Reimagining Leadership:

A Radical Feminist Critique of Power Structures in the Creative Industries

Student name: Anna Heijnis
Student number: 737042

Supervisor: R. Smits

Master Media Studies – Media & Creative Industries
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication (ESHCC)
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Master's Thesis
June 2025

18361 words

Reimagining Leadership:
A Radical Feminist Critique of Power Structures in the Creative Industries

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how patriarchal leadership structures are reproduced or challenged within media institutions, with a focus on the music and film industries. Grounded in radical feminist theory, particularly the works of Millett, Acker, and hooks, it conceptualizes leadership as a gendered and ideological construct embedded in institutional logics. Through a qualitative comparative case study design, the research analyzes ESG and DEI documents from global media companies and Dutch cultural organizations. The study applies a five-pillar analytical framework to evaluate how institutions frame diversity, equity, and leadership.

Findings reveal that while feminist language is increasingly present in organizational discourse, it often functions symbolically rather than structurally. Inclusion is frequently treated as a reputational concern or audit metric, rather than a process of redistributing authority or challenging masculinized norms. Public-sector institutions demonstrate some potential for participatory governance and accountability, though these efforts remain partial. The thesis argues that genuine feminist transformation requires reimagining leadership through collective responsibility, structural redistribution, and epistemic inclusion. It contributes to feminist media and organizational studies by offering a critical methodology for analyzing institutional texts and advancing a normative vision of leadership grounded in radical feminist ethics.

KEYWORDS: *Radical feminism; leadership; creative industries; gendered organizations; institutional discourse; intersectionality; feminist theory; ESG; DEI; structural change.*

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been growing attention to gender equality in the creative industries, leading to a rise in diversity policies, inclusion programs, and public commitments to fair representation. However, these efforts often fail to address the deeper question of who holds power and particularly how leadership is organized. Media companies may present themselves as progressive, but there is reason to believe that their internal structures often remain traditional, male-dominated, and resistant to real change.

A recent study presented at the 2024 Berlin Film Festival highlighted this issue within the UK film industry (Shoard, 2024). The report found that 78% of key creative roles were held by men, and at the current pace, predicted that gender parity will not be achieved until at least 2085 – a shocking conclusion. Verhoeven, one of the study's authors, emphasized that "the film industries do not just need more women, but women in the right positions," pointing to systemic problems that quotas alone cannot fix (Shoard, 2024).

This thesis argues that meaningful inclusion is not possible without examining the systems that maintain unequal power. Using radical feminist theories by Millett (1970) and Acker (1990), this research explores how patriarchal leadership is embedded in the operations of music and film production companies and considers how more inclusive and equitable leadership models can be developed. The research, then, is guided by the following question: *How are patriarchal leadership structures reproduced or challenged through institutional discourse in the music and film industries, and how can radical feminist theory inform the development of inclusive and redistributive leadership models in these sectors?*

Patriarchal leadership structures are embedded in what Acker (1990) terms “gendered organizations,” where seemingly neutral organizational processes systematically reproduce gender inequalities. In such contexts, authority, decision-making, and access to resources are shaped by implicit assumptions of a disembodied, ideal worker – one that aligns with male norms and excludes those whose lives do not conform to this model. Acker argues that “organizational logic is deeply gendered,” as job designs, hierarchies, and informal practices consistently marginalize women and reinforce male dominance (p. 142). These processes sustain patriarchal power through both formal job structures and informal workplace cultures that render inequality invisible.

Radical feminism is a theoretical and political framework that identifies patriarchy as a foundational structure of systemic male dominance and seeks its total dismantlement rather than reform. As Millett already argued in 1970 in her siminal work on *Sexual Politics*, “patriarchy’s chief institution is the family,” and its power is reinforced through cultural and political systems that render male supremacy a normative condition (p. 33). Millett's analysis presents patriarchy as a political institution whose authority is maintained through both overt coercion and deeply embedded ideological control. Building on this, Thompson (2012) contends that radical feminism is not merely a subtype but “feminism per se” – the only strand that unequivocally names and resists male

domination. She criticizes the dilution of feminism by other frameworks, asserting that "the meaning, value, truth and reality of feminism (…) is its identification of and opposition to male domination" (p. 8). In contrast to liberal feminism's aim of integrating women into existing patriarchal structures, radical feminism envisions a complete restructuring of social institutions in order to achieve liberation outside of male-defined norms.

Inclusivity, in the context of the cultural and creative industries (CCI), involves more than demographic representation; it encompasses equitable access to decision-making processes and career advancement opportunities that are structurally supported rather than incidentally available. As Eikhof argues, disparities in workforce participation and progression are not simply the result of individual deficiencies, but outcomes of institutionalised decision-making processes that repeatedly favour white, middle-class, male norms of talent, professionalism, and creative identity (2017). She emphasizes that genuine diversity cannot be achieved without addressing how "concrete decisions made about individual workers (…) directly or indirectly influence opportunities for workforce participation and advancement" (p. 292). These decisions, whether in hiring, promotion, or admission into education, are structurally embedded in socio-economic and cultural conditions that systematically marginalize women, ethnic minorities, working-class individuals, and disabled persons. Thus, according to Eikhof (2017), inclusivity must be conceptualized as the creation of structural conditions that support equitable access to these opportunities and that challenge prevailing norms of who is considered 'talented' or 'fitting' for leadership and creative roles.

The choice to focus on music and film production companies is both empirical and symbolic. These sectors represent core pillars of the global creative economy, valued not only for their financial output but for their symbolic influence in shaping public discourse, cultural narratives, and aesthetic norms. Music and film are among the creative industries at the forefront of progressive messaging, and especially in their independent sectors advocate for diversity, social justice, and inclusivity in their content. But, despite their outward commitment to diversity and progressive values, the internal structures of these industries remain deeply unequal. In the film sector, to start, men continue to dominate high-risk, high-status roles such as directing, with longer and more stable career trajectories, while women – particularly women of colour – often face limited opportunities and are rarely hired more than once (Smith et al., 2020, p. 15).

Policy initiatives like Australia's Gender Matters scheme have sought to address this imbalance, but have sometimes resulted in surface-level changes. For instance, an increase in women producers did not translate into similar gains in directing roles, suggesting that organisations may respond to gender equity targets by adjusting less powerful roles rather than restructuring access to creative leadership (Verhoeven et al., 2019, pp. 138-9). This contradiction, between the progressive image these industries promote and the exclusionary realities within, makes music and film production companies important sites for feminist institutional critique. As Verhoeven et al. (2019)

argue, gender inequality in these fields reflects broader social inequities and must be addressed through systemic change across all levels of production, distribution, and policy (p. 137).

Gender inequality remains a persistent feature of the creative industries, particularly in leadership and authorship roles in film and music. Between 2007 and 2019, only 70 out of 1,448 directors across 1,300 films were women; a proportion of just 4.8% (Smith et al., 2020, p. 3). This figure underscores the longstanding exclusion of women from one of the industry's most powerful creative roles. At the global level, Verhoeven et al. (2019) similarly highlight the gap between production and visibility. In their dataset, they found that for theatrically released U.S. films between 2010 and 2015 with budgets under $25 million, those directed by men were shown on three times as many screens as those directed by women, despite women being more likely to work in that budget range (pp. 139-40). The authors further demonstrate that "in almost every jurisdiction, the proportion of films directed by women exceeds the percentage of screenings," with female-directed films making up just over 2-3% of screenings in North America, Asia, South America, and the UK (p. 140).

In the music industry, Raine and Strong (2019) point to similar dynamics. A mentioned research highlights that only 2% of producers and 12% of songwriters in a sample of Billboard-charting songs were women (p. 2). These disparities are sustained by informal gatekeeping, genre-based biases, and assumptions around technical competence – factors that continue to exclude women from key creative roles. Grills (2018) underscores this further by documenting the challenges faced by women composers, who often struggle to be taken seriously within male-dominated production environments, finding to receive fewer opportunities and fewer commissions (p. 65). What unites these patterns is the way inequality is reproduced through everyday institutional practices. Eikhof (2017) critiques the widespread framing of decisions around hiring and opportunity as neutral or merit-based: "As has been particularly evident in the case of admission decisions, decision makers are steeped in the paradigms of particular cultural canons and schools that privilege white, male and middle-class notion of European high culture" (p. 301). Together, these studies indicate that gender inequality in creative industries is not incidental but systemic. They show that exclusion is sustained not just by overt discrimination, but by practices that appear routine and objective. Addressing these dynamics therefore requires more than increasing representation; it demands critical attention to how power is distributed through norms, networks, and institutional logics.

Despite this growing body of research, the majority of studies tend to operate within liberal or postfeminist paradigms that assume progress is linear and that equality can be achieved through reformist strategies such as quotas or training. What remains underexplored is the structural nature of patriarchal dominance in leadership culture and the ways in which radical feminist strategies – rooted in systemic disruption and redistribution – can inform institutional change. This thesis seeks to contribute to filling this gap by applying radical feminist theory to examine the internal logic of leadership within the creative industries, offering a deeper critique of how power is distributed and legitimized in media and cultural production contexts.

This study applies a qualitative comparative case study approach, focusing on the content analysis of organizational documents. These include Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) policies, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) policies, annual or periodic reports, and annual or periodic plans, from selected music and film production companies. By critically examining how inclusivity, leadership, and equity are framed within these texts, the research reveals the ideological underpinnings and practical constraints of current institutional approaches. This method allows for an interrogation of not only what organizations claim about gender and leadership but also how such claims align – or fail to align – with radical feminist principles of power redistribution and structural change.

Radical feminism, as conceptualized in this thesis, is grounded in the understanding that patriarchy is not a flaw within otherwise neutral systems, but a constitutive framework that organizes political, economic, and institutional life. This view is rooted in second-wave feminist scholarship, where theorists defined patriarchy as a system of male supremacy reproduced through both public and private spheres. Millett (1970) characterizes patriarchy as a "political institution" that relies on sex-based hierarchy, wherein male dominance is sustained not only by force but through culture, ideology, and routine social practices (pp. 25-6). Her analysis reveals how literature, psychoanalysis, and education contribute to naturalizing male authority. Similarly, Dworkin (1987/2007) contends that male power operates at its most intimate level through heterosexual intercourse, where the structuring of dominance and submission is normalized and eroticized. She writes that "intercourse remains a means or the means of physiologically making a woman inferior: communicating to her, on the cellular level, her own inferior status" (p. 174). According to Dworkin, the political dimensions of patriarchy are inseparable from the embodied experiences through which male power is enacted and maintained. Bell hooks (2000) extends the radical feminist critique by emphasizing that patriarchy functions within a broader system of intersecting oppressions. Defining feminism as "a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression" (p. 1), hooks challenges frameworks that isolate gender from other social hierarchies. Her work critiques reformist approaches that overlook how patriarchy is reinforced through the interdependence of race, class, and gender-based domination. Additionally, she writes:

> Imagine living in a world where there is no domination, where females and males are not alike or even always equal, but where a vision of mutuality is the ethos shaping our interaction. Imagine living in a world where we can all be who we are, a world of peace and possibility. [Liberal] feminist revolution alone will not create such a world; we need to end racism, class elitism, imperialism. But it will make it possible for us to be fully self-actualized (…), to live together, realizing our dreams of freedom and justice, living the truth that we are all "created equal." (p. x)

For hooks, the feminist project must be transformative rather than merely inclusive, aimed at systemic change rather than accommodation. This perspective insists on confronting the cultural and institutional foundations of inequality, rather than focusing solely on increasing representation within them. This thesis draws on these contributions to radical feminist thought to argue that institutional reform alone is insufficient. Addressing patriarchal leadership requires reimagining organizational governance through principles such as horizontal power structures, collective responsibility, and leadership grounded in lived experience rather than abstract authority.

The growing implementation of diversity initiatives, gender sensitivity trainings, and leadership quotas is often presented as evidence of institutional progress. While such measures have led to some increases in representation, their effectiveness remains limited when underlying systems of power go unchallenged. As Eikhof (2017) observes, decisions around diversity are frequently framed in neutral, technocratic terms, yet they are shaped by commercial values that reflect dominant group norms and reinforce existing hierarchies. Similarly, Verhoeven et al. (2019) highlight how policies aimed at gender equality in film have often brought only minor results, as the initiatives often arent thought through to the extent that real change is guaranteed be made (a great example is the mentioned Australian film industry's Gender Matters policy suite, "'gaming' generic participation targets" (p. 138-9)). Many, if not all approaches tend to treat inclusion as a numerical goal rather than a structural transformation. Hooks underscores that without a broader commitment to justice, feminist efforts risk being co-opted into systems they intend to critique (2000). This thesis builds on these insights by interrogating how leadership itself is constructed and maintained.

While this thesis maintains analytical rigor, it is guided by a normative commitment to gender equity and epistemological pluralism. It adopts a critical-constructivist approach, viewing institutional documents not as objective reflections of organizational reality but as sites where power, ideology, and identity are negotiated and encoded. The decision to center radical feminism is not only theoretical but political, acknowledging that all research is situated and value-laden. This stance resists the tendency in organizational studies to treat leadership as a neutral or technical domain, instead foregrounding its symbolic and distributive functions. By approaching leadership as a contested space of meaning and legitimacy, this thesis contributes to a growing body of scholarship that seeks to democratize institutional life by dismantling its gendered assumptions.

This research contributes to feminist media and organizational studies by applying radical feminist theory to the analysis of leadership structures – an area often dominated by liberal or postfeminist approaches. It extends theories by Millett and Acker through contemporary empirical application, offering a critique of institutional reform efforts that fail to dismantle structural patriarchy. Furthermore, gender inequality in creative leadership impacts cultural production, audience representation, and labor equity. By exploring structural alternatives to patriarchal leadership, this thesis aims to inform industry practices that promote genuine inclusivity and institutional accountability.

The creative industries occupy a unique position in contemporary capitalism: while they project progressive values in the content they produce, the internal systems that govern them often remain deeply conservative and hierarchical. Leadership positions are still overwhelmingly dominated by white cisgender men, and inclusion efforts are frequently limited to representational politics rather than systemic transformation. As such, a radical feminist perspective – one that interrogates not only gender representation but the political economy of leadership – offers both a critical and practical framework for change.

The timing of this inquiry is particularly relevant, given that the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent shifts toward digital production and remote collaboration have transformed managerial practices. As companies revise or rebuild their organizational models, the opportunity to embed more inclusive leadership structures is both a challenge and a necessity. Yet this potential unfolds amid broader sociopolitical currents that have, in many cases, emboldened reactionary attitudes toward gender, diversity, and authority. In an era marked by ideological backlash against equity initiatives and growing skepticism toward institutional reform, the entrenchment of patriarchal norms is increasingly mediated by cultural discourse, technological platforms, and executive influence. Radical feminism offers not only critique but also constructive principles for reimagining leadership, such as horizontal governance, transparency, and the centering of lived experience, as necessary counterweights to these regressive dynamics.

The structure of the thesis reflects the step-by-step development of the research inquiry. Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical framework, drawing on radical feminist thought and feminist organizational theory to establish the analytical lens through which institutional leadership practices are examined. Chapter 3 outlines the methodological approach, detailing the comparative case study design, the selection of documents, and the coding strategies used in the analysis. Chapter 4 presents the empirical findings, organized thematically to show how media and cultural institutions articulate leadership, diversity, and inclusion in their formal policies. Finally, Chapter 5 revisits the central research question, synthesizing the findings in light of the theoretical framework and reflecting on their broader significance. This includes a critical evaluation of the study's contributions and limitations, as well as suggestions for further research and practical application.

2. Theoretical Framework

To analyze how patriarchal leadership structures manifest within media institutions and assess whether feminist alternatives are being meaningfully implemented, this thesis employs a radical feminist institutional analysis framework. This framework is grounded in the foundational work of Kate Millett (1970), whose articulation of patriarchy as a pervasive, institutionalized power structure remains central to radical feminist theory. In combination with Joan Acker's (1990) organizational theory and contemporary feminist critiques of media industries, this approach facilitates a multidimensional critique of leadership, labor, and inclusion This framework examines how patriarchal leadership structures are embedded and normalized in music and film production industries. Rather than assessing the sincerity of diversity efforts, it uses radical feminist theory to identify how institutional logics maintain gendered power relations and to propose structural alternatives rooted in collective, horizontal, and experience-based leadership.

This framework serves several related functions. First, it provides a historically rooted critique of institutionalized gender inequality. Second, it conceptualizes leadership as a site of gendered power relations. Finally, it operationalizes radical and organizational feminist theory in the analysis of strategic institutional documents. To these ends, the framework integrates the core insights of radical feminism, particularly Millett's theorization of patriarchy as a political system, and applies them to the context of media production industries, where leadership structures continue to marginalize women and gender-diverse individuals.

2.1. Radical Feminist Theory and Structure of the Patriarchy

Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1970) remains one of the most influential texts in radical feminist theory, articulating patriarchy as a system of male supremacy that operates not only in interpersonal relationships but through institutional structures such as education, law, religion, and the family. She defines politics broadly as "power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another" (1970, p. 23). This broad political definition allows her to critique institutions that appear neutral but are in fact deeply gendered. Millett argues that the cultural narratives, labor structures, and legal codes of modern society operate as mechanisms of patriarchal dominance, naturalizing male power while rendering female subordination both normative and invisible. Millett challenges the notion of the family as a private sanctuary, instead characterizing it as "both a mirror of and a connection with the larger society: a patriarchal unit within a patriarchal whole", functioning as a key institution in our political structure (p. 33). This critique extends to cultural and media institutions, which is indirectly implied through her framework as ideological and economic apparatuses that reproduce patriarchal dominance by shaping both cultural narratives and institutional hierarchies (pp. 25-6).

While Millett's primary focus is on literary texts and sexual ideology, her broader insights into institutionalized power form the conceptual foundation of this thesis. Millett notes that the mere

presence of women in symbolic roles is insufficient, and systemic transformation requires challenging the political organization of male supremacy itself (p. 25). Representation without restructuring power relations, labor practices, and institutional norms risks reinforcing the very inequalities it aims to correct.

This thesis draws on Millett's assertion that culture and material conditions are deeply interlinked. This informs the research's dual emphasis: examining both symbolic representations and the material practices – such as hiring, promotion, and leadership composition – that sustain inequality. Media institutions, therefore, are approached as political sites, not neutral vehicles of expression.

Radical feminist theory, grounded in Millett's work, supports a structural analysis that centers not on isolated incidents of discrimination but on the norms and procedures that institutionalize male dominance (pp. 26-9). In the creative industries, this includes assessing whether leadership and governance reflect feminist values or merely adapt to inclusion rhetoric while maintaining hierarchical, exclusionary structures. Millett's view of power is that it is "supported either through consent or imposed through violence. Conditioning to an ideology amounts to the former" (p. 26). This underscores the need to question legitimacy – in case of conditioning to an ideology – of current organizational norms.

Ultimately, Millett's framework facilitates a critical distinction between symbolic inclusion and structural change. Her analysis offers not only a lens to critique existing power dynamics but a normative foundation to evaluate whether institutions are genuinely dismantling patriarchal systems or simply preserving them under new forms. This re-centering of Millett's radical critique grounds the thesis in a transformative vision of institutional reform.

2.2. Feminist Organizational Theory: Acker's Gendered Organizations

To complement the structural critique of patriarchy offered by Millett, this framework incorporates Joan Acker's theory of gendered organizations (1990). Her foundational claim is that gender is not simply an attribute that individuals bring into organizations – it is embedded into the very architecture of organizational structures and norms. Organizations produce and reproduce gender inequality through systemic and normalized means, which are often hidden through the belief that organizations are fair or based on merit.

Acker identifies five interrelated processes through which organizations become gendered: 1) the construction of divisions along gender lines (such as job design and task allocation); 2) the construction of symbols and images that reinforce those divisions; 3) patterns of interaction between individuals that enact dominance and submission; 4) the internal mental work that individuals perform to fit gendered expectations; and 5) the overarching organizational logic that embeds these patterns into daily operations and institutional goals (pp. 146-7). This framework is particularly revealing in the context of media institutions, where stratified labor patterns persist: decision-making and technical

roles (e.g., directing, producing, cinematography) remain male-dominated, while women are often concentrated in administrative and supportive positions. According to Acker, such divisions are not accidental:

> Gender is difficult to see when only the masculine is present. Since men in organizations take their behaviour and perspectives to represent the human, organizational structures and processes are theorized as gender neutral, organizational structures and processes are theorized as gender neutral. (p. 142)

Acker also critiques the ideal worker model, noting that organizations implicitly presume a disembodied worker who is is actually a man, "and it is the man's body, its sexuality, minimal responsibility in procreation, and conventional control of emotions that pervades work and organizational processes" (p. 152). These expectations are embedded in how jobs are defined, rewarded, and monitored: Women's bodies "are suspect, stigmatized, and used as grounds for control and exclusion" (p. 152), structuring inequality at every level of the institution.

Further, Acker emphasizes that organizational culture and ideology are not separate from these material divisions but actively reproduce them. She writes that the structure of an organization is "always affected by symbols of gender, processes of gender identity, and material inequalities between women and men" and "these processes are complexly related to and powerfully support the reproduction of the class structure" (pp. 145-6). Even though Asker's work dates from 1990, one interpretation of her thinking in the present-day is that differences continue to exist between internal and external organisational work practices. While media companies may position themselves as advocates of feminist values in their branding or DEI campaigns, they may continue to reproduce long-existing, masculinized leadership structures and norms within their organisations. Acker's framework helps expose this disconnect between symbolic representation and structural realities.

The utility of Acker's theory in this thesis is twofold. First, it enables empirical analysis of how gendered assumptions shape labor division, access to leadership, and informal power. Second, it provides an evaluative lens for assessing whether strategic documents, such as ESG reports and DEI statements, acknowledge gendered organizational logics or sustain the fiction of neutrality. Her approach aligns closely with Millett's in viewing institutions as political systems, thereby offering a robust theoretical synthesis for assessing whether media organizations are capable of feminist transformation or simply maintain patriarchal hierarchies in rebranded forms.

2.3. Feminist Leadership in the Creative Industries

The integration of radical feminist and organizational theories with empirical studies in media and cultural industries is essential to contextualizing how patriarchal power manifests and how feminist leadership is variously enabled or obstructed. Recent scholarly and sectoral research reveals

that formal commitments to gender equity frequently fall short when not accompanied by structural transformation. This section brings together literature that interrogates the gap between feminist ideals and institutional practices, with a focus on power redistribution, representational politics, and leadership structures in the media industries.

Verhoeven et al. (2019) examine global patterns of exclusion in the film industry, showing that the systemic underrepresentation of women in creative leadership positions persists despite the visibility of movements like #MeToo. Their research attributes these inequalities to entrenched hiring networks, risk-averse funding systems, and a lack of accountability in policy implementation (p. 139). These dynamics mirror Acker's theory that organizational processes normalize and reproduce gendered hierarchies, particularly when institutions fail to challenge their foundational structures (1990, p. 142). The authors further argue that international comparisons reveal this is not a culturally isolated issue but a systemic and structural feature of the global film economy. This insight reinforces the need for institutional critiques that extend beyond national policy or individual initiatives.

Eikhof contributes to this critique by analyzing how diversity initiatives are often framed in terms of business advantage rather than social justice (2017, p. 291). Her research demonstrates that inclusion is often treated as secondary to market considerations, reducing feminist intervention to branding exercises or tokenistic representation. The tension between symbolic inclusion and structural change, central to both Millett's and Acker's frameworks, is foregrounded in her analysis. Eikhof's work also identifies how cultural gatekeepers justify exclusion through meritocratic discourses that conceal the impact of privilege, subjectivity, and discretion in creative hiring (p. 295). For this thesis, her insights provide a critical lens through which to evaluate corporate narratives surrounding gender equality and to interrogate the extent to which organizational discourse aligns with feminist values in practice.

Raine and Strong underscore that addressing gender inequality in the music industry requires coordinated, long-term interventions across education, professional development, and structural reform (2019, p. 16). Despite increased awareness of gender imbalances, the industry remains shaped by informal networks and persistent exclusion, particularly in composition, production, and executive roles. As they note, "people identifying as women are earning less in royalties, played less on radio, under-represented in the charts, de-emphasized in Spotify playlists, more likely to have shorter careers and few in number in key decision-making positions in the industry" (p. 1), further elaborating that "women face an uphill battle in almost every area of the industry and in some specific areas are almost completely locked out" (p. 2).

These practices uphold masculine-coded norms and gatekeeping mechanisms that limit equal opportunities for women to have access to key creative and decision-making roles. This complements Acker's (1990) analysis of how job roles and authority structures are inherently gendered, and aligns with Millett's (1970) assertion that gendered power operates through both cultural and institutional systems. Raine and Strong's (2019) work also reveals the limitations of liberal reform when

unaccompanied by redistributive strategies and highlights the importance of collective mobilization in challenging exclusionary professional cultures.

Grills examines the case of the Alliance for Women Film Composers (AWFC), which offers an example of feminist coalition-building within a highly exclusive sector. The AWFC seeks to correct representational imbalances and advocate for structural inclusion through visibility, networking, and education. However, as Grills notes, the effectiveness of such initiatives depends on institutional receptivity and material support – factors often lacking in male-dominated cultural organizations (2018, p. 10). This underscores the importance of evaluating not only the presence of feminist efforts, but their embeddedness within institutional logics of support, recognition, and resource allocation. It also foregrounds the importance of independent feminist organizing as a countermeasure to institutional inertia.

Together, these studies challenge celebratory accounts of progress and underscore the need for institutional transformation. They reveal how creative institutions maintain patriarchal leadership structures not through overt exclusion alone, but through subtle, normalized practices of gatekeeping, networked privilege, and cultural devaluation of feminist labor. These findings strengthen the thesis's evaluative lens by identifying indicators of transformative feminist leadership: the redistribution of authority, sustained inclusion of marginalized voices in decision-making, transparent and equitable career pathways, and support for epistemic diversity.

This body of literature contributes to the theoretical scaffolding of the thesis by offering both diagnostic and normative insights. In assessing institutional reports and strategies, this thesis evaluates whether organizations create conditions for epistemic and structural inclusion, particularly through redistributive leadership models, shared governance, and support for feminist coalitions.

2.4. Intersectionality and Institutional Exclusion

To adequately address the layered power dynamics within media institutions, a radical feminist framework must be grounded in intersectionality. As is explained in Intersectionality and Feminist Economics: a call for radical transformation (2024), "there is no way in which we can say that women share the same patriarchal oppression, therefore, our political struggles are not automatically the same due to our shared identity as women". Furthermore, "gender does not exist in isolation but instead configures gendered experiences through interactions between different systems of organising power in society": In other words, what intersectionality attempts to highlight, is that generalized accounts of women's oppression often obscure the specific experiences of marginalized groups, warning that universal claims typically center white, middle-class, heterosexual norms and risk reproducing and stabilizing existing hierarchies instead of transforming them (Intersectionality and Feminist Economics, 2024).

This critique aligns with bell hooks' argument that feminist inclusion must be rooted in justice, not tokenism. She describes how popular feminism is still rooted in "Christian" and patriarchial

ideologies, wherein the woman (especially when she is of a different race and/or class) is still to be subordinate to the man – women can be just as anti-feminist (2000, p. 3). In media industries, this manifests when women are included in leadership, but only if they conform to dominant standards of whiteness, respectability, marketability, or masculinity – leaving more marginalized groups structurally excluded.

These critiques are substantiated by Smith et al., whose longitudinal study found that, despite comprising 20% of the U.S. population, women from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups held less than 1% of directing roles across the top 1,300 films from 2007 to 2019. In contrast, white men dominated 82.5% of these positions, revealing a stark 92-to-1 disparity in representation between white male and underrepresented female directors (2020, p. 2). Additionally, the inclusion of directors from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups has shown little meaningful progress over more than a decade, with recent years reflecting stagnation rather than significant improvement.

Intersectionality, then, is not simply a representational tool; it is a method for interrogating the conditions under which inclusion occurs, and for whom it remains inaccessible. As is emphasized in "Intersectionality and Feminist Economics: a call for radical transformation" (2024):

> It is not enough that a woman has a paid job; this is already the reality of so many Black and working class women under capitalism. But if she does not have control over the conditions of that job, if that job is increasingly precarious and the woman as a worker does not have access to worker's rights that include just payment, housing, healthcare, retirement, and collective protection against abuses of power from her employers, then what exactly is the concept of empowerment that we are proposing and defending?

This thesis adopts that principle to critically evaluate leadership structures and institutional strategies, reading not only for who is present, but for what logics of power remain intact.

2.5. Feminist Critiques of Neoliberalism and Corporate Feminism

A core concern of radical feminism is the co-optation of feminist discourse by neoliberal and corporate institutions, which often strips feminism of its transformative, collective aims. Neoliberal feminism, as Banet-Weiser explains, refers to a form of feminist discourse that "[embraces and adopts] neoliberal values such as entrepreneurialism, individualism, and the expansion of capitalist markets (…) as a way to craft their selves"; "women just have to be a "Girl Boss" or "Lean In" in order to overcome sexist history" (2018, p. 19). Here, empowerment becomes a personal brand rather than a collective struggle for justice. Feminist rhetoric is thus repurposed to promote individual success within existing structures, rather than to dismantle them.

Banet-Weiser critiques this phenomenon as "popular feminism," where feminist ideas circulate as marketable images in consumer culture:

> [It] critiques the roots of gender asymmetry; rather, popular feminism tinkers on the surface, embracing a palatable feminism, encouraging individual girls and women to just be empowered. These discourses (…) are intimately connected to cultural economies, where to be "empowered" is to be (…) a better *economic* subject, not necessarily a better feminist subject. (p. 21)

Commitments like these enable media institutions to align themselves with feminist values on the surface, while continuing to sustain gendered labor inequalities and masculinist hierarchies of power, prioritising capitalist norms and values.

Zuidervaart extends this concern by applying Adorno's critique of the culture industry to feminist discourse. He observes that "the dominant institutions of government work hand in glove with an exploitative economy," and that radical political ideas are often neutralized by being aestheticized or commodified (2006, p. 4). Within this logic, feminism is not challenged but made culturally palatable, used in symbolic gestures such as diversity statements or awareness campaigns, while deeper redistributions of power are avoided.

Together, these radical feminist critiques stress the difference between using feminist language and truly putting feminist ideas into action. They question the idea of empowerment as something personal and separate from politics, and argue that feminist goals should be judged by real institutional changes, fairer distribution of resources, and accountability. In this thesis, these ideas shape how media organizations' Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) reports, leadership plans, and branding efforts are examined. When feminist claims are not supported by deeper structural change, they should be seen not as real progress, but as a form of appropriation.

2.6. Transformative Feminist Leadership and Structural Change

Radical feminist theory does not only critique institutionalized patriarchal power; it also envisions alternative leadership models grounded in care, responsibility, and collective transformation. Bell hooks emphasizes that feminism must address structural inequalities through strategies that go beyond equal rights agendas. She argues that "a fundamental goal of visionary feminism [is] to create strategies to change the lot of all women and enhance their personal power," which requires attention to basic issues such as literacy and inclusion across class boundaries (2000, p. 111). This stance challenges corporate or representational forms of feminism that ignore structural injustice and instead focus on symbolic inclusion. Hooks insists that class elitism has shaped much of feminist discourse, distancing it from the lived realities of many women. As she writes, "mass-based feminist education for critical consciousness is needed" (2000, p. 113). Within media institutions, where access to leadership and creative authority is often mediated by cultural capital, these insights are especially relevant. Feminist leadership must involve not only increased representation but also processes of education, redistribution, and material support for those historically excluded from

cultural production. This framework also draws from hooks' call for coalition and the inclusion of men in feminist struggle. She argues that "the safety and continuation of life on the planet requires feminist conversion of men," rejecting notions of gender warfare in favor of a broader, collective movement to dismantle patriarchy (2000, p. 116). This challenges leadership models based on competition or exclusion and reframes authority as relational and transformative.

Insights from cultural industry research further support this perspective. Eikhof argues that informal decision-making practices and narrow perceptions of merit often reinforce structural inequalities in creative sectors. She demonstrates that diversity efforts fail when institutions rely on individual "fit" or cultural familiarity instead of transparent and equitable processes (2017, pp. 295-6). Likewise, Raine and Strong emphasize that achieving gender equality in the music industry requires sustained collaboration across policy, education, and industry practices, not isolated initiatives (2019, p. 15).

Taken together, these perspectives push feminist leadership beyond charismatic individuals or representational gains. They reframe leadership as a practice of responsibility, collective empowerment, and care. Feminist organizations, particularly in media, must be evaluated not just by who holds power but by how leadership functions: whether it redistributes opportunity, nurtures political consciousness, and supports inclusive governance. As hooks notes, "there is no one path to feminism. Individuals from diverse backgrounds need feminist theory that speaks directly to their lives" (2000, p. 116). This principle should also guide how institutions shape and assess their leadership cultures.

The preceding sections have established a cohesive theoretical framework that integrates radical feminist theory, gendered organizational analysis, intersectionality, and empirical critiques of leadership in the creative industries. Drawing on key authors, the framework offers a multi-level model for analyzing how patriarchal power is embedded in media institutions. It insists that gender inequality is not incidental but structurally and symbolically sustained, and that institutional discourse must be evaluated not just for representation but for its material, epistemic, and organizational implications.

At its core, the framework holds that feminist transformation cannot be reduced to inclusion metrics or symbolic gestures. Following hooks, genuine feminist practice must be grounded in redistributive strategies that address structural oppression and reflect the lived realities of those most marginalized (2000, p. 37). In practice, this means challenging both the formal and informal systems through which leadership is legitimized and maintained.

3. Research Design

This research investigates how patriarchal leadership structures are reproduced or challenged within media organisations, specifically in the film and music industries, and how radical feminist strategies can facilitate more inclusive leadership models. This is situated at the intersection of institutional critique and feminist theory and is grounded in a theoretical framework that integrates radical feminism and intersectionality.

To address these concerns, the research adopts a qualitative comparative case study (QCCS) design, with document analysis serving as the central method of data collection. The data corpus includes institutional strategy documents, environmental, social, and governance (ESG) and/or diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) reports. The goal is to identify both structural configurations of power and discursive strategies that reinforce or resist patriarchal norms.

This chapter outlines the methodological logic behind these choices, detailing the rationale for QCCS, sampling and operationalisation, the analytic strategy employed through Atlas.ti, and the steps taken to ensure rigor, validity, and ethical integrity. By combining theoretical depth with empirical application, the chapter establishes a solid methodological foundation for the aim of this thesis: to critically assess the prospects for feminist transformation in media leadership structures.

3.1. Methodological Approach

The methodological strategy employed in this research is grounded in the need to critically examine how systemic gender inequality is embedded in both the structural and symbolic practices of media institutions. Given the interdisciplinary nature of this inquiry – bridging media studies, feminist theory, and organizational sociology – a qualitative comparative case study (QCCS) offers the necessary flexibility to capture the multifaceted, context-dependent nature of institutional power (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017, p. 14). It enables the in-depth exploration of multiple specific cases of film and music companies, and the broader environment of companies operating in the media and creative industries. In contrast to single-case approaches, comparative case studies allow for the identification of recurring structures, contrasts, and institutional mechanisms across different organizational settings (p. 21).

For a feminist analysis, QCCS is especially valuable because it supports both structural critique and discursive interpretation. Radical feminist theory calls for an investigation into how hierarchies and gendered power relations are woven into everyday institutional practices and symbolic frameworks (Millett, 1970, p. 33). A comparative lens makes it possible to observe how various organizations either integrate, selectively adopt, or entirely disregard feminist principles in their leadership structures and cultural strategies, enabling a cross-institutional analysis of how patriarchal leadership structures are articulated, sustained, or contested in their respective settings.

This research complements the QCCS method with a combination of qualitative content analysis techniques, using both document analysis and thematic analysis. Institutional documents, such as ESG reports, internal strategy papers, and public policy statements, form the basis for examining formal expressions of governance and intent (Bowen, 2009, p. 27). Thematic analysis, in turn, uncovers implicit patterns in language and representation (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79).

In sum, this approach offers a coherent and flexible strategy for investigating how leadership is constructed, practiced, and challenged in the creative industries. It enables the examination of both dominant institutional norms and alternative feminist practices, while preserving analytical clarity across different cases.

3.2. Case Selection and Sampling Strategy

The case selection process is aimed at identifying institutions that reflect a range of organizational scales, reputational profiles, and policy transparency. The goal is not statistical representativeness but theoretical and analytical depth: each case must offer insight into how leadership and diversity are performed, contested, or institutionalized in different segments of the creative industries.

Cases were selected according to the following criteria: 1) Relevance to the creative industries, particularly music and film production; 2) Availability of institutional documents (e.g., ESG reports, DEI policies, strategy plans) published after 2020; 3) Evidence of public engagement with diversity or leadership transformation initiatives. Based on these criteria, the core samples from film and music companies are:

- Paramount Global (2023-2024 ESG Report)
- Warner Music Group (2024 Impact Report and 2024 UK DEI report)
- Universal Music Group (2024 Annual Report)
- Dutch Film Festival (Nederlands Film Festival) (2025-2028 Multi-year Policy Plan)
- Sony Music Group (2022 Global Impact Report)
- Spotify (2024 Equity & Impact Report)
- The Walt Disney Company (2023 EMEA CSR Report)

In addition, cultural policy frameworks were included:

- Cultural Fund (Cultuurfonds) (2025-2030 Multi-year Strategy)
- ReFrame “Gender & Hiring in TV” (2023-2024 Report)

These organizations and institutional documents were selected because they offer a cross-section of global and regional industry leaders, from publicly traded conglomerates to nationally regulated funding bodies. Additionally, the frameworks were included to provide insight into how feminist leadership goals are shaped not only within corporate environments but also through sector-

wide advocacy and regulatory influence. They offer discursive and strategic benchmarks that reflect industry norms, set funding conditions, and promote structural change – making them essential for understanding the broader institutional landscape in which media companies operate.

This multi-level comparative strategy provides a robust framework for evaluating how gender, leadership, and power are constructed, contested, or strategically obscured across institutional scales and media environments.

3.3. Operationalisation

Importantly, the methodological approach operationalizes the five analytical pillars developed in the theoretical framework's synthesis. This is also what the coding scheme is derived from, and how the analysis started:

- *Structural Gendering and Power Distribution*: Examines how leadership roles are organized and described, who holds authority, how masculinized norms are embedded, and how access to decision-making is structured. This pillar directly draws on Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations, where organizational logics – from hierarchies to informal norms – reinforce male dominance. Acker shows that even "neutral" job roles embed masculinist norms, structuring access to leadership in ways that marginalize others. Millett (1970) supports this claim more broadly by arguing that institutions are not neutral but politically organized to sustain patriarchy. Applying this pillar allows the research to identify how leadership is structured in practice – not only who holds power but how it is legitimized. By coding for terms such as "leadership criteria," "executive presence," or "merit," the analysis reveals whether gendered assumptions underlie ostensibly inclusive discourse.
- *Intersectional Awareness and Epistemic Inclusion*: Assesses whether institutions acknowledge overlapping systems of oppression and whether marginalized voices and forms of knowledge are recognized within leadership discourse. This reflects hooks' (2000) and Crenshaw's (1991) emphasis on intersecting systems of oppression. As outlined in the Theoretical Framework, generic references to "women" often obscure race, class, and other exclusions. Intersectionality critiques liberal inclusion models that neglect how leadership remains inaccessible to most non-white, queer, disabled, or working-class individuals. The inclusion of this pillar thus enables an epistemological critique: whether institutions acknowledge the legitimacy of multiple knowledge systems and leadership styles. Codes associated with this pillar assess whether documents mention intersectionality, cite disaggregated data, or acknowledge structural inequality beyond gender alone.
- *Material and Symbolic Labor Recognition*: Analyzes how affective, reproductive, and diversity-related labor – including emotional and care work – is framed, valued, or erased in institutional narratives. Building on hooks' (2000) critique of capitalist co-optation and Fraser's (2009) work

on recognition and redistribution, this pillar evaluates how institutions frame affective labor, care work, and diversity initiatives. Often, such work is feminized, devalued, and invisibilized – a phenomenon well-documented in Grills (2018) and Eikhof (2017). This pillar codes for mentions of emotional or relational work (e.g., mentorship, DEI committees), assessing whether they are institutionally supported or merely expected. It reveals whether diversity labor is symbolic or materially recognized (e.g., compensated, structurally integrated).

- *Feminist Rhetoric vs. Structural Change*: Identifies gaps between feminist language and the implementation of redistributive strategies, exposing moments where rhetorical commitments lack structural follow-through. This links to Banet-Weiser's (2018) critique of "popular feminism" – where feminist language is absorbed into branding without redistributive consequence. Zuidervaart's (2011) concept of institutional justice similarly critiques surface-level reform as masking deeper structural inertia. This pillar identifies disjunctions between language and action: moments where documents use feminist-sounding terms ("empowerment," "equity") without accompanying policy detail or accountability. Codes like "strategic ambiguity," "symbolic inclusion," or "rhetorical commitment" enable analysis of institutional branding strategies that may signal inclusion while preserving power hierarchies.
- *Relational Practices and Institutional Accountability*: Evaluates the extent to which organizations embed transparency, reflexivity, and responsibility in leadership culture, or rely instead on symbolic gestures and superficial mechanisms. Rooted in hooks' (2000) and Dworkin's (1987) calls for collective responsibility and accountability, this pillar examines whether institutions embed reflexive mechanisms: transparency, reporting procedures, participatory governance, and stakeholder feedback. It assesses whether leadership culture is responsive to critique or merely performative. Codes target the presence of external audits, reporting lines, complaint systems, and their procedural clarity. The analysis will ask whether power is shared or simply monitored.

Important to note is that the choice to rely on textual analysis is shaped by practical constraints. Access to internal actors through interviews was challenging and limited or even unavailable; although attempts were made to contact female leaders, directors, and other prominent figures in significant companies and the wider cultural and creative industries – some directly involved in diversity, equity and inclusivity efforts, others included for their positionality as non-male, non-white, non-cisgender, and/or non-heterosexual – these individuals proved largely inaccessible due to busy schedules and institutional gatekeeping. However, this constraint aligns with the research's focus on institutional self-representation. The study is not concerned with individual attitudes but with how organizations construct leadership, gender, and power in their strategic narratives. These documents are thus treated as expressions of institutional epistemologies: so, what organizations know, say, and choose to emphasize.

In sum, this methodological design provides a theoretically consistent, practically feasible, and politically attuned approach to investigating how patriarchal norms are reproduced or resisted in the leadership cultures of media institutions.

3.4. Method of Analysis

The document analysis in this research was designed as a systematic process for evaluating institutional texts as sites where power, ideology, and organizational identity are actively constructed. Documents were treated not as neutral repositories of information, but as instruments through which institutions articulate strategic priorities, legitimize authority, and perform alignment with social values such as equity and inclusion. They serve both administrative and symbolic functions, making them especially relevant for analyzing how leadership cultures are narrated and framed.

Interpretation relied on a combined approach to content analysis, employing both manifest and veiled coding. Manifest codes were developed from explicit statements within the documents, such as leadership goals, diversity metrics, or stated commitments to equity. Veiled codes were drawn from patterns in language, tone, and structure, with attention to strategic ambiguity, symbolic gestures, or ideological framing. For instance, the repeated invocation of inclusion without clear mechanisms of implementation was treated as a meaningful discursive strategy.

This analytical framework is supported by the use of Atlas.ti, which provides a transparent and systematic environment for coding and thematic development. The software enables line-by-line coding across varied document types and supports the identification of recurring themes, contradictions, and omissions that are central to feminist institutional critique.

The coding process was guided by three critical dimensions: content (what is stated), structure (how it is framed), and omission (what is absent). These dimensions reflect the broader feminist critique at the heart of this research, which emphasizes the politics of visibility, the structuring effects of discourse, and the ideological work of silence.

To ensure analytical consistency, an initial codebook was developed based on a pilot set of documents and refined throughout the process as new themes emerged. Codes were grouped into thematic categories aligned with the five operational pillars outlined in the theoretical framework: structural gendering, intersectional awareness, recognition of symbolic and material labor, the gap between rhetoric and reform, and institutional accountability. Examples of recurring codes include "symbolic representation," "masculinized leadership norms," "intersectional invisibility," and "performative inclusion."

Each document was coded line-by-line, and emerging codes were organized into higher-order themes using the software's network view function. Frequent theme clusters included:

- Visibility versus invisibility of women and marginalized groups in leadership discourse;
- Policy framing of diversity and its operational vagueness;

- Narrative tension between progress rhetoric and structural inertia;
- Exclusion of intersectionality in strategic commitments;
- Delegation of change to external partnerships or symbolic committees.

By analyzing documents across institutional types and genres, the research traces both alignment and contradiction in how leadership and gender are constructed. Internal strategies are compared with external academic perceptions and critiques, highlighting the tensions between stated commitments and underlying logics of power. This dual reading not only supports the triangulation of findings but also enables a deeper understanding of how patriarchal leadership structures are maintained, negotiated, or contested within the cultural and creative industries.

The result of this thematic coding process is a multilayered map of how media institutions narrate, manage, or resist feminist leadership transformations. It operationalizes feminist theory in the empirical analysis, showing where and how institutional texts align or conflict with radical critiques of patriarchal power.

3.5. Ethical Considerations and Limitations

Given the feminist orientation of this research, ethical reflexivity and critical awareness of the researcher's positionality are essential components of the design. Although the study does not involve human subjects and is therefore exempt from formal ethical review boards concerning consent and anonymity, it nonetheless requires attentiveness to representational ethics, data integrity, and researcher accountability.

First, the use of public documents and media sources raises questions about how institutional narratives are interpreted and contextualized. While these texts are publicly available, their strategic nature means that they are designed to perform particular ideological functions. Ethical analysis must therefore interrogate not only the content of these texts but their rhetorical and political implications.

Second, there is the risk of confirmation bias. Given the critical stance of the theoretical framework, particularly its grounding in radical feminism and institutional critique, there is a potential that the analysis could lean toward affirming theoretical expectations rather than allowing findings to emerge inductively. This is mitigated triangulation of sources and iterative coding procedures. The use of negative case analysis also serves as a safeguard against interpretive closure, encouraging to account for contradictions or absences in the data.

Researcher positionality must also be addressed. As a feminist scholar critically engaging with power, there is an ethical obligation to remain reflexive about the analytical lens applied. This includes acknowledging the partiality of knowledge and the situated nature of critique. Throughout the project, care has been taken to balance critical scrutiny with respectful representation of institutional efforts, recognizing that some organizations are at different stages of awareness or transformation.

There are also limitations tied to the scope and accessibility of data. The analysis is restricted to publicly available documents; internal communications, decision-making processes, or informal leadership practices are beyond the reach of this study. As such, the analysis focuses on how institutions *present* themselves, which may differ from how they *operate* in practice. This creates a performative bias inherent to the data.

Lastly, although the study includes a diverse range of institutions, it remains concentrated on primarily Western, English-speaking contexts, with Dutch frameworks included as a secondary focus. As a result, the findings may not fully capture global variations in gendered leadership practices within media industries.

In summary, while this study is methodologically rigorous and theoretically grounded, it remains limited by the representational and strategic nature of its source material, the partial access to organizational dynamics, and the interpretive frameworks guiding its critique. These limitations are acknowledged transparently, and the ethical procedures in place aim to ensure that the analysis remains both critical and responsible.

3.6. Methodological Contribution and Alignment with Theoretical Framework

This research design contributes to feminist media studies and institutional analysis by advancing a methodological framework that integrates radical feminist critique with qualitative comparative case study logic. By aligning the methodological approach with the theoretical foundations laid out in the thesis, this research extends feminist institutional critique into applied analysis of real-world policy and strategy documents.

The use of document and media analysis to interrogate organizational narratives aligns closely with Acker's concept of gendered organizations, which emphasizes the ways in which bureaucratic logics conceal masculine norms within supposedly neutral institutional practices (1990, p. 142). The methodological focus on how leadership and diversity are discursively framed and operationalized in reports directly addresses Acker's call to make the invisible visible (p. 139) – particularly the gendered assumptions underlying institutional legitimacy and meritocracy.

Moreover, the radical feminist emphasis on structural power and the reproduction of patriarchal authority (Mackay, 2015; Thompson, 2012) is operationalized through the selection of documents that both explicitly and implicitly define the terms of leadership, inclusion, and transformation. This enables the research to identify how patriarchal ideologies persist through the symbolic and procedural elements of institutional strategy.

The use of thematic analysis, coding, and triangulation also reflects the influence of intersectional critique. By coding not only for gender representation but for exclusions and silences – so too around race, class, disability, and queerness – the analysis remains attuned to the layered and intersecting systems of inequality. This approach ensures that the methodology is not only theoretically aligned but ethically consistent with the aims of radical feminist praxis.

In practical terms, this study contributes a replicable methodological template for future research that seeks to analyze institutional alignment with feminist principles without relying on access to internal actors. It shows how institutional texts, often overlooked in favor of interviews or ethnographic observation, can serve as valuable artifacts for critical analysis. This methodological stance is especially relevant in industries where internal access is highly controlled or politicized.

Furthermore, the study offers a critique of current DEI discourse and policy frameworks by exposing the performative nature of many inclusion efforts. By applying feminist theoretical insights to the language and structure of institutional reports, the methodology challenges dominant paradigms of reform and accountability, offering a lens that is both critical and constructive.

Finally, this research design demonstrates how feminist theory can move beyond critique to actively shape empirical methodologies. It exemplifies the productive tension between theory and method, using methodological rigor to advance the thesis' central argument: that meaningful institutional change requires a fundamental reimagining of leadership beyond patriarchal norms. In doing so, the study reinforces the relevance of feminist methodologies to organizational research and cultural policy evaluation alike.

4. Results

This chapter presents the empirical findings of the study, based on a qualitative thematic analysis of institutional documents across the creative industries. Guided by a radical feminist and intersectional framework, the analysis interrogates how leadership, inclusion, and accountability are constructed within corporate reports, policy strategies, and public-facing commitments. Using Atlas.ti, the documents were coded both deductively – drawing from the five analytical pillars developed in the theoretical framework – and inductively, capturing patterns and contradictions as they emerged in the data.

The findings are organized into four thematic subchapters: 1) *Governance and Accountability*, which explores how organizations formalize responsibility and oversight mechanisms; 2) *DEI Implementation and Leadership Pipelines*, which examines how inclusion is operationalized through recruitment, mentoring, and advancement strategies; 3) *Ideological Framing and Strategic Ambiguity*, which analyses the discursive language used to frame DEI and feminism, and the extent to which these narratives reflect ideological positioning or reputational concern; and 4) *Structural Conditions and Intersectional Inclusion*, which focuses on resource allocation, epistemic inclusion, and how institutions approach race, class, gender, and accessibility.

While the original methodological framework was structured around five analytical pillars – 1) Structural Gendering and Power Distribution; 2) Intersectional Awareness and Epistemic Inclusion; Material and Symbolic Labor Recognition; 3) Feminist Rhetoric vs. Structural Change; and 4) Relational Practices and Institutional Accountability, the presentation of findings is organized differently. During the process of coding and thematic clustering, it became clear that the empirical data aligned more naturally around four broader thematic groupings. These thematic subchapters integrate multiple dimensions of the original analytical pillars but do so in ways that better reflect how the institutions themselves construct and communicate leadership, equity, and transformation.

This transition does not represent a theoretical shift but rather an analytical refinement. Each theme remains grounded in the conceptual concerns outlined in the Theoretical Framework. For instance, *Governance and Accountability* encapsulates elements of both structural gendering and institutional responsibility, while *Ideological Framing and Strategic Ambiguity* directly engages with critiques of performative feminism articulated by Banet-Weiser (2018) and Zuidervaart (2006). Similarly, *Structural Conditions and Intersectional Inclusion* incorporates intersectional theory (hooks, 2000; Intersectionality and Feminist Economics, 2024) and critiques of epistemic exclusion, while *DEI Implementation and Leadership Pipelines* links closely to Acker's (1990) analysis of gendered hierarchies in organizational logics.

As such, this reorganisation honours the theoretical structure of the thesis while allowing for an empirically grounded and conceptually coherent analysis of the documents studied.

Rather than treating institutional discourse as neutral, this chapter reads policy texts as political artefacts that reveal how organizations conceptualize gender justice, authority, and transformation. Taken together, the findings illuminate both the symbolic and structural dimensions of institutional change, highlighting the disjunctures between feminist rhetoric and material redistribution.

4.1. Governance and Accountability

This section examines how governance structures are mobilized in organizational discourse as mechanisms of legitimacy, oversight, and institutional accountability. Drawing from radical feminist and institutional theory, it explores the extent to which organizations operationalize responsibility for diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) at the executive level, and whether these mechanisms reflect genuine power redistribution or serve primarily reputational functions. The analysis asks: To what extent is there a system of accountability in place for implementing DEI commitments? Are decision-making responsibilities centralized or shared? Do governance practices move beyond audit-based models toward participatory or feminist-informed frameworks of collective responsibility? By analysing how institutional documents present leadership accountability – through board structures, ethics hotlines, oversight committees, or reporting procedures – this section identifies the degree to which governance is embedded in substantive commitments or remains a symbolic assurance mechanism. It further considers the presence of strategic ambiguity, examining how institutional language obscures or clarifies power structures. Through this lens, the chapter differentiates between governance models that reinforce hierarchical control and those that begin to integrate feminist principles of transparency, redistribution, and stakeholder inclusion.

Across the dataset, governance appeared both as a way for organizations to show legitimacy and as a practical structure through which they organized their DEI efforts. Most of the analyzed companies described formal accountability systems – usually involving executives or board members – as proof of their commitment. However, the analysis shows major differences in how these systems work, how strictly they are followed, and how transparent they are. Some reports outlined clear structures for oversight and follow-through, while others used vague language about leadership support without providing specific data or clear methods to measure progress.

Paramount's ESG report stands out for its explicit framing of governance as a board-level responsibility. It notes that "The Nominating and Governance Committee of the Board has direct oversight of our handling of ESG matters, and regularly considers ESG-related matters at its meetings." (2024, p. 21). Similarly, Disney's CSR disclosure identifies the Governance and Nominating Committee as responsible for monitoring "human rights-related policies", and the Compensation Committee for "topics such as workforce equity matters" (2023, p. 10). These examples reflect what feminist institutionalists would call formal rule enforcement; the visibility of inclusion within executive routines and risk management.

Yet, across several reports, these mechanisms are neither accompanied by enforcement strategies nor framed in terms of power redistribution. Universal Music Group (UMG), for example, references the existence of a "champion for women in music" on its Supervisory Board (2024, p. 47). However, the report does not clarify any evaluative feminist frameworks or accountability procedures. Similarly, Warner Music Group UK outlines mentorship and development programs as part of its DEI strategy (2024, p.13), but these are not accompanied by enforcement structures or redistributive measures. The absence of external evaluation or binding oversight reflects a broader pattern in which leadership inclusion is promoted without altering institutional power arrangements.

This ambiguity is consistent with critiques in the 2024 ReFrame report, which found that, despite many inclusion initiatives, "none [of the 19 researched series] had a showrunner who was a woman or of a minority gender" (p. 7). Feminist theorists such as Acker (1990) would interpret this gap as symptomatic of gendered institutional design – where inclusion is managed as an ancillary concern rather than a core function of leadership.

Moreover, even where governance mechanisms are detailed, they often operate through audit logics that reduce inclusion to risk or compliance categories. For instance, Disney (2023) and Spotify (2024) report periodical ESG reviews (p. 41; p. 47) and code-of-conduct trainings (pp. 13, 31; pp. 24, 31, 52) but frame these as instruments of reputational assurance rather than transformative tools. The documents lack any expression of aiming to center systemic change, and rather carefully formulate themselves – while still centering corporate resiliance, mitigating risks and preserving brand trust – to be progressive and inclusive. Spotify's ESG document states their "Equity, Diversity, and Impact (…) efforts are building a thriving, inclusive culture at Spotify while making a real impact in the world around us" (2024, p. 18); avoiding any language that states they are trying to change the patriarchal system.

In contrast to the predominantly audit-driven models found in the corporate sector, two Dutch public-sector documents – the Meerjarenstrategie 2025-2030 from the Commissariaat voor de Media and the Meerjarenbeleidsplan 2025-2028 from the Nederlands Film Festival (NFF) – articulate alternative frameworks that integrate elements of participatory governance and collective responsibility. The Meerjarenstrategie frames oversight not solely as a top-down imperative but as a shared response to complex issues developed in collaboration with stakeholders through reflection sessions (Commissariaat voor de Media, 2024, p. 10). This approach emphasizes that they regularly communicate about their oversight to provide insight into and accountability for their work (p. 6). By decentralizing responsibility and embedding reflective practice, the Meerjarenstrategie aligns with hooks's vision of collective accountability grounded in care, dialogue, and non-hierarchical governance (2000, p. 98).

A similar logic is visible in the NFF's four-year policy plan, which treats governance as a learning trajectory and collective commitment. The festival declares that it challenges the Dutch film sector to reflect on its own choices through open dialogue between stakeholders, policymakers, and

politics (NFF, 2024, p. 5). This communicative structure is reinforced by transparent reporting mechanisms, such as disclosing volunteer compensation practices, publication of a behaviour code, and the availability of both internal and external confidential counsellors to manage complaints (p. 18).

However, these participatory efforts coexist with persistent contradictions. The leadership framework in the Meerjarenstrategie endorses attentiveness to others but simultaneously stresses the need for decisiveness and leaders who stand by their decisions (Commissariaat voor de Media, 2024, pp. 7-8). This dualism mirrors Dworkin's critique that discourses of collective responsibility often operate within structures that preserve centralized authority (1987, p. 64). Similarly, while the NFF promotes horizontal consultation, its governance chart consolidates ultimate decision-making within an executive board and advisory bodies, maintaining top-down strategic control (NFF, 2024, p. 16).

Further evidence of these paradoxes can be found in how ethical reporting systems are operationalized. Paramount's ESG report highlights its 24/7 anonymous hotline, *OPENLINE*, managed by a third party to ensure confidentiality (2024, p. 20). Likewise, Disney lists "The Guideline" as a mechanism for confidential reporting and pledges that complaints will be handled respectfully and responsibly (Disney, 2023, p. 13). However, neither system offers insight into complaint outcomes, investigations, or structural consequences – or at least, this is not made clear in the document – rendering these mechanisms opaque. This aligns with Banet-Weiser's critique of popular feminism as a mode of visibility that often masks the absence of institutional transformation, where performative gestures of empowerment substitute for structural change: visible gestures toward ethics substitute for institutional transformation (2018, p. 24).

In contrast, the NFF incorporates binding elements such as its affiliation with and subscription to the Mores code, the national reporting centre for undesirable behaviour in the creative sector (2024, p. 18). While still situated within soft-law arrangements, this external anchoring introduces at least partial accountability beyond the internal chain of command.

Taken together, these examples reveal a continuum of governance models. At one extreme lie corporate audit regimes that integrate diversity and inclusion into risk portfolios – e.g., Paramount's quarterly dashboards to the Audit Committee (2024, p. 19) and Disney's integration of DEI into Enterprise Risk Management frameworks (Disney, 2023, p. 14). These mechanisms frame inclusion primarily as a safeguard for reputational stability rather than as a response to structural injustice. At the other end, public-sector institutions like the Commissariaat voor de Media and NFF demonstrate more participatory approaches that incorporate stakeholder dialogue, transparent reporting, and external review.

Yet even these relatively progressive examples fall short of what Acker describes as altering the foundational assumptions of organizational practice (1990, p. 146). Decision-making power remains concentrated at the board level, and stakeholders lack mechanisms for financial redistribution or policy veto. As a result, inclusion efforts, though symbolically significant, continue to operate

within and reinforce existing hierarchical structures. In conclusion, although "governance" has become a ubiquitous keyword in DEI strategy discourse, its enactment often remains procedural rather than transformative. With rare exceptions, most models prioritize auditability over accountability, and performance over power-sharing. Future frameworks would need to embed participatory monitoring, publish case outcomes, and allocate decision-making power more equitably to meet the demands of feminist institutional transformation.

4.2. DEI Implementation and Leadership Pipelines

This section investigates how organizations frame and implement DEI strategies related to leadership development and internal advancement. Focusing on inclusion as it is articulated through career pipelines, training initiatives, and demographic targets, the analysis evaluates whether such strategies contribute to structural transformation or reinforce existing institutional hierarchies. The central questions here include: Is leadership treated as a neutral site to be diversified, or as a historically gendered and racialised domain requiring structural change? Are authority and decision-making power meaningfully redistributed? Do organizations support long-term interventions such as professional development, educational reform, or succession planning for minoritised groups? This section draws on Acker's concept of gendered organizations and hooks' emphasis on collective empowerment to assess whether leadership pathways are procedurally equitable, transparently governed, and substantively inclusive. By distinguishing between developmental logics that individualize inclusion and systemic reforms that challenge dominant norms, the analysis reveals the extent to which DEI efforts function as either managerial tools or redistributive strategies aligned with feminist transformation.

Across the dataset, leadership-focused DEI strategies predominantly frame inclusion in terms of access rather than institutional transformation. Most initiatives concentrate on expanding representation through internal pipelines, mentoring programs, and reporting structures, but few challenge the underlying gendered or racialised hierarchies that determine who leads, how authority is exercised, and which norms are valued. This distinction reflects Acker's critique that treating organizational structures as gender-neutral obscures how dominant institutional logics are themselves gendered. Without challenging these foundations, additive inclusion fails to disrupt the hierarchical systems that sustain male dominance (1990, p. 140). Institutional transformation would require redistributing decision-making power, revising leadership evaluation criteria, or decentralising control—all strategies largely absent from the corporate documents reviewed. Instead, most reports articulate inclusion as a matter of individual development, positioning leadership as a meritocratic endpoint rather than a contested domain shaped by unequal access to authority.

At Spotify, the Equity & Impact Report claims that 40.8% of their directors identify as female (2024, p. 34). The report links these outcomes to internal equity audits and an "innovation culture" aimed at inclusivity, but avoids discussion of how leadership is defined or reproduced institutionally

(p. 31). Leadership is positioned as a neutral site to be diversified rather than a domain historically shaped by masculinist norms. Although Spotify references regular pay equity analyses and data-informed talent decisions (p. 33), it stops short of framing these measures as challenges to the underlying gendered power dynamics of leadership. The report outlines extensive demographic tracking and internal audits but does not articulate what consequences – if any – follow from failing to meet inclusion targets at the leadership level. Acker's argument that power is reproduced through seemingly objective systems of evaluation remains relevant: without interrogating the assumptions underpinning leadership competence, equity audits become managerial tools rather than redistributive mechanisms (1990, p. 146).

Universal Music Group references multiple DEI structures, including a "Global Impact Team" designed to "tackle a variety of critical issues, including equality" (2024, p. 4). This framing reflects a pattern common in the dataset, where taskforces or councils are positioned as consultative bodies without direct executive mandate. Although UMG refers to "artist-centric" strategies and the protection of underrepresented voices (p. 4), the governance link between these advisory structures and formal leadership remains ambiguous. There is no mention of promotion equity audits, gender-based succession planning, or redistributive targets. The absence of procedural accountability reinforces the sense that leadership development initiatives serve to surface diversity rather than institutionalise it. As in other corporate cases, the leadership frame centres on responsiveness rather than restructuring.

Warner Music Group emphasizes internal mobility and leadership training programs across its 2024 Impact Report. Its "Top Line" initiative, a global leadership program, aims to develop "mindsets, behaviours, and tools to tackle today's biggest challenges" (2024, p. 8), while "Management Explored" is framed as a tool for "fostering inclusive management styles" (p. 8). These initiatives are embedded within a framework of organisational learning and career development. However, no data is provided on the progression of minoritised groups into senior leadership, nor are outcomes tied to structural redistribution. While Warner UK launched targeted A&R internships for women and non-binary applicants in response to sectoral gender imbalances, the CEO explicitly frames these efforts as a "business imperative," with no institutional measures reported for long-term advancement or board-level change (WMG UK, 2024, p. 3). The report suggests leadership development is responsive to market opportunity, not necessarily anchored in equity.

Sony Music Group's 2024 Global Impact Report includes references to over 24 leadership development programs (2024, p. 9) and a DEI data model known as *MILES* – Measuring Inclusion, Leadership, and Equity Strategy (p. 13). While this model enables granular tracking of demographic indicators, the report does not outline structural consequences or enforcement mechanisms. DEI is framed as contributing to a "people-centric culture" and "career advancement opportunities" (p. 5), but not as a tool to challenge existing leadership norms or decision-making practices. The model's orientation is managerial and diagnostic, reinforcing Banet-Weiser's argument that popular feminism

is often absorbed into market logics, emphasizing visibility and individualism over structural challenge, thereby aligning more with corporate reputation than with feminist transformation (2018). Leadership is imagined as accessible through development rather than as a set of institutionalised relations to be transformed.

Across these corporate cases, leadership-focused DEI strategies adopt a developmental logic: inclusion is achieved through the expansion of opportunity pipelines, performance metrics, and competency frameworks. However, few reports articulate how these strategies intersect with institutional governance or resource control. Promotion remains conceptually individualised, with minoritised professionals encouraged to navigate existing hierarchies rather than reshape them. Even where disaggregated data is disclosed, it is rarely linked to policy enforceability or oversight structures. Leadership is treated as a site of aspiration and accountability, but not of conflict or institutional negotiation.

Public-sector initiatives in the dataset more clearly attempt to embed leadership equity within procedural mechanisms. For instance, the Nederlands Film Festival (NFF) frames inclusion not as a supplementary goal but as a structural requirement. The 2024 strategy report states that both the internal team and supervisory board must reflect the diversity of the Dutch population (p. 18), tying this ambition to practical reforms in recruitment, programming, and audience engagement. Selection procedures are revised to include representation criteria, while jury panels and presenters receive targeted awareness training and support (p. 18). These measures are embedded in organisational planning and are backed by partnerships with accessibility organisations and cost-reduction schemes for low-income audiences (p. 9). Leadership is not only diversified but subjected to procedural reform. This orientation aligns with hooks' argument that leadership accountability must include enforceable mechanisms, not just representational gestures (2000, p. 98).

While the CvdM's Meerjarenstrategie does not position leadership as its central concern, aspects of its funding framework reinforce the logic of structural accountability. The organisation ties funding eligibility to demonstrated inclusive practice, and evaluation procedures require recipients to document how leadership and governance structures reflect diversity commitments. This suggests that leadership is indirectly shaped through funding conditions, creating an external lever for institutional reform. Though less prescriptive than NFF, this model positions inclusion as a systemic responsibility rather than an individual achievement.

Taken together, the dataset reveals a divide in how leadership is operationalised across commercial and public institutions. Corporate strategies predominantly treat leadership inclusion as a capacity-building exercise, embedded in performance culture and individual growth models. While these approaches may improve access, they do not interrogate how leadership is defined or governed. Public-sector frameworks, by contrast, begin to articulate leadership as a shared and accountable structure – though not without limitations. The more procedural orientation of institutions like NFF

signals a move beyond representational optics, but tensions remain between symbolic progress and material transformation.

Most notably, across the sample, leadership is rarely defined as a gendered or racialised structure in itself. Instead, it is approached as a site of potential diversification, where inclusion can be measured through access but not through control. Acker's theory of gendered institutions remains salient: when organisational structures are presumed neutral, reforms risk reproducing the same hierarchies they aim to address (1990, p. 141). The policy materials suggest that DEI is widely understood as a tool for visibility, compliance, or brand enhancement – but less frequently as a framework for redistributing institutional power.

4.3. Ideological Framing and Strategic Ambiguity

This section analyzes how feminist ideas, DEI values, and institutional identity are discursively constructed in policy and strategy documents. Rather than evaluating inclusion based on numerical targets or procedural efforts alone, the focus here is on how institutions *frame* their commitments – what kind of ideological work is being done through tone, language, structure, and omissions. The analysis asks: Is inclusion positioned as a business advantage or a matter of social justice? Are feminist claims presented as structural commitments, or as symbolic gestures for reputational gain? Do documents acknowledge the political nature of institutional power, or do they maintain an image of neutrality and technocracy? Particular attention is paid to the use of strategic ambiguity – language that appears progressive but avoids specificity or accountability. Drawing on critiques by Banet-Weiser, hooks, and Zuidervaart, this section explores how popular feminist discourse is appropriated into corporate branding, often repackaging empowerment as individual advancement rather than collective transformation. By tracing how feminist rhetoric is mobilized, softened, or sidestepped, the analysis reveals whether institutions treat DEI as an ethical imperative or as a reputational strategy. This reading situates policy texts not just as operational blueprints, but as ideological artefacts that manage perception, authority, and legitimacy.

While corporate rhetoric around diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) has become increasingly standardized across the creative industries, the underlying structural commitments of such initiatives remain varied and often ambiguous. This chapter analyses how selected organizations articulate their aims regarding long-term structural inclusion, resource redistribution, and feminist-aligned transformation. Particular attention is given to the institutional language of commitment, recognition of systemic inequality, and the mechanisms proposed to redress power imbalances in leadership and access. In line with Zuidervaart's concept of institutional justice (2011), the analysis evaluates whether these organizations move beyond symbolic representation to structural redistribution.

Universal Music Group (UMG) asserts a commitment to systemic change through the establishment of its Global Impact Team, which aims to tackle structural inequalities across several axes, including equality, education, and community engagement (2024, p. 4). However, while the

formation of such teams signals institutional investment, the language of their remit often remains general and unquantified. The report frequently employs terms like "positive change" and "develop strategies" without specifying concrete redistributive policies or measurable benchmarks (p. 4). This aligns with Banet-Weiser's critique that corporate feminism often relies on empowerment discourse without challenging patriarchal structures (2018, p. 134). The reliance on reputation-driven language, such as "leading the industry" or "artist-centric innovation," frames inclusion as a competitive advantage rather than a justice imperative.

In contrast, Warner Music Group (WMG) provides a more detailed account of structural support mechanisms through its suite of internal leadership and mobility programs. The Top Line program and Management Explored initiative aim to equip leaders with inclusive strategies and offer executive coaching, explicitly aiming to diversify leadership pipelines (WMG, 2024, p. 8). Notably, these initiatives include international expansion into South Africa, Mexico, and South Korea, suggesting a more globalized approach to talent development (p. 8). However, while the scope of these programs is commendable, the report does not clarify whether these training opportunities translate into redistributive shifts in power or sustained changes in decision-making bodies. The structural impact thus remains implied rather than confirmed, resonating with hooks' (2000, p. 111) warning that care and inclusion must be embedded within systems of accountability to avoid mere representation. Furthermore, the report positions these initiatives under the banner of performance and operational excellence, indicating a residual alignment with managerialist logics.

Spotify’s Equity & Impact Report emphasizes internal workforce diversity and outlines efforts to improve representation across gender and racial categories, particularly in leadership (2024, pp. 3-6). However, the report frames these efforts within a language of talent development, employee satisfaction, and productivity. Terms such as “equity,” “impact,” and “inclusion” are used aspirationally but are not grounded in systemic or structural analysis. No mention is made of patriarchy, intersectionality, or redistribution. Moreover, DEI initiatives are described in relation to internal employee communities (e.g., employee resource groups), without reference to external accountability or transformative frameworks. This aligns with Banet-Weiser’s critique of institutional feminism being appropriated for reputational enhancement (2018, p. 144), and Zuidervaart’s warning about the depoliticization of justice language in neoliberal discourse (2011, p. 48).

At the level of national cultural policy, the Dutch Cultural Fund offers a more explicitly redistributive approach. The strategy proposes responsibility as a shared process, emphasizing participatory governance involving policymakers, artists, and production staff (Meerjarenstrategie, 2024, p. 12). This framework disrupts traditional hierarchical leadership models and aligns with Crenshaw's call for intersectional governance structures that account for overlapping systems of exclusion (1991). However, the strategy's practical implementation remains largely conceptual at this stage, and future reporting will be required to evaluate the extent to which participatory governance becomes institutionalised.

The Nederlands Film Festival (NFF) outlines a strategy for 2025-2028 that balances visibility with practical interventions. The plan emphasizes education, regional outreach, and talent development outside traditional channels (2024, pp. 6-8). While it does not explicitly name class-based exclusion or elitism, the focus on accessibility and decentralization suggests an intent to broaden participation in the cultural sector beyond dominant institutional pipelines. One notable initiative includes contributing to and supporting development programs for those from non-dominant backgrounds (p. 12). These efforts suggest a redistributive ambition grounded in both access and representation. However, the policy also adopts strategic ambiguity in its language, referring to broad societal goals and shared cultural values without delineating accountability mechanisms. As such, while the NFF recognizes structural exclusion, its strategies risk dilution if not paired with transparent implementation frameworks. The report does not clarify whether these initiatives are developed in consultation with marginalized communities or whether intersectional oversight mechanisms are in place.

The Disney EMEA CSR Report (2023) centers on external-facing initiatives such as inclusive content localisation and regional community programs, with an emphasis on storytelling that reflects audience diversity (2023, p. 6). The report mentions inclusive recruitment and internal employee networks but provides no substantive details on leadership accountability, systemic reform, or redistributive frameworks (p. 31). There is no reference to structural inequality or intersectional exclusion. Diversity is positioned as a narrative and engagement tool rather than a principle of institutional restructuring. This reflects broader concerns about symbolic inclusion that reinforces branding goals while avoiding structural critique, as warned by Banet-Weiser (2018, p. 144).

In summary, while some reports – particularly from the Dutch Cultural Fund and Spotify – incorporate aspects of long-term structural reform, most initiatives remain nested within symbolic frameworks or performance-driven DEI agendas. Strategic ambiguity, vague benchmarks, and a reliance on empowerment rhetoric undermine claims to radical inclusion. As hooks (2000, p. 111) emphasized, structural care requires accountability, transparency, and redistribution. These elements remain unevenly distributed across the field, with policy documents often operating within what Zuidervaart critiques as institutional inertia: a tendency to preserve dominant structures while signalling reform (2011, p. 44). Moving beyond liberal feminist integration thus requires not only rhetorical commitment but material intervention, sustained resource allocation, and systemic reorganization of authority.

4.4. Structural Conditions and Intersectional Inclusion

This section evaluates whether institutional approaches to inclusion are materially supported, intersectionally aware, and grounded in long-term structural change. Shifting the focus from symbolic discourse and individual access, it interrogates the structural conditions under which participation becomes viable: funding mechanisms, class barriers, epistemic recognition, and embedded systems of

support. The analysis asks: Are inclusion efforts backed by resource allocation, enforcement, and institutional infrastructure? Do they address overlapping marginalizations – race, class, disability, sexuality – and support epistemic diversity in leadership? These questions are rooted in intersectional feminist critique, which resists additive diversity models and instead calls for structural transformation. As hooks (2000, p. 111) and Zuidervaart (2011, p. 48) argue, care and justice require institutional commitment to material redistribution and plurality. Accordingly, this chapter assesses whether organizations embed solidarity, redistribution, and collective support, or whether inclusion is reduced to symbolic campaigns. The role of men as allies, and whether inclusion is framed as collaborative or exclusionary, is also considered.

The Universal Music Group (UMG) Annual Report offers a notable example of partial engagement with structural conditions. The report highlights investment in community programs and global initiatives but remains vague about how these investments translate into long-term institutional reform (2024, p. 116). For instance, while the Global Impact Team is referenced as a key driver for social equity, the mechanisms of its operation and its integration within organizational governance structures are not clarified. There is also limited mention of class dynamics or intersectional concerns beyond gender and race, pointing to a narrow operational scope for inclusion. The ambiguity surrounding long-term accountability structures and performance outcomes raises questions about whether these programs serve marginalized groups in sustainable and transformative ways.

Warner Music Group (WMG), by contrast, introduces explicit resource allocations in its report, including the Opendesk Internship and Mentoring Remixed (2024, pp. 13). These initiatives are framed as systemic responses to historical exclusion, with the Mentoring Remixed being “a reciprocal mentoring program that connects junior employees from traditionally marginalized communities with senior mentors” (p. 13). The report further indicates internal financial investments in leadership development for underrepresented employees. However, the absence of disaggregated data by class, ability, or sexual orientation, and a continued reliance on performance evaluation language, limits the extent to which the initiatives can be assessed as intersectionally grounded. While hooks (2000, p. 111) argues that genuine inclusion depends on systems of care that enable material flourishing, the WMG report tends to frame care as mentorship or coaching, not institutional transformation. Additionally, while funding is presented as ongoing, no timeframe or longevity guarantees are given, further complicating assessments of institutional commitment.

Spotify outlines a strategic focus on three areas: workforce equity, product inclusion, and creator equity (2024, p. 5). Initiatives such as GLOW and Frequency are highlighted as platforms aimed at increasing visibility and engagement for underrepresented communities, especially within the LGBTQIA+ and Black creator ecosystems (pp. 25, 35). While these programs demonstrate a commitment to representation and cultural awareness, the report lacks detailed discussion of structural redistribution, internal governance, or systemic accountability. There is no reference to demographic workforce data, leadership restructuring, or intersectional frameworks addressing class, disability, or

geographic inequity. Instead, equity is framed as an aspirational principle embedded in company culture and product design. This emphasis on branding and ecosystem support, without anchoring in material institutional transformation, reflects a symbolic model of inclusion. The absence of measurable accountability structures or redistributive strategies suggests alignment with liberal DEI paradigms, where visibility and innovation are prioritized over authority-sharing or anti-patriarchal reform. Zuidervaart's concern that institutions might selectively recognize injustice while failing to structurally address it is especially relevant here (2011, p. 54).

The Nederlands Film Festival (NFF) does include class dynamics and epistemic inclusion in its strategy plan. The organization explicitly references structural class elitism in access to education and the labor market, and proposes scholarships and mentorship programs for filmmakers from underrepresented backgrounds (2024). The inclusion of regional talent development and partnerships with educational institutions suggests efforts to widen institutional reach. However, there is less discussion of LGBTQ+ or disability inclusion, and the report does not elaborate on how male allies are engaged in feminist efforts – nor in any other samples, explicitly. For NFF specifically, now, this limits the extent to which the its approach can be read as fully intersectional or structurally embedded. Additionally, the strategy provides limited detail on evaluation criteria, raising concerns about how success will be measured and maintained over time.

Paramount's report repeatedly positions inclusion within a language of compliance and benchmarking, referencing metrics, key performance indicators (KPIs), and internal surveys (2024, pp. 4, 7, 20-3). While the company reports data disaggregated by race and gender, it provides no systematic account of how institutional barriers are dismantled or how material resources are allocated for inclusion. Inclusion is framed as an internal audit function, and equity becomes a matter of efficiency rather than justice. This reflects Banet-Weiser's concern that institutional feminism is often instrumentalised, becoming a tool of reputational management rather than structural care (2018, p. 144). Furthermore, the absence of structural reform narratives or community-centered collaboration suggests a model of inclusion that remains inward-looking and status-preserving.

Disney emphasizes external-facing representation and community campaigns but includes little data on resource redistribution or epistemic inclusion (2023). Although the report references partnerships and outreach initiatives, these are largely centered on audiences and content rather than internal hiring, leadership, or long-term equity strategies. Importantly, there is no mention of internal inclusion metrics beyond gender, nor is there acknowledgment of class or disability. In this way, inclusion remains aligned with consumer visibility rather than organizational transformation. The report thus falls short of meeting hooks' call for collective and material care practices (2000). The absence of sustained education and retention pathways further weakens the credibility of the inclusion model presented.

Across the dataset, material backing for inclusion efforts is uneven, and explicit engagement with intersectionality remains the exception rather than the norm. While Cultuurfonds and NFF offer

grounded and redistributive frameworks, corporate actors more often rely on performance metrics, symbolic partnerships, and narrow diversity targets. Intersectional categories such as class, disability, and geography are regularly under-addressed, and few reports explicitly position inclusion within a broader system of care. As Zuidervaart argues, institutional justice requires structures that not only recognize but actively sustain epistemic plurality and shared power (2011, p. 48). Without these, even well-intentioned DEI policies risk reproducing the very exclusions they seek to overcome. Institutions must therefore be evaluated not only on their rhetorical inclusivity or demographic reporting but on whether they embed care and justice into the redistribution of cultural, financial, and epistemic capital.

The analysis across this chapter demonstrates that institutional approaches to inclusion and leadership remain shaped by deeply embedded patriarchal norms. Governance structures, while often prominently featured, tend to serve as assurance mechanisms rather than vehicles for accountability or redistribution. As seen in the first section, formal oversight rarely translates into participatory leadership or shared responsibility. The second subchapter further highlights how DEI strategies focus on developing individual potential within existing hierarchies, rather than restructuring the foundations of authority. Leadership pipelines are framed as neutral pathways, masking how access and legitimacy are shaped by gendered and racialized assumptions. In the third section, this logic is reinforced by the strategic use of language: organizations frequently deploy feminist rhetoric while avoiding structural commitments, aligning with critiques of popular feminism and neoliberal co-optation. Finally, the fourth subchapter reveals that even when institutions acknowledge intersectionality or cultural safety, these acknowledgements are rarely matched by transformative action. Instead, inclusion is instrumentalized, and risk is framed in reputational terms. Together, these findings confirm the utility of a radical feminist framework for uncovering how institutions narrate change without destabilizing the conditions that sustain patriarchal power. This provides the foundation for the concluding chapter’s reflection on institutional transformation and feminist possibility.

5. Conclusion

This thesis set out to investigate how patriarchal leadership structures manifest in the creative industries, with a specific focus on music and film production companies, and to explore which radical feminist strategies might contribute to more inclusive models of leadership. The central research question guiding this research was: *How do patriarchal leadership structures manifest in the creative industries, specifically in music and film production companies, and what radical feminist strategies can be implemented to establish more inclusive leadership models?* This question emerged from the recognition that despite the increasing visibility of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts, leadership in cultural production remains predominantly white, male, and shaped by exclusionary norms.

In response, this study adopted a radical feminist institutional analysis, grounded in the theoretical contributions of Millett, Acker, hooks, Dworkin, and Banet-Weiser. Rather than examining individual attitudes or quantitative representation, the thesis interrogated the structural and symbolic mechanisms through which patriarchal norms are reproduced within institutional logics. The use of strategic documents, such as ESG reports, DEI frameworks, and cultural policy plans, allowed for an analysis of how organizations narrate and manage inclusion, governance, and authority.

This concluding chapter synthesizes the findings of the previous chapters and reflects on their broader theoretical and practical implications. In doing so, it moves beyond critique to consider what these findings mean for feminist institutional research, cultural policy, and future inquiry. By drawing these threads together, the chapter reaffirms the need to fundamentally reimagine leadership – not only who leads, but how leadership is structured, legitimized, and transformed.

Across the four analytical subchapters, this thesis has shown that patriarchal leadership structures persist in the creative industries not only through exclusion, but through structural inertia, symbolic compliance, and the repurposing of feminist language for institutional gain. Together, these findings answer the central research question by demonstrating how patriarchal power is maintained within leadership logics across music and film production companies, and why radical feminist strategies remain largely absent from institutional frameworks.

Chapter 4.1 illustrated that governance structures serve more as instruments of reputational assurance than as vehicles of power redistribution. In most corporate reports, inclusion was framed as a responsibility of executive boards or specialist committees, with oversight mechanisms such as ESG dashboards, ethics hotlines, or compliance trainings embedded in risk management frameworks. Rather than signalling an epistemic shift in how leadership is conceptualized or exercised, governance appeared instrumental – designed to demonstrate responsiveness, protect brand legitimacy, and avoid reputational damage. Public institutions, including the Nederlands Film Festival and the Commissariaat voor de Media, presented more participatory approaches, emphasizing stakeholder dialogue and horizontal accountability. Yet even here, final decision-making remained concentrated in

hierarchical structures. These patterns underscore how patriarchal authority remains embedded in organizational form, even where DEI ambitions are visible.

Chapter 4.2 extended this analysis by examining how leadership pipelines are constructed and operationalized through DEI initiatives. Most companies positioned inclusion as a matter of access: expanding representation through mentorships, audits, or talent development programs. However, these initiatives rarely challenged the underlying criteria through which leadership is defined, evaluated, or rewarded. Leadership remained masculinized in form – centered on abstract competence, autonomy, and resilience – and individualized in pathway. DEI efforts, though often robust in their internal scope, treated inclusion as something to be attained by navigating existing hierarchies, not by transforming them. This developmental logic aligned with Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations, which argues that institutions naturalize male norms of performance and render them invisible through discourses of neutrality and merit.

The third subchapter, 4.3, analyzed how organizations ideologically frame their inclusion efforts. Drawing on Banet-Weiser's critique of popular feminism (2018), it became evident that many institutions mobilize feminist terms such as "empowerment," "equity," and "impact" as markers of brand identity. These terms often appear in mission statements or CSR framing, but are decoupled from structural commitments to redistributive justice. This strategic ambiguity allows institutions to adopt the aesthetic of transformation without altering their internal power relations. Feminist discourse thus becomes a reputational asset – marketable and depoliticized – rather than a catalyst for change. Hooks' critique of feminism co-opted by market and institutional logic (2000) is especially relevant here, as inclusion is framed not as a practice of justice, but as a mode of institutional performance.

Chapter 4.4 addressed how institutions approach intersectionality and cultural safety, revealing that even when organizations acknowledge overlapping systems of oppression, they tend to do so through a risk-management lens. Structural marginalization is cited, yet few strategies move beyond recognition toward structural transformation. Where inclusion of underrepresented voices is addressed, it is often framed as beneficial for innovation or reputation rather than as a political imperative. Moreover, safety is frequently defined in procedural or legalistic terms – through codes of conduct or external hotlines – rather than through frameworks of care, mutual accountability, or collective wellbeing. This framing echoes Dworkin's critique that patriarchal institutions manage embodied vulnerability through abstraction and containment rather than through shared responsibility (2007, p. 64). Institutions may acknowledge the need for safety, but rarely center it as a relational or political commitment.

Taken together, these findings confirm that patriarchal leadership structures persist through a combination of symbolic compliance, managerialism, and epistemic exclusion. They also explain why radical feminist strategies remain largely absent from institutional frameworks. Such strategies, centering collective governance, redistributive leadership, and care-based accountability, conflict with

dominant organizational logics grounded in efficiency, competitiveness, and control. Even where incremental progress occurs, it is often framed in terms of performance, rather than transformation.

This synthesis also answers the second part of the research question: What radical feminist strategies could be implemented to challenge these structures? The empirical findings suggest that genuine transformation would require institutions to adopt participatory models of governance, recognize and compensate symbolic and affective labour, embed intersectional leadership criteria, and relinquish control as the primary mode of authority. These shifts would move leadership from a masculinized, individualistic model toward a relational, accountable, and inclusive practice grounded in feminist values. While rare in the analyzed documents, partial elements of these strategies were visible in public cultural policy, particularly in funding frameworks that tied inclusion to access, transparency, and shared decision-making. These isolated examples, however, remain structurally constrained by broader neoliberal and patriarchal institutional norms.

In sum, the thesis has shown that patriarchal leadership is not a residual condition to be corrected through inclusion metrics or talent development. Rather, it is a constitutive feature of how leadership is defined, legitimized, and institutionalized in the creative industries. Radical feminist theory makes this visible, and offers conceptual and practical tools to reimagine leadership as a site of collective responsibility, epistemic plurality, and structural care.

The findings of this study substantiate the value of a radical feminist framework for analyzing leadership structures in the creative industries. By drawing on Millett's (1970) understanding of patriarchy as a political institution, Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations, and hooks' (2000) ethics of care and structural accountability, the thesis demonstrates how leadership functions as a key site through which patriarchal power is reproduced. The research confirms that leadership is not a neutral or technical function but is deeply embedded in gendered, racialized, and classed institutional norms. These norms are sustained through discursive framings, symbolic gestures, and procedural logics that obscure inequality while legitimizing existing hierarchies.

Acker's theory proved especially generative in interpreting the structural findings. Her claim that organizations are not gender-neutral but systematically reproduce masculine norms through job design, evaluation standards, and informal cultures was evident across the dataset (1990, p. 140). Leadership in the analyzed documents was consistently framed in terms of disembodied competence, strategic thinking, and autonomy – qualities that reflect historically masculinized ideals. At the same time, inclusion efforts were individualized and depoliticized, asking marginalized individuals to adapt to dominant standards rather than challenging the standards themselves. This confirmed Acker's assertion that inequality is most enduring when embedded in supposedly neutral organizational processes (1990, p. 142).

Millett's (1970) conceptualization of patriarchy as a political system also proved foundational. Institutions did not simply reflect broader gender inequalities – they actively organized them. Even

where inclusion was prioritized, institutional authority remained rooted in hierarchical and masculinized governance structures. Decision-making power was rarely redistributed; instead, feminist language was layered atop existing arrangements. Millett's distinction between structural power and symbolic participation provided the conceptual vocabulary to differentiate between representation and transformation. The widespread use of feminist rhetoric in institutional reports – without accompanying changes to governance or resource allocation – underscored her point that systems of male dominance are sustained through ideological conditioning and cultural legitimacy (Millett, 1970, pp. 25-29).

Hooks' (2000) work brought additional depth to the interpretation of institutional care and accountability. Her insistence that care is not merely interpersonal but structural highlighted the limits of compliance-based safety measures. Initiatives such as ethics hotlines, reporting portals, and DEI dashboards were framed as tools for protecting individuals from harm, yet rarely addressed the systemic power structures that produce exclusion in the first place. While some public-sector documents moved toward participatory governance and collective reflection, they often maintained centralized control. Hooks' emphasis on collective responsibility, mutuality, and material support helped frame these efforts as partial and constrained. Her work also guided the critique of how feminist leadership is narrowed into respectable, marketable forms – available only to those who align with dominant institutional values (hooks, 2000, p. 3).

Banet-Weiser's (2018) critique of popular feminism was particularly useful in analyzing how feminist language circulates within the creative industries. She argues that empowerment has been transformed from a collective project of justice into an individual, brand-compatible aspiration. This logic was evident in the data: companies presented DEI initiatives as evidence of innovation, resilience, or "impact," reducing feminism to a corporate asset. The thesis confirms her view that feminist discourse has been aestheticized, instrumentalized, and reabsorbed into institutional logics of growth, competitiveness, and reputational advantage. At the same time, it expands on her framework by illustrating how institutions do not simply borrow feminist language, but actively reorganize it to reinforce existing authority.

Dworkin's (2007) contribution helped articulate the limits of technocratic safety and the institutional avoidance of embodied vulnerability. While her critique is often applied to sexual politics and physical autonomy, its core insight – that patriarchal systems manage bodies through domination, abstraction, and silence – remains relevant in the organizational context. The analysis revealed that care was frequently framed as a policy category rather than a lived practice; bodily realities, affective labour, and caregiving responsibilities were largely absent from leadership frameworks. This affirmed Dworkin's contention that patriarchy remains operative precisely where bodies are excluded from institutional imagination.

While these theoretical perspectives proved analytically robust, some limitations also emerged. The radical feminist framework was less well-equipped to account for hybrid institutional practices –

initiatives that partially incorporate feminist values while remaining constrained by organizational structures. It also offered limited tools for analyzing ambiguity, contradiction, or co-optation as strategic and negotiated processes. These gaps suggest the potential value of integrating adjacent frameworks, such as Black feminist thought, decolonial feminism, or feminist organizational sociology, in future research. Still, the central insight remains: Leadership cannot be understood apart from the systems of gendered power that shape institutional knowledge, authority, and legitimacy.

While this thesis offers a theoretically grounded and empirically supported analysis of patriarchal leadership structures in the creative industries, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. These reflect not only practical constraints, but also the epistemological choices made in designing the research.

First, the study relies exclusively on public-facing institutional documents – ESG reports, DEI frameworks, annual plans, and policy strategies – as its data corpus. These texts are valuable for what they reveal about how institutions narrate inclusion and leadership, but they are not direct reflections of internal dynamics or lived experience. Organizational self-representations are often curated and strategic, especially in the context of reputational risk. As such, the analysis cannot account for informal power structures, interpersonal dynamics, or unrecorded forms of resistance and negotiation. This limits the study's ability to assess how institutional discourse translates into practice.

Second, the exclusion of interviews or ethnographic observation was a pragmatic and political decision. Despite attempts to contact female, queer, and racialized leaders within the sector, access was largely denied or obstructed. While this constraint aligns with the study's focus on institutional epistemologies rather than individual experiences, it also narrows the perspective. A richer understanding of how feminist practitioners navigate institutional spaces – how they resist, comply, or subvert dominant norms – remains outside the scope of this research.

Third, the thesis is geographically limited to primarily Western, English-speaking institutional contexts, with some inclusion of Dutch cultural policy. As such, its conclusions may not be fully generalizable to global creative industries, particularly those shaped by postcolonial, Indigenous, or Global South frameworks. Patriarchal leadership takes different forms across institutional, legal, and cultural settings, and future research would benefit from a more comparative or transnational scope.

Fourth, the theoretical framework – while rigorous – also imposes certain limitations. The choice to center radical feminism provides analytical clarity and political coherence, but it also risks overlooking alternative or hybrid models of feminist resistance that do not align neatly with its principles. In particular, the emphasis on systemic critique may downplay incremental or tactical interventions that can hold transformative potential, even if they do not meet a purist standard of structural change.

Finally, the thesis is shaped by the researcher's own positionality: a feminist academic working within the institutional context she critiques. While the study employs reflexivity and maintains

analytical distance, it is not outside the systems it examines. This embeddedness underscores the political nature of feminist research itself and reaffirms the need for transparency, humility, and openness to complexity in the interpretation of power.

The findings of this thesis carry significant implications for how leadership is conceptualized, practiced, and challenged within the creative industries. Most immediately, they suggest that institutional inclusion efforts – particularly those focused on representation, talent development, or reputational metrics – are insufficient when decoupled from structural transformation. Organizations may publicly embrace diversity and equity, but if their internal governance, evaluation criteria, and authority structures remain intact, such efforts risk reinforcing the very hierarchies they claim to dismantle.

For media companies, labels, festivals, and cultural policy bodies, this implies that inclusion must move beyond demographic counting and toward institutional redistribution. This includes not only revising leadership pipelines but redefining leadership itself. Metrics such as executive diversity rates or DEI investment cannot substitute for structural analysis. Institutions should examine how decisions are made, by whom, and according to which norms of legitimacy. Redistributive practices – such as participatory governance, collaborative budgeting, or collective decision-making frameworks – should be treated not as experimental or symbolic, but as integral to feminist organizational transformation.

Furthermore, the study underscores the need to materially support the labour of inclusion. Emotional labour, representational labour, and diversity advocacy are often offloaded onto marginalized employees without adequate compensation or authority. Institutions must formally recognize and resource these contributions – whether through workload redistribution, dedicated infrastructure, or meaningful influence over policy and culture. Without this, DEI becomes another form of exploitation: politically potent in appearance but disempowering in practice.

The thesis also calls into question how inclusion is framed in corporate narratives. When empowerment is presented as a business advantage – an indicator of innovation, agility, or brand leadership – it becomes detached from its political roots. This framing aligns with Banet-Weiser's (2018) critique of popular feminism as a mode of reputational performance. Feminist practitioners working within institutions must remain vigilant against this co-optation, resisting efforts to reduce structural critique to marketable identity. Public commitments to diversity should be accompanied by accountability structures, transparency about failures, and long-term plans for redistribution – not simply branding initiatives or momentary campaigns.

Cultural policymakers and funders, especially in the public sector, have an important role to play in this process. As seen in examples like the Nederlands Film Festival and the Dutch Cultural Fund, policy instruments can require institutions to demonstrate procedural equity, stakeholder participation, and transparent governance as conditions for funding. These mechanisms – when

implemented meaningfully – offer a pathway for holding institutions accountable to feminist principles. However, even in these cases, change remains limited by hierarchical control and the absence of enforceable sanctions.

Finally, the findings speak to feminist practitioners and coalitions operating within or adjacent to institutions. The gap between institutional rhetoric and structural commitment is not only a site of frustration, but also of opportunity. Independent networks, advocacy groups, and unionized creative workers may find ways to leverage the visibility of inclusion agendas while pushing for deeper change. The feminist project of transforming leadership will not be achieved solely through institutional reform. It will require coordinated pressure, cross-sector solidarity, and a refusal to accept appearance in place of accountability.

Building on the findings and limitations of this study, several promising avenues for future research emerge. First, more empirical work is needed on the informal dynamics of leadership cultures within creative and cultural institutions. Ethnographic or observational studies – such as boardroom shadowing, meeting ethnographies, or diary studies with decision-makers – could illuminate how gendered authority operates outside formal texts. These methods would offer insight into how leadership is enacted, challenged, or negotiated in daily practice, complementing the institutional discourse analysis conducted here.

Second, future research should examine how feminist knowledge and critique circulates within institutional environments. This includes tracing how concepts like “equity,” “care,” and “intersectionality” are translated, resisted, or depoliticized within organizational processes. Mapping these epistemic flows, for example, through interviews with DEI professionals or analysis of internal training materials, would offer a deeper understanding of the politics of meaning-making inside institutions.

Third, a comparative analysis of masculinized leadership cultures across different segments of the creative industries, from music production and film to publishing, fashion, and advertising, could reveal both sector-specific logics and transversal mechanisms of exclusion. Special attention should be given to how leadership norms are gendered, racialized, and classed in ways that uphold patriarchal legitimacy.

Fourth, there is a pressing need for research on how female and minoritized leaders are incentivized or pressured to conform to dominant standards of whiteness, respectability, and marketability (hooks, 2000, p. 3). A focused inquiry into leadership performativity – for instance, through media profiles, hiring trends, or self-narratives of “successful” women in leadership – could expose how institutional norms shape not just who leads, but how they must lead.

Fifth, an underexplored yet critical topic is the relationship between institutional leadership and the nuclear family model. The organization of work in the creative industries remains deeply entangled with gendered and heteronormative assumptions about care, time, and mobility. Research

on paid parental leave policies, caregiving arrangements, and the cultural logics surrounding parenthood in management could reveal how family structures are naturalized in ways that uphold patriarchal norms – often privileging men or childless women in leadership tracks. Studying how creative institutions frame parental support could thus illuminate broader ideologies of control, flexibility, and embodied labor in leadership contexts.

Finally, future research should consider how emerging digital governance mechanisms – including algorithmic hiring, AI-driven promotion tools, and workplace surveillance – interact with gendered leadership hierarchies. Do these technologies amplify existing biases or create new forms of exclusion? A radical feminist analysis of digital infrastructures could contribute meaningfully to debates on the future of institutional authority and feminist resistance.

Taken together, these directions suggest that research on leadership in the creative industries must remain attentive to the material, cultural, and epistemological layers of power. Moving beyond institutional statements toward lived experience, ideological critique, and structural analysis will be essential for understanding, and ultimately transforming, the persistent masculinization of leadership in cultural production.

This thesis has argued that patriarchal leadership in the creative industries is not simply a legacy of exclusion, but an ongoing institutional logic – sustained through structures of governance, symbolic inclusion, and epistemic control. Even as organizations embrace the language of equity and visibility, they often do so in ways that preserve masculinized authority, depoliticize feminist demands, and instrumentalize diversity as a reputational asset. In response, the research has advanced a radical feminist analysis of leadership – one that insists on redistribution, structural accountability, and care as central to institutional transformation.

Leadership, as it is currently practiced in many cultural organizations, remains tethered to normative ideals of autonomy, neutrality, and control. These ideals, as this study has shown, are gendered, racialized, and classed – shaping not only who leads, but how leadership is defined and legitimized. This framing must be disrupted. Reimagining leadership requires more than reformist strategies or symbolic representation. It calls for a fundamental shift in how authority is shared, how power is held to account, and how institutional practices are aligned with feminist values of justice, mutuality, and structural care.

This project is not complete, nor should it be. Feminist institutional critique is necessarily ongoing; attentive to contradiction, grounded in situated knowledge, and committed to practical transformation. The goal is not simply to expose the persistence of patriarchal norms, but to imagine – and demand – alternatives. If cultural institutions are to reflect the futures they claim to support, they must begin by transforming the conditions under which leadership is imagined, practiced, and distributed. Anything less is not inclusion, but illusion.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158.

Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). *Empowered: Popular feminism and popular misogyny*. Duke University Press.

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2017). *Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Commissariaat voor de Media. (2023). *Strategie 2025–2030: Toezicht met maatschappelijke impact*. https://www.cvdm.nl/publicaties/.

Dworkin, A. (2007). *Intercourse* (20th anniversary ed.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1987).

Eikhof, D. R. (2017). Analysing decisions on diversity and opportunity in the cultural and creative industries: A new framework. *Organization, 24*(3), 289-307. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508416687768.

Grills, M. (2018). Creating a more inclusive industry: The Alliance for Women Film Composers. *Women Leading Change, 4*(1), 61-70.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. South End Press.

Institute for Economic Justice. (2024, March 18). *Intersectionality and feminist economics: A call for radical transformation*. https://iej.org.za/blogs/intersectionality-and-feminist-economics-a-call-for-radical-transformation/.

Mackay, F. (2015). Radical feminism. *Theory, Culture & Society, 32*(7-8), 332-336. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276415616682.

Millett, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. Avon Books.

Nederlands Film Festival. (2024). *Meerjarenbeleidsplan 2025–2028*. https://www.filmfestival.nl/.

Paramount Global. (2024). *2023–2024 ESG report*. https://www.paramount.com/.

Raine, S., & Strong, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Towards gender equality in the music industry: Education, practice and strategies for change*. Bloomsbury Academic.

ReFrame & Women In Film. (2024). *ReFrame report on gender & hiring in TV: 2023–2024*. https://www.reframeproject.org/.

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. Knopf.

Shoard, C. (2024, February 20). *UK film industry may achieve gender parity in 2085, study finds*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/film/2024/feb/20/uk-film-industry-may-achieve-gender-parity-in-2085-study-finds.

Smith, S. L., Choueiti, M., Yao, K., Clark, H., & Pieper, K. (2020). *Inclusion in the director's chair: Analysis of director gender & race/ethnicity across 1,300 top films from 2007 to 2019*. USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative.

Sony Music Group. (2022). *Global impact report*. https://www.sonymusic.com/.

Spotify Technology S.A. (2024). *Equity & impact report 2024*. https://www.spotify.com/.

The Walt Disney Company. (2023). *Sustainability & social impact report*. https://thewaltdisneycompany.com/.

Thompson, D. (2012). *Radical feminism today*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446219102.

Universal Music Group. (2024). *Annual report 2024*. https://www.universalmusic.com/.

Verhoeven, D., Coate, B., & Zemaityte, V. (2019). Re-distributing gender in the global film industry: Beyond #MeToo and #MeThree. *Media Industries, 6*(1), 136-163.

Warner Music Group. (2024). *DEI, gender pay gap, and ethnicity pay gap reports – UK edition*. https://www.wmg.com/.

Warner Music Group. (2024). *Impact report 2024*. https://www.wmg.com/.

Appendix A

Atlas.ti Codebook

name	comment	codegroup
Who holds decision-making power?	Leadership must dismantle male-dominated hierarchies; create feminist, non-hierarchical alternatives	Structural Gendering and Power Distribution
Does content challenge patriarchal norms?	Disrupts gender norms, objectification, violence; centers women's narratives	Structural Gendering and Power Distribution
Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?	Leadership accountable to inclusive, feminist goals beyond profit	Relational Practices and Institutional Accountability
Are marginalized groups given structural authority?	Power-sharing models, community control, co-governance	Intersectional Awareness and Epistemic Inclusion
Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?	Policies with binding targets, budgets, and enforcement mechanisms	Feminist Rhetoric vs. Structural Change
Do DEI programs change labor conditions?	Structural improvement in conditions for women, BIPOC, LGBTQ+, disabled workers	Material and Symbolic Labor Recognition
Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?	Support for caregivers, parental leave, anti-harassment protections	Material and Symbolic Labor Recognition
Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?	Resists branding/PR use of feminism; focuses on structural change	Feminist Rhetoric vs. Structural Change
Are creators empowered as agents of change?	Marginalized creators control narratives; storytelling as liberation	Intersectional Awareness and Epistemic Inclusion

Appendix B

Atlas.ti folder / overview tables

document	quotation	codes
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	probleemgericht, risicogestuurd, proactief en systeemgericht toezicht	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	probleemgericht, risicogestuurd, proactief en systeemgericht toezicht	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	we kennen elkaars kwaliteiten, waarderen die en vertrouwen erop	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	We bevorderen dat media-aanbod vrij is van politieke en commerciële invloeden.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	Een deel van de Nederlanders voelt zich niet gerepresenteerd of erkend door (publieke) media.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?, Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?, Are creators empowered as agents of change?, Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Meerjarenstrategie-2025-2030.pdf	We bevorderen de diversiteit aan geluiden in het medialandschap	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?, Are creators empowered as agents of change?, Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?

NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Raad van Toezicht (RvT), bestaande uit zeven leden die in herkomst en geslacht de samenleving representeren	Who holds decision-making power?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	inclusieve organisatie; zowel het team (medewerkers, freelancers en vrijwilligers) als de RvT-leden moeten de Nederlandse bevolking weerspiegelen. Aan deze prioriteit geven we de komende jaren vorm door bewustwordingstrainingen, andere selectieprocedures en begeleiding op de werkvloer.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?, Who holds decision-making power?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Jaarlijks worden de salarissen en freelance tarieven geïndexeerd.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Tijdens het festival organiseert het NFF, mits noodzakelijk, filmpolitieke werkbijeenkomsten rond specifieke onderwerpen uit het audiovisuele veld waarover kort daarna politieke besluit- vorming plaats zal vinden.	Who holds decision-making power?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Het NFF ondersteunt en draagt bij aan initiatieven als KLEUR en Vrouwen in Beeld om gelijkwaardigheid en inclusiviteit binnen de sector te stimuleren.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Het NFF hanteert een gedragscode, heeft zowel een interne als externe vertrouwenspersoon en is aangesloten bij Mores (Meldpunt ongewenste omgangsvormen podiumkunsten-, televisie- en filmsector).	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	We zetten actief in op een inclusieve samenstelling van het team, onder meer bij werving van medewerkers en vrijwilligers, en door een veilige werkomgeving te creëren.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Ook in themaprogramma’s als Vrouwen in Beeld en Queer Day met geselecteerde films en gasten, stimuleren we het gesprek over urgente en actuele onderwerpen.	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	. In 2021 introduceerde het NFF een genderinclusief Gouden Kalf voor beste acteerprestatie, een ontwikkeling die felle discussies	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?

	opleverde, zowel in onze sector als daarbuiten.	
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Deze Talenthub, opgericht door Studio Camera en ondersteund door het NFF, wordt een plek waar beeldmakers met verschillende achter- gronden een uitdagend curriculum en veilige ruimte vinden om hun handschrift en talent verder te ontwikkelen.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
NFF-Meerjarenbeleidsplan-2025-2028.pdf	Voor makers van digitale cultuurproducties bieden we elk jaar drie Fellowships Digitale Cultuur. Bij dit traject verkennen de geselecteerde kunstenaars een jaar lang nieuwe interdisci- plinaire manieren om werk te creëren. Zij krijgen de financiële ruimte en de begeleiding om hun eigen grenzen te verleggen en om het begrip van het artistieke en technologische proces te verdiepen.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Globally, women's representation in the workforce is consistently growing, both overall (now 52.2% of our global workforce) and within executive roles (36.7% globally).	Who holds decision-making power?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	29.9%	Who holds decision-making power?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	MOBILITY IMPACT LEADERSHIP EQUITY SAFETY	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	partnership with The MOM Project – a community growing by 20,000+ moms, dads and allies every month – to support bringing members back into the workplace. Currently, the organization supports 90% female and 50% ethnically diverse candidates through hiring, education and retention solutions.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Women's Initiative Network (WIN)'s mission is to unite and support Sony women of all levels and backgrounds, to promote their professional development and	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?

	opportunities within the company, and to foster community in the Sony universe as well as with other external women's groups	
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	HUE's (Helping Unite Everyone) mission is to empower, celebrate, and build community among the diverse and intersectional community of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) at Sony Music Group and beyond. HUE focuses on harnessing the collective power of our communities to shape global culture throughout the entertainment industry.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	we are committed to making sure our workplaces are not only more representative of our communities, but also truly equitable spaces where diverse colleagues of all backgrounds and at all levels are excited to stay and grow their careers	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	This includes our commitment to pay equity. We're conducting regular surveys in pursuit of that goal, such as internal evaluations and collaborations with Mercer, in which we assess systemic differences in employee pay by gender and race (where that information is available). We're using that information to help ensure our employees are being paid fairly, and getting equal pay for equal work. This work will continue on a regular basis.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	To offer every employee inclusive support as they develop skills and explore career options, and to support colleagues from historically excluded groups in advancing to leadership, we've partnered with leading organizations	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	We know that DE&I commitments must go beyond what we say to what we do. Today, every employee—in every division and department—has an opportunity to help us take our company take the next transformative steps towards enhancing our company culture, by	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?, Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?

	embracing our DE&I framework and strategy, MILES.	
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Annual reimbursement for wellbeing expenses • Virtual and in-person health fair and annual enrollment campaign • Sony Music Group provided more than 200 counseling sessions and wellbeing webinars over the last 2 years • Increased fertility coverage, which includes IUI, IVF, egg freezing and surrogacy • Increased bereavement leave allowance • A series dedicated to raising awareness and dispelling harmful stigmas about mental health • Virtual fitness and meditation sessions • Virtual and onsite counseling sessions with our EAP provider • Mental health webinars • Online and text-based mental health and sleep support • In the U.S., provide comprehensive care, including reimbursement for travel if it is required to access healthcare services.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	• Hundreds of workshops focused on DE&I education, Early Careers, Core Professional Skills, and other key career aspects	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	The Village's mission is to create a space for working parents and caregivers to come together to share diverse experiences, resources, and solutions in a supportive and non-judgmental way in an effort to ensure our employees and their families thrive. We want to support employees through their parenting and	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?

	caregiving journey from pregnancy, delivery, time away from the office, return to work and beyond.	
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	SWIM is committed to building a community of women from across the company, and beyond, to celebrate, support, empower and develop. We will actively champion diversity, inclusion, equality and allyship by providing opportunities for networking, increased representation, development, increased safety measures and hosting inspirational events - working together to change the narrative.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Outloud, a group for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ+) and LGBTQ+-friendly employees. Raising awareness of important LGBTQ+ issues and culture, networking opportunities and finding opportunities to extend support to the larger community.	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	further upgrades to our parents rooms; continued mandatory accessibility training; and gender identity resources for all employees.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	In recent years, we've launched global philanthropic funds; spearheaded civic engagement campaigns; implemented policies to make good on our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion; created new initiatives to support our artists and songwriters; and regularly surveyed our global team to determine our next frontiers. These are just a few examples of the efforts we make to support our people, our communities, and our environment—all while maintaining high standards of governance that set up our business for long-term success.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	every single individual who makes our work possible. From our global team to our artists, songwriters, composers and creators —as a member of Sony Group Corporation —it takes enormous creative collaboration from all	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?

	kinds of people to push our music industry forward.	
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	developing initiatives, experiences, and programming to champion diversity, advance equity, and foster inclusion. It means advocating for measurable and actionable solutions to systemic issues that impact our communities. It means introducing programs that support our people holistically—from career advancement opportunities to mental health services. And it means taking a modern, flexible approach to work-life balance. In other words: at Sony Music Group, we are fully invested in helping our people reach their fullest potential.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Legacy Unrecouped Balance Program An initiative paying through qualifying earnings to many of our longstanding artists, songwriters and participants around the world—without regard to their recoupment status. This unprecedented effort is part of our commitment to developing new financial opportunities for our talent, and it has already helped thousands of creators and estates receive millions of dollars in royalty payments for the first time in decades.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
SMG-Global-Impact-Report.pdf	Beyond our royalty analytics and enhancement tools, we also offer SME artists a Real Time Insights app for as-it-happens analysis of key data informing marketing decisions and royalty collections – including the platforms, playlists and audiences driving engagement and consumption as well as copyright information and registration status of songs around the globe.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	40.8% Woman	Who holds decision-making power?

Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	o emphasize continuous learning with existing people managers, we introduced a new Inclusive Leadership workshop to over 120 global leaders across the business focused on: • Cultivating inclusive team norms • Creating a culture of collective care • Driving inclusive talent development	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?, Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We believe in amplifying our bandmate's unique perspectives, backgrounds, and experiences. With Spotify operating in 184 markets, expanding cultural intelligence, and adapting across work styles is core to our success as a global company.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We conduct our employee engagement survey, Tune In, biannually which delivers invaluable insights into employee sentiments. We track progress against the following statements	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We have conducted an annual pay-equity review since 2015 comparing the pay of bandmates who are doing "like for like" work. The goal of these reviews is to identify and rectify any pay differences that cannot be accounted for by experience, performance, or other valid factors. We also consider pay equity when making other pay decisions, such as during hiring and compensation reviews. Our ultimate aim is to foster an environment where equitable pay practices are consistently applied, and every employee is compensated fairly.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We launched a new guide curated for transgender and non-binary employees to feel informed, prepared, and supported during their transition process at work. The guide is also a helpful tool for anyone who may find themselves supporting transitioning members	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?

	of the Spotify community and beyond.	
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We work across our business to ensure that our hiring leaders and recruiters have the tools, resources, and support they need to attract and retain diverse talent globally. We apply the same lens to internal hiring to ensure bandmates have a fair and positive experience. We work closely to design processes and tools to embed best practices and accountability with internal movement and the growth of talent. We're working toward three key outcomes: • Building diverse teams that reflect the global nature of our business • Best-in-class processes that mitigate bias and are accessible to all • A consistent process with tools and resources for recruiters and hiring managers to be effective We support our bandmates, especially our interviewers and hiring leaders, with the tools, resources, and training to practice inclusivity throughout the hiring process. Our interview training modules provide additional education on how to make the recruitment and hiring processes more inclusive.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We're proud of our global support for parents, offering every bandmate six months of paid parental leave when they expand their family. In 2024, we launched a new parental leave hub to make navigating the leave process easier for everyone. By centralizing essential information on a new dedicated hub, employees are provided with many resources that make the process of taking parental leave more accessible.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	• Parental leave: We provide a minimum of six months of paid gender-neutral parental leave for biological and adoptive parents. In 2024, 6.6% of full-time bandmates took parental leave. Out of these, we saw that 53.0% were men,	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care

	42.8% were women, and 4.2% used another term/did not declare.	work recognized?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Family-forming and expansion: We offer family- planning benefits, including in vitro fertilization (IVF), egg freezing, and adoption services to all bandmates.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	All The Feels: This Employee Assistance Program (EAP) provides bandmates and their loved ones with therapy coverage and access to free, confidential, professional counseling sessions. • Work from Anywhere: The value created by our people doesn't depend on where they work, so we support bandmates to choose what works best for them, either working at home, from one of our offices or something in between	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Domestic Abuse Support Program At Spotify, our goal is to help bandmates understand, recognize, and effectively respond to domestic abuse through our Domestic Abuse Support Program. The program provides training on how to identify the signs of domestic abuse and respond with appropriate support; we also have a directory of local organizations that can help. We support all bandmates affected by domestic abuse through the following initiatives: • Training and resources • Paid leave and work adjustments • Subsidies for temporary accommodation • Safety planning • Confidential referral service: one-to-one sessions with social workers through an external partner	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Spotify is dedicated to advancing gender equity in music through the EQUAL Global Music Program,	Does content challenge

	launched in 2021 to amplify and celebrate women creators worldwide.	patriarchal norms?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Spotify's destination for celebrating Black art, entertainment, creativity, culture, and community— both on and off platform—	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Across music, we supported new playlists highlighting black, LGBTQIA+, and women talent and artist releases through paid ads and on platform promotion	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	we were committed to transparency and accountability, measuring our progress across key areas that define our success. These include	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Inclusion and amplifying diverse voices are at the heart of everything we do—both within Spotify and in the communities where we live, work, and play. This work isn't just something we talk about; it's central to who we are, driven by our commitment to lasting change.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Within Spotify, we strive for pay equity, fairness, and equal access to career growth opportunities. EDI is not only essential to creating a workplace where everyone can thrive but also powers innovation, fosters belonging, and helps bring our values to life. Beyond our walls, we leverage the power of our platform to make an impact. Through campaigns and strategic partnerships, we uplift the world's voices, support creators, and make well-being a priority for our audiences.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	NextGen is a program that empowers creators through training, resources, and opportunities. Supported by the Creator Equity Fund, Spotify partnered with four Historically Black Colleges and Universities	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	In February 2022, Spotify established the Creator Equity Fund (CEF), a multi-year initiative to amplify and support primarily	Are creators empowered as agents of change?

	Black and LGBTQIA+ artists and creators in the U.S., U.K., and Brazil. Since its inception, we've leveraged our resources to help professional and aspiring creators reach new audiences, connect with industry influencers, and hone their crafts. Through the CEF, our goal is to ensure equity is part of the industry's DNA and Spotify's ecosystems for years to come.	
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	We regularly assess high-level risks, including ESG risks, to our business through our Enterprise Risk Assessment Program.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Spotify-Equity-Impact-Report-2024.pdf	Our Spotify Code of Conduct and Ethics is our principal policy regarding business ethics, and it sets the tone for how we expect all employees and those acting on Spotify's behalf to act. The Code requires respect for and compliance with laws, rules, and regulations. We maintain robust ethical policies and procedures, including our global policies on the prohibition of bribery and corruption, conflicts of interest, insider trading, discrimination and harassment, and protection of confidential data and personal data. We also prohibit all forms of human trafficking, slavery, servitude, and forced or compulsory labor in our business and supply chain. All bandmates are prompted to annually review and acknowledge their compliance with the Code and with many of these key global policies (Global Policy Review). This exercise is reinforced by accompanying training videos (on compliance-related topics such as conflicts of interest, anti-corruption, side businesses, insider trading, and confidentiality) and messaging from senior leadership that sets the tone from the top on reiterating the importance of compliance with these policies. By the end of 2024, 94.6% of bandmates had completed their Global Policy Reviews. All new employees are also expected to comply with and confirm their commitment to abide by policies	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?

	prohibiting corruption, discrimination, and harassment within the first 30 days of employment. We will continue to follow-up with any employees that have not yet completed the training.	
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	ME is our award-winning global training program for people managers. Delivered in sessions over 14 weeks, ME focuses on fostering inclusive management styles and adapting to change	Who holds decision-making power?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	ERGs at WMG are employee-led communities designed to foster inclusivity, support diverse perspectives, and empower individuals from underrepresented groups. Our 10 ERGs, with chapters across the world, include	Who holds decision-making power?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	Our local offices and ERGs have produced an array of programs to honor occasions that are important to various communities, and allow all employees to celebrate these events, no matter their personal background	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	In the past year, the Workplace Experience team has focused on several initiatives in regard to neurodiversity, gender inclusivity, and mental and physical wellness. For example, we are developing a set of operational principles to better accommodate neurodivergent individuals across our offices. This year we have broadened the use of wellness rooms in our U.S. offices to support prayer, meditation, and other elements of mental and physical wellness.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	Our ERGs organized nearly 70 events in 2024 to build community, network, and learn together	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	an inclusive workplace free from discrimination and harassment,	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	Our new Family Caregiver Leave policy ensures employees receive full pay for up to 6 weeks while caring for an ill family member.	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?, Do

		DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	In the U.S., we expanded our partnership with Progyny, a Fertility and Family Planning benefits specialist. Our benefit includes two initial consultations per year, fertility medication coverage, and options for fertility preservation.	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?, Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	Now in its third year, our Go Visit program allows employees to work remotely for up to 20 days a year from anywhere in the world, offering flexibility and promoting work-life balance. I	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	We also delivered tailored training covering topics like implicit bias to teams in Turkey, Italy, Poland, MENA, India, the UK, and South Africa to help give a nuanced view of what diversity looks like in each local community.	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?, Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	To promote gender equality, Warner Chappell Music hosted a mixer with nonprofit Women in Film for the second year at our Downtown LA office. This event brought together more than 200 women from the film, television, and music industries. It provided a platform for aspiring professionals to connect with industry veterans	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	We remain eager to promote gender diversity within the music industry, especially in areas where women have been historically underrepresented, such as the Artists & Repertoire (A&R) function	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?, Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	give them the expertise and opportunities to amplify their unique visions and reach fans everywhere. Our goal is to nurture their creativity and help them navigate the complexities and challenges of the music industry	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
WMG_2024_Impact_Report_Final.pdf	Top Line is our global leadership development program. Each year, we expand the program's global reach and build leadership	Are creators empowered as agents of change?, Do

	networks across North America, Europe, Latin America, Africa, Australia, and Asia. Our goal with Top Line is to equip leaders with the mindsets, behaviors, and tools to tackle today's biggest challenges and to lead and innovate in our rapidly changing world. Graduates of Top Line are invited to join the global Top Line X Alumni community, providing further opportunities for networking, problem solving, and ongoing career development.	DEI programs change labor conditions?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	GENDER/RACIAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY 50% 6 out of 12 Director nominees are women and/or racially/ ethnically diverse GENDER DIVERSITY 42% 5 out of 12 Director nominees are women RACIAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY 25% 3 out of 12 Director nominees are racially/ ethnically diverse (Asian, Black, Latina)	Who holds decision-making power?

TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	The company has nominated 12 Directors for our 2024 annual meeting whose backgrounds encompass a range of talents, skills, and expertise, including experience leading global organizations. Eleven of those 12 Director nominees are independent.† Our Directors reflect the diversity of the company's shareholders, employees, customers, guests, and communities, with six out of 12 nominees representing diverse gender, ethnic, and/or racial backgrounds.	Who holds decision-making power?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Oversight and strategic direction related to key policies, practices, and programs discussed in this report are illustrated in the chart to the right. This chart reflects functions that collaborate on select sustainability-related efforts, but does not include all functions within each vertical depicted.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	• Sets standards for when, where, and how social compliance audits assess compliance with ILS program standards • Reviews audit and assessment reports regularly and issues corrective action plans, as appropriate, to promote improvement in working conditions	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Disney's Center for Living Well (CLW) provides high-quality healthcare and helps our employees, cast members, and their families stay well and get the care they need. Since its opening, the CLW has expanded to now include a pharmacy in Anaheim, California, in addition to locations in Orlando, Florida and Celebration, Florida that offer preventive care, gynecology, obstetrics, vision services, mental health care, and more. The Center for Living Well is open to active employees, cast members, and covered family members enrolled in eligible medical plans	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?

TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	isney is committed to fostering a respectful and equitable workplace culture. As part of that focus, we broadened our 2023 adjusted pay ration analysis to include data for bonus and long-term incentive awards, in addition to base pay, for eligible U.S. employees based on gender, race, and ethnicity, controlling for role, experience, and location. Each adjusted pay ratio was 99%+ as of September 2023, across all categories.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	In 2023, almost all hourly full-time and part-time employees within our U.S. Disney Experiences business earned a base rate of $17/hour or more, and median hourly earnings were $19/hour.†	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Family care resources such as childcare and senior care programs, long-term care coverage, paid family care leave, and a family-building benefit supporting options such as fertility treatments and adoptions • Free mental health and well-being resources	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	introducing a new personalized online Annual Enrollment benefits experience; conducting an equity review of U.S. health and retirement plans; implementing global minimum standards for international medical, life, and disability plans;	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	The Disney International Labor Standards (ILS) program governs labor standards compliance across the extensive supply chain for Disney-branded consumer products. Now in its third decade, the ILS program: • Establishes requirements for licensees and vendors to monitor their supply chains for compliance with Disney's Code, including local labor and environmental laws • Specifies where products may be produced and maintains the names and locations of factories	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?

	authorized to manufacture Disney-branded products • Sets standards for when, where, and how social compliance audits assess compliance with ILS program standards • Reviews audit and assessment reports regularly and issues corrective action plans, as appropriate, to promote improvement in working conditions • Provides guidance, training, and capacity building to vendors and licensees on how to improve the labor conditions of their facilities	
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Reimagined Mickey's Toontown at Disneyland Resort Opened with accessibility in mind, including sensory and interactive elements and storytelling that celebrates our differing abilities	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	We foster a culture of belonging that enables our workforce to deliver stories, experiences, and products that reflect, and resonate with, global audiences	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	We invest in the talent development, career mobility, safety, and overall well-being of our people to inspire and empower them to do their best	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Disney endeavors to be a force for good, bringing positive, meaningful, and measurable impact to communities around the world. Guided by our Charitable Giving Guidelines, we prioritize financial contributions, in-kind donations, and nonprofit collaborations that align to our sustainability and social impact focus areas; leverage our unique resources, skills, talents, and expertise; and address pressing community needs.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Film Independent Imaginar Producers Residency Supports Hispanic and Latino independent producers with a $50K	Are creators empowered as agents of change?

	grant and mentorship, made possible by Disney, Searchlight Pictures, and the National Association of Latino Independent Producer	
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	$1M in grants Contributed in celebration of the theatrical release of Marvel Studios' Black Panther: Wakanda Forever to nonprofits working to reduce the gender gap in technology	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	99%+ adjusted pay ratios For U.S. employees based on gender, race, and ethnicity	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Oversees environmental, social, and governance programs and reporting, including with respect to environmental sustainability policies and initiatives, as well as human rights-related policies, lobbying, and political strategy	Who holds decision-making power?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Disney conducts business in accordance with high standards of business ethics and complies with applicable laws, rules, and regulations. We hold our Board of Directors accountable to our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics for Directors. Our Standards of Business Conduct apply to our employees and include resources and tools that help promote ethical conduct and compliance with the law. We regularly engage our leaders and employees on these standards through training and other communications.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	We take a meaningful and measurable approach to expanding our pipeline of talent and strive to follow industry best practices, including marketing roles on platforms that reach potential candidates from a wide range of sources. We offer optional training to support leaders in identifying, attracting, and engaging a multifaceted talent pool. And we foster accessible workplaces and strive to recruit, train, and integrate	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?

	employees with disabilities in alignment with industry best practices. To attract and retain talent across the company, we also invest in talent development programs across the enterprise, including initiatives such as the Black Talent Network, Heroes Work Here, Women's Talent Network, and Disney Aspire.	
TWDC-EMEA-CSR-Report_2023.pdf	Our Board's Governance and Nominating Committee has formal oversight of environmental, social, and governance programs and reporting, including with respect to environmental and sustainability policies and initiatives related to climate change impacts. Leadership provides updates on these and other ESG topics to the committee at least annually.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	a new A&R internship for women and non-binary individuals.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Publication dates are very important in understanding pay gap data - it takes a long time for positive actions to feed through into results.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Please remember, reporting our next set of Gender Pay Gap data early is not a mandatory requirement. We'll be doing it to demonstrate the impact significant changes in the top leadership quartile are having in narrowing our Gender Pay Gap	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?, Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	t is also not mandatory to report our ethnicity pay gap data. We're doing that because we believe it's the right thing to do. And we know that transparency about our Ethnicity and Gender Pay Gaps together will help us in our drive to become a more diverse and inclusive company at all levels.	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	We are making positive progress in the diversification of our business through the implementation of a number of targeted initiatives. From a companywide restructure that addressed the gender and ethnicity imbalance at the most	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?

	senior levels of the business and the promotion of employees from within, through the introduction of new programmes, to opening our doors to young professionals, we are addressing pre-existing structural and systemic challenges and seeing real change emerge. We know that lasting change will take some time to become fully embedded across the company; however, we are confident that our strategic approach - which places employees at the centre of our initiatives – will redesign the community and culture as you want to see it within Warner Music.	
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	new parental leave policy, which includes up to 12 months leave for all parents, with up to 26 weeks of that being fully paid	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Our A&R internship for women and non-binary individuals is tackling the longstanding tradition of male domination in certain roles and at senior levels of the business. We are also incredibly proud of our new parental leave policy, which includes up to 12 months leave for all parents, with up to 26 weeks of that being fully paid. Coupled with our emergency back-up care for children and elders through Bright Horizons, without doubt this makes us an industry leader in this space. Gender equality in parenting leads to gender equality at work	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Gender equality in parenting leads to gender equality at work.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	addressing structural barriers to equity,	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Across the Upper Middle, Lower Middle and Lower Quartiles, our female representation is over 58%	Who holds decision-making power?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	But it's important to note that while our results are presented in a binary format (female/male), we recognise that gender is not binary, that we have trans, non-binary and gender expansive people working at	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?

	WMG, and that these groups are underrepresented in leadership roles. While we can't yet report on this dimension of representation, due to data quality and data privacy concerns, we are working to address these issues.	
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Employees can also benefit from Coach's Corner, which offers 60 minute confidential one-to-one sessions with a professional coach to help you reach these goals or overcome any challenges you might be facing. We have handpicked a library of culturally competent coaches with diverse backgrounds offering a wide range of experience and insight to support you on your career journey.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	This demonstrates our commitment and ability to attracting diverse talent at entry level which, through the development, nurturing and promotion of employees internally, will set us in good stead for cultivating a more diverse overall workforce in the future.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	To reflect this, we expanded Management Explored, our flagship global management development programme available to all people managers, which helps to build and nurture inclusive high performing teams. Alongside this, WMG's award winning leadership development programme, Top Line, has so far seen 36 global leaders come together over ten months to take part in virtual and in person learning experiences and intensive personal coaching. Underpinned by the core principle of leading inclusively, this initiative is creating a community of leaders who are trained to manage and support diverse teams, and delivering real world impact by solving high value signature leadership problems.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?

	Spearheaded by Women of Warner and our People team, and nominated for Music Week's Women in Music Award, Leaders on the Rise brings female leaders together throughout the year at a number of events designed to educate and empower. One of the many sessions held last year, "Step into your power", led by Executive Coach, Emma Hossack, focused on sharing knowledge and experience with junior team members on how to prepare for a promotion. We are planning more of these events for 2024.	
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Gender representation and pay gap at Warner Music UK (WMUK)	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	We want to change that perception and level the playing field so that all young people, regardless of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status or any other diversity dimension, can access the industry we work in. Research has shown that due to historical and systemic barriers, non-White ethnic groups are disproportionately likely to be economically disadvantaged. As such, whilst we are striving to level the playing field for all, our social mobility initiatives aim to impact higher proportions of employees from underrepresented ethnic groups.	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Employees with children born or adopted on or after 1st June 2023 will now benefit from: \ Up to 26 weeks' full paid maternity / paternity leave \ Up to 12 months' leave for all parents which no longer has to be shared with your partner \ Flexi working for four weeks before and after your leave	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?

	\ Childcare allowance for two years for all eligible employees Our progressive approach to parental leave takes gender out of the equation. We are levelling the playing field, challenging the stereotypes about gender and parenting, and supporting employees as they raise a family. It's a powerful investment in the long-term sustainability of our company and will fuel further progress in closing the Gender Pay Gap.	
WMG-UK-DEI-GPG-EPG-Reports-FINAL-1.pdf	Music has a long history of influencing society and impacting the world around us. We believe it is important to play our part in driving positive change and providing platforms to enable employees to play your part. We are all accountable and we can use our influence to increase our impact.	Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	Eric Hutcherson (Executive Vice President, Chief People and Inclusion Officer	Who holds decision-making power?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	UMG is managed by corporate executives (the Corporate Executives). The current Corporate Executives consists of nine key members, each of whom oversees a specific aspect of the business.	Who holds decision-making power?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	The Company's employee resource groups (ERGs) provide a platform for underrepresented employees to network, share experiences and help shape employee programming, and play a crucial role in supporting the Company's commitment to fostering inclusion and belonging.	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	Directors Executive Directors Non- Executive	Who holds decision-making power?

	Directors Senior Managers Female 5 0 5 13 Male 9 2 7 56 Total female and male 14 2 12 69 % Female 36 0 42 18.8 % Male 64 100 58 81.2	
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	While the composition of the senior management as at December 31, 2024 was considered to be diverse, the Company acknowledges that there is room for improvement, especially with regards to gender diversity. Although such improvement cannot happen overnight, especially since the senior managers are typically committed to the Company for the long term, the Company has the aspiration that by December 31, 2026, at least 20% of the senior managers is female, which would reflect a 2.5% increase compared to December 31, 2023, i.e., the date on which the D&I Policy became effective.	Who holds decision-making power?, Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	The Company supports equitable pay practices through the implementation of a global job architecture, in which individual pay reflects experience, skillset, performance against goals and scope of responsibilities but does not differentiate on the basis of protected characteristics.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	Specifically for the Board and senior management1, the Board has also adopted a separate diversity and inclusion policy (the D&I Policy) as per articles 2:142b and 2:166 of the Dutch Civil Code and best practice provision 2.1.5 of the	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?

	Code, laying down the elements of a diverse and inclusive composition of the Board and senior management as well as appropriate and ambitious aspirations in this respect. As set out in the D&I Policy, the Company acknowledges the benefits of greater diversity, including with regards to gender or gender identity, age, nationality, ethnicity and cultural or other background, and remains committed to ensuring that the Directors and senior managers bring a wide range of expertise, experience, competencies, other personal qualities and perspectives	
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	With respect to the Board, the Company is committed to promoting diversity and inclusion in the boardroom and to ensuring that all Directors are able to contribute to Board discussions and has the aspiration: ■ to improve or safeguard gender diversity among the Non-Executive Directors, such that at least one third of the Non-Executive Directors is female and at least one third of the Non-Executive Directors is male, thereby at all times taking into account the Dutch statutory gender diversity requirement with regards to the Non-Executive Directors; ■ to improve gender diversity among the Executive Directors, such that at least one Executive Director is female and at least one Executive Director is male in the event that there are three (or more) Executive Directors; and ■ to improve or safeguard diversity with regards to age, nationality,	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?

	ethnicity and cultural or other background as well as to create and maintain a variation in expertise, experience, competencies, other personal qualities and perspectives within the Board.	
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	With respect to the senior management, the Company is committed to promoting diversity and inclusion among the senior managers and has the aspiration: ■ to improve gender diversity among the senior managers, such that by December 31, 2026, at least 20% of the senior managers is female, which would reflect a 2.5% increase compared to December 31, 2023, i.e., the date on which the D&I Policy became effective, and at least 20% of the senior managers is male; and ■ to improve or safeguard diversity with regards to age, nationality, ethnicity and cultural or other background as well as to create and maintain a variation in expertise, experience, competencies, other personal qualities and perspectives within the senior management.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	MG's Code of Conduct includes a zero- tolerance policy towards harassment, discrimination, violence, child labor, slavery, human trafficking, and unsafe working conditions.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	ur Code of Conduct encourages an inclusive environment that promotes individual expression, creativity, innovation, and achievement and emphasizes that within UMG diverse backgrounds and skills are valued as well as individual differences in race, ethnicity, gender or gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, religious affiliation, age, experience, and thought.	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?

UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	And finally, one of 2024's announcements of which I am proudest is the formation of our Global Impact Team, whose mission is to enact positive change in our industry and in the communities in which we serve. This cross-functional group of executives brings a deep understanding of our global organization and will develop and execute strategies to tackle a variety of critical issues, including: equality; mental health and wellness; food insecurity and the unhoused; the environment; and education.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	Encouraging a growth mindset through mentoring and programs that support a culture of innovation	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	As the Company is committed to enhancing its appeal as an employer and creating a positive and healthy workplace, it provides programming and support for a Company-wide culture of physical health, mental health and overall wellbeing. The Company has in place regionally- specific employee assistance programs, which, among others, include counseling sessions, in-the-moment support for emotional wellness, self-guided mindfulness, cognitive behavioral therapy programs and work-life assistance	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	Globally, our employee benefits are suited for the diverse needs of our workforce and support a company-wide culture of physical health, mental health awareness, and overall wellbeing. In addition to competitive compensation structures, our total rewards program is central to our strategy for enhancing our appeal as an employer and creating a positive, healthy workplace. While specific benefits vary by region, in the United States, for instance, UMG's medical plans provide unlimited access to mental health services at no cost when using in-network	Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?, Do DEI programs change labor conditions?

	providers; includes comprehensive family support programs and prioritize women's health through targeted benefits; includes 12 weeks of paid family leave time to care for loved ones; and covers travel for employees and eligible dependents for fertility-related medical care.	
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	WOMEN'S NETWORK: Serves to advance the position of women in the music industry by providing a support system that allows members to express themselves and realize their goals – both professional and personal	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?
UMG_2024_Annual_Report.pdf	s a champion for women in music	Who holds decision-making power?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Our Board is also ethnically diverse, has a majority of female members, and has a member who identifies as LGBTQ+, bringing a diverse set of experiences and perspectives to its deliberations.	Who holds decision-making power?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Our Board consists of our non-independent, non-executive chair and five other directors, all of whom are independent	Who holds decision-making power?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Office of Global Inclusion (OGI)	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Payouts under our short-term incentive program (STIP) are primarily based on performance against quantitative and qualitative measures, including ESG priorities. For 2023, 5% of the company's performance for STIP purposes was based on a holistic, qualitative assessment of how well we continue to make progress on company-wide equity and inclusion initiatives. An additional 5% was tied to organizational development, including building a high-performing and inclusive culture.	Is leadership evaluated based on feminist goals?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	The CBS Performers with Disabilities Talent Initiative broadened its focus in 2023, offering opportunities for people with disabilities (PWDs) to	Are there enforceable policies for inclusion?, Do DEI programs

	enhance their acting, storytelling, and pitch capabilities. CBS Casting and Paramount's Office of Global Inclusion (OGI) also created an internal task force to ensure robust programming and enhanced access.	change labor conditions?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	In 2023, we built on our brands' and studios' longstanding efforts to broaden our creative talent pool by hosting our third consecutive year of apprenticeships through the Content for Change Academy. The Academy continues to provide emerging storytellers with paid experience in entry-level creative and production roles — with no need to enroll in traditional four-year colleges or universities	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Pay equity is also an essential component of an unbiased, dynamic workplace, and we believe that all employees should be paid fairly and equitably, based on the requirements of their role and their performance, regardless of their gender or ethnicity. We are committed to the ongoing process of regularly reviewing pay equity. We plan to further enhance the progress that we have made on our global job architecture, which will enable us to work toward conducting our perennial pay equity reviews on a global scale.	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	• Health, life, and disability insurance • Matching 401(k) contributions for U.S.-based employees • Tuition reimbursement up to $10,000 annually • Pre-tax commuter benefits, including bicycle expense reimbursement • Enhanced fertility, adoption, and surrogacy benefits • 12 weeks of paid parental leave • 6 weeks of paid caregiving	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is reproductive labor or care work recognized?

	• Childcare, eldercare, pet care resources • Flexible work hours • 3-week to unlimited PTO for full-time U.S. employees (pro-rated first year)	
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Drawing on our research and the perspectives of our transgender, non- binary, and gender-expansive colleagues, we are working to tell stories that subvert stereotypes, inspire allyship, and promote understanding	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	We strive to create programming that enables children to see themselves in diverse characters, while growing in empathy and curiosity	Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Our Creators House event series brings together emerging creators, industry executives, and storytellers to share ideas, break bread, and design the future of the most inclusive, authentic content.	Are creators empowered as agents of change?
Paramount_ESG_Report_2023-2024.pdf	Our commitment to ESG starts at the top, with our Board of Directors and senior leadership. The Nominating and Governance Committee of the Board has direct oversight of our handling of ESG matters and regularly considers ESG-related matters at its meetings	Who holds decision-making power?
Reframe_ReportDocument_TV_2024_FINAL.pdf	This chart displays the consistent average gap of nearly 12% for directors and 14% for writers year over year (2021-24) between the percentage of regular episodes written or directed by qualifying candidates and the percentage of pilot or first episodes written or directed by qualifying candidates.	Who holds decision-making power?, Does content challenge patriarchal norms?
Reframe_ReportDocument_TV_2024_FINAL.pdf	Showrunner: None had a showrunner who was a woman or of a minority gender. • Director or Writer: Only one of these projects qualified in each of these categories by having more than 50% of their episodes written or directed by a qualifying candidate. None of them met the 25% inclusion rubric for employing	Who holds decision-making power?

	persons of color in either of these categories.	
Reframe_ReportDocument_TV_2024_FINAL.pdf	Hollywood's institutions have thus far failed to make inclusion part of the industry's DNA"	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?, Is there critique of capitalist co-optation of feminism?
Reframe_ReportDocument_TV_2024_FINAL.pdf	Overall, year over year, persons of these minority genders remain underrepresented in all key roles	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	a 2020 UCLA study found that across eleven studios, 91% of CEOs and 80% of senior executives were male	Who holds decision-making power?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	Only 18.6% of studio subsidized film deals and 35.7% of studio subsidized television deals were with women-owned companies in 2018.	Who holds decision-making power?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	Only 18% of production companies with non-studio funding were women-owned	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	The average funding valuation for male Entrepreneur survey respondents was $24.4 million—over seven-times that of female Entrepreneur survey respondents' average funding valuation	Are marginalized groups given structural authority?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	Only 18.6% of studio subsidized film deals and 35.7% of studio subsidized television deals were with women-owned companies in 2018	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	The average funding valuation for male Entrepreneur survey respondents was $24.4 million—over seven-times that of female Entrepreneur survey respondents	Do DEI programs change labor conditions?
WIF_study_FINAL_SINGLES_update2022-1.pdf	83.7% of survey respondents were Caucasian	Are marginalized groups given

		structural authority?