

“There’s a lot of woman in him”:¹ the feminine as a deviance from the norm

“Há muita mulher dentro dele”: o feminino como um desvio da norma

Renan Gomes de Moura^a

Rejane Prevot Nascimento^a

Denise Franca Barros^a

Recebido: 13/09/2018

Aprovado: 17/06/2019

^a Universidade do Grande Rio, Duque de Caxias, RJ, Brazil

Abstract

This article seeks to understand how femininity is understood by organizations from the perspective of masculine homosexuals, with a special focus on the concept of Ableism. In this qualitative research, data was collected through in-depth interviews with 13 masculine homosexuals living in the state of Rio de Janeiro and the corpus was analysed using Content Analysis (Bardin, 2009). Our field research showed that effeminate gays and women are considered to be inferior to those people with hetero-masculine behavior. In this context, femininity within the organizational environment is considered as a deficiency, and those who have this deficiency are excluded from this environment or encouraged to overcome this deficiency.

Keywords: Gender; Ableism; Feminine; Organizations; Gays.

Resumo

O presente artigo busca compreender como a feminilidade é entendida pelas organizações a partir da perspectiva dos homossexuais masculinos, com enfoque especial no conceito de *ableism* (capacitismo). Nesta pesquisa qualitativa, os dados foram coletados em 13 entrevistas em profundidade com homossexuais masculinos moradores do estado do Rio de Janeiro e o corpus foi analisado a partir da Análise de Conteúdo (Bardin, 2009). Nossa pesquisa de campo mostrou que gays afeminados e mulheres são considerados inferiores àqueles que demonstram comportamento het-

¹ A phrase taken from an interview with a homosexual male as part of a survey carried out by one of the authors of this work on the “feminine being” within organizations. In this excerpt, the interviewee describes how he interprets the view company recruiters have of his behavior during the job selection process.

eromasculino. Nesse contexto, a feminilidade dentro do ambiente organizacional é considerada como uma deficiência, e aqueles que possuem tal deficiência são excluídos de tal ambiente ou encorajados a superar tal deficiência.

Palavras-chave: Gênero; Capacitismo; Feminilidade; Organizações; Gays.

Introduction

In some societies today, being gay is still considered a social problem and a motive for exclusion, primarily because the homosexual is considered a strange and abnormal individual (Boswell, 1998). This fact is even more accentuated when we consider the effeminate gay, especially within organizations that work very much like systems of social control. These organizations try to shape individuals on many different levels to fit their needs, a process they call socialization (Motta, 1993).

Although gay individuals already face major hurdles in society because of their sexual orientation, in the case of effeminate gays this resistance seems to be even more extreme. One can say they are excluded not only from society but also from the gay community itself, for which “the feminine is so abominable that whoever is [feminine] makes every effort not to be” (Almeida, 2011, p. 17). Areda (2006) considers that “to be gay may, in principle appear to be a form of escape from heteronormativity” (p. 3), but this has not proved to be the case, with many homosexuals tending to expel the feminine from their behavior and going to extreme lengths to exhibit the parameters traditionally established by hegemonic masculinity. It is no coincidence that one of the strategies used to do away with homoaffectivity in the corporate environment, as noted by Souza, Bianco and Silva (2016), is to “give extreme value to the physical form, which [he] considers belongs to the ‘real man’, not to be confused with the ‘little queen’” (p. 36).

Sedgwick (1993) states that the gay movement itself rejects effeminate gay adults, and indeed this same movement has generally refused to accept, for example, effeminate children into its fold. The effeminate boy thus represents a secret among gay voices and thoughts that inspires fear because of the boy’s undetermined gender (Cornejo, 2011).

In this work, we have adopted femininity as a characteristic that is common to both men and women, since “not every human being of the feminine sex is necessarily a woman; it is up to this being to be a part of this mysterious and threatened reality that is femininity” (Beauvoir, 1980, p. 7). Having said that, we should point out that in developing this present work the femininity we have opted for is

the one generally used in Gender Studies because, as Butler (2015) points out, “gender itself becomes a floating device, with the consequence that man and the masculine can mean as much a feminine body as a masculine body, and woman and feminine can mean as much a masculine body as a feminine body” (p. 24). In our view, “notions of masculinity and femininity are important, to the extent that society is and has been structured on the basis of social constructions of gender” (Teixeira, Perdigão & Carrieri, 2016, p. 369). In both organizations and society there is a certain rejection of that which is considered feminine, and any behavior associated with femininity should be strictly avoided, especially but not exclusively amongst men (Moura, Nascimento & Barros, 2017). One should point out that the behavior of organizations reflects the society in which they operate, and those that operate within a patriarchal social environment naturally reproduce male domination within their organizational culture (Santos & Antunes, 2011). As a result, inside organizations the feminine is considered a negative symbolic coefficient and is stigmatized, thereby directly affecting everything that feminine subjects are and do (Figueiredo, 2009). This said, Moura, Nascimento and Barros (2017) believe that “this rejection of the feminine is a way of maintaining the heterosexual man and dominant male in his privileged position within society” (p. 60), and in this context, feminine inferiority is exclusively social (Saffioti, 1987).

A certain notion of “normality” is subjacent to this process of exclusion, highlighting the standards that are expected from such a group. The concept of ableism, originally used in studies on disability (Campbell, 2009), may be useful in discussing what we consider a major gap in critical gender studies on the subject of being gay: namely, the inferioritization or demeaning of the effeminate gay. In line with Tong (1999), we believe that literature dealing with critical disability studies can help us better understand other categories of similar importance, such as race and gender.

For Campbell (2009), the concept of ableism is deeply entrenched in our culture, which in turn generates a capacity to reproduce, through a collective belief, the idea that “disability” is inherently negative and that it can be improved, cured or even eliminated altogether. Along this line of thought, Velho (1979) notes that some individuals have certain characteristics that are considered as “abnormal”, and they are consequently considered to be deviants. This notion and deviation are the result of the existence of types of behavior that are considered “average” or “ideal”, depending on the standards set down by the existing social system (Velho, 1979). Schneider (1978) writes that “deviation is created by society: that is, a certain person is a deviant because the label of deviation has been successfully allotted to him” (p. 60). In view of these considerations, one must then ask the question: how is femininity seen by masculine homosexuals, from the perspective of ableism?

With this research question in mind, this article seeks to better understand how femininity is understood by organizations from the perspective of masculine homosexuals, with a special focus on ableism. The importance of discussing this subject lies in its ability to let the marginalized be heard (Alvesson, Bridgman & Willmott, 2009). According to Ibarra-Colado (2007), present-day literature is a stereotyped version of man, white, liberal, heterosexual and upper class, and there is, therefore no room to discuss gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality among others. One should stress that the proposed subject is far from random, since it deals with a question of body-politics².

The effeminate gay within organizations

The past two decades have witnessed an increase in the quantity of literature being produced on the subject of gender and, more acutely, on the subject of homosexuality in different areas of business (Altaf, Troccoli & Moreira, 2013; Baxter, 2010; Brenner, Lyons & Fassinger, 2010; Dias, Oliveira, Lucian, Barbosa & Kovacs, 2009; Dick, 2008; Garcia & Souza, 2010; Kulick, 2009; Serano, 2016; Siqueira & Zaulli-Fellows, 2006). Indeed, one can safely say that gay people represent an important issue within the field of business studies. Although such subjects have increasingly gained a foothold in business, there are still certain gaps that need further study, such as, for example, questions that deal with effeminate gays. This is in view of the fact that business literature on gender is somewhat outdated when it comes to dealing with this particular subject.

Homophobia within organizations and adherence to policies of diversity are merely the tip of the iceberg according to Benedetti (2005). The so-called gay population is fragmented and divided up into many different categories, with any change that people make to their bodies immediately giving rise to a new gender. In other words, one can safely say that the gay segment is not homogeneous but rather heterogeneous, divided up into different sub-groups. Moura and Lopes (2014) describe how studies on gender and sexual discrimination in the workplace have been on the increase in recent years. A survey carried out by consulting firm Santo Caos in Brazil, in 2015 showed that 40% of homosexuals had already suffered some form of direct discrimination in their place of work. This figure may well be underestimated as a lot of discrimination is not seen as such, even by the gay community. One should point out that those who want to be accepted into an organization must necessarily assume male heterosexual traits (Santos, 2015), which is, in itself a clear sign of the phobia that exists against any traces of the feminine in a man (Bergling, 2001; Cornejo, 2011).

2 For Grosfoguel (2007), the term body-politics is used to legitimize a subject who is researching situations in which he himself is involved, such as, for example, a black person researching black people. In short, body-politics is used when the body of the researcher legitimizes his own studies.

Siqueira & Zaulli-Felows (2006) consider that organizations are more susceptible to accepting homosexuals into their workforce, providing, however that they are not effeminate and do not waiver from the social standards of heteronormality. One should once again point out that those who want to be accepted into an organization must necessarily assume male heterosexual traits (Santos, 2015), a clear sign in itself of the phobia that exists against any traces of the feminine in a man (Bergling, 2001; Cornejo, 2011).

Caproni Neto, Bretas, Saraiva and Silva (2015) note that the question of sexuality is taboo within organizations, and that this taboo is rooted in heteronormality. According to these authors, those who do not fit into this category are classified by organizations in a pejorative and negative way, creating stereotypes and encouraging workers to reject non-hegemonic sexualities “as well as defining each one’s “place” in society” (Caproni Neto et al., 2015, p. 212). In this sense, Anjos (2000) writes that “homosexual identity has its attributes and meanings nuanced in accordance with the social standing of individuals” (p. 277), with these attributes and meanings being reproduced in the job market, where effeminate gays exercise professions in which it is possible for them to interact with feminine identities. However, there is also a certain segregation in these professions since effeminate gays belonging to the “lower classes” tend to exercise professions that are, socially speaking considered “inferior” and undervalued, such as, for example, hairdressers, waiters, cooks etc. (Anjos, 2000). Those who belong to the “upper classes”, meanwhile, still have their feminine traces, but they tend to try to contain them to ensure that they are socially acceptable in other professions involving some degree of sensitivity, such as, for example, those that lean towards the arts and intellectual pursuits (Anjos, 2000).

Irigaray and Freitas (2009) reveal that in the work environment “the question is not whether you are gay, but whether you admit to being gay or have an effeminate way about you” (p. 8). Based on this perception, one can easily see that the act of entering and coming out of the closet is a constant reality in the life of homosexuals within organizations. These authors also note that “effeminate behavior and ornaments that are perceived as effeminate are inadmissible, even if the employee in question is heterosexual” (Irigaray & Freitas, 2009, p. 8). All this suggests that femininity within organizations is strongly discouraged, even among women. In this sense, Motta (2000) reports that even women should man-up, even though they too are often criticized when they adopt masculine behavior, as shown in the following excerpt: “If they don’t ‘man-up’ they are out of the game. If they do, they are criticized for ‘trying to take on a man’s role’” (Motta, 2000, p. 10).

Caproni Neto et al. (2015) consider that those power relations that involve sexuality and the imaginary that encircles it, such as for example “the imaginary that deals with the sexual act and the submissive role that has been socially built around the

feminine” (p. 192), are reflected in the organizational world, where the feminine is considered as being submissive to the masculine. Jammaers, Zanoni and Hardonk (2016), meanwhile, add that negative representations, especially in language form, used against people with “disabilities” result in these people being considered as deviants. In this case, organizations tend to treat such individuals as unproductive and confine them to the margins of the workplace, or else treat them as subordinates within the same.

Gender and ableism

One cannot claim that this relationship between femininity and deficiency is a modern-day phenomenon, since Segni (1969) has already shown that during the Middle Ages, the feminine, in the form of the woman, was already being treated as a characteristic of incapacity. This can be clearly seen in the words of Pope Innocent III, who said:

If we left it to the female sex after conception to feed the child in her womb, this would be dangerous: this would be so detestable and impure that, in contact with her, fruit would stop sprouting, orchards would dry up, herbs would wilt and the trees themselves would drop their fruit, if a dog ate them, goes insane, when a child is conceived, if it has contact with the menstrual blood it is born with leprosy or as a monster (with deficiencies) because it is born of this corruption. (1969, p. 15)

For Campbell (2009), the concept of ableism involves attitudes that work as barriers and that contribute to the subordination of people considered to be disabled by liberal society. This set of barriers, which can be implemented either consciously or unconsciously, means that some people are treated differently or unfairly compared to others because of their real or presumed disabilities (Campbell, 2009). Such differences are clearly seen in comparisons between subjects that are considered “normal” and those considered “abnormal”. This derives, according to Wolbring (2012) from the term “handicapped”, or a set of practical suppositions that are aimed at dealing out different and unequal or unfair treatment to subjects because of their supposed mental, physical or behavioral differences (Bogdan & Biklen, 1977). The two approaches do interest us, however, mainly because both the concept of ableism and that of handicapped represent negative attitudes that are experienced by those considered abnormal. This is because they do not comply to the rules and norms established by the existing culture and are therefore seen as “damaged” beings, or considered to be people without sufficient capacity or ability to perform simple tasks or work (Wolbring, 2012). Campbell also shows that to register certain subjects in terms of their disabilities and essential shortcomings merely serves to favour a specific understanding of normality

that is proportional to the interests of dominant groups. In this context, one can highlight the fact that “men sought out ways and means of dominating this original source of terror and anxiety, and the solution they found was to create strict mechanisms of ideological control that produced the domesticated feminine” (Leal, 2004, pp. 9-13).

In light of this, one can then assume that the “naturalization” of the social and cultural processes of discrimination against the feminine represent an easier way to legitimize male “superiority”, as well as that of white men and heterosexuals (Saffioti, 1987). Viana (2006) notes that the feminine is seen as fragile, weak and submissive, the result of which is that homosexuals and women become the targets of jokes and defamatory taunting, and essentially become social beings that are “abnormal” in the face of machismo. Furthermore, Acker (1990) shows that organizations constitute an arena in which the images of gender are invented and reproduced in accordance with whatever suits them. This author also shows that homosexuals can be marginalized through normative discourses of professionalism, but that they are also capable of subverting these in order to build and assert a sense of self as professionals (Rumens & Kerfoot, 2009). This said, Rumens and Broomfield (2014) consider that even those work environments that are seen as being gay-friendly can be affected by the demand for heteronormality. This seems even more the case when dealing with effeminate gays, especially within organizations, which work very much like systems of social control and that shape individuals on many different levels to fit their needs, a process which they call socialization (Motta, 1993). There is evidence too that organizations represent environments in which a relationship of power rooted in sexuality prevails, and this consequently results in the feminine being submissive to the masculine (Caproni Neto et al., 2015).

In this context, one should highlight some traits that are common to men, such as: excessive aggressiveness, fear of being gay, fear of having a feminine side, endless desire to be seen as highly sexual and emotional introversion, considered a way of avoiding being vulnerable. All these characteristics can essentially be considered a form of fear

since what other reason could there be for us to constantly use someone’s gayness, weakness or femininity as an insult? We hate anything that in some way we fear, whether it is a fear of being contaminated or that of being identified with the other. (Valadares, 2016, p. 6)

Similarly, Mello and Nuernberg (2012) observe that “deficiency” can be viewed as an experience resulting from issues lived through whilst constructing gender. These authors also consider that “femininity and deficiency reinforce each other mutually, while deficiency and masculinity contradict each other, exactly because of the

stereotypes that are associated with these hegemonic forms of identity, which are based on the binomial of aggression/passivity (Mello & Nuernberg, 2012, p. 6).

From this context, it is possible to relate ableism and organizations, for inside the organizations it is convenient to link some people to the ableism, considering that those who are marked with characteristics that lead to the devout have a fragility in the status that consider them as legitimate organizational members (Dobusch, 2017), for example, in their researches, Sang, Richards and Marks (2016), found that there are organizational practices that seek to create constraints of tasks for certain subjects, that is, seek to prevent them from exercising certain positions, which entails in the no progression of the career perspective, the core of these practices objectify to give the positions of higher hierarchical level for the men while the women should occupy the positions of auxiliary. From this perspective, a relationship between gender and ableism can be identified.

The methodological approach

Firstly, this article adopted a qualitative approach and the preference for this particular methodological approach was based on the fact that it allows one to interpret meanings, as well as the intentions of those being interviewed (Godoi & Balsini, 2010).

The body of the research shown in this article is made up of transcripts of interviews carried out with thirteen masculine homosexuals living in the state of Rio de Janeiro. The method used for constructing this body of research involved an in-depth interview. The tool used was a semi-structured interview script.

Data was collected in two flights occurring in 2016 and 2019. First, we conducted 7 in-depth interviews and analyzed the corpus using the concept of Ableism. A new round of data collection was carried out and the final 6 interviews were crucial not only to build a better understanding of the main results, but also to confirm the saturation of the results.

Since the proposed subject of the research sought to better understand certain aspects relating to the experiences of the interviewees, the interview method allowed the interviewees to speak their minds, to describe their experiences in the past or the present and to report things they had witnessed. This also allowed the interviewees to feel comfortable with the subject under discussion and allowed the researchers, depending on their epistemological position, to consider the stories or accounts as being truthful and as being a reconstruction of reality or re-enactment of the same (Poupart, 2008).

Access to the subjects of the research was achieved using the snowball technique. This technique was chosen because it involves a strategy that

resolves the problem of access in a convenient way: you can always find at least one person who can be observed or interviewed, and you can then try to get this individual to present you to others, act as your sponsor, thus setting off a kind of sampling snowball effect. (Becker, 1993, p. 155)

The method used to analyze the body of research involved content analysis. For Bardin (2009), the term CA signifies:

A set of communication analysis techniques aimed at obtaining, using systematic and objective procedures to describe the content of messages, certain indicators (quantitative or not) that allow one to infer knowledge relating to the conditions of production/reception (inferred variables) of these messages. (Bardin, 2009, p. 47)

This said, the content analysis of the body of research produced for this work followed the three stages proposed by Bardin (2009), which were: (1) pre-analysis; (2) codification or material exploration; and finally, (3) treatment of the results; inference and interpretation (2009, p. 121).

Presentation and analysis of the body of research

In this section, we show the body of research and its analysis.

The categories of analysis consisted of normativity, femininity, ableism, and deviation. The creation of the categories occurred through the theoretical reference, to which we tried to articulate the concepts of deviation, normality, femininity and ableism.

Previous research suggests that feminine characteristics are seen as inferior within organizational context (Moura, Nascimento & Barros, 2017). As Campbell (2009) indicates, a certain notion of “normality” is subjacent to any process of exclusion of the disabled people. Homosexuality in organizations as a subject provided us many descriptions of homophobic behaviors, stigma against gay employees, transphobia, and many others (Altaf, Troccoli & Moreira, 2013; Baxter, 2010; Brenner, Lyons & Fassinger, 2010; Kulick, 2009; Serano, 2016; Siqueira & Zaulli-Fellows, 2006). We contend that the inferiority of the effeminate gay or the feminine characteristics in

organizational life is seen as a deviance from the norm and, as such, is often described a physical and/or cognitive deficiency.

Table 1 – Profile of interviewees

ID	Educational background	Job description	Organization	Public/Private	Self-definition	Age
E1	Secondary education	Telemarketing operator	Telemarketing services provider	Private	Heteromasculine	26
E2	Management (Higher Education)	Cashier	Financial institution	Private	Effeminate	23
E3	Communication Media (Higher Education)	Journalist/ radio presenter	Media company	Private	Heteromasculine	40
E4	Logistics technician	Project technician	Film production	Private	Heteromasculine/effeminate	21
E5	Electronic engineering (Higher Education)	Trainee	Telecommunication	Private	Heteromasculine/effeminate	26
E6	Management (Master's Degree)	Department chair/ professor	University	Private	Heteromasculine	46
E7	Law (Higher Education)	Trainee	Public Justice System	Public	Effeminate	21
E8	Accounting (Higher Education)	Finance supervisor	Secretary of Health	Public	Effeminate	27
E9	Management (Higher Education)	Public advisor	City Hall	Public	Heteromasculine	41
E10	Management (Higher Education)	Administrative assistant	University	Private	Heteromasculine/effeminate	29
E11	History (Higher Education)	Administrative assistant	University	Private	Effeminate	29
E12	Law (Higher Education)	Federal prosecutor	Public Justice System	Public	Effeminate	52
E13	Secondary Education	Salesman	Shoes store	Private	Heteromasculine/effeminate	24

Source: Developed by the authors.

The first topic covered here attempts to show how the characteristics associated with femininity expressed in their bodily movements, by the interviewees in question, help define them as being “incapable” within organizations to carry out certain functions. The second topic shows how femininity can manifest itself as a negative characteristic, one that is related to the concept of deviance.

Topic: The “feminine being” as an “incapable being”

Through this topic we sought to clarify how organizations perceive the feminine through the perspective of masculine homosexuals. To this end, the subjects of our interviews were asked the following question: “How do you think organizations view the feminine?” One of the interviewees in his answer stated the following:

Must be seen as an animal, right; because people today prefer to hire a more masculine person than feminine. Like me . . . clothing stores, shoe stores, because like it or not those are the ones that offer the most job opportunities, I don't see a feminine gay. Even today women have to behave differently, the woman is not a woman inside the company. Women today like to put on makeup, but depending on the company they can't overdo it, they have to downplay it. Many don't even wear makeup to work. I think it's a general thing, something like that . . . so they must think us as animals, right . . . to prohibit certain things. (E4, 2016).

The aforementioned comments make it clear that some organizations prefer not to hire feminine employees, or indeed anyone that shows tendencies traditionally associated with femininity, as in the case of effeminate gays. They also show that those to whom femininity is attributed as being something natural by society, as in the case of women themselves, should abdicate from this femininity if they want to be offered jobs in organizations. This suggests that organizations constitute a veritable arena in which they seek to reinvent issues of gender in accordance with their desires. Subject E4 considers that this reinvention is done by means of one of the ways of expressing gender, which is femininity. This fact has already been noted by Acker (1990), who wrote that organizations invent and reproduce questions of gender to suit their needs. Subject E4 also says that the feminine should be viewed as some kind of animal, in other words something unnatural, strange and uncommon. This view fits in with those of Wolbring (2012) where subjects are considered to be “abnormal” because they are compared with those who are seen, by society as being “normal”, and he refers to this kind of comparison as “handicapism”.

Subject E3 stated that the feminine within organizations, in the form of the effeminate gay, is viewed as a woman by his heterosexual colleagues, and that “*Women are only fit to pilot the cooker, the sink or the washing machine, but that women do have caprice, neatness and sweetness*” (E3, 2016). Subject E6, meanwhile said that the feminine, within organizations occupies “*a subaltern position. A position that is not involved in the decision-making process. A position that ends up being, to a certain degree, neglected. I think this is the big problem*” (E6, 2016).

It's seen as shocking. For the always scandalous gay, it's always surprising. For women, there is still that thing of machismo, a woman's place is in the kitchen, the man has to bring home the bacon. The woman will continue doing that feminine work, delicate, but nothing that involves being in charge, including in my company, it's completely broken. The woman who is in charge, she knows everything about the company, she knows what can be done and what can't, she knows when to do and when not to do. The feminine has always been seen, and is far from ceasing to be seen as the fragile sex. (E1, 2016)

Along similar lines, subjects E3 and E13, when questioned about whether organizations are neutral environments in relation to gender issues, answered the following:

No. We know . . . I'm a journalist, I don't have to learn anymore about it . . . In the job market, you have the woman earning less than the man, you have so many women but we offer fewer job openings to women than men, and that says it all. They don't offer women opportunities, inside Volkswagen to be a mechanic, they don't give a woman the opportunity to be a bus driver, you know.... Nothing to do with strength because women are also very strong. But because of prejudice. (E3, 2016)

I do not think, for example, I've worked in a place where the boss used to say that women didn't do a good work, that they were hired only to decorate the store. I thought to myself it was an absurd and I was even glad that no friend of mine was around to hear that. I don't know why he thought so, but that's it, he's a man and he is the owner of the business. (E13, 2019)

The comments made by subjects E3, E4, E1 and E13 clearly show that the characteristic of femininity, or those traces usually associated with the feminine are seen as shocking and offensive, and these characteristics result in feminine subjects being socially conditioned to exercise functions or professions that involve characteristics such as fragility, gentleness and caprice. One can therefore surmise that femininity is understood as a “deficiency” that prevents feminine beings from occupying certain roles within the organizational environment. Such practices are related to ableism, as per Campbell (2009), who described ableism as a set of attitudes that work as barriers and contribute to the subordination of those people considered as being deficient in some way by society. These excerpts of the interviews also suggest that organizations seek to dominate feminine subjects by domesticating them, as for example in restricting them to certain specific professions . This fact illustrates the ideas of Leal (2004), who stated that men (understood here as organizations) create mechanisms of ideological control whose purpose is to domesticate the feminine.

When questioned why the feminine is devaluated in organizations, subject E10 (2016) reported that *“the woman is always seen in an inferior way, or in a dangerous way”*, this subject uses woman as an example of what is to be feminine, but also makes clear that the feminine people are a kind of threat in the organizations, since it is considered a dangerous characteristic. In this context Valadares (2016) observes that there is a fear of what is considered feminine and, as an attempt to overcome this fear, people treat everything that is feminine as a weakness. When we asked interviewee E11 how the effeminate gay was seen within the organizations, he said: *“I think, the physiognomy of the effeminate homosexual presents characteristics as if they were less capable, unable to work. It was as if they were incapable of working, really”* (E11, 2019). It is perceived that being feminine, or the characteristics of femininity, are issues that lead organizations to see those who have them as “disabled,” once they are seen as having a reduced ability to work. Although Segni (1969) has shown that since the Middle Ages the feminine people were seen as incapable, this judgment of the feminine being has been not modified until present times.

The other subjects of the survey, when questioned about the feminine being seen as a negative aspect by organizations, replied: *“It is a complex answer, because, there is so much to be achieved in terms of respect, in relation to the feminine, the women and gays”* (E10, 2016), *“Yes. I think it has improved, but even so, it still needs to evolve further”* (E5, 2016) and then justified this lack of appreciation of the feminine as being due to the “fragilities” implicit in femininity.

For associating the image of the woman as a more finicky person, and, eventually I have already read about businessmen who don't like to hire women because they might get pregnant and you then have all that business of maternity leave, right...these are the reasons I can think of, I can't think of any others right now. I think that in part effeminate behavior is associated with women, and many people think that women are less capable, or at least less able to do certain things, so that may have something to do with it, perhaps. (E5, 2016)

Some of the comments made by subjects E5 and E10 suggest that the feminine being is considered a deficiency by organizations, since, according to this interviewee, they consider the feminine as a negative characteristic and one unable to carry out certain functions, as shown by Campbell (2009). In a similar way, the interviewee 9 when asked about what he considered “female” characteristics, replied:

When we talk about being female, we are talking about feminism and sexism, and the female is related to housekeeping, that it's a kind of

feminine thing. It is about having pleasure to do the cleaning, making good food, washing clothes; you think that this is the female universe. (E9, 2016)

Through this fragment we perceive that, for the subject 9, the female characteristics are inadequate to the organization environment, since the feminine characteristics are related to domestic work. The feminine, in this context, is perceived as a barrier that prevents subjects who have traces of femininity from accessing the organizations, submitting themselves to domestic work. It comes to be seen as a deficiency by society, because as Campbell (2009) relates, the ableism works with a barrier that leads individuals to subordination, because the feminine characteristics are related to deficiency and can be manifested consciously or unconsciously.

About the relation between males and females in the organizations, the subject E10 said:

I think that being male has a lot of credibility, more credibility than being female, I think that being male is a synonym of power, not only in the labor market, because the labor market is part of society, in all societies and, in that sense, any introspective attitude, any behavior that you show some kind of weakness, are seen as inferior. (E10, 2016)

This fragment shows that, for this subject, the organizations understand the feminine as a inferior work force, with less capacity. In this context, in a social and organizational hierarchy, femininity is a disability based on mutually reinforcing gender issues, which is not perceived with masculinity, since it is at the top of the hierarchy of organizational and social valuation. According to Mello and Nuernberg (2012), the categories gender and disability reinforce each other, which is not the case with masculinity, since it has the characteristics of better skills and is always linked to activity (in opposite of passive and submissive) and superiority.

An interesting question that emerged in the production of the corpus of the research consisted of characterizing what was an effeminate gay, and in that sense one of the interviewees related that he was “*a binary man with feminine tones, that are identified from the exclusion with male archetypes, and approximation with feminine archetypes*” (E12, 2019). Through this affirmation we can understand that for this subject what makes him feminine is what he does not have from the masculinity, which theoretically “incapacitates” him for the masculine roles in the work. He is excluded by his **not masculinity**. Later, he says that he is excluded from the work groups because, for men, “everything that is not part of the universe that they value is necessarily feminine”, so since he does not talk about soccer, women, etc., he ends up being considered feminine. This speech illustrates Campbell’s (2009)

thought that homosexuals are seen as deviant by society, and rendering them as incapable due to the absence of masculinity is an important mechanism that serves to privilege an unique understanding of normality, that is stipulated by the interests of the majority groups.

Topic: the feminine as a “deviation from the norm”

In this topic, we sought to determine how the feminine is seen as an undesirable characteristic, both by feminine subjects and by organizations. Interviewee E5 was asked about the relationship between femininity and organizations and his answer was: “*When you talk about feminine, I think about my boss, but my boss is a right “brute”, she’s the kind that bangs on the table, gives orders and cancels them, and makes it happen, know what I mean*” (E5, 2016, author’s emphasis). Similarly, subject E11 (2019) reported that: “*Women who are occupying a position within the company, are masculinized, and get harder, not because they want, but by the logic of that market, and they become other person.*” Another subject reported that:

I do not speak in theoretical terms, but more empirically, I say that it ends up being always “a shot in the foot” of these people who fight so much for identity, because sometimes women want to match so much to the role of men in the labor market, that they end up assuming positions as masculine as these men who treat them in a lower way. (E10, 2016)

The speech fragments show that the feminine being can evolve within organizations, but for this to happen feminine subjects must behave like men, they must adopt aggressive characteristics normally attributed to men due to the power of the phallus, because, as the interviewee states, his boss “bangs on the table” to show who is the boss, which clearly shows that one must have masculine characteristics in order to know how to manage. In this sense, the feminine comes across as an issue that can be eliminated within organizations. This excerpt aligns with Campbell (2009), when he states that ableism is rooted in our culture, in which it generates a capacity to reproduce, through a collective belief, the idea that certain issues are considered a “deficiency”, in this case the feminine, which is portrayed as inherently negative and that could be improved, cured or even eliminated. This excerpt also aligns with the thinking of Motta (2000) when he states that even women should masculinize themselves in the workplace environment in order to be accepted.

The speech of the interviewee E10 allows us to observe that the feminine is seen as something inferior, because it separates what are the roles of men and women at work, which demonstrates the social inferiorization of the feminine beings and,

as Saffioti (1987) affirms, female inferiority is a social issue. In order to ascertain the extent to which femininity is seen as a renegade characteristic by organizations, the interviewees were asked why effeminate gays were excluded by organizations, and two of the subjects gave the following answer: “because they have traits that are aligned with women” (E3, 2016).

So I will say it how I see it, how people see it. You go to an interview and you are effeminate, and the person says “Ah, there’s a lot of woman inside him”, and I need men. People think like that, in a wrong way too. Because if he’s a man, and is there for a man’s job, he has to take the man’s job, and not steal the woman’s job, you know. (E4, 2016, author’s emphasis)

Another subject admitted that he had feminine traits and because of that wasn’t accepted by his work colleagues: “In fact, I worked in a private office owned by my mom, but it didn’t work out, exactly because I am gay, there were lots of men there and they didn’t accept me. When I began with my voice, with my things, they would cross their legs” (E7, 2016). Another interview that fits in with this same line of reasoning is that given by subject E1, who claimed he had had to give up his feminine characteristics in order to be accepted at work, since, according to him, organizations are extremely masculinized and there is no room for feminine subjects:

*I hope to God that it changes one day. But, I reckon it will take a long time. **This may entail a decision on the part of the feminine being, or she suppresses or she dominates the place, whether she is gay or woman.** Did I change in an external way? I changed, but within four walls I am the same. But if you have to do something to achieve your goal, you put your head down and do it (E1, 2016, author’s emphasis)*

Subject E2, when questioned about feminine subjects stated that organizations strongly resist taking in these individuals, since femininity is considered a notably negative characteristic that superimposes itself on and excludes all other professional characteristics of individuals.

There is a resistance. A lot of resistance. It is . . . I think that society isn’t ready for it yet, so much so that it doesn’t accept it. I think that, it is...unfortunately, the prejudice is considerable, people don’t understand a lot of things, they see something that doesn’t exist and unfortunately the opportunities simply do not exist for this group. Because people can’t differentiate between the personal and the professional. Because there is this standard of the man,

the woman, the masculine, the feminine, and unfortunately one or other manages "to get a space near the sun", let us say. (E2, 2016)

The interviewee E11 (2016) observed that the effeminate gay is seen as "*fragile, who has no capacity . . . Ah, you know what they think, that we are emotionally weak, that in management positions we are not able to make decisions, comparing gays to women.*" The speeches of E2 and E11 are similar to the conclusions of Moura, Nascimento and Barros (2017) about the fact that there is a rejection of what is considered as feminine and the behaviors associated with femininity.

Based on the aforementioned excerpts, it becomes clear that gay people with feminine traits are disparaged by organizations and thereby excluded, since these same feminine traits imply that they are liable to all the prejudice usually attributed to women. It is clear that for a gay or a woman to be accepted into an organization they must have male characteristics, as feminine characteristics are considered a "deviance", something undesirable and something abnormal. As one can see in the interviews given by subjects E4 and E5, this fact is linked to the views of Velho (1979), who considered that subjects with characteristics considered as abnormal are viewed as "deviants". These interviews are also aligned with the ideas put forward by Irigaray and Freitas (2009) and Santos (2015), who consider that gays with feminine behavior are inadmissible within the organizational environment and that only those with heteronormative behavior are acceptable. This clearly shows that the problem is not one of being gay, but that of being effeminate.

An important fact to be mentioned is about the relationship between interviewees and the colleagues at work. Almost all participants of this research reported that they feel excluded and, sometimes, constrained by colleagues, mainly when they are effeminate, as mentioned by interviewee E2:

In my work there are several departments. And in my department it doesn't happen, thank God I do not suffer anything. But in other departments there are people who criticize, but I do not live with that person at work. With me it's just in the aisles when I see them. (2016)

Through this fragment it is possible to understand that femininity is not seen as a normal characteristic in some organizations, since it has become a target of debauchery and criticism by other men and even by the women at work.

Besides, men who have traits of femininity are seen as subjects outside the norm, since they have become targets of debauchery and criticism, resulting in their inferiorization by organizations, as reported by Campbell (2009) and Velho (1979).

To these authors, the individuals that have characteristics considered “abnormal” are seen as deviant, since they do not present the ideal behavior, that is the heteromorphic behaviors. From this perspective, it can be considered that effeminate gays are workers marginalized by their heterosexual peers, and that their behavior is “outside” the norm. As emphasized by Rumens and Kerfoot (2009), gays can be marginalized through normative discourses, even through criticism and debauch, as we can see in the case of interviewee E2.

When we asked about the equality of opportunities between gays and heterosexuals, most of interviewees said that they feel that they do not have the same opportunities. This fact can be observed in E12’s speech:

No, of course not! Because in order to grow in a company, you have to make friends, to join groups. And if you’re not married, there’s not a woman to give you that background, if you don’t talk about soccer or if you don’t go to the male parties, you’re not in the male groups . . . I think it’s even sectarian, it is separated. Maybe sometimes, in some organizations, they can give a chance to homosexuals, they give them a chance to say: “we have gays in here, we are nice”, the gay for them is a kind of knickknack. I think that to ascend in business you have to be heteronormative. Even if you are gay, you have to affirm yourself as heteronormative. (E12, 2019)

It is important to mention that interviewee E12 occupies a high position in the federal justice department as a federal prosecutor, but even in this position he feels the inequality of treatment between his peers and him. The previous speech fragment also reinforces the idea that the effeminate gay is the one that escapes from the organizational norms, and that these norms are reproduced from the socially acceptable behaviors, that are considered as normal. Santos and Antunes (2011) points out that organizational behavior is a reflection of the behaviors of the society in which the organizations are inserted, thus, those that are inserted in a patriarchal society tend to value heteronormativity and patriarchy. This speech reveals that the effeminate man is so distant from the norm that, even if he is capable of assuming new responsibilities at work, he only assumes it when organizations want to create a positive image in a context that values the diversity management. Soon, his capacity to work is annulled, considering that what is important to organizations is its image related to what is considered socially acceptable, despite the social issues of inequality.

Conclusions

We now once again ask ourselves the same question that inspired our research into this subject: how is femininity viewed by organizations from the perspective of masculine homosexuals?

Firstly, there is clear evidence that the “feminine being” should not be used as a synonym for “woman,” since many of our interviewees considered themselves to be feminine beings for having characteristics associated with femininity. In this context, for example, we have the effeminate gays, who share not only their femininity, but also all the social “burden” this entails with women.

Our field research clearly showed that effeminate gays and women are considered to be inferior to those people with heteromale behavior. This inferiorization is strongly reflected within organizations, which, through their practices and policies treat femininity as a characteristic of incapacity, and as a factor that prevents those who display it from exercising certain tasks, functions or positions within these same organizations. In this context, femininity within the organizational environment is considered a deficiency, and those who have this deficiency are excluded from this environment. Where they are not excluded, they are encouraged to try to eliminate this deficiency.

In order to be accepted and considered normal, women and effeminate gays give up their femininity and have to adopt behavioral characteristics normally associated with heteromale behavior.

This field research also helped us perceive that femininity, in addition to being viewed as a deficiency, also leads those that possess it to be considered as abnormal/substandard/deviant, since the only behavior considered as acceptable within organizations, according to the interviewees, is that shared with heterosexual men. Evidence of this is forthcoming in one of the interviews where the subject talks about his (female) boss being a “brute”, and that she “bangs on the table” to show who is boss.

There are ableist practices within organizations, which materialize in the form of bigoted attitudes that hierarchize subjects according to their bodies’ compliance with an ‘ideal’ behavior and functional capacity.

One can also view organizations as being environments that reproduce heterosexism and consider heteromale behavior as the example to be followed, at the same time giving femininity an inferior status and considering it a veritable deficiency.

Applied Human and Social Sciences in general, and the interdisciplinarity between organizational, feminist and gender studies more specifically have much to

gain from looking more closely at the subject of ableism, in view of the fact that social devices and meanings offer great potential for this scientific field to progress in terms of its most emerging topics. The reflections presented here point to the importance of the transversality of ableism to the gender and diversity policies adopted within organizations, and vice versa, which in turn offer researchers in this field of knowledge the prospect of new political and theoretical reflection on gender and diversity studies.

References

- Acker, J. H. (1990). Jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Almeida, D. M. V. (2011). "Sou gay, porém totalmente discreto": os estereótipos e a criação do ethos em um site de relacionamento gay. *Revele*, 3, 34-61. doi:10.17851/2317-4242.3.0.39-61
- Altaf, J. G., Troccoli, I. R., & Moreira, M. B. (2013). Você é o que você veste? A associação da autoidentidade do gay masculino ao vestuário de luxo. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*, 6(4), 760-782.
- Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T., & Willmott, H. (2009). Introduction. In M. Alvesson, & H. Willmott, *Critical management studies* (pp. 1-26). London: Sage.
- Anjos, G. (2000). Identidade sexual e identidade de gênero: subversões e permanências. *Sociologias*, (4), 274-305. doi:10.1590/S1517-45222000000200011
- Arede, F. (2006). *Ser gay e a possibilidade de não ser homem*. Paper presented at the VII Seminário Internacional Fazendo Gênero: Gênero E Preconceito, Florianópolis, SC.
- Bardin, L. (2009). *Análise de conteúdo*. Lisboa: Edições 70.
- Baxter, J. (2010). *The language of female leadership*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beauvoir, S. (1980). *O segundo sexo: a experiência vivida* (v. 2). São Paulo, SP: Nova Fronteira.
- Becker, H. (1993). *Métodos de pesquisa em ciências sociais*. São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.
- Benedetti, M. (2005). *Toda feita: o corpo e o gênero das travestis*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Garamond.
- Bergling, T. (2001). *Sissyphobia: gay men and effeminate behavior*. New York: Southern Tier.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, D. (1977). Handicapism. *Social Policy*, 7(5), 14-19.

- Boswell, J. (1998). *Cristianismo, tolerancia social y homosexualidad*. Barcelona: Muchnik.
- Brenner, B. R., Lyons, H. Z., & Fassinger, R. E. (2010). Can heterosexism harm organizations? Predicting the perceived organizational citizenship behaviors of gay and lesbian employees. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 58(4), 321-335.
- Butler, J. (2015). *Problemas de gênero: feminismo e subversão da identidade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
- Campbell, F. K. (2009). *Contours of ableism: the production of disability and abledness*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caproni Neto, H. L., Bretas, P. F. F., Saraiva, L. A. S., & Silva, A. N. (2015). Desenhando a vivência: um estudo sobre sexualidade, trabalho e tabu de homens gays. *Bagoas*, 9(12), 189-216.
- Cornejo, G. (2011). La guerra declarada contra el niño afeminado: una autoetnografía "queer". *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 39(5), 79-95. doi:10.17141/iconos.39.2011.747
- Dias, I. S. T., Oliveira, B. R. B., Lucian, R., Barbosa, M. L. A., & Kovacs, E. P. (2009). Motivações do público homossexual na escolha dos destinos turísticos. *Observatório de Inovação do Turismo: Revista Acadêmica*, 4(1), 1-20. doi:10.12660/oit.v4n1.5736
- Dick, F. S. (2008). Sexual orientation and its basis in brain structure and function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of sciences*, 105(30) 10273-10274. doi:10.1073/pnas.0805542105
- Dobusch, L. (2017). Gender, dis-/ability and diversity management: unequal dynamics of inclusion? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(5), 487-505. doi:10.1111/gwao.12159
- Figueiredo, M. D. (2009). *A mulher em ambientes de identidade masculina: novas formas de produção simbólica do discurso feminino ou da dominação masculina?* Paper presented at the XXXIII Encontro da ANPAD, São Paulo, SP.
- Garcia, A., & Souza, E. M. (2010). Sexualidade e trabalho: estudo sobre a discriminação de homossexuais masculinos no setor bancário. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 44(6), 1353-1377. doi:10.1590/S0034-76122010000600005
- Godoi, C. K., & Balsini, C. P. V. A. (2010). Pesquisa qualitativa nos estudos organizacionais brasileiros: uma análise bibliométrica. In: C. K. Godoi, R. Bandeira-De-Mello, & A. B. Silva (Orgs.), *Pesquisa qualitativa em estudos organizacionais: paradigmas, estratégias e métodos* (pp. 89-107). São Paulo, SP: Saraiva.

- Grosfoguel, R. (2007). Dilemas dos estudos étnicos norte-americanos: multiculturalismo identitário, colonização disciplinar e epistemologias decoloniais. *Ciência e Cultura*, 59(2), 32-35.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality: thinking otherness from the margin. *Organization*, 13(4), 463-488. doi:10.1177/1350508406065851
- Irigaray, H. A. R., & Freitas, M. E. (2011). Sexualidade e organizações: estudo sobre lésbicas no ambiente de trabalho. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 18(59), 625-641.
- Jammaers, E., Zanoni, P., & Hardonk, S. (2016). Constructing positive identities in ableist workplaces: disabled employees' discursive practices engaging with the discourse of lower productivity. *Human Relations*, 69(6), 1365-1386. doi:10.1177/0018726715612901
- Kulick, D. (2009). *Travesti: sex, gender and culture among Brazilian trans-gendered prostitutes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Leal, J. C. (2004). *A maldição da mulher: de Eva aos dias de hoje*. São Paulo, SP: DPL.
- Mello, A. G., & Nuernberg, A. H. (2012). Gênero e deficiência: interseções e perspectivas. *Estudos Feministas*, 20(3), 368-384. doi:10.1590/S0104-026X2012000300003
- Motta, F. C. P. (1993). Controle social nas organizações. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 33(5), 68-87. doi:10.1590/S0034-75901979000300002
- Motta, F. C. P. (2000). Masculino e feminino nas organizações. (Relatório de Pesquisa/2000). São Paulo: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- Moura, R. G., & Lopes, P. L. (2014). *O preconceito e a discriminação de transgêneros no processo de recrutamento e seleção de pessoal: uma revisão bibliográfica*. Paper presented at the XI Simpósio de Excelência em Gestão e Tecnologia (Seget), Resende, RJ.
- Moura, R. G., Nascimento, R. P., & Barros, D. F. (2017). O problema não é ser gay, é ser feminino: o gay afeminado nas organizações. *Farol: Revista de Estudos Organizacionais e Sociedade*, 4(11), 1478-1541.
- Poupart, J. (2008). *A pesquisa qualitativa: enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Rumens, N., & Broomfield, J. (2014). Gay men in the performing arts: performing sexualities within 'gay-friendly' work contexts. *Organization*, 21(3), 365-382. doi:10.1177/1350508413519766

- Rumens, N., & Kerfoot, D. (2009). Gaymen at work: (re)constructing the self as professional. *Human Relations*, 62(5), 763-786. doi:10.1177/0018726709103457
- Saffioti, H. I. B. (1987). *O poder do macho*. São Paulo, SP: Moderna.
- Sang, K. J. C., Richards, J., & Marks, A. (2016). Gender and disability in male-dominated occupations: a social relational model. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(6), 566-581. doi:10.1111/gwao.12143
- Santos, J. C. S., & Antunes, E. D. (2011). *Relações de gêneros e liderança nas organizações: rumo a um estilo andrógino de gestão*. Paper presented at the III Encontro de Gestão de Pessoas e Relações de Trabalho, João Pessoa, PB.
- Santos, M. P. (2015). *A constituição e a administração da identidade de gênero homossexual masculino assumida no trabalho e a sua articulação com o consumo*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade do Grande Rio, Rio de Janeiro RJ.
- Schneider, J. W. (1978). Deviant drinking as disease: alcoholism as a social accomplishment. *Social Problems*, 25(4), 361-372. doi:10.2307/800489
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1993). *Epistemología del armario*. Barcelona: Ediciones de la Tempestad.
- Segni, L. (1969). *On the misery of the human condition*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: a transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity*. Berkeley: Seal Press.
- Siqueira, M. V. S., & Zauli-Fellows, A. (2006). Diversidade e identidade gay nas organizações. *Revista Eletrônica de Gestão Organizacional*, 4(3), 69-81.
- Souza, E. M., Bianco, M. F., & Silva, P. O. M. (2016). Análise arqueológica das estratégias utilizadas por homossexuais no trabalho bancário. *Farol: Revista de Estudos Organizacionais e Sociedade*, 3(6), 12-59. doi:10.25113/farol.v3i6.2520
- Teixeira, J. C., Perdigão, D. A., & Carrieri, A. P. (2016). O discurso gerencialista e a construção de ideais estéticos femininos e masculinos. *Farol: Revista de Estudos Organizacionais e Sociedade*, 3(7), 366-417. doi:10.25113/farol.v3i7.2679
- Tong, R. (1999). Dealing with difference justly: perspectives on disability. *Social Theory and Practice*, 25(3), 519-530.
- Valadares, G. N. (2016). Criticar masculinidades tóxicas é diferente de criticar os homens. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/319iLH5>
- Velho, G. (1979). O estudo do comportamento desviante: a contribuição da antropologia social. In G. Velho (Org.), *Desvio e divergência: uma crítica da patologia social* (pp. 17-28). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar.

Viana, F. O. (2006). *Armário: sobre a homossexualidade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Orgástica.

Wolbring, G. (2012). Expanding ableism: taking down the ghettoization of impact of disability studies scholars. *Societies*, 2(3), 75-83. doi:10.3390/soc2030075

Acknowledgements

This study was partially funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brazil.

We thank the editor and O&S reviewers for the valuable contributions to improve the ideas and discussions of this article.

About the Authors

Renan Gomes de Moura

PhD student in administration at Universidade do Grande Rio. E-mail: renangmoura@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-6605-1631

Rejane Prevot Nascimento

PhD in production engineering at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. Professor at the Administration Graduate Program of Universidade do Grande Rio. E-mail: rejaneprevot@uol.com.br. ORCID: 0000-0002-5242-9509

Denise Franca Barros

PhD in administration at Fundação Getúlio Vargas. Professor at the Administration Graduate Program of Universidade do Grande Rio. E-mail: denise.fb@globo.com. ORCID: 0000-0003-1640-6171

