Conflict by Incorporating Gender and Class,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(4), 355-371.
- Hatcher, C., (2003) 'Refashioning a Passionate Manager: Gender at Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(4), 391-412.
- Heiskanen, T., Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, K., Leinonen, M., & Ylostalo, H., (2018) 'Gender issues on change agenda – practising intersectionality in action research,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(5), 459-474
- Henttonen, E., LaPointe, K., Pesonen, S., & Vanhala, S., (2013) 'A Stain on the White Uniform — The Discursive Construction of Nurses' Industrial Action in the Media,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 20(1), 56-70.
- Hoeber, L., (2007) 'Exploring the Gaps between Meanings and Practices of Gender Equity in a Sport Organization,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 14(3), 259-280.
- Holvino, E., (2010) 'Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(3), 248-277.
- Hopfl, H., (2000) 'The Suffering Mother and the Miserable Son: Organizing Women and Organizing Women's Writing,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 7(2), 98-105..
- Husso, M., & Hirvonen, H., (2012) 'Gendered agency and emotions in the field of care work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 19(1), 29-51.
- Irving, S., & Helin, J., (2018) 'A world for sale? An ecofeminist reading of sustainable development discourse,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(3), 264-278
- Jansson, M., Mortberg, C., & Berg, E., (2007) 'Old Dreams, New Means: an Exploration of Visions and Situated Knowledge in Information Technology,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 14(4), 371-387.
- Jones, K., & Clifton, J., (2018) 'Rendering sexism invisible in workplace narratives: A narrative analysis of female entrepreneurs' stories of not being talked to by men,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(5), 557-574.
- Kensbock, S., Bailey J., Jennings, G., & Patier, A., (2015) 'Sexual Harassment of Women Working as Room Attendants within 5-Star Hotels,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(1), 36-50.
- Knights, D., & Kerfoot, D., (2004) 'Between Representations and Subjectivity: Gender Binaries and the Politics of Organizational Transformation,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(4), 430-454.

- Knoppers, A., (2011) 'Giving Meaning to Sport Involvement in Managerial Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(s1), e1-e22.
- Krefting, L.A., (2003) 'Intertwined Discourses of Merit and Gender: Evidence from Academic Employment in the USA,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 260-278.
- Kong, TSK., (2006) 'What It Feels Like for a Whore: The Body Politics of Women Performing Erotic Labour in Hong Kong,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(5), 409-434.
- Lee, R., (2018) 'Breastfeeding bodies: Intimacies at Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(1), 77-90.
- Lewis, P., & Simpson, S., (2016) 'Hakim revisited: Preference, choice and the postfeminist gender regime,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(2), 115-133
- Lombardo, E., (2016) 'The Spanish gender regime in the EU context: Changes and struggles in times of austerity,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(1), 20-33.
- Mauthner, N.S., & Edwards, R., (2010) 'Feminist Research Management in Higher Education in Britain: Possibilities and Practices,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(5), 481-502.
- Metcalf, B., & Linstead, A., (2003) 'Gendering Teamwork: Re-Writing the Feminine,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(1), 94-119.
- Mills, A.J., (2002) 'Studying the Gendering of Organizational Culture Over Time: Concerns, Issues and Strategies,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(3), 286-307.
- Mirchandani, K., (1999) 'Feminist Insight on Gendered Work: New Directions in Research on Women and Entrepreneurship,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 6(4), 224-235.
- Munro, A., (2001) 'A Feminist Trade Union Agenda? The Continued Significance of Class, Gender and Race,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(4), 454-471.
- Nentwich, J.C. (2006) 'Changing Gender: The Discursive Construction of Equal Opportunities,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(6), 499-521.
- Nilsson, G., (2013) 'Balls Enough: Manliness and Legitimated Violence in Hell's Kitchen,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 20(6), 647-663.
- Ozkazanc-Pan, B., (2018) 'Networking towards (in)equality: Women entrepreneurs in technology,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(4), 379-400.
- Page, M.L., (2011) 'Gender Mainstreaming — Hidden Leadership?,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(3), 318-336.
- Palmer, E., & Eveline, J., (2012) 'Sustaining Low Pay in Aged Care Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 19(3), 254-275.
- Parsons, E., & Priola, V., (2013) 'Agents for Change and Changed Agents: The Micro-politics of Change and Feminism in the Academy,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 20(5), 580-598.

- Rippin, A., (2015) 'Feminine Writing: Text as Dolls, Drag and Ventriloquism,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(2), 112-128.
- Ross-Smith, A., & Huppertz, K., (2010) 'Management, Women and Gender Capital,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(5), 547-566.
- Ross-Smith, A., & Kornberger, M., (2004) 'Gendered Rationality? A Genealogical Exploration of the Philosophical and Sociological Conceptions of Rationality, Masculinity and Organization,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(3), 280-305.
- Ronen, S., (2018) 'The postfeminist ideology at work: Endorsing gender essentialism and denying feminine devaluation in the case of design work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(5), 514-530
- Rousseau, C., (2015) 'Wages due lesbians: Visibility and feminist organising in 1970s Canada,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(4), 364-374.
- Rumens, N., (2003) 'Working at Intimacy: Gay Men's Workplace Friendships,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(1), 9-30.
- Rumens, N., (2017) 'Postfeminism, men, masculinities and work: A research agenda for Gender and Organization Studies Scholars,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 245-259.
- Sangster, J., & Smith, J., (2016) 'Beards and bloomers: Flight attendants, grievances and embodied labour in the Canadian Airline Industry, 1960's-1980's,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(2), 183-199.
- Saraswati, L.A., (2017) 'The gender politics of human waste and human-as-waste: Indonesian Migrant Workers and elderly care in Japan,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(6), 594-609.
- Sayers, J.G., & Jones, D., (2015) 'Truth Scribbled in Blood: Women's Work, Menstruation and Poetry,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 22(2), 94-111.
- Sinclair, A., (2005) 'Body and Management Pedagogy,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(1), 89-104.
- Smithson, J., & Stokoe, E.H., (2005) 'Discourses of Work-Life Balance: Negotiating 'Genderblind' Terms in Organizations,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(2), 147-168.
- Sorensen, S.O., (2017) 'The performativity of choice: postfeminist perspectives on work-life balance,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 297-313.
- Stanworth, C., (2000) 'Women and Work in the Information Age,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 7(1), 20-32.
- Stewart-Thomas, M., (2010) 'Gendered Congregations, Gendered Service: The Impact of Clergy Gender on Congregational Social Service Participation,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(4), 406-432.

- Swan, E., (2017) 'What are white people to do? Listening, challenging ignorance, generous encounters and the 'not yet' as diversity research praxis,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(5), 547-563.
- Swan, E., (2017) 'Postfeminist stylistics, work femininities and coaching: a multimodal study of a website,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(3), 274-296.
- Tancred, P., (1995) 'Women's Work: A Challenge to the Sociology of Work,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 2(1), 11-20.
- Taylor, B.W.K., (2006) 'A Feminist Critique of Japanization: Employment and Work in Consumer Electronics,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(4), 317-337.
- Thanem, T., (2010) 'Free At Last? Assembling, Producing and Organizing Sexual Spaces in Swedish Sex Education,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(1), 91-112.
- Thomas, R., & Davies, A., (2002) 'Gender and New Public Management: Reconstituting Academic Subjectivities,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(4), 372-397.
- Tyler, M., & Taylor, S., (1998) 'The Exchange of Aesthetics: Women's Work and 'The Gift',' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 5(3), 165-171.
- Watts, J.H., (2009) "'Allowed into a Man's World' Meanings of Work–Life Balance: Perspectives of Women Civil Engineers as 'Minority' Workers in Construction,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(1), 37-57.
- Webb, J., (1997) 'The Politics of Equal Opportunity,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(3), 159-169.
- Wilson, F., & Thompson, P., (2001) 'Sexual Harassment as an Exercise of Power,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(1), 61-83
- Yates, S., Riach, K., & Johansson, M., (2018) 'Stress at Work, Gendered Dys-appearance and the Broken Body in Policing,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(1), 91-105.
- Young, A., (2018) 'Latest Scientific Discovery Drops Bombshell – 'Mother Nature' is biologically male – ruminations on the value of care as sustainable organizational practice,' *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(3), 294-308.

Appendix 3 – Papers in FT50 listed journals and in GWO, in press or accepted for publication, as at end 2018. Nb: of these, the 6 papers accepted for publication in Human Relations constitute a special issue devoted to feminism (see Bell et al., 2019)

- Baker, D. and Kelan, E. (2018). Splitting and blaming: The psychic life of neoliberal women. *Human Relations*.
- Ghazal, M. and Khan, M. (2018). NGO-led organizing and Pakistan's homeworkers: A materialist feminist analysis of collective agency. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Huopalainen, A. and Satama, S. (2018). Mothers and researchers in the making: Negotiating 'new' motherhood within the 'new' academia. *Human Relations*.
- Jack, G., Riach, K. and Bariola, E. (2018) Temporality and gendered agency: Menopausal subjectivities in women's work. *Human Relations*.
- Moosmayer, D., Waddock, S., Wang, L., Hühn, M, Dierksmeier, C. and Gohl, C. (2018). Leaving the road to Abilene: Addressing the normative paradox of responsible management education. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2018). CSR as gendered neocoloniality in the Global South. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Sinclair, A. (2018) Five movements in embodied feminism: A memoir. *Human Relations*.
- Tyler, M. (2018). Reassembling difference? Rethinking inclusion through/as embodied ethics. *Human Relations*.
- Vachhani. S. and Pullen, A. (2018). Ethics, politics and feminist organizing: Writing feminist infrapolitics and affective solidarity into everyday sexism. *Human Relations*.
- Adkins, L., (2018) 'Work in the shadow of finance: Rethinking Joan Acker's materialist feminist sociology,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Baines, D., & Armstrong, P., (2018) 'Non-job work/unpaid caring: Gendered industrial relations in long-term care,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Clarke, C., & Knights, D., (2018) 'Who's a good boy then? Anthropocentric masculinities in veterinary practice,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Colley, L., & White, C., (2018) 'Neoliberal feminism: The neoliberal rhetoric on feminism by Australian political actors,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Coulter, K., & Fitzgerald, A., (2018) 'The compounding feminization of animal cruelty investigation work and its multispecies implications,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Davies, O., & Riach, K., (2018) 'From mainstream measuring to multispecies sustainability? A gendered reading of bee-ing sustainable,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Finkel, R., & Danby, P., (2018) 'Legitimizing leisure experiences as emotional work: A post-humanist approach to gendered equine encounters,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Fodor, E., Glass, C., & Nagy, B., (2018) 'Transnational business feminism: Exporting feminism in the global economy,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.

- Grosser, L., & McCarthy, L., (2018) 'Imagining new feminist futures: How feminist social movements contest the neoliberalization of feminism in an increasingly corporate-dominated world,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Jones, S., Martinez-Dy, A., & Vershinina, N., (2018) "'We were fighting for our place': Resisting gender knowledge regimes through feminist knowledge network formation,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Lin, Y.W., & den Besten, M., (2018) 'Gendered work culture in free/libre open source software development,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Mavin, S., Elliot, C., & Stead, V., (2018) 'Economies of visibility as a moderator of feminism: 'Never mind Brexit. Who won Legs-it!,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Mavin, S., & Grandy, G., (2018) 'Women leaders, self-body-care and corporate moderate feminism: An (im)perfect place for feminism,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- McGregor, J., & Davies, S.G., (2018) 'Achieving pay equity: Strategic mobilization for substantive equality in Aotearoa New Zealand,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Ozkazanc-Pan, B., (2018) 'On agency and empowerment in a #MeToo world,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Ross, F.J., (2018) 'Professional feminists: Challenging local government inside out,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Rottenberg, C., (2018) 'Women Who Work: The limits of the neoliberal feminist paradigm,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Rubery, J., (2018) 'Joan Acker and Doing Comparable Worth,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Satama, S., & Huopainen, A., (2018) "'Please tell me when you are in pain': A heartbreaking story of care, grief and female–canine companionship,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Sayce, S., (2018) 'Revisiting Joan Acker's work with the support of Joan Acker,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Stojmenovska, D., (2018) 'Management gender composition and the gender pay gap: Evidence from British panel data,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.
- Taylor, N., & Fraser, H., (2018) 'Resisting sexism and speciesism in the social sciences: Using feminist, species-inclusive, visual methods to value the work of women and (other) animals,' *Gender, Work & Organization*.

Notes

¹ <https://www.ft.com/content/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0> [accessed 28.01.2019]

² Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, Harvard Business Review, Human Relations, Human Resource Management, Journal of Business Ethics, Journal of International Business Studies, Journal of Management, Journal of Management Studies, MIT Sloan Management Review, Organization Science, Organization Studies, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Strategic Management Journal.

³ We know from reviewers of this paper and our own understanding of the field that we could have made this search more complete through a full-text search, which would increase the volume of published articles in our sample. We are not convinced, however, that this change would be quantitatively or qualitatively significant. In other words, we are fairly confident based on our knowledge of our field that we have not excluded many articles or different forms of feminist contribution to MOS by focusing only on what we term explicitly feminist work.

⁴ We excluded work published but as yet only available in press, commentaries or response pieces. In press articles for FT50 listed journals and GWO are listed in appendix 3 online.

⁵ This is clearly in part a function of the journal's relatively high number of articles published (recently, seven volumes/twenty-eight issues per annum, providing a total of around 200 articles each calendar year, in comparison with a more conventional single volume of 6-8 issues and 30-35 articles each year). However this journal does also appear to have a long-standing commitment to furthering debate on feminism, now being formalized in the development of a dedicated section on 'Feminisms and business ethics', curated by a feminist section editor Charlotte Karam, to develop knowledge concerned with 'unpacking the embedded power relations and the ways in which they perpetuate ongoing inequalities and hierarchies faced by women and other marginalized groups in the context of business, management or organizing for daily life' (see section description: [https://www.springer.com/journal/10551/submission-guidelines#Instructions for Authors_Sections and Section Editors](https://www.springer.com/journal/10551/submission-guidelines#Instructions%20for%20Authors_Sections%20and%20Section%20Editors)).

⁶ See Henry et al. (2016) on entrepreneurship and small business research, Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2015) on tourism studies, and Thompson (1999) on business communication. See also cognate areas of social science: Johnson (2015) on political science, Barretti (2011) on social work, Aitchison (2001) on leisure research, and Thompson and Walker (1995) on family studies.