Article:

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY

Learning the rules of the game: How is corporate masculinity learned and enacted by male professionals from nonprivileged backgrounds?

Andreas Giazitzoglu[1] | Daniel Muzio[2]

[1]Newcastle University Business School, Newcastle upon Tyne

[2]The York Management School, University of York, York, UK

Correspondence
Andreas Giazitzoglu, Newcastle University Business School, 5 Barrack Rd, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4SE, UK.
Email: Andreas.giazitzoglu@ncl.ac.uk

Abstract

Focusing on the lived intersection of social class and hegemonic masculinity, this article uses data elicited over a 5-year period to analyze the experiences of 10 white male participants from nonprivileged socioeconomic backgrounds, who were recruited as information technology professionals by a prestigious professional service firm (PSF). Employing a Bourdieusian perspective, we reveal how participants learned to enact the configuration of corporate masculinity deemed hegemonic in the field of their employing PSF. We pay particular attention to how participants engaged with distinctive forms of cultural capital to enact corporate masculinity, and the symbolic violence and "hidden injuries of class" this represents and leads to. In turn, we highlight how classed masculine norms create exclusion, marginalization, and discrimination in organizations. We suggest that class becomes recognized as a germane area for scholars of diversity and inequality to focus on and integrate in the future, in their ongoing investigations into which social norms create marginalization in organizations.

KEYWORDS
Bourdieu, exclusion, masculinity, professional services, social class

1 | INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades, critical diversity research has revealed how organizations do not operate as neutral settings, providing equal opportunities to all, but rather are social systems imbued with gendered, racialized, ableist, ageist, and heterosexual social norms, which systemically exclude, marginalize, and discriminate against individuals belonging to historically subordinate groups on account of their "difference" (Acker, 2006; Ashcraft, 2013; Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Calás & Smircich, 2006; Holck, 2018). As Ahonen, Tienari, Meriläinen, and Pullen (2014) point out, an interesting question within critical research in diversity is which "diversity issues" and "minority subjects" are focused on, and which subjects have been neglected.

Whereas this literature has extensively researched gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, able-bodiedness, and their multiple intersections to explain power inequality, it has remained relatively silent about social class (yet see, for exceptions, Adib & Guerrier, 2003; Holvino, 2011; Zanoni, 2011). This is surprising as, similar to these social identities, social class represents a fundamental ground of social classification, on which contemporary societies are hierarchically structured (Acker, 2006). Hence, power dynamics in work organizations are seldom completely un-related to class relations and the prevailing social norms which are informed by such relations (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). Yet, studies of social class and the classed nature of organizations, jobs, and professions have largely fallen outside the remit of critical diversity studies (but see, for exceptions, Riach & Cutcher, 2014; Zanoni, Janssens, Benschop, & Nkomo, 2010).

In this contribution, we would like to draw attention to the continued relevance of social class as a principle of organizing and more specifically to its operation in conjunction—at the intersection (Hearn, 2014; Holvino, 2011)—with profoundly gendered professional social norms. We do so by investigating the classed nature of corporate hegemonic masculinity in a professional service firm (PSF) through the experiences of white working-class male recruits.

Our analysis is guided by the research question: how is corporate masculinity learned and enacted by white male professionals from nonprivileged backgrounds? Empirically, we rely on longitudinal interview data, collected over a 5-year period, from a cohort of 10 white male information technology (IT) professionals (participants) from working-class backgrounds, who were recruited into an elite PSF where "the cerebral world of … masculinity inhabited by middle-class and well-educated men" (McDowell, 2006, p. 832) is normative. Theoretically, we draw on Bourdieu's theory to outline how participants learned to enact, over time, the codes of "corporate" masculinity associated with middle-class, well-educated men, to skillfully play the professional "game" and advance their careers, while bypassing some of the institutional exclusion their class backgrounds created. Our analysis pays particular attention to the ways participants came to accept corporate masculinity as a "doxa"—a taken-for-granted reality—of the firm, and learned to develop appropriate forms of symbolic cultural capital as part of their learning process.

At the same time, we show how this learning process generates symbolic violence, and results in "hidden injuries of class" (Sennett & Cobb, 1972) for participants, who never fully integrate into the culture of their PSF despite their attempts to configure corporate masculinity, and who come to experience habitus cleft, as their attempts to enact corporate masculinity estranges them from their communities of origin. Our analysis provides an important and original empirical contribution to our understanding of the classed nature of corporate hegemonic masculinity, and the extent white men experience marginalization and exclusion if they do not conform with dominant forms of corporate masculinity within their organization. By virtue of our longi-tudinal design, we are able to show how corporate masculinity was interpreted and interacted with by par-ticipants through time, in temporal ways, as they spent more time in the field of their PSF, learning "the rules of the game" and increasing their stake in the game. Building on our empirics, we call for social class to be recognized as an understudied but highly significant theme that critical diversity scholars should consider in more detail, as part of their ongoing attempts to understand how power and inequality function in

contemporary organizations, and how particular social identities, and their intersections, create marginalization for some organizational members.

2 | HEGEMONIC WHITE CORPORATE MASCULINITY IN PSFS

Hegemonic masculinity is the "normative … most honored way of being a man" (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832) in a cultural context. "Men are not intrinsically hegemonic; rather, they must accomplish hegemonic masculinity in and through their enactments, by referring to the particular codes of the (hegemonic) masculinity sought" (Giazitzoglu, 2020, p. 69). Extensive scholarship has documented how PSFs are pervaded by hegemonic masculine corporate cultures, in which white men are considered "ideal workers." Corporate masculinity is characterized by "ceaseless availability, rationality, control, ruthlessness, ambition, aggression, stamina, and mental and emotional strength" (Gregory, 2016, p. 8) and an unwavering dedication to one's career. Those who do not meet "the normative constructions of hegemonic masculinity" (Gregory, 2016, p. 17) are marginalized and discriminated against.

Most studies investigate how PSFs' masculine cultures exclude women. Gregory (2016) depicts the marginalization experienced by women in British and American computing and advertising PSFs during the Thatcher era. Gregory positions masculinity as a key part of "the game" played in PSFs. This excludes women inside and, less obviously, outside of work. Women generally find themselves excluded from the hyper-masculine car, alcohol, sexualized, sport-based, and competitive forms of entertainment that many male employees in PSFs engage with outside of work. For female employees, this further affirms a sense of being outside of "the game." Hatmaker (2013) illustrates the marginal, peripheral status of women employed in heavily gendered engineering firms. Hatmaker's illustration shows women responding to their marginalization through two strategies: "impression management," so as to "fit in" by reproducing traits associated with masculinity (see also Wajcman, 1999) and "coping strategies," so as to better manage their marginalization, emotionally.

Kumra and Vinnicombe (2008) and Bolton and Muzio (2007) focus on the key issue of promotion to partnership in PSFs, and point out that while an increasing number of women are recruited by PSFs, very few women progress to partnership roles in them. Kumra and Vinnicombe (2008) explain this by showing that women are less likely to "fit" a culturally constructed, masculine-centered model of "success" while Bolton and Muzio (2007), focusing on law PSFs, show promotion criteria, emphasizing billable hours and "rain making" are gendered, and relegate women to subordinate positions. Accordingly, women are disadvantaged, judged unfairly, and are prevented from fully progressing to the top of their organization's structures.

Tomlinson, Muzio, Sommerlad, Webley, and Duff (2013) show how women and minority ethnic employees face a series of structural challenges within law firms, which impact both their recruitment and career progression. Tomlinson et al. (2013) show how respondents engage in a number of response strategies, ranging from assimilation to withdrawal, with the majority of respondents "playing the game" by reproducing—rather than participating in strategies that challenge—the masculine status quo within PSFs. Thus, despite rhetoric about equal opportunities, old inequalities persist in legal structures for women and Black and minority ethnic employees, whose ethnicity and gender make them, as marginalized subjects, reluctant or unable to participate in the strategies needed to join the upper echelons of their organization.

Less frequently, studies address how PSF cultures are shaped by ageist and embodied norms. Yet the significance of age and embodiment is demonstrated in Riach and Cutcher's (2014) study of a highly competitive UK hedge fund in the City of London, in which middle-class, athletic, fit, and muscular male bodies are idealized. By ensuring their bodies look and perform as such, aging male traders can prove they—and their bodies—are "built to last," thus remaining employable in a physiologically demanding profession that requires long hours spent working, socializing, and managing stress. Thus, traders offset the marginalization an aging body may create for them, by

letting their bodies function as "accumulation strategies"; as part of their lifelong accomplishment of a professional masculine identity.

Although the extant literature often mentions the upper-class background of the vast majority of PSF employees, the classed nature of PSF hegemonic masculinity has largely remained unexamined (yet, for an exception, see Riach & Cutcher, 2014). While recognizing the hegemonic position of white masculinity in PSFs, it is important to acknowledge that not all white male professionals benefit equally from it. White professional men are not a homogenous group. They are a diverse category, differentiated on the basis of their social class origins, and associated masculinities.

Following Winlow (2001, p. 38) and Nayak (2006, p. 820), working-class masculinity generally refers to the "hard" masculinity acquired and learned when one is conditioned through a nonprivileged context (e.g., in socioeconomically marginalized families and spaces). Codes of working-class masculinity include the ability to participate in violence if needed, hedonism, irresponsibility, machismo, over-emotive reactions, and loyalty to "the lads" (i.e., other working-class men), rejection of authority and distinctive styles of dressing and talking (Hayward & Yar, 2006). Working-class masculinity is hegemonic among certain men and in certain social contexts, such as in the gym and among "the lads" studied by Giazitzoglu (2018). However, in other contexts, codes and tastes associated with working-class masculinity are stigmatized and dismissed as "parochial," "laddish," and "loutish" (Stahl, 2015, pp. 18–19; Walker & Roberts, 2018).

A working-class background can be a source of shame and embarrassment for employees, who feel compelled to disguise their socioeconomic origins during organizational interactions (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Kallschmidt & Eaton, 2018). This is especially the case in contexts imbued with upper-class norms, such as PSFs (Ashley & Empson, 2017; Cook, Faulconbridge, & Muzio, 2012; Harvey & Maclean, 2008; Ingram & Allen, 2018; Spence, Carter, Husillos, & Archel, 2017).

3 | THE PSF AS A BOURDIEUSIAN FIELD

We see the PSF studied as a Bourdieusian field; metaphorically, this can be presented as players engaging and interacting in a game. Players are broadly speaking the employees of the PSF, who agree to play because they believe the gain is worth it: being seen as a competent and legitimate employee, and thus keeping and improving one's position in the PSF. The game is played in accordance with "rules" or regularities (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 98), which orient how players should and should not behave, interact, and present themselves, yet, these rules are not explicit and codified. We see corporate masculinity—and its inherently middle-class connotations—as such expected expression of professional behavior within the PSF. Put differently, for employees to be seen as credible players, they need to enact a specific form of corporate masculinity, in accordance with the one expressed by the dominant incumbents. In this sense, corporate masculinity can be seen as belonging to the PSF's doxa, that is, the taken-for-granted norms operating in the organization and posing as normal or "natural" form of masculinity.

Cultural capital refers to both "cultural knowledge" (including knowledge in the form of educational qualifications) and physical "cultural goods" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 5) or status symbols, such as expensive watches, sports cars, and tailored suits. Displaying these middle-class forms of cultural capital is an effective way for PSF employees to construct legitimacy, credibility, and belonging as players in a PSF's field (Ashley & Empson, 2017; Cook et al., 2012; Harvey & Maclean, 2008; Spence et al., 2017). Thus, cultural capital functions as symbolic capital for PSF employees, who can use cultural capital to visually denote their tastes are aligned with those of incumbents.

Professionals who were raised in privileged—that is, middle-class and upper middle-class—backgrounds are likely to have learned how to engage with middle-class cultural capital before their employment. This can be explained via Bourdieu's notion of habitus. A habitus—or "structuring structure"—is the set of cultural experiences

and dispositions that one has collected and encountered before entering a given field. Habitus forms "the intentionality without the intention, the knowledge without cognitive intent, the pre-reflective, infra-conscious mastery that agents acquire in the social world" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 19) and "predisposes ... individuals towards certain ways of behaving" (Allen & Hollingworth, 2013, p. 500). Having been brought up in the habitus of affluent families, boarding schools, elite universities, and other elite institutions, middle-class recruits "fit" in PSF fields, with a priori knowledge of how to "play the game" in a PSF by drawing on middle-class forms of cultural capital. This not only bolsters middle-class applicants' chances of recruitment into a PSF (Cook et al., 2012; Ingram & Allen, 2018; Rivera, 2015), but also heightens their chances of feeling, metaphorically, like a "fish in water" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 127) in a PSF's field once employed, as they already possess and enact habitus associated with competent and legitimate employees. This also helps middle-class recruits cement relationships with a PSF's (typically middle-class) clients (Ashley & Empson, 2017; Hanlon, 2004; Harrington, 2017; Rivera, 2015), at a time when middle-class status is seen as a proxy for professional competence (Ingram & Allen, 2018; Spence et al., 2017, p. 217).

In contrast, those who are brought up in working-class contexts have been exposed to, and most likely know best, working-class habitus and will have acquired working-class cultural capital (e.g., in their vocal accents and dress sense), but not middle-class cultural capital and will therefore be at a disadvantage. However, for their careers to evolve, male professionals from working-class backgrounds must learn "the rules of the game" operating in their PSF, acquire and display knowledge of corporate masculinity, to be seen as competent players. They need to utilize middle-class cultural capital to position themselves as relevant players in the PSF field. Accordingly, this results in a process of symbolic violence, whereby more powerful social groups and individuals impose their ideals, norms, and doxa on the less powerful, who themselves, participate in this domination by accepting this prevalence.

We now outline the research context we studied, and the data acquisition and analysis techniques we employed to answer our research question.

4 | RESEARCH CONTEXT

Our analysis focuses on the regional office of a prestigious management consultancy firm referred to as *Ferguson* (a pseudonym). It adheres to the definition of a PSF given by Von Nordenflycht (2010) due to its knowledge intensity and professionalized workforce. Ferguson is a Fortune Global 500 and S&P500 company, with revenues of over £34 billion. It employs over 400,000 people globally, with clients in over 200 cities. Ferguson's UK operations are headed from several offices in the City of London. It opened a regional office, near a post-industrial city in the north of England (UK) in the early 2000s. This office provides IT support to Ferguson's clients, predominantly other global PSFs who employ Ferguson to design, implement, and manage their large-scale IT systems.

White working-class men are statistically less likely to enter the professions than middle-class men (Laurison & Friedman, 2016, p. 680). When they do enter the professions, white working-class men earn on average 17% less than middle-class men doing the same roles (Laurison & Friedman, 2016, p. 669). In IT—the profession focused on here—males from working-class backgrounds earn an average of £11,000 a year less than men from privileged backgrounds (Friedman, Laurison, & Miles, 2015, p. 277).

Our research centered on 10 male participants, who found employment as IT professionals in Ferguson's regional office between 2003 and 2013. All participants self-identified as "white British." Some participants were among the first recruits to find employment in Ferguson's regional office.

In the area around Ferguson's regional office, there is a shortage of "traditional" PSF recruits, that is, individuals from affluent backgrounds who are graduates of Russell Group universities, which are considered the most prestigious British universities (Ingram & Allen, 2018), and who learned how to enact corporate masculinity pre-recruitment. This has left a gap for local IT graduates from less privileged backgrounds to enter Ferguson, in a way that is atypical for PSF recruitment. Hence, participants were recruited in the context of Ferguson facing a

shortage of skilled graduates willing to live and work in the post-industrial area its regional office resides. As a consequence of their socioeconomic backgrounds and rather exceptional recruitment into a prestigious PSF, participants are a highly relevant cohort to examine when considering how corporate masculinity is learned by male professionals from nonprivileged backgrounds, as a consequence of their exposure to the "rules" and doxa of a professional cultural field.

5 | WORKING OUT CLASS

Information was generated about the educational attainment, homes, and occupations of participants' parents, with these variables being long-standing measures of one's social class origin (Goldthorpe, Llewellyn, & Payne, 1980). On this basis, participants were classified as people who grew up in homes that fit "emergent service workers," "traditional working class," or, less commonly, "new affluent worker" categories proposed by Savage et al. (2013, p. 230). These backgrounds represent nonprivileged ones that do not usually bestow the ability to engage with "high-brow" cultural capital on those socialized within them (Friedman et al., 2015, pp. 261–263). Participants studied at post-1992 universities as the first generation of university attendees in their families and have lived in the local region for all of their lives. Post-1992 universities are seen as less prestigious and less academically rigorous than the allegedly elite collection of British universities categorized as "Russell Group" universities. PSF recruits are normally graduates of Russell Group institutions. This further shows that participants' pre-recruitment experiences are markedly different from other "ideal," typical PSF recruits. How corporate masculinity was learned by participants and "formulated, reformulated and amplified" (Messerschmidt, 2018) within their enactments was the focus of our data collection.

6 | DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected over a 5-year period, through a series of 34 qualitative interviews, with the same participants being interviewed at different stages (i.e., the probation and early post-probation stages) of their careers. This allowed us to document and compare participants' narratives at different points in their learning processes, and see how their enactments of corporate masculinity and engagement with cultural capital fluctuated over time.

Research participants were generated through a gatekeeper: TT. TT is a long-term employee in Ferguson. TT participated in interviews with the first author during an earlier, separate study. TT agreed to be interviewed for this project, and introduced the first author to other participants who constitute an "office clique" within Ferguson's regional office and who gave informed consent to participate in a series of semi-structured interviews "about what it's like where you work and how where you work has impacted you." In this, rather informal, way access was negotiated. Interviews took place in the first author's house, participants' houses, and local coffee shops. All participants were promised anonymity. In line with ethical guidelines, no harm came or will come to participants because of their consensual involvement with this study. Ferguson are unaware of the research project and are kept anonymous as an organization. Having accessed participants, contact was maintained with them through emails, text messages, and a WhatsApp group.

Interview questions were designed following the phenomenological analysis approach, to reveal how participants subjectively "make sense" of their experiences in relation to the research question (Gill, 2014). Interviews followed a sociobiographic approach (Tomlinson et al., 2013, p. 252), whereby we asked participants to reflect on their time in Ferguson with reference to biographical narratives and anecdotes they had already articulated in earlier interviews (Tables 1 and 2).

TABLE 1 Participants' pathways into and roles within Ferguson

Participant: pseudonym and age (during phase 1 of research)	Education	Role and history in Ferguson
TT (gatekeeper), 36	Degree in Computing and IT (would not disclose grade)	Entered Ferguson in 2003 at the age of 21. Currently level 2 IT support. Worked as a doorman as a student
JJ, 35	BSc (nonhonors) in Computing and Practice (2:1)	Entered Ferguson in 2004, having completed his degree. Worked in a supermarket before Ferguson. Level 3 IT support
FT, 33	BSc (Hons) IT, Management, and Business (2:1) with sandwich year in industry	Entered Ferguson in 2007 having completed degree and having spent some time working for an ICT firm who employed him during a sandwich year. Has worked in level 2 IT support since
CT, 28	BSc (Hons) IT (2:1); MSc Cyber Security	Entered Ferguson in 2013 (IT support level 2) after MSc
EO, 39	BSc (Hons) IT (first-class honors)	Entered Ferguson in 2002 having completed degree and having worked in a local IT firm for a year. Works in IT, level 3
BD, 28	BSc Computing and Information Science (first)	Entered Ferguson in 2012 as IT support (level 2) having completed degree and having worked as a swimming instructor
RM, 38	Started a 4-year degree in Computing for Industry in 1998, but graduated with a HND in Computing in 2002	Entered Ferguson as IT support (level 2) in 2005 having worked in IT at a local high school
BT, 39	BSc (Hons) in IT subject (would not give title or grade)	Recruited to work in IT support, level 2, in 2007 having completed degree and having worked "in mobile phone technology"
CZ, 35	BSc (Hons) Computer Science (first); MSc Data Science	Entered Ferguson at the age of 24, having completed MSc and having spent some time working in IT for a local communications firm. Works in IT support, level 3
HB, 27	BSc and MSc in Computer Science	Entered Ferguson as level 2 IT support in 2010, immediately after completing his MSc. Recently became level 3 IT support

Abbreviations: ICT, information and communications technology; IT, information technology.

7 | DATA ANALYSIS

Each interview transcript was read several times, so familiarity with data was established. Data was then coded using *Ethnograph* software and analyzed. Analysis focused on inductively developing data within transcripts into a cohesive narrative to answer the question: how is corporate masculinity learned and enacted by male professionals from nonprivileged backgrounds? We used Bourdieu's ideas of field, habitus, doxa, symbolic capital, and cultural capital to code data and contextualize data theoretically. These concepts appeared particularly relevant when initially reading data. They became theoretical lenses and frameworks that we

TABLE 2 Research process and inducted themes

Phase and time of research	Number of interviewees	Primary theme(s) of questions asked	Key themes to emerge from interviews
1: Dec 2012—Dec 2013	10	1. Participants' general experiences of Ferguson 2. Participants' current roles 3. Participants' backgrounds and lives before Ferguson, including questions about participants' parents' occupations and educational attainments	Ferguson systemically uses socialization techniques. Examples of socialization experienced by participants include biyearly formal appraisals, informal leisure nights, and, most importantly, inductions in London. Through socialization techniques, the sort of masculinity deemed ideal in Ferguson is communicated to participants. Participants constitute a set of "local" employees from distinctive, nonprivileged socioeconomic backgrounds. Participants all experienced a habitus cleft when they first entered Ferguson's field, on account of their working-class masculinities
2: Mar 2014—Aug 2014	9	1. How do Ferguson communicate to participants what is expected of them? 2. How do participants experience the culture of their office and firm? 3. How does Ferguson's culture compare with participants' experiences of "life before Ferguson"?	Evidence emerges that participants can denote a masculinity, deemed ideal and hegemonic in Ferguson, by engaging with certain cultural artefacts and status symbols (e.g., suits and reading spectacles) and displaying specific knowledge and tastes (e.g., knowledge and tastes relating to the Conservative Party). Without knowing it, participants are discussing how cultural capital can be used by them to project corporate masculinity. The cultural field of Ferguson contrasts heavily with participants' pre-recruitment cultural experiences, in their communities of origin
3: Jan 2015—Feb 2015	9	1. How and why have participants changed over time, during their employment? 2. Why some recruits fail to "change" their masculinities/change their masculinities to a lesser extent than others?	More data on participants' cultural capital use is elicited. A journey from working-class masculinity to corporate masculinity is evident in participants' discourses. Complying to corporate masculinity through cultural capital use gives participants a sense of being partly, though not fully, anchored in Ferguson. A sense that some local recruits are less willing to change the intersection of their class and masculinity is expressed

T A B L E   2   (Continued)

Phase and time of research	Number of interviewees	Primary theme(s) of questions asked	Key themes to emerge from interviews
4: Jul 2015	1	Member-checking	Inducted findings, derived from the research process so far, are discussed with TT, following the principles of member-checking
5: Dec 2016–Mar 2017	5	1. Reflective interviews, further comparing participants' past and present masculinities 2. Narratives and statements expressed by participants in earlier interviews are read out and reflected on by participants	Participants described and accounted for the differences in their status, masculinity, and use of cultural capital "then" (in the early days of their employment and before their employment) and "now." Specific examples of cultural capital, which participants engage with, were listed and discussed. The journey from working-class masculinity to corporate masculinity is further articulated, phenomenologically. The "hidden injuries of class" experienced by participants in their communities of origin as well as in their professional interactions are discussed

consulted when iteratively answering the research question, in relation to participants' phenomenological narratives.

Our longitudinal design allowed us to capture how participants' narratives evolved over time, revealing participants' learning of corporate masculinity as a temporal process. Furthermore, our longitudinal design allowed us to see how participants' learning of corporate masculinity entailed experiences of habitus cleft and symbolic violence for them.

8 | REFLEXIVITY

Owing to his participation in an earlier study, a level of rapport existed during the research process between the first author and TT. As a result of the multiple years spent researching, closeness emerged between all participants and the first author during fieldwork. As a white man from a similar socioeconomic background to the participants, who had himself learned to enact a different form of masculinity to suit the cultural field of a Russell Group business school, the first author has experienced a similar lived experience to participants. In some interviews, participants noticed the first author wore cufflinks depicting an Oxford University crest. Participants were intrigued about the cufflink's symbolism, asking "what life was like at Oxford for a normal lad like you?" All of this shows a high level of closeness and familiarity existed in the research process, with participants seeing the first author as "normal," resembling themselves, and—like them—somehow at odds with elite institutions, not normally accessible to "men like us."

Accordingly, it is necessary to reflexively consider how elicited data might have been impacted by the closeness between the researcher and the researched; with reflexivity being understood as a "researcher's consciousness of her or his own assumptions and prejudices" (Hibbert, Sillince, Diefenbach, & Cunliffe, 2014, p. 283). This closeness allowed access to a rare but salient cohort of PSF employees to emerge and be sustained over the whole research period. Further, we believe it meant a level of honesty and openness in the research process, resulting in rich qualitative data emerging from participants who may otherwise be reluctant, even embarrassed, to reveal the extent of their learning of corporate masculinity. Also, interviewing participants in "nonwork places," such as houses and coffee shops, appeared to further heighten the level of detail in data acquired, and create a richer context for analysis: participants said they felt "looser" and "freer" when "they talked about work outside of work," and therefore potentially ventured empirical data with more qualitative validity.

While recognizing the benefits of closeness in the research process, it is also necessary to outline a source of possible bias in the sample. Our contact person TT selected who was interviewed. While this was necessary for access to emerge, TT may have sought out informants who were most "like" him, reducing the scope of the collected narratives (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007). It is possible that male professionals from working-class backgrounds employed in Ferguson who were not interviewed would have given different accounts to those captured.

9 | GETTING HURT: LEARNING THE RULES OF THE GAME

During their first 4 months of employment, all participants experienced discomfort. Participants' working-class masculinities were "looked down on" by incumbents in Ferguson, such as line managers who:

> looked down on us, not because of ... work [technical skills] which has always been good but because of how we were, like how we looked and acted and spoke. (TT)

In their narratives, participants reflected on their own working-class masculinity, contrasting it with the masculinity projected by affluent male recruits, who were positioned as ideal in Ferguson:

we called them the golden boys ... their backgrounds were [Russell Group university] and they were just different ... the managers thought they were great because they were posh, even though they were shit at programming. (FT)

Participants felt somewhat marginalized in Ferguson: distinct and different to the "posh" men around them, despite participants apparently being better at doing the technical job of programming.

Ferguson's office, which appeared to participants as "top of the range" (BD), with "posh art on the walls" (BT) and "the best of the best equipment" (JJ) also contributed to participants feeling "unworthy" (CZ) and "like imposters" (HB) in a field that "intimidated" (TT) them. Participants cited their accents as a further source of distinction between themselves and corporate men: "I talked like I was dragged up" (FT). They also discussed their dress sense in this regard: "I realized I was the only guy in the office with trainers on, I didn't realize it would be a problem at work, but it was" (EO). One respondent identified the "general auras" of corporate men they met as a further source of the experiential discomfort they experienced in Ferguson's field during their early months of employment: "they [managers] all had this general aura of confidence and strength and I've always been shy and introverted, it's bad manners to act like they do where I come from" (RM).

Accordingly, participants experienced a disjunction between the habitus and doxa they knew before employment, and the habitus and doxa they encountered when recruited into Ferguson. This created a sense of internal suffering and destabilization for participants:

you come from a house like mine ... and you go into that ... office, and it is a different world ... like living on a farm all your life then visiting New York city ... it was very uncomfortable. (CT)

Despite this, participants were eager to find long-term employment in Ferguson, due to associated financial benefits, which functioned as incentives and motivations for participants to remain in a field they found discomforting:

where else around here could we have got paid that much? It was the golden ticket getting in there ... it was a London job with a London salary but in this region. (FT)

10 | GETTING SOCIALIZED INTO THE GAME: LONDON'S CALLING

Participants attended formal inductions at one of Ferguson's central London offices. Inductions occur for all new recruits, within their first 6 months of employment, when new employees are most receptive to organizational inculcation (Solinger, van Olffen, Roe, & Hofmans, 2013). Induction attendance is mandatory. At inductions, participants are introduced to what form of masculinity they are expected to enact, and what cultural capital they are expected to display and enact, as part of their professional roles. In other words, at induction, participants learn what an ideal man looks like, acts like, and sounds like to be seen as a credible employee according to the doxa of Ferguson.

Participants cited clothing as a form of cultural capital they learned to engage with at inductions, in order to aesthetically adhere to the corporate masculinity that is hegemonic in Ferguson. Participants discussed the necessity to wear "white or maybe blue business shirts" (HB) at work, with "ties that have a thick knot ... never a skinny tie" (BD). Participants also mentioned how, during inductions, they learned to use embodied cultural capital to enact corporate masculinity, including "neat haircuts ... and manicured nails" (JJ), and modify their vocal styles by speaking "slowly with as little regional-accent as possible" (EO) and "making sure you spend more time listening than talking ... only discussing facts, never opinions" (TT).

Hence, the rules and codes associated with enacting corporate masculinity were revealed during inductions. Simultaneously, participants began to realize how men who personify corporate masculinity in Ferguson have different tastes (in a Bourdieusian sense) and knowledge to working-class men they know (e.g., fathers and uncles). This is made clear in the way JJ discusses contrasting ways men "think about and wearing suits":

> Where we come from, you … think about wearing suits … [working-class people] only wear suit if you're in court or at wedding, but at work it's not that you'll wear a suit, it's that you'll wear the right suit in the right way with the right accessories … people in the professional world notice these things and they matter a lot … there are codes to it and working-class lads are not aware of it, it's like a secret code.

As part of their inductions, participants were transported "first class on a train to a swanky hotel" (RM), where they stayed for 5 days. Prior to inductions, some participants had never visited London, and most participants had never seen the "city area" of London where "tall buildings" (RM) and other markers of advanced capitalism flank Ferguson's headquarters. Exposure to London appeared to enhance participants' respect for Ferguson. London's "professional" culture became contrasted with the "rough" culture of post-industrial northern England in participants' discourses:

> it's the north south divide … that I keep coming back to, it's like up north we are the hard workers, the pit-workers and ship-builders … rough, tough people … in London it's all fashion and money … down there [London] they just have different ways of doing things and different ways about them … professional … but it [induction experience] was like now you're a part of us, now you leave the old ways behind. (BD)

The corporate masculinity that participants learned to enact had geographical connotations for participants, who saw corporate masculinity as a London phenomenon, not associated with the sorts of "hard working but poor" post-industrial spaces where participants grew up and work.

Participants often described inductions as populated by "them" and "us." This division is encapsulated in the following anecdote, which shows the disdain that London Ferguson personnel felt towards Ferguson's regional office and the a-typical recruits it employs:

> I was using the bathroom [in London, on an evening during induction] and I was locked in the cubicle and I could hear two of them [Ferguson managers or consultants based in London] talking … they were saying: "Wow have you heard this lot talking? I can't understand them, it's like they live in the 1980s and stuff like that …" The other one was laughing hysterically, like he was on drugs or something, and in the end … said: "Well as long as they can program." (TT)

It is significant that participants are accepted "as long as they can program." This suggests a classed division of labor and masculinity operates in Ferguson, with those in London "doing consultancy and project management," and those in Ferguson's regional office "doing the programming." In this way, participants' subcultural status in Ferguson is further revealed: according to London's actors, participants are viewed as men "up north" who programmed, as opposed to men in London, who enacted corporate masculinity proper, and who were involved in the more glamorous (and lucrative) operations of Ferguson. The above quote indicates that participants are seen as culturally and geographically peripheral and at the margins of Ferguson's field.

11 | ENACTING THE RULES OF THE GAME IN PRACTICE

Given their experiences during their early stages of employment and induction, participants may have viewed Ferguson skeptically, and rejected the corporate masculinity that constituted the field. However, in the first 2 years of their employment, they became increasingly willing to "play the Ferguson game" by enacting the codes of corporate masculinity they were exposed to at induction.

Examples of engagement with cultural capital given by participants include them adopting the dress code associated with corporate masculinity uncritically. "I stopped asking why I should wear it [suit] and just started wearing it" (CZ). Or, eating and drinking certain foods due to these foods' status connotations: "when I was in London I saw all the big-shots coming into the office with espressos and eating sushi at lunch—I was like raw fish? That's minging! [local word for disgusting]. But then I started doing the same, walking around making a big thing of it with my café Nero coffee and Marks and Spencer's sushi" (BD). And displaying artefacts and opinions aligned with the British Conservative Party's politics and royal family, due to the connotations such alignment has:

> my dad is a massive Labour supporter and he hates the royals so he'd be furious if he knew but in London it was obvious that [names Ferguson manager] and all his crew were … boarding school type Tories [Conservative Party supporters] and [names person] had a picture of Margaret Thatcher on his desk and one night made a toast to the Queen, like we were having a beer and he stood up and said "to the Queen" and all the others stood up too and [puts on voice] like this "to the Queen!" … so I started getting into all that, and I even had a picture of the Queen on my desk when [names person] visited … he saw it [the picture] and smiled, like almost nodded at me to say well done … they saw me as a good bloke. (FT)

Further examples of acquiring embodied cultural capital among participants include them "working on facial skin": "when I started [Ferguson] I had acne but my manager … got me onto this skin regime … you can't be dressing in nice suits but then have a face like that" (BT). Obtaining "better teeth": "I've had a lot of work done—my teeth were a problem because of the food I ate growing up, all sugar and that rubbish … and I was conscious of it … so now I feel like I can smile" (JJ). "Improving" accents (all participants mentioned their working-class accents as now being "less regional") and wearing fake spectacles to "look the part":

> I wanted to … look … more corporate, ideally … American news presenters … I tried a beard and it softened me but it didn't look clean-cut enough, a bit too scruffy … that's why I got these [shows interviewer a pair of tortoiseshell spectacles] they really look the part don't they? There's nothing in them (laughs), the glass isn't proper; it's just normal glass frames, but it makes me look the part. (HB)

12 | HABITUS CLEFT

As time progressed, participants were able to enact corporate masculinity with increasing naturalness, using symbolic cultural capital to "play the game" in Ferguson. However, it is important to not over-state the extent to which participants' corporate masculinities create a sense of belonging for them within Ferguson. Participants experience ongoing "hidden injuries of class" on account of their backgrounds. As put by JJ: "I'll never be an old Etonian." Participants "know their place" (RM) in Ferguson, accepting themselves as "little pawns" (EO) who are "tolerated and appreciated" (BD) though not fully integrated. Participants' ongoing marginalization within Ferguson is evident during their interactions with Ferguson's London offices in particular. Participants feel colleagues in

London "still look down on us and always will no matter what" (TT). Participants' ability to learn and enact corporate masculinity has anchored them, though not fully integrated them, within Ferguson.

Some local recruits from atypical socioeconomic backgrounds "failed" their probations and were "dropped" by the company (i.e., not employed post-probation). Participants talked about them in disparaging terms:

> those guys had the golden ticket but they were so small-town and small-time basically immature they weren't willing to grow up and embrace it, too immature to move on from who they were when they were teenagers. (CZ)

> I remember one evening I was working in the office with [names] ... Do you remember a song about I think it was Gangnam style? And there was this dance to it? and all he kept saying was I can't wait to go out into the bars and do the dance, I've been learning it all week, so I can dance with my mates, and he left about 7 p.m. and went straight out. I worked late that night thinking yeah enjoy your stupid dance, that's why you've never made it here, because you'd rather be in a shit-hole with a bunch of scum doing some stupid dance than delivering to clients. (HB)

These quotations suggest participants believe dismissal from Ferguson was the fault of the "dropped," for their failing to conform to corporate masculinity (i.e., failing to work past 7 p.m.). Seemingly, participants internalized the organizational doxa that corporate masculinity is "better" than working-class masculinity; and that local recruits have an almost moral obligation to conform to corporate masculinity once employed. It also reveals the divisions between how "working-class lads in working-class jobs" define "working hard" in comparison with men from working-class backgrounds employed in PSF roles. Working-class men in working-class roles typically see "working hard" as being rooted in physical labor, associated with industrial and manufacturing work; and see their leisure time as something earned (Giazitzoglu, 2014, p. 335). However, participants have come to see "working hard" as manifested in acts like "working late" and "delivering to clients." There is also a sense of sacrifice associated with participants' definition of working hard: they are disciplined to do without leisure time in order to deliver in the context of their field.

Outside of work, the corporate masculinity learned and enacted by participants is, however, seen to impair—even "poison"—participants' social relationships in their communities of origin. Participants suggest working-class friends and family members they "grew up with" and "knew back in the day ... seem to like me less now" (EO), "think I've changed for the worse" (BT), and "tell me I'm a cunt like straight to my face" (CT). Participants experience ridicule as a result of the corporate masculinity they have adopted. Accordingly, participants sneer at places and people associated with their pre-Ferguson pasts:

> So embarrassing. One night I went for a meal with my mam, dad and brothers and their girlfriends—it was meant to be this whole happy families act, back at [names town] ... I didn't even take [names his girlfriend] because I knew how embarrassing it would be and her family are not like mine ... the night was summed up as shit restaurant, local crap food, loads of wannabes there thinking they're some-thing they're not, basically wishing they were in [names city restaurants] ... I asked for al dente pasta and they looked at me like I was, well they don't even know what that is! ... When they saw I was wearing cufflinks, they were all just laughing at me for ages, so embarrassing, like: "Oh, we are Neanderthal and let's laugh at [names his surname] because he wears nice things now." (JJ)

> I got in a huge row with [names close family member] ... they basically said this all started at uni-versity, getting above yourself and then getting some posh job, you've changed for the worse ... you can see it just poisons them ... I deserve respect from them, outside of their little world I'm more of a someone than them, I mean objectively I actually have success. (RM)

Empirics reveal a paradox associated with learning corporate masculinity for participants. Enacting corporate masculinity anchors participants in Ferguson, but fails to fully integrate them. Simultaneously, enacting corporate masculinity has caused participants to become estranged from people in their communities of origin. Consequently, participants come to straddle two different cultural contexts, yet don't legitimately belong within either. Learning corporate masculinity comes at a psycho-social cost.

13 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, we set out to investigate how recruits from nonprivileged socioeconomic backgrounds learned the rules of the corporate hegemonic masculine game at a PSF and developed appropriate forms of cultural capital to play it successfully. By focusing on participants' narrated experiences over time, we have documented in detail how corporate masculinity is enacted in this field. Our study builds on extant literature which recognizes that a form of corporate masculinity is hegemonic in PSFs (Connell, 2012; Connell & Wood, 2005; Gregory, 2016), elucidating the classed micro-level symbols and codes of corporate masculinity. It exists in codes ranging from vocal accents to how one wears a suit, shirt and tie, to knowledge of restaurants. It is also a configuration of masculinity with geographical connotations, associated with London rather than post-industrial northern British spaces. This advances our understanding of corporate masculinity, from a term that refers to the hegemonic white, male "face of the firm" (Gregory, 2016) to a classed phenomenon, made up of symbolic cultural capital that has to be learned and enacted.

Our analysis uniquely unveils the classed nature of masculinity in professional organizations, and the kind of "learning" that this entails for white working-class men who might at first sight seem well positioned to embody "the ideal worker" (Acker, 2006). The small amount of work that does consider the exclusion of professional white working-class men (e.g., the special issue of *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion* on "Critical Reflections from Men in the Field"; see McKearney, 2014) has generally focused on white, male academics' accounts about how the combination of whiteness and working-class masculinity relates to them "doing" academic research, and the sense of guilt they feel for their privilege (e.g., Hearn, 2014). While such work is interesting, it fails to emphasize the inequality that exists between typologies of men within organizational structures, on account of those men's contrasting classed masculinities. It also fails to point to how class establishes a hierarchy of masculinities between men, and the pressures on working-class men to learn the rules of middle-class, corporate masculinity, to build a career in PSF contexts.

The longitudinal research design enabled us to unveil participants' learning process over the years. Drawing on rich data, we have shown that "learning the rules of the game" of a PSF is a dynamic process, infused with struggle. Specifically, participants' working-class backgrounds cause them "hidden injuries of class" (Sennett & Cobb, 1972) in Ferguson and experiences of embarrassment and shame, akin to the experiences of the working-class professionals analyzed by Kallschmidt and Eaton (2018) and McLeod, O'Donohoe, and Townley (2009). Also, we have illustrated the symbolic violence inherent in participants' learning. Participants are seen as lesser by incumbents in their field, on account of their class backgrounds, and judged negatively against middle-class men, despite them being "better programmers." Simultaneously, we have shown how participants progressively adhere to the field's doxa which results, for some of them, in looking down on features of their own social class of origin. Furthermore, we have revealed the habitus cleft encountered by participants and the associated hysteresis effect experienced, as a result of participants failing to belong in either the working-class contexts they knew pre-employment, or the PSF field they entered post-employment.

We finish by making a plea to critical diversity scholars to integrate social class into future research that attempts to empirically investigate and understand how social norms create marginalization in organizations. We suggest class should join more established themes like ableism, ageism, heteronormativity, and whiteness as a key site of power inequality within organizations. Our longitudinal design allowed us to capture the complex and

contradictory dynamics of learning to navigate a field, whereby success requires a transformation of one's classed practices and, ultimately, oneself, and is likely to entail lasting contradictory feelings. We encourage future research to employ a longitudinal design where possible, to see in more detail how class is "lived" as a source of diversity and marginalization over time. The contradictions we uncovered are not limited to the workplace but, as one's social trajectory starts in the family and the community, are likely to cut across multiple fields and social roles. Future research is warranted that explores how social mobility changes one's "difference" both at work and beyond.

ORCID

Andreas Giazitzoglu ⬛ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2763-9600

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class and race in organizations. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 441–464.

Adib, A., & Guerrier, Y. (2003). The interlocking of gender with nationality, race, ethnicity and class: The narratives of women in hotel work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(4), 413–432.

Ahonen, P., Tienari, J., Meriläinen, S., & Pullen, A. (2014). Hidden contexts and invisible power relations: A Foucauldian reading of diversity research. *Human Relations*, 67(3), 263–286.

Allen, K., & Hollingworth, S. (2013). "Sticky subjects" or "cosmopolitan creatives"? Social class, place and urban young people's aspirations for work in the knowledge economy. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 499–517.

Ashcraft, K. (2013). The glass slipper: "Incorporating" occupational identity in management studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 6–31.

Ashley, L., & Empson, L. (2017). Understanding social exclusion in elite professional service firms: Field level dynamics and the "professional project." *Work, Employment & Society*, 31(2), 211–229.

Benschop, Y., & Doorewaard, H. (1998). Covered by equality, the gendered subtext of organizations. *Organization Studies*, 19(5), 787–805.

Bolton, S., & Muzio, D. (2007). Can't live with 'em; can't live without 'em: Gendered segmentation in the legal profession. *Sociology*, 41(1), 47–64.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.

Brannick, T., & Coghlan, D. (2007). In defense of being "native": The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1), 59–74.

Calás, M., & Smircich, L. (2006). From the "woman's point of view" ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & T. Lawrence (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies* (pp. 284–346). London, UK: Sage.

Connell, R. (2012). Inside the glass tower: The construction of masculinities in finance capital. In P. McDonald & E. Jeanes (Eds.), *Men, wage work and family* (pp. 65–79). New York, NY: Routledge.

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859.

Connell, R., & Wood, J. (2005). Globalization and business masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, 7(4), 347–364.

Cook, A., Faulconbridge, J., & Muzio, D. (2012). London's legal elite: Recruitment through cultural-capital and the reproduction of social exclusivity in city professional service fields. *Environment & Planning A*, 44, 1744–1762.

Friedman, S., Laurison, D., & Miles, A. (2015). Breaking the "class" ceiling? Social mobility into Britain's elite occupations. *Sociological Review*, 63(2), 259–290.

Giazitzoglu, A. (2014). Learning not to labour: A micro analysis of consensual male unemployment. *International Journal of Sociology & Social Policy*, 34(5–6), 334–348.

Giazitzoglu, A. (2018). Being and naughtiness: An account of being an ethnographic-insider studying white, working class gym-users. *Qualitative Report*, 23(3), 696–709.

Giazitzoglu, A. (2020). This sporting life: The intersection of hegemonic masculinities, space and emotions among rugby players. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 27(1), 67–81.

Gill, M. (2014). The possibilities of phenomenology for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(2), 118–137.

Goldthorpe, J., Llewellyn, C., & Payne, C. (1980). *Social mobility and class structure in modern Britain*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Gray, B., & Kish-Gephart, J. (2013). Encountering social class differences at work: How "class work" perpetuates inequality. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4), 670–699.

Gregory, M. (2016). *The face of the firm: Corporate hegemonic masculinity at work*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hanlon, G. (2004). Institutional forms and organizational structures: Homology, trust and reputational capital in professional service firms. *Organization*, 11(2), 186–210.

Harrington, B. (2017). Habitus and the labor of representation among elite professionals. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 4(3), 282–301.

Harvey, C., & Maclean, M. (2008). Capital theory and the dynamics of elite business networks in Britain and France. *Sociological Review*, 56(1), 105–120.

Hatmaker, D. (2013). Engineering identity: Gender and professional identity negotiation among women engineers. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(4), 383–396.

Hayward, K., & Yar, M. (2006). The "Chav" phenomenon: Consumption, media and the construction of a new underclass. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 2(1), 9–28.

Hearn, J. (2014). On men, organizations and intersectionality: Personal, working, political and theoretical reflections (or how organization studies met profeminism). *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 33(5), 414–428.

Hibbert, P., Sillince, J., Diefenbach, T., & Cunliffe, A. (2014). Relationally reflexive practice: A generative approach to theory development in qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(3), 278–298.

Holck, L. (2018). Unequal by structure: Exploring the structural embeddedness of organizational diversity. *Organization*, 25(2), 242–259.

Holvino, E. (2011). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 17(3), 248–277.

Ingram, N., & Allen, K. (2018). "Talent-spotting" or "social magic"? Inequality, cultural sorting and constructions of the ideal graduate in elite professions. *Sociological Review*, 67(3), 723–740.

Kallschmidt, A., & Eaton, A. (2018). Are lower social class origins stigmatized at work? A qualitative study of social class concealment and disclosure among white men employees who experienced upward mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 115–128.

Kumra, S., & Vinnicombe, S. (2008). A study of the promotion to partner process in a professional services firm: How women are disadvantaged. *British Journal of Management*, 19, 65–74.

Laurison, D., & Friedman, S. (2016). The class pay gap in higher professional and managerial occupations. *American Sociological Review*, 81(4), 668–695.

McDowell, L. (2006). Reconfigurations of gender and class relations: Class differences, class condescension and the changing place of class relations. *Antipode*, 38(4), 825–850.

McKearney, D. (2014). Critical reflections from men in the field. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 33(5), 404–479.

McLeod, C., O'Donohoe, S., & Townley, B. (2009). The elephant in the room? Class and creative careers in British advertising agencies. *Human Relations*, 62(7), 1011–1039.

Messerschmidt, J. (2018). *Hegemonic masculinity: Formulation, reformulation, and amplification.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Nayak, A. (2006). Displaced masculinities: Chavs, youth and class in the post-industrial city. *Sociology*, 40, 813–831.

Riach, K., & Cutcher, L. (2014). Built to last: Ageing, class and the masculine body in a UK hedge fund. *Work, Employment & Society*, 28(5), 771–787.

Rivera, L. (2015). *Pedigree: How elite students get elite jobs.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Savage, M., Devine, K., Cunningham, F., Taylor, N., Johs, M., Hjellbrekke, L., & Miles, A. (2013). A new model of social class? Finding's from the BBC's Great British Class Survey Experiment. *Sociology*, 47(2), 219–250.

Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1972). *The hidden injuries of class.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Solinger, O., van Olffen, N., Roe, A., & Hofmans, J. (2013). On becoming (un)committed: A taxonomy and test of newcomer on-boarding scenarios. *Organization Science*, 24(6), 1640–1661.

Spence, C., Carter, C., Husillos, J., & Archel, P. (2017). Taste matters: Cultural-capital and elites in proximate strategic action fields. *Human Relations*, 70(2), 211–236.

Stahl, G. (2015). *Identity, neoliberalism and aspiration: Educating white working class boys.* London, UK: Routledge.

Tomlinson, J., Muzio, D., Sommerlad, H., Webley, L., & Duff, L. (2013). Structure, agency and career strategies of white women and black and minority ethnic individuals in the legal profession. *Human Relations*, 66(2), 245–269.

Von Nordenflycht, A. (2010). What is a professional service firm? Toward a theory and taxonomy of knowledge-intensive firms. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(1), 155–174.

Wajcman, J. (1999). *Managing like a man: Women and men in corporate management.* Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Walker, C., & Roberts, S. (2018). *Masculinity, labour and neoliberalism.* London, UK: Palgrave.

Winlow, S. (2001). *Badfellas: Crime, tradition and new masculinities.* Oxford, UK: Berg.

Zanoni, P. (2011). Diversity in the lean automobile factory: Doing class through gender, disability and age. *Organization*, 18(1), 105–127.

Zanoni, P., Janssens, M., Benschop, Y., & Nkomo, S. (2010). Guest editorial: Unpacking diversity, grasping inequality: Rethinking difference through critical perspectives. *Organization*, 17(1), 9–29.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Andreas Giazitzoglu is a Senior Lecturer at Newcastle University Business School. He specializes in researching the intersection of class and masculinities, as lived constructs, in relation to work, organizations, and enterprise. He has published in leading journals including the *International Small Business Journal*, *Gender, Work and Organization*, and the *Journal of Business Venturing*. He holds degrees from the universities of Oxford and Durham.

Daniel Muzio is a Professor of Management at the University of York. He is a general editor of the *Journal of Management Studies* and a founding editor for the *Journal of Professions and Organization*. Daniel's research interests include the organization and management of professional services firms, the sociology of the professions, organizational and professional wrongdoing, and diversity, inclusion and equal opportunity. Daniel has published in several leading management, sociology, and social sciences journals, including: *Organization Studies*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Human Relations*, *Journal of Economic Geography*, *Sociology*, and the *British Journal of Sociology*.