GEXcel workshop: 'Diverse Perspectives on Transnationalisation/Virtualisation', Roskilde University, Denmark. *Changing Men and Masculinities in Gender Equal Societies Conference*, January 2009

Hegemony, Transnationalisation and Virtualisation: MNCs and ICTs

Jeff Hearn Linköping University, Sweden, and Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland

This paper is part of a joint GEXcel workshop session on the diverse implications of transnationalisation and virtualisation for critical studies on men and masculinities. GEXcel is organized through a number of research themes, in this case, Theme 2 'Deconstructing the hegemony of men and masculinities: contradictions of absence' (http://www.genderexcel.org/node/101). Transnationalisation and virtualisation take many forms and have many implications for men and gender relations. They comprise acutely contradictory processes, with multiple forms of difference, presence and absence for men in power and men dispossessed through, for example, forced migration. Different transnationalisations problematise taken-for-granted national, organisational and local contexts, and men and masculinities there in many ways. This paper builds on critical debates on the concept of patriarchy in relation to intersectionalities and transnationalisations. It uses the concept of transpatriarchies to speak of the structural tendency and individualised propensity for men's transnational gender domination. It focuses on non-determined structures, forces and processes, not comprehensive unity or fixity. This is illustrated by consideration of multinational corporations (MNCs), and information and communication technologies (ICTs), sex trade and virtualisation.

Hegemony

The concept of hegemony has figured strongly in studies on men, especially through the concept of hegemonic masculinity; however, one might argue that what is more hegemonic than this is the hegemony of men. Hegemony addresses relations of power and ideology, including domination of the 'taken-for-granted', and 'commonsense'. It highlights the importance of consent, even if that is provisional and contingent, and even if that consent is backed by force. Hegemony speaks more to complicity than brutal enforcement. It refers to and reinforces what has been called the "fundamental outlook of society" (Bocock, 1986). Understandings of hegemony need to move away from the notion of fundamental outlook of a *given 'society'*, nation and the nation-state to the growing importance of the transnational. Hegemony encompasses formation of social groupings, not just their operation and collective action. It is a structural concept, or at least invokes assumptions of structure, but is not structuralist.

Theorising on hegemony can be understood in terms of different theories of ideology within Marxian analysis. Abercrombie and Turner (1978) showed how Marx presented two theories of ideology. In the first, set out in the *Preface* (Marx, 1959/1975), "social being determines consciousness". In the second, also in the *Preface*, but more famously in *The German Ideology*, "the economic structure, the real foundation" determines "a

legal and political superstructure", such that the ideas of "the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas." (Marx and Engels, 1845/1970). This notion of ideology is more concerned with the social formation than activities of particular classes. Gramsci (1971) took the latter mode one step further, rejecting economic determinism. He saw politics and economics, in his historical frame of 1920s Italian Marxism and communism, set within wars of position and manoeuvre. In his view of hegemony the cultural and intellectual realm was more important, with greater political impact than as an effect of economic structure and relations. Hegemony encompassed the range of social arenas – material, economic, political, cultural, discursive – rather than prioritising the economic or the cultural. Mike Donaldson (1993: 645) summarises some features of hegemony as:

> … about the winning and holding of power and the *formation (and destruction) of social groups* in that process. It is about the ways in which the ruling class establishes and maintains its domination. The ability to impose a definition of the situation, to set the terms in which events are understood and issues discussed, to formulate ideals and define morality is an essential part of the process. Hegemony involves persuasion of the greater part of the population, particularly through the media, and the organization of social institutions in ways that appear "natural," "ordinary," "normal". The state, through punishment for non-conformity, is crucially involved in this negotiation and enforcement. (my emphasis)

Hegemonic masculinity

The notion of hegemonic masculinity has been developed from Raewyn Connell and colleagues working on gendered social processes within patriarchy. They have emphasised *processes* of hegemony, dominance/subordination, complicity, marginalisation, resistance and protest (Connell, 1995). This process usage of hegemony has been by no means as popular or as influential as another usage employed by Connell and colleagues, in linking hegemony to masculinity. In this, 'hegemony' as a key social process mutates to 'hegemonic' as a descriptor of certain (multiple) masculinities. In this latter scheme, *forms* of masculinity have been recognised, principally hegemonic masculinity, legitimating "patriarchy"; complicit masculinity, bringing benefit without effort; subordinated masculinity, by gender-related relations, for example, gay; marginalised masculinity, by, for example, class or ethnicity. In their 1985 paper Carrigan, Connell and Lee write that hegemony:

> … always refers to an historical situation, a set of circumstances in which power is won and held. The construction of hegemony is not a matter of pushing and pulling of ready-formed groupings but is partly a matter of the *formation of these groupings*. To understand the different kinds of masculinity demands an examination of the practices in which hegemony is constituted and contested – in short, the political techniques of the patriarchal social order. (p. 594) (my emphasis).

One might argue that there is slippage from the formation of these groupings to the understanding of the different kinds of masculinity.

Some critiques of hegemonic masculinity

The concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' has been subject to a variety of qualified critiques in recent years (for example, Donaldson, 1993; Hearn, 1996, 2004; Wetherell and Edley, 1999; Whitehead, 1999, 2002; Demetriou, 2001; Howson, 2006). These critiques have highlighted. A range of questions are yet to be clearly answered:

- Is hegemonic masculinity a cultural ideal, cultural representations, everyday practices or institutional structures?
- Can hegemonic masculinity be reduced to fixed set of practices?
- Should one talk of hegemonic masculinities in the plural?
- How do various dominant and dominating forms, such as violence and control of resources, interconnect with each other?
- Why use the term, "masculinity"? What does it mean, include or excluded?
- Does hegemonic masculinity fit detailed empirical studies, for example, how men talk about themselves?
- How does hegemonic masculinity relate to postcolonial critiques?
- Where is the counter-hegemonic? (Donaldson, 1993)

The hegemony of men

Most importantly, the concept of hegemony has generally been employed in too restricted a way. The focus on masculinity is too narrow. If we are interested in what is hegemonic about gender relation to men and masculinity, then it is 'men' who or which are far more hegemonic than masculinity. Instead, it is time to go back from masculinity to men, to examine the hegemony of men. This involves addressing the hegemony of men – in both senses. The hegemony of men seeks to address the *double complexity that men are both a social category formed by the gender system and dominant collective and individual agents of social practices*. This perspective raises key social processes:

- hegemonic acceptance of the category of men.
- systems of distinctions and categorisations between different forms of men and men's practices to women, children and other men ("masculinities").
- which men and which men's practices – in the media, the state, religion, etc - are most powerful in setting those agendas of those systems of differentiations.
- the most widespread, repeated forms of men's practices.
- men's various and variable everyday, "natural(ised)", "ordinary", "normal" and most taken-for-granted practices to women, children and other men, and their contradictory, even paradoxical, meanings.
- how women may differentially support certain practices of men, and subordinate other practices of men or ways of being men.
- interrelations between these elements above … relations between 'men's' formation within hegemonic gender order, that also forms 'women', other genders and boys, and men's activity in different ways in (re-)forming hegemonic differentiations among men. (Hearn, 2004).

Men are both a social category formed by the gender system and collective and individual agents, often dominant agents. These uses are intersectional and embodied in specific

ways. Dominant uses of the social category of men have often been restricted by, for example, class, ethnicity/racialisation and (hetero)sexuality. Less examined are the construction of the category of men in terms of assumptions about: age, ageing and (dis)ability; bodily presence; and nationality/national context. Despite the explicitness of Connell and colleagues, some elements have been neglected in recent applications of hegemony to men and masculinities, including relations hegemony to: "patriarchy"; "bodies"; changing "form" of the social, especially the virtual; moves from the fundamental outlook of 'society' towards the "transnational". The last two aspects of the *transnational hegemony of men* are now examined, through MNCs and ICTs.

Globalisation and transnationalisation

Moving beyond national, societal cultural contexts has been prompted by various global(ised) and transnational researches over recent years. Most of these have been developed under the rubric of 'globalisation', subsequently refined as 'glocalisation'. In this, it is assumed that the specificities of place are becoming transcended through economic, political and cultural linkages. There is a considerable literature that questions the usefulness and accuracy of the notion of globalisation (Hirst and Thompson 1999; Rugman 2000; Banerjee and Linstead 2001; Petras and Veltmeyer 2001). One aspect of the critique needing more emphasis is how nation-states, national boundaries and organised labour at the national level remain important (Edwards und Elger, 1999; Gibson-Graham, 1999; Waddington, 1999; Alasuutari, 2000; Kite, 2004). Thus, transnationalisation seems a more accurate concept than globalisation (Hearn, 2004b).

This necessitates considering interrogating meaning(s) of "the transnational" more generally. While much social science can be characterised by "methodological nationalism" (Beck 2000), this is challenged by analyses of the transnational. Most conceptualisations of the transnational appear to depend upon two fundamental elements: the *nation* or *national boundaries*; and *'trans'* (across) relations, as opposed to 'inter' relations or 'intra' relations (Hearn 2004b). This raises the prospect of the difference between transnational relations and international relations, in which, it could be argued, the nation is less problematised. Speaking of transnational relations raises a paradox: they refer to the nation, yet at the same time also to relations across nations. *The nation is simultaneously affirmed and deconstructed*. In short, the element of 'trans' refers to two basically different notions, as well as more subtle distinctions between and beyond that:

- *moving across* or *between* two or more somethings, in this case, across national boundaries or between nations, as in negotiations between states;
- *metamorphosing*, problematising, blurring, transgressing, breaking down, even dissolving something(s), in this case, nations or national boundaries – in the most extreme case, leading to the demise of the nation or national boundaries, as in blurrings of identity in migration or blurring of policy responses between states.

This contrast may be clearer if we consider migration. Transnational migration can refer to the movement of people between nations across national boundaries, without or with little problematisation of the nation(s) or boundaries. This might be so in the compilation of migration statistics. On the other hand, transnational migration can be seen in terms of the creation of transnational communities, social locations and identities that

problematise nations and national boundaries. Many transnational studies recognise transnational social spaces, flows and forms of deterritorialisation, translocality and transnationality (Appadurai 1995, 1996; Hannerz 1992, 1996; Ong 1999), in which social space is not strictly or primarily experienced or understood as physical, geographical space of nationally-located place that the people occupy.[1]

In these moves, structured gender domination – patriarchy – shifts from being located in or limited to a national or societal context towards transnational contexts. To represent this shift, I employ the concept of trans(national)patriarchies, or transpatriarchies. This is a way of talking about patriarchies, intersectionalities and transnationalisation at the same time (Hearn, 2004a, 2005, 2008). Interestingly, most formulations of patriarchy, like those of hegemony, have been characteristically based on domination within a particular society or nation (Hearn, 2004a). The nation has often been represented in the modern era as one of the most powerful forms of hegemony. Limiting patriarchy, like hegemony, to a *particular* society, nation or 'culture' is increasingly problematic. Global transformations, as well as regional restructurings may be part of the changing hegemony of men.

Key issues are 'Third World' development, militarism, postcolonialism, multinational corporations, finance capitalism, oil, energy and water policy; global circulation of representations, governmental and transgovernmental machineries, multinational corporations, information and communication technologies. A recent list from a conference presentation by Connell (reported in Esplen and Greig, 2008) reads: transnational corporations' gender-segregated labour forces; almost total dominance of men at top levels of transnational corporate management, military, arms trade and international organisations; masculinisation of capital market trading floors and business media; sexualisation of women in global mass media; internationalisation of sex trade; gender segregation of international sports industries. The perspective on transpatriarchies raises many understudied questions, especially when considering the social category of men. In many transnational movements, both physical and virtual, particular groups of men are the most powerful actors (Hearn, 1996; Connell, 1998).

MNCs within/as transpatriarchies

multinational corporations (MNCs), and their organisation and management are one of the taken-for-granted elements of transnational hegemony of men within transpatriarchies. MNCs are typically constructed as gender-neutral, without gender – in everyday discourse, research, media and political debate. Many and various gender issues within and between corporations – gendered management, hierarchies, authority, informal relations, processes – are left unanalysed, as part of taken-for-granted hegemony of the supposedly 'gender-neutral' MNC.

Men as management, management as men

[1] Interestingly, a focus on transnational migration is not often combined with other aspects of transnationalisation, such as transnational organisations (*pace* Sassen, 1996; Westwood and Phizacklea, 2000; Morgan, 2001; Pries, 2001; Coe et al., 2003). This is even though such arenas link together, as in internationalization of capital and labour.

A key example of the impact of transnationalisation is the importance of (transnational) managers in transnational organisations for the formation and reproduction of gender orders in organisations and societies. Men, masculinities and their social construction and social power are generally left unspoken in discussions of such matters; they are an 'absent presence' (Hearn, 1998), even though (and perhaps because of) their dominance, especially at the highest levels, and within business policy, practice and discourse. There is immense scope for attention to such issues in gendering international business-to-business activity, alliances, partnerships, supply chains, financial dependencies and other inter-corporate relations – formal or informal, and often involving men at the high levels.

Men, masculinities and their social construction and social power are generally left unspoken; they are, in that sense, invisible, an "absent presence" (Hearn, 1998), even though (and perhaps because of) their dominance, especially at the highest levels. The 'transnational capitalist class' (Sklair, 2001) is in practice very much a male transnational capitalist class. Management often involves homosocial practices, with men's preference for men and men's company, and use of masculine models, stereotypes and symbols, often from sport, the military and evolution, such as the "law of the jungle". Male homosociality, combining emotional detachment, competitiveness and viewing women as sexual objects, suppresses subordinate masculinities and reproduces hierarchies among men. Management, especially what is understood as effective business management, has often been assumed to be consistent with characteristics traditionally valued in men (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1993). This is even with historical transformations of management, from male near-monopoly, to dominant traditional forms, and to modern forms of gendering (Kerfoot & Knights, 1993; Roper, 1994; Collinson & Hearn, 1996).

In these situations there have initial attempts to analyse 'business masculinities' (Connell and Wood, 2005) and 'transnational business masculinity' (Connell, 1998). In light of the globalisation of business life and the expansion of transnational organisations, the concept of 'transnational business masculinity' describes a new form of masculinity among globally mobile managers. Connell (1998) sees this form of masculinity as marked by "increasing egocentrism, very conditional loyalties (even to the corporation), and a declining sense of responsibility for others (except for purposes of image-making)." Importantly, this pattern, however, represents only one of several versions of senior managerial men's practices; for example, some may appear to adopt more conventional marriage-type social relations and lifestyles (Hearn et al., 2008). Studies focusing on senior managers, still overwhelmingly men, are necessary to understand how the hegemony of men is reproduced and changed globally. These 'men of the world' (Hearn, 1996) are powerful individual corporate leaders in and of contemporary transpatriarchies.

Men and intersectionality

Interconnections of gender relations and intersectionality (and 'diversity') are an important area for further analysis. Questions of difference among men, such as by age, class, ethnicity, nationality, religion, are usually left in silence, as are matters of the interconnections between power, unities and differences amongst and between men.

Research on diversity and intersectionality needs to be linked with a focus on structured asymmetrical power relations between men and women. A challenge is to maintain this double focus on difference without neglecting gender and other structural powers.

Intersectional gendered global and transnational issues form the business environment of MNCs and reconstruct internal structures and processes of MNCs. Concentrations of capital are increasing, with gendered forms and effects. MNCs are themselves also vulnerable to huge risks, from terrorism to financial crises and computer hacking and viruses. Though studies of gender and organisations have predominantly focused on the nationally based, single organisation, there are growing moves towards more consideration of transnational and multinational organisations. MNCs operate at the intersections of international/global, national, regional and local traditions and strategic international management, and are thus subject to contradictory gendered pressures.

Intersectional gendered production networks are evolving from changes in international political economy. In this, MNCs have used different intersectional gendered strategies in strategic management. Changes in trade and financial agreements have prompted moving their production and services to draw on cheaper female labour forces elsewhere. Another aspect of change concerns how governments in developing and transitional economies have tended to ignore gender employment issues permitting MNCs to reproduce gendered divisions of labour (Pyle and Ward, 2003). A third concerns international mergers and acquisitions (M&As), with their own intersectional gender dimensions, across national/cultural and institutional/organisational boundaries. Fourthly, there are intersections in local cultural patterns with global restructuring. Recruitment and appointment processes can sometimes be contradictory processes of gendered organisational and individual resistance, with local units resisting expatriate recruitment or standardisation, regardless of corporate policies. MNCs have often supported gender segregation and inequalities in labour markets, raising questions on how MNCs implement gender policies in diverse localities. Research here can be assisted by attention to transnational cultural change and various forms of deterritorialisation and hydridity.

Corporate internal structures impact on gender policy, diversity management and IHRM, through more or less centralised control systems. Internal corporate structures create differences in intersectional gender relations in management. Relations between different units within MNCs have further impacts, depending on whether they are highly integrated globally, local networks or strongly centralised. Corporations with strong headquarters contrast with polycentric corporations, where headquarters issues looser guidelines on, say, EOPs to local subsidiaries. Centralised corporations may develop EOP, even when these have insignificant impacts in local areas and at high levels. Decentralised corporations may be more likely to respond to local conditions, with more autonomous, variable structures within local or functional units (Hearn and Parkin, 2001).

Most organisations are doubly gendered: public domains and organisations are dominantly valued over private domains, and within organisations structures and

processes are themselves gendered, perhaps most obviously in certain men's domination through management and other mechanisms. In the case of MNCs, organisations are triply gendered, with the global and transnational dimension adding further intersectional gendered dominations, across time, space, cultures, inter-organisational powers and virtual technologies. Management of MNCs adds a fourth form or layer of intersectional gendering, generally. Male-dominated management in transnational organisations contributes in many ways to the (re)production of gender orders.

How is it that MNCs, research on them, and policy development, usually manage *not* to explicitly attend to gender issues and the obvious intersectional gender structuring of international business. Is this mere carelessness or something more significant? This is itself a form of gendering of knowledge, in both practice and theory (Hearn et al., 2006).

Virtualisation as/in transpatriarchies

ICTs are a key aspect of global change. Rapid growth in ICTs changes social structures and processes; like MNCs, they are difficult to control and police. ICTs are a key taken-for-granted element of transnational hegemony of men within transpatriarchies. ICTs are not just texts but exist within and create material social and sexual relations.[2] ICTs use multiple complex technologies characterised by: instantaneousness, asynchronicity, time/space compression, reproducible image production, creation of virtual bodies, blurring of 'real' and 'representational' (Hearn and Parkin, 2001). Wellman (2001) has set out the 'social affordances of computerised communication networks': broader bandwidth (thus greater effectiveness); wireless portability; globalised connectivity; personalisation. ICTs are not disembodied technologies but are operate in local social practices. They are everchanging, becoming cheaper and more widespread, though still beyond the reach of many. They contribute to fundamental change in forms of control and democracy, with the technology for both decentralised TAZs (temporary autonomous zones) and strong centralised surveillance. ICTs and virtuality challenge historical constructions of nation-state and hegemonic politics of space. They facilitate a model of organisation (in both corporate and more general senses), highlighting transformations of boundaries in nations, locales, subjectivities.

Men's sexual uses of ICTs

ICTs are part of broader histories of the publicisation of sexuality and technologies of the senses. Increasingly complex technologies have developed from the peep show, photography and film, and histories of 'the real', the glossy image, the pin-up, the star, the film icon. Telephones brought 'call girls'; specialist telephone sexual services, sexlines and telephone sex followed. Video and television technologies have led onto sex videos, sex channels and sex pay TV. ICTs have raised possibilities of techno-sex, high-tech sex, non-connection sex, mobile phone sex, virtual sex. New forms of sex, sexual storytelling, sexual genres, sex talk shows and digital sexual media have mushroomed.

Incipient 'globalisation' of sexuality through ICTs can be produced through glocalised social practices. ICTs have multiple impacts on sexuality, with changing forms locally/

[2] US research suggests that Internet users spend just under 10 hours a week visiting over 200 million websites (Cooper et al., 2001: 6).

globally. There are daily reports of how ICTs are changing how sexuality is done and experienced, in chat lines, internet dating, email sex, cybersex, cyberaffairs, falling in love on the Net, providing new channels for sexuality and sexualised violence. Speed and ease of ICTs creates many possibilities for new forms of cybersexual experimentation, such as mixed or multi-media sex, interactive sex, interactive pornography. Cybersex activity includes pornography exchange; real-time discussions, and compact disk distribution (Delmonico, 1997).[3] There are sometimes inadvertent uses and constitutions of sexuality and sexualised violence, such as sexual spamming or webjacking.

Moves to and interplays of virtualities and surveillances, along with changes around (cyber)sexualities at a distance and non-direct physical contact mediated by 'new' technologies, constitute major historical changes with profoundly contradictory implications (Hearn, 2006). These are likely to bring new forms of transpatriarchies, imperialism and neo-colonialism, with virtual imperialist/neo-colonialist exploitation flourishing alongside and supportive of direct non-virtual imperialisms/neo-colonialisms, as uses of ICTs to facilitate global sex trade (Hearn, 2006). ICTs have produced hugely successful historical transformations in promoting global trafficking and sexual exploitation of women in supplying encyclopaedic information on prostitution, and the (re)constitution and delivery of the sex trade (Hearn and Parkin, 2001; Hughes, 2002). Live videoconferencing is amongst the most advanced technology currently on the Web: live audio and video communication is transmitted over the Internet from video recorder to computer, and back again. This involves buying live sex shows, in which the man can direct the show in some cases, with real time global communication possible. Pornographers are also leaders in developing Internet privacy and secure payment services. DVDs provide increased possibilities for making videos with scenes shot from multiple angles, so the viewer can choose that preferred. Viewers can interact with DVD movies similarly to video games, giving the man apparently more active role. The "real" and the "representational" converge; and the sexual commodification can proceed apace.

ICTs create major opportunities to organise sexuality differently, and for new forms of sexuality: techno-sex, high-tech sex, non-connection sex, mobile phone sex, internet dating, email sex, cybersex, cyberaffairs, virtual sex, multimedia interactive sex and so on. Virtual communities of interest, for or against particular sexualities, may appear to offer safe and trustworthy arenas for support, and this may be so in some cases. Yet the familiarity of the Web can be deceptive: its familiarity may constitute a new hegemony. Comparison may be made with critiques of engineered 'familial' corporate cultures (Ezzy, 2001) developed alongside the disembodiment of global corporate institutions. ICTs increasingly offer an apparent 'home' for members of sexual communities, but are also social sites for extension and diffusion of disembodied sexual capitalism, consumer cultures and pleasures (Bernstein, 2001). What may initially be self-help social-sexual communities of interest can become exclusionary, pay-to-use capitalist enterprises, as with purchase of MySpace.com from Intermix Media by Rupert Murdoch's NewsCorp.

[3] Men comprised over 80% of respondents of Cooper et al.'s (2001) survey of 9,265 website respondents; men generally used the Web for sexual pursuits, women more chatrooms.

Virtualisation processes present sites for both reinforcements and contestations of hegemony in terms of bodily presence/absence of men. These involve positive, negative and contradictory effects of certain uses of information and communication technologies (ICTs) upon men's, and women's, sexuality and sexual violences, as men act as producers and consumers of virtuality, represent women in virtual media, and are themselves being represented, even made dispensable.

Constitution of men's, and women's sexualities

ICTs do not only act as media for sexualities and sexualised violences, but increasingly can be constitutive of them, and may do so in new ways in the future. On one hand, sex is increasingly constructed in the context of disembodied social institutions, the state and corporations, and the laws, controls and ideologies engendered. On the other, sexual activity, without any payment, whether on one's own or with another or others, is possible in many and various embodied forms beyond the reach of ICTs, in the privacy of 'one's own home'. 'Private' sexualities are sites of power and dominance; they may constitute sexual violence. However, such (non-commercial) sex can be recorded, written about, photographed, videoed, televised, placed on the Web, retrieved from user interfaces, with or without participants' permission or knowledge, transferred to other technologies and multimedia. As modes of production and communication become more disembodied, possibilities for the reproduction of sexual texts increase – even accessible on millions of pc screens worldwide through photo- and video-sharing. The same or similar sexual practices can be enacted forcibly or non-forcibly, with or without payment (as with 'do-it-yourself' web pornography). These possibilities are likely to increase.

Various uses of ICTs for sexualities and sexually violent purposes can blur into each other. Representation is pornographised globally; pornography is liable to virtualisation, as images once stored electronically can be reproduced and manipulated: "the woman", and perhaps "the man", become dispensable. The impact of ICTs increases potential for various global/local sexualised cultures and men's more general pornographising of sex. If a man is buying a car, information on or advertizing of the car do not comprise the offer of the car. However, with sexuality and sexual violence, information or advertizing of sexuality and sexualised violence can themselves comprise the offer and experience of sexuality and sexualised violence – as in covert circulation of legal and other documents on child sexual abuse amongst child sex offenders in prisons for their sexual purposes.

There are greater possibilities for cyber(org)sexualities. These can take mundane forms, such as greater sexual activity and exertion through heart surgery. Far-reaching innovations might be sexually-coded 'implants' that would allow people to seek others with similarly or presumed compatibly coded sexualities. These can be external to the body skin, in a 'blackberry' or mobile phone-type device, or physically implanted within. ICTs provide possibilities for various forms of sexual experience, such as, as places for meeting by mutual agreement potential romantic/sexual partners (sometimes with less emphasis on physical appearance) or 'safer' sexual experimentation and identity exploration. There are increasing technical possibilities for many-to-many 'social software' and 'new sexual affordances' for mutual identification (e.g. the Yenta matchmaker system that combines virtual community, collaborative filtering and web-to-

cellphone technology, so people can know who is in physical vicinity at that moment and who shares certain affinities and willingness to be contacted (Rheingold, 2000; Wellman, 2001; Schofield, 2003). This links with technological possibilities of making public people's emotional lives and emotional-sexual lives. There are established studies and practices on how non-verbal behaviour conveys information on knowledge, intentions and emotions, with biometrics and photo-tracking of micro-movements of faces in security and counter-terrorism applications. The future possibility appears of 'choices' in social-sexual conduct with or without knowledge of others. It might be possible to meet people with or without knowledge of what they are thinking or feeling, emotionally, sexually. One might be able to meet someone with: i) no such information on either side (assuming just two parties for the moment); ii) full knowledge by both parties; or iii) knowledge by one but not both parties, which the other might accept or to block, as in current filtering technology. Going out on a date could be done with or without (some degree of) access to the other person's thoughts and emotions, sexual or otherwise.

Another aspect of ICTs is sexual surveillance, bringing its own contradictions. While many ICTs are experienced and represented as giving individuals access to "more information", they also provide means for corporate entities to access far more information "about us". Google, Amazon and similar bodies hold masses of information on personal preferences, through their virtual inquiries and searches. Such compilations of information, promoted in combinations of technologies/systems integrated into larger wholes, as part of 'surveillant assemblages'. These are likely to further produce new commodifications of the self, whereby flesh and sexualities are partly reduced to 'data doubles' (Haggerty and Ericson, 2000), largely controlled by men. ICTs offer possibilities for new forms of sexualities whereby people, individually or in groups, display their sexualities, even the "whole" of their (sexual) lives. Webcams, mobile phones and reality shows change possible practice, identity and image-making, through "revealing" rather than hiding from surveillance (Koskela, 2004), and new possible forms of sexuality in the face of "the disappearance of disappearance" (Haggerty and Ericson, 2000). A related example is "dogging", where sexual relations conducted in public are swiftly advertized to many participants and onlookers through Skype and mobile phone access (Bell, 2006). All 'privacy' is now potentially public (Hearn, 1992).

Sexual and sexual-legal subjectivities are subject to transforming socio-spatial forms and potentialities, according to relations of gender/sexual power (dissident/subordinated, dominant/privileged) and sexualised violences (violated/violating). Such variations within globalisation and transnationalisation have definite socio-spatial dimensions, for example, the observation, limits and transcending of national sovereignties in law, culture and sexuality. These all constitute technologies of sexuality, dominant and dissident. This is not only a matter of commercialised sexuality, but constitution of non- or less commercialised sexualities, whether through virtual meeting, internet dating, non-contact socio-sexual relationships or use of internet pornography. ICTs, such as mobile phones, can also function as 'extensions of their owner' facilitating long-distance relationships.

Conclusion

Broadening the interconnections of gender and transnationalisation means gendering men as an explicit part of analysis. In these debates there remains a general repeated resistance to considering men's practices as gendered, to "naming men as men" (Hanmer 1990; Collinson and Hearn 1994). Men's practices are integral in (re)producing gender inequality between men and women and amongst men. These are heavily embedded in social, economic and cultural relations, so that men's dominant or complicit practices may easily be equated with what counts as normal, usual or official way of doing things: hegemony of men, as category and actors. There is the need to put together gendering men and gendering transnationalisation. Despite growth in Critical Studies on Men, gendering men is still a lacuna in many 'critical' analyses of transnationalisation, and even though in many transnational processes particular groups of men are the main purveyors of power (Hearn 1996): 'since the agents of global domination were, and are, predominantly men, the historical analysis of masculinity must be a leading theme in our understanding of the contemporary world order.' (Connell 1993: 606).

With breakdown of old empires, new postcolonialisms and neo-liberal and postcolonial 'globalising masculinities' have developed (Connell 1998; Griffin 2005). Though usually couched in gender-neutral terms, such as 'the global market', these changes have implications for 'transnational business masculinity' and 'bourgeois-rational masculinity', with intensifying financial and communications linkages (Youngs 2004: 86). Contemporary globalising masculinities also extend to cyberglobalising masculinities. Notions of 'globalising masculinities' or configurations of men's transnationalising individual and collective practices are useful, but challenges remain. First, this can easily become ethnocentric, Western-centric, with transnationalisation assumed to spread from Western centres. Different viewpoints are needed to analyse the men and gender power in different regions: to 'deconstruct the dominant' (Hearn 1996). Second, there are politico-theoretical challenges, such as around materialism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, in applying masculinities to specific sites. Third, there is the complex formation and transformation of gendered transnational classes and civil society, often peopled and led by men.

New and changing forms of transpatriarchies operate partly very much in the flesh, partly virtually – creating new forms of extended power for certain groups of men. There are very many ways in which transpatriarchies and transpatriarchal powers and processes develop and change through various forms of transnationalisations. These include the extensions of transnational patriarchal power, including processes of transnational individual and collective non-responsibility of men, and processes of surveillance (and their disruption). Such changes may bring loss of some men's expected security and privilege, with shifts of the locus of power from individual to transnational. Also transpatriarchies involve opportunities for processes of recouping of patriarchal power, transnational movements and formation of transnational social, political, cultural spaces. These can be intensely contradictory in their experience and effects (Hearn 2006, 2008). These structural and agentic differentiations, with and without force, suggest multiply differentiated (trans)patriarchies that are stable and changing, fixed and flexible. They comprise new potentialities and hegemonies of men, both persistent and contested.

Selected bibliography (by J. Hearn)

'From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men', *Feminist Theory* 5(1), 2004, 49-72.

Information Society and the Workplace, co-edited with T. Heiskanen, Routledge, London, 2004.

'Tracking 'the transnational': Studying transnational organizations and managements, and the management of cohesion', *Culture and Organization* 10(4), 2004, 273-290.

'Gendered leaderships and leaderships on gender policy: National context, corporate structures, and chief Human Resources managers in transnational corporations', with R. Piekkari, *Leadership* 1(4), 2005, 429-454.

'The implications of information and communication technologies for sexualities and sexualised violences: contradictions of sexual citizenships', *Political Geography* 25(8), 2006, 944-963.

'Gender in international human resource management', with B. Metcalfe and R. Piekkari, in G. Ståhl and I. Björkman (eds.) *Handbook of Research on International Human Resource Management*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2006, 502-522.

'Feeling out of place? Towards the transnationalizations of emotions', in S. Fineman (ed.) *The Emotional Organization: Passion and Power*, Blackwell, Oxford, 2007, 184-201.

'Deconstructing the hegemony of men and masculinities: Contradictions of absence', in S. Adrian, M. Gustavson and N. Lykke (eds.) *GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume I. Proceedings from GEXcel Kick-off Conference*, Tema Genus Report Series, Linköping, 2007, 23-35.

'Sexualities future, present, past … Towards transsectionalities', *Sexualities: Studies in Culture and Society* 11(1), 2008, 37-46.

'How about transpatriarchies?', in K. Jones and G. Karlsson (eds.) *Gender and the Interests of Love: Essays in Honour of Anna Jónasdóttir*, Örebro University Press, Örebro, 2008, 197-222.

'A materialist-discursive approach to sexuality, sexual violence and sexualing globalisation: the case of ICTs', in L. Gunnarsson, A. G. Jónasdóttir and G. Karlsson (eds.) *GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume II. GEXce Theme 1: Gender, Sexuality and Global Change*, Tema Genus Report Series, Linköping, 2008, 65-76.

'"Women home and away": Transnational managerial work and gender relations', with M. Jyrkinen, R. Piekkari and E. Oinonen, *The Journal of Business Ethics* 83(1), 2008, 41-54.

'Policy, men and transnationalism', with R. Howson, in R. Howson, M. Donaldson, R. Hibbins and B. Pease. (eds.) *Migrant Men: Critical Studies of Masculinities and the Migration Experience*, Routledge, New York, 2009.

'Patriarchies, transpatriarchies and intersectionalities', in E. Oleksy (ed.) *Gender and Intimate Citizenships: Politics, Sexualities and Subjectivity*, Routledge, London, 2009.

Managers Talk about Gender: What managers in large transnational corporations say about gender policies, structures and practices, with R. Piekkari and M. Jyrkinen, Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, 2009.