

Labour and Birth Stories:

A Feminist Poststructural Reading of the Discourse of Work-Family Interaction

**By
Mary Susan Runte**

**A Dissertation Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Management)**

November, 2005 Halifax, Nova Scotia



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-17659-7
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-17659-7

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Labour and Birth Stories:

A Feminist Poststructural Reading of the Discourse of Work-Family Interaction

By
Mary Susan Runte

A Dissertation Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Management)

November, 2005, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Copyright Mary Runte, 2006

Approved: Dr. Albert J. Mills
Chair

Approved: Dr. Patricia Bradshaw
External Examiner

Approved: Dr. Jean Helms-Mills
PhD Committee

Approved: Dr. David Wicks
PhD Committee

Approved: Dr. Martha McDonald
PhD Committee

Date: March, 2006

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation—actually, I would like to share this PhD--- with my two daughters.

Tigana: When asked by others what “her mommy was writing about” Tigana (who was 3 when I entered the PhD and has now reached the mature age of 8) would reply that I was “teaching people that kids are more important than work.” You taught me that, Tigana, and any and all of you who have gained knowledge, insight or comfort from my research on this topic, owe Tigana your thanks.

Kasia: During the early days of the dissertation writing, Kasia (who is 2 years old now as I approach graduation) would lie curled up in my arms as I sat typing at my keyboard. I swear that at one point, her small and delicate head bore the mark of the “Shift” key impressed into its features. As I would toil long and hard doing my work, I would feel the warmth of her body, see her gentle smile and feel renewed in my purpose.

When asked by others how I “managed” to earn a PhD “despite having” two small children I can only reply that I did it for them and I did it with them.

Labour and Birth Stories:

A Feminist Poststructural Reading of the Discourse of Work-Family Interaction

by Mary Runte

Abstract

A hermeneutic analysis of work-family interaction is undertaken from a feminist post-structural perspective to destabilize the definitions of 'work', 'family', and 'work-family' in organizational discourse. This hermeneutic inquiry begins by confronting mainstream human resource management literature with the lived experience of women and men to demonstrate that over forty years of empirical research has failed to adequately address the issues. A detailed review and subsequent critical analysis of the human resource management literature reveals a conceptually limited discourse that serves to obfuscate real social structures to the disadvantage of women. A citation analysis identifies seminal articles from which this literature draws its theoretical foundations, which then leads to analysis of the social, political and historical context within which this discourse emerged. This hermeneutic inquiry concludes by arguing the human resource management discourse emerged from and retains the repressive assumptions of the Cold War era and that no meaningful advances can occur in this field until the current discourse is dismantled.

April 3, 2006

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the many people who, knowingly or unknowingly, influenced me on this journey. In particular, however, I would like to thank my PhD dissertation committee--Albert, Jean, David, Martha-- for supporting me as I undertook this journey—even when the path that I was on radically departed from the traditional thesis route. Pat Bradshaw, my external, first introduced me to critical feminist research during my MBA years at York University. I hope that you can hear your voice echo in my work, because you truly had a profound influence on my academic development.

I would like to thank my advisor, mentor and friend, Albert Mills. I will always remember my first day in the PhD program. Albert had assigned me the monumental task of leading the initial class on the topic of Burrell and Morgan's Sociological Paradigms. Being the person I am, I took a risk and developed a lighthearted, but (I hoped) insightful game of "Where's Weber" to illustrate a challenge to the incommensurability thesis of the authors (only those who have 'been there; done that' can possibly understand this reference). Albert and I became engaged in a dialogue about the authors' central thesis and I found myself leaving the class in tears. Not tears of despair. Rather, I cried from a sense of profound comfort — finally, for the first time in my academic life, I felt that I had found an ideological home. Thank you, Albert, for creating a space for those of us who dare question ideological norms--a space where one is not criticized for being Critical.

Above all others--I would like to thank Robert. From the day we met, my darling husband has been encouraging me to pursue a PhD. I know that he doesn't believe this, but I really don't think that I could have done it without his support. Knowing that you believed in me, my dear, was the most precious of gifts. You are as kind as you are brilliant. I'm happy to be your retirement plan.

I would lastly like to thank my colleagues at the University of Lethbridge. To all those who would (supportively) ask me daily for updates on my progress, I can now respond "Yes, I've finished the %^!&* thesis!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: Why am I doing this?.....	1
Introduction: The Discourses of Work-Family.....	1
Feminism and Work-Family.....	5
Radical Feminism.....	11
Psychoanalytic Feminism.....	12
Feminist Poststructuralism: A Contribution to the field.....	14
Feminist Post-structural Critique.....	15
Power-Knowledge.....	18
Language and the Social Construction of Experience.....	19
The Current Study.....	20
Living within the Discourse.....	21
 CHAPTER 2: Methodology.....	 24
The Discourses of Work-Family.....	24
The Discourse of Work.....	24
The Discourse of Family.....	25
The Meta-Discourse of Work-Family.....	26
Why Discourse?.....	27
The Discursive Field.....	28
Why Hermeneutics?.....	30
The Hermeneutic Circle.....	34
Outline of Study.....	36
 CHAPTER 3: Text as Experienced -- Asking Mom and Dad:.....	 42
Let me tell you about the time.....	42
Method.....	43
Data.....	43
Sample and Data Collection.....	47
Content analysis.....	50
Themes.....	53
Limitation: When a limitation is not really one.....	69
Conclusion.....	70
 CHAPTER 4: Text as Read.....	 72
Introduction.....	72
Method.....	73
The Text: The HRM Contribution to Work-Family Research.....	77
Antecedents.....	79
Time-based conflict.....	79
Strain-Based Conflict.....	86

Behaviour based Conflict	88
Outcomes	91
Employer Outcomes.....	91
Family Outcomes.....	100
Employee Outcomes	108
Reading Beyond the Lines	118
 CHAPTER 5: Text as Revealed.....	120
Introduction	120
Method.....	120
Results.....	123
Casting the roles: gendering the domains	123
Parent=Mother.....	124
Themes.....	126
 CHAPTER 6: Parenting the Text.....	148
Introduction.....	148
Method:.....	150
Phase 1	151
Phase 2	152
Phase 3	153
Phase 4	155
Phase 5	158
Results.....	159
Theories of Work-Family in Seminal HRM Work-Family Literature	160
Limitations	178
Discussion	181
 CHAPTER 7: The Ancestral Home: Cold War, Chilly Climate.....	185
Introduction: Positioning Discourse in Time	185
Method.....	187
The Feminist Potential of War-Time Employment of Women.....	191
Constraining Cold War Discourses: From War to Post War to Cold War	195
From Discourse to Theory: Women's Place.....	218
Conclusion	227
 CHAPTER 8: Text as Lived — Continuing Cold War Chill on Work-Family.....	231
Introduction.....	231
Bringing the Discourses “Home:” A Toll Bridge	233
Speeding Across the Toll Bridge.....	235
From Home to Work:.....	235
From Work to Home:	238
Emergent Discourses or Same Old Story?.....	244
Work-Family Balance.....	245
Work-Life Balance	250
Conclusion	255

Future Research.....	256
Contribution	259
To work-family literature.....	259
Mainstream HRM Research:	259
Feminist Research:.....	261
Historical Research:.....	261
For organizations:	262
For individuals.....	264
Reflection on a journey.....	266
References.....	269

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 5.1: Methodology Guideline

APPENDIX 6.1

ISI Web of Science: Journals in subject areas Management, Business, Applied Psych

APPENDIX 6.2

100 most cited articles on Work-Family

APPENDIX 6.3

Excluded Articles

LABOUR AND BIRTH STORIES: A FEMINIST POSTSTRUCTURAL READING OF THE DISCOURSE OF WORK-FAMILY INTERACTION

CHAPTER 1: WHY AM I DOING THIS?

REFLECTIONS ON WORK AND FAMILY DISCOURSES

Introduction: The Discourses of Work-Family

Over the past four decades, there has been a dramatic influx of women into the workplace (Baughman, DiNardi, & Holtz-Eakin, 2003; Marshall, 1999). Concurrently, there has been a trend towards men and women working longer and more intensely (Lewis and Cooper, 1999; Poster & Prasad, 2002) and this trend is accelerating. Green (2001), for example, identifies that work effort has intensified since 1981. "Between 1986 and 1997 there have been substantial increases in the number of sources of pressure inducing hard work from employees" (Green, 2001, p. 53). Other areas of life are being crowded by the time and emotional demands of work (Leit & Schor, 1994). Researchers in human resource management have recognized the changing demographics of organizational life and the resultant tug of war between work and nonwork demands (Gottlieb, Kelloway & Barnham, 1998). This tension is most often characterized as "work-family conflict", and identifying its causal and mitigating elements has preoccupied a growing stream of academic research for over 40 years (Burke, Weir & Duwors, 1979, 1980a, 1980b, Gottlieb et al. 1998; Gross, Mason & McEachern, 1958; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991; Hepburn & Barling, 1996; Jones & Butler, 1980; Kanter, 1977; Werbel, 1978).

Researchers have come to acknowledge that, utilizing Kanter's (1977b) original distinction, the work and family spheres are "integrated" rather than "separated". Separation, which implies little or no interaction between the two domains — a disengagement and segmentation from work during nonwork time (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Piotrkowski, 1979) — has given way as the dominant orientation of the literature to an open-systems approach to the work-life interface, where interaction between the domains becomes the problematic for analysis. As Hall and Richter (1988) suggest, early conceptions of the overlap between work and nonwork life, although rejecting segmentation and disengagement, still implied that the boundary was inflexible and impermeable, both in terms of time and location, often leading to conflict between the two domains when one attempted to engage simultaneously in multiple roles. Early research on the interface assumed that gender roles translated into domain allegiance, with men assuming primary responsibility in the work domain and women assuming primary responsibility in the family domain (Voyandoff, 1984).

More recently, recognizing demographic shifts in the work and family domains, research has focused on the permeability of the domains and the (mostly) negative implications of dual role allegiance on employees, organizations, and family members. Gutek et al., (1991) and Frone, Russell and Cooper (1992a), for example, identified a reciprocal relationship between these spheres of work and family: the actions and interactions in one domain impact (usually negatively) upon actions and interactions in the other. Academic discourse on work-family interaction has therefore focused on explaining, managing and mitigating the deleterious effects of these domain interactions. As will be examined in this dissertation, however, recognition by academics that both

men and women have dual (or multi) levels of responsibilities has not meant that the conceptualization of the domains is now less gendered, nor that the needs of all stakeholders are now equally considered.

In addition to academic response to the problematic of work-family domain interaction, legislative and workplace policies have emerged to make it easier for people - in particular, women -- to combine paid market work with family responsibilities. Family-friendly working practices, for example, are intended to help reduce the conflict between domains, and are presented as a strategy mutually beneficial to individuals and organizations. Benefits, such as childcare support, flex-time and flex-place allow employees greater opportunities to meet their employment goals, while recognizing that they maintain family-centered commitments. For the organization, these benefits are elements of a competitive strategy facilitating staff retention, alleviating high levels of absenteeism, and fostering organizational commitment.

A broad and expanding research and practitioner-oriented agenda has attempted to manage or mitigate the negative outcomes of work-family domain interaction. Why, then, do employed parents continue to struggle? I believe that the answer is to found by analyzing the discourses of "work-family" and exploring ways in which hegemonic assumptions both shape and limit our awareness and interpretation of the issues. Discourse analysis is predicated on the belief that we are bound one way or another by certain definitions, understandings and explanations (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). These underlying assumptions can become entrenched within a discourse such that they become the invisible "common sense" basis for all subsequent interpretation, placing ideological blinders not only on the researchers, but often even on those whose direct lived

experience might otherwise contradict and challenge these shared understandings (Weedon, 1987). The purpose of discourse analysis is to uncover and critique these unquestioned, hegemonic assumptions.

The meta-discourse of work-family interaction, shared understandings of the interface and interplay of the domains of work and family, is the focus of this dissertation. The discursive field of work-family interface is broad, encompassing divergent and contradictory perspectives. I focus on a subset of the discursive field, the academic discourse within the Human Resource Management (HRM) literature that centers upon analyses that reflects particular understandings of the relative importance of the work and family spheres. These shared understandings become the lens through which experience is viewed by those impacted by this academic discourse.

Embedded in the meta-discourse of “work-family interaction,” are the discourse of work and the discourse of family, each with of which has its own set of entrenched assumptions and shared understandings that reflect the social and political context in which they developed, and their accompanying discourses, such as discourses of masculinity and femininity. “Work” constitutes *paid* activity that is primarily undertaken at a “work *place*”. “Family” refers to nonwork activities centered in the home. On the surface the modern workplace and home-life appear to stand in sharp contrast to one another. The workplace seems to epitomize the modern concern with bounded time, masculinity and the necessity of effective “use time” (e.g., efficiency, effort, organizational commitment, speed-up) (Wallace, 1997). Home-life, on the other hand, is characterized by idealized images of the affective domain and femininity, where one is nurtured, supported and provided relief from the pressures of work (Davidson & Cooper,

1984). Yet the reported experiences of working people seem to belie this supposed duality (Hochschild, 1997). For many, home life is experienced as an appendage of the workplace, highly constrained by the workplace's demands for time-effort balance. This lived reality is seldom reflected, however, in a discourse that continues to conceptualize two distinctly separate spheres of life (cf. Hochschild, 1997; Ryan, 1979; Struminger, 1979; Weeks, 1990).

Feminism and Work-Family

An increasing consciousness of the “gender blindness” of organisational theories has led to a feminist challenge to mainstream approaches that fail to take gender differences into account (Calas & Smircich, 2006; Mills & Tancred, 1992). As will be discussed in Chapter 5, however, this gender blindness is less apparent (and thus more insidious) in research on work-family, where research has focused upon identification of the sex-based differences in work patterns and priorities that create the condition of conflict. Gender is highlighted if it supports the exclusion of women from male systems of power, but obviated when doing so supports the primacy of workplace agendas.

The relative absence of feminist voice within mainstream HRM literature on work-family belies a strong feminist debate — which has mostly taken place outside mainstream management literature — about the economic and social function of paid and unpaid work in relation to women's oppression. On the one hand are those feminists who view motherhood as a key barrier to equality and economic independence; on the other

are those that argue that motherwork is inherently as (or more) significant than marketwork, and therefore the basis of women's demand for recognition and accommodation in the public sphere.

This debate is longstanding. In the United States from the 1890s, for example, women in the Progressive movement lobbied for the vote and claimed the role of "public housekeepers" on the grounds that motherhood gave women a natural and superior insight into such social goods as the need to "clean up" local corruption or, at the international level, to ensure world peace (cf. Ellen Keys (1914) and Jane Addams (1914)). Mothers were superior humans; public affairs needed their influence.

Countering this claim from the outset were such feminists as Gilman (1898) and Goldman (1969) who took the equality side of the debate: Arguing that mothering, and the consequent exclusion from paid employment, were what restricted women, they insisted that only the repudiation of such roles could improve women's condition.

In the 1960's and 1970's, second wave feminists such as Dinnerstein (1976), Firestone (1970), and Friedan (1967), took up this position and forcefully argued that women's role within the home, and specifically their role in biological reproduction and motherhood, was the primary source of women's subordination. If women were to be liberated and achieve equality with men, then the ties of motherhood which bound women to the domestic sphere had to be *loosened*, if not transcended altogether. Women needed to gain economic independence from men through full participation in market labour. "Ironically, the only kind of work which permits an able woman to realize her abilities fully, to achieve identity in society... is the kind that was forbidden by the

feminine mystique; the lifelong commitment to an art or science to politics or profession” (Friedan, 1967, p. 348). Firestone (1979) predicted that science would eventually enable the full realization of this project by reproducing artificially, thus eliminating the female reproductive function and both biological and social motherhood.

In contrast, other feminists adopted a structural approach, arguing that “it is the isolation and debasement of women under the terms of male-dominated ideology and social structures that must be fought, not the activity, the humanizing, imperative, of mothering, or of being a parent, itself” (Elshtain, 1981, p. 333). From this standpoint, the target of feminist critique shifted from motherhood itself to the social institutions that controlled and defined mothering practices. Characteristic of research that tackled institutional structures as exclusionary of women was Kanter (1977a, 1977b) who argued in her thesis, *Work and Family in the United States*, that extant organizational structures were not reflective of the reality that women and men engage in both work and family roles and that these structures excluded women, in particular, from full participation in the work domain.

The potential of this groundbreaking thesis on work-family (Kanter, 1977b), however, was not capitalized upon within academic discourse on work family. A citation analysis of peer reviewed articles within the management field (using ABI Inform) reveals that Kanter’s book on work-family is cited only 34 times. Employing the citation ratio formula developed in Chapter 6, this would rank this text as the 98th most cited text on work-family issues without excluding non HRM articles. A content analysis of those 34 articles highlights that this landmark monograph is cited primarily to identify a shift in awareness of permeable domain boundaries between the work and family realms.

Although this is indeed a significant contribution to the work-family discourse, it is nonetheless a very limited application of Kanter's work. Kanter's radical thesis that institutions should change to integrate women and women's priorities was ignored in favour of a more liberal interpretation of the work: that differences between women and men were eroding due to women's involvement in market work. The structural implications of her thesis were therefore not capitalized upon.

Thus, the dominant discourse continued to suggest that women's differences needed to be mitigated against; women seeking advancement were to act as if male in extant structures. The limited application of Kanter's work is underscored by the absence of any reference to it in the latest *Handbook of Organizational Studies* entry (Calas & Smircich, 2006) on feminisms and organizational analysis in the area of work-family.

The trajectory of contemporary feminist critiques of motherhood and marketwork in management literature reflects a fundamental divide within feminism itself, characterized as the sameness/difference debate. Those advocating "sameness" emphasize how women and men are alike, in the hope of promoting social and political equity through integration of women into structures traditionally dominated by men, such as market work. In organizational research, this agenda is associated with liberal feminism and is empiricist in technique (Calas & Smircich, 2006; Harding, 1986). Sameness feminists in the 1960s and 1970s argued that any formulation of women as different to men could be used as a pretext to justify the exclusion of women from the workplace and public life (Harding, 1986). In the last two decades, however, the focus has shifted to the social construction of gender and the biological roots of sex. The overriding goal is sexual equity reflecting an acceptance of biological sex difference, but

demanding that cultural confabulations of gender norms be displaced. Organizations are assumed to be gender neutral and liberal feminist researchers document the persistence of sex segregation in terms of individual limitations or “structural errors” (Calas & Smircich, 2006, p. 17). The redirection of liberal feminism from equality to equity has been attributed to the influence of Kanter (1977a)'s examination of the role and experience of women in organizations. Although my reading of Kanter (1977a) reveals more radical than liberal leanings (for example, in her call for a fundamental restructuring of merit systems in organizations), Calas and Smircich (2006) focus on her influence in liberal feminism. This may reflect the limited application of Kanter's theses; or more positively, that the impact of the radical perspective has been through its integration into mainstream organizational thought and practice. The shift in the liberal feminist agenda from equality to equity, a redirection of priority identified by Calas & Smircich (2006) as having occurred in the past two decades, may thus reflect the influence of radical thought as transformative when acting upon the agenda of feminism, albeit on a somewhat limited basis.

The liberal agenda, with its theme of women succeeding by undifferentiating themselves from men and eliminating barriers, dominates feminist organizational analysis on work-family (Smithson & Stokoe, 2005). Work-family factors, for example, are presented as barriers to mobility (Carnicer, Sanchez, Perez & Jimenez, 2003) and as predictors of emotional exhaustion (Posig & Kickul, 2004). The liberal feminist research on work-family attempts to identify the extent of the overlap between the work-family domains and the consequence of the overlap (e.g. Burke & Bradshaw, 1981); the implications of work-family on commitment (e.g. Osterman, 1995); the emergence of

new career structures, such as part time or flexible work (e.g. Jacobs, 1999); and the presence/exclusion of women from extant organizational structures. The “glass-ceiling” research (e.g. Lyness & Thompson, 2000), for example, examines barriers preventing women's fair access to senior organizational positions. A limited definition of “work” or “success” is applied within this research stream: Women engaged in unpaid labour are dependent on men and devalued, since their work is outside the recognized sphere of public economic production, and referred to as “nonwork” within HRM research. Strategies recommended to mitigate the effects of the inevitably negative work-family interaction further exemplify the liberal feminist tradition of promoting equality with men through emulation of their behaviours. Organizations are encouraged to develop strategies to facilitate employee (women) coping behaviours (Carnicer et al, 2003); management training programs to educate supervisors and workers on how to mitigate stress (Posig & Kickul, 2004); and the development of childcare options to assist employees to outsource family responsibilities (Allen, 2001). In an attempt to slough off the label of inferiority, feminist researchers, in the liberal (sameness) tradition, have endeavored to argue that women are equally capable and exhibit comparable skills to men. An emphasis on gender similarity, however, draws attention away from women's biological distinctiveness as it relates to childbearing and breastfeeding, for example, and allows male needs, experiences and behaviours to determine the norm against which variables are measured. A tension within the liberal orientation to work-family research between the pursuit of an agenda of sameness for gender issues and difference for sex-based issues (such as pregnancy and breastfeeding) is resolved by focusing on gender neutrality of organizational concepts and practice with an acknowledgement of the need

for exceptions and individual level modification as required. Gender differences in organizational life are highlighted to facilitate integration, rather than underscored as a need for radical change. For example, in the areas of job satisfaction (e.g. Burke, 2001) and recruitment (e.g. Freeman, 2003) research focuses on integration of diversity agendas into workplace programs, but not on radical shifts in organizational culture. Despite the acknowledgement of sex based difference and the spillover of these biological differences into social behaviour, the agenda of liberal feminism remains principally allied with the sameness agenda and reflects women's experiences in organizations, wherein women may perform as if men, embracing male ways of being (Gilligan, 1982; Rasmussen, 2001; Wicks & Bradshaw, 1997).

Difference feminists address women's specific experience as women, emphasizing the differences and uniqueness of women in their research agenda. Ignoring women's contribution to society as mothers, difference feminists argue, inhibits our understanding of nurturing activity or the possible development of a socio-political system grounded in an ethics of care (Derry, 1997; Iriguary, 1985a). Other difference feminists argue the moral superiority of women. Transformation of extant structures, rather than reformation or integration of women is the goal of the difference side of the debate, an agenda that is associated with radical and psychoanalytic forms of feminism.

Radical Feminism

The radical feminist agenda as applied to organizational studies emerged in the late 1960s and focused on challenging extant patriarchal structures and introducing new practices into organizational life. Radical feminism is "woman centered" and focuses on

the relation between sex and power (Weedon, 1997). Radical feminism is seen in efforts to create more “female-friendly” institutions (e.g. Brown, 1992); to support the development of special spheres or separate institutions for women, including forms of feminist separatism (Koedt, Levine & Rapone, 1973; Iannello, 1992); and to bring about more fundamental transformations of existing, male dominated, organizational structures (e.g. Wicks & Bradshaw, 1997; P. Martin 1990). Distinctly feminist organizational structures act as challenges to the divide between the personal and political; organizational structures are seen as organic and reflective of the members' values. They are “feminist values in action” (Calas & Smircich, 2006, p. 26). The survival of these organizational forms, however, is tenuous and often requires a symbiosis between bureaucratic norms and feminist values (Thomas, 1999) or a rethinking of how organizational success should be measured (Ferree & Martin, 1995).

Radical feminist work on work-family interaction is all but absent from the organizational studies literature despite the fact that discussion on the role of mothering is elemental to radical feminist thought (Calas & Smircich, 2006). Mothering is viewed as either the site of patriarchal oppression or as the location of women's distinctiveness which has been corrupted by patriarchy and needs to be reclaimed under feminist terms (Rich, 1979). The separation of work and family is either critical – according to the first perspective which would see reproduction and mothering activities removed from gender—or irrelevant—according to the second perspective which would see feminist ways of organizing to wholly embrace this aspect of women's life.

Psychoanalytic Feminism

Psychoanalytic feminism employs clinical approaches to examine the interaction of developmental experiences and identity. The patriarchal family is elemental in shaping women and men's senses of self. Chodorow (1978), for example, argues that mothering is reproduced through the enactment of social roles and thereby limits differentiated development. Changing social structures is requisite; gender differences are enacted in individuals due to social norms and social conditioning related to parenting. Rewriting the scripts of parenting is elemental to changing gender norms.

Tong (1998) speaks to the gendered nature of psychomoral development that results in the prioritization of male ways of knowing and being and the distinctiveness of women's "way of thinking" (p. 131). Gilligan (1982) has focused on differences in women's moral development and communication patterns. Current application of psychoanalytic feminism denies biological determinism, emphasizing social construction, and focuses on exposing the primacy given to male ways of thinking.

Applied to organizational theory, psychoanalytic feminism differs from liberal feminism in terms of the proscriptive for change. Change is not to be achieved at the individual level, through the direct adoption of male ways of being, but through redressing the cultural and historical roots embedding difference in the individual based on gender. Rather than focusing on the difference in psychosexual or psychomoral development as creating a deficit for women, increasingly psychoanalytic feminists are focusing on the advantages or superior aspects of women's difference. Interactional leadership for example, whereby women prioritize relational needs, is being examined as a preferred leadership technique (Rosener, 1990, 1995). In the work-family literature, this

feminist orientation is reflected in research on the valuing of care activities (Rasmussen, 2001).

Feminist Poststructuralism: A Contribution to the field

The difference stream of feminism can be criticized for ignoring the diversity amongst women, thereby essentializing a universal “woman” (Calas & Smircich, 2006). Further, in this view “man” remains the standard whereby difference is measured; male is the referent from which women are distinguished. Both the sameness and difference tradition are dependent upon this standard, a standard that has been critiqued by “women centered theorizing.” Ironically absent, however, has been the critique of work-family issues through this woman centered lens (Calas & Smircich, 2006). What has not been “called into question are problems inherent in the concept of work/family... placing family, and the value of parenting more generally, on equal footing with all other value-creating institutions in society, including business organizations” (Calas & Smircich, 2006, p 37-38). A feminist poststructural critique of work-family is therefore lacking in organizational research, although an examination of the implications of masculinist norms has been applied to other dimensions of organizational theory (e.g. Calas & Smircich, 1991 and Bradshaw, 1996 on leadership; Calas & Smircich, 1997 on business ethics; Meyerson, 1998 on stress). Calas & Smircich (2006) identify that in terms of application to work-family organizational studies, this standard of the prioritization of male norms remains largely unchallenged. Until now.

This dissertation adopts a post-structural perspective, a perspective all but absent from feminist or mainstream management research on work-family (Calas & Smircich,

2006). I argue that the mainstream HRM research agenda on work-family has failed to address the needs of mothers and fathers in market work because it has accepted a managerial bias that supports the superordinancy of work. The liberal tradition of feminism, which has dominated the feminist critique of work-family, has also not addressed work-family issues because it likewise prioritizes work and presents family needs as less important, thus implicitly deeming the feminine as inferior. Radical and psychoanalytic approaches to organizational studies have not taken up this challenge, perhaps because of a continued focus on biological or psycho-social roots of difference. My research therefore fills a gap in both mainstream and feminist theory on work-family by adopting a poststructural lens that facilitates the exposure of the biases inherent in the existing work-family research. Rather than exploring if or how women are innately similar/different; superior/inferior to men, I focus on how they have been constructed as such within mainstream HRM research on work and family. Extant research, whether mainstream or feminist, will benefit from my casting "suspicion on the proclaimed objectivity and universality of organizational knowledge" and my presentation "of the possibility of other voices [my own and others] to demonstrate it otherwise" (Calas & Smircich, 2006, p 65).

By exposing the discourses and historical roots of the patriarchal bias, I have made a unique contribution to HRM research.

Feminist Post-structural Critique

In this dissertation, the critique of the work-family discourse is undertaken through a feminist poststructural lens (Weedon, 1987). Underlying my approach is an

acknowledgement of the relationship between knowledge, power and discourse (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996). The dominant discourse of work-family interaction as it exists in HRM text, is a representation of “knowledge”; patterns of privilege and exclusion that are embedded within this discourse create and fortify the boundaries of “knowledge”.

I label myself a feminist poststructuralist because I adopt poststructural principles, but with a specific focus on the gendered nature of knowledge production and the way it maintains and reinforces the power relationships between the sexes (Calas & Smircich, 1992; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jacobsen & Jacques, 1997; Weedon, 1987). Linked to this theoretical position is an emphasis on diversity; a unitary view of women sharing a common world, shared condition of oppression, or common “women’s voice” is rejected in favour of recognition of the different situations, subjectivities and experiences of individual women (Calas & Smircich, 1992). Many postmodern feminists refuse to recognize “woman,” or terms or concepts that portray woman as a collection of “essences.” In other words, all women are individuals, and attempts to make generalizations about them is inappropriate. Deleuze (1994), for example, calls for feminists to acknowledge a “postgender” world and not to focus on “women” as a conceptual entity. This attitude makes it difficult, however, to challenge gender barriers. As Braidotti (1994) has noted “one cannot deconstruct a subjectivity one has never controlled” (p.117).

Spivak (1988) coined the term “strategic essentialism” which describes the strategy of feminists, such as Irigaray, whereby an “essentialist” position about women is temporarily accepted before a “postgender” position is attainable. The basis of Irigaray’s work, for example, rests on assumptions about sexual difference: the difference between

the sexes constructs lived experience, and is an entrenched frame of reference for humans. While this is ostensibly a limited essentialist claim, Braidotti (1994) argues that it provides a useful point of entry for theory and politics, noting that “the essentialist belief in ontological difference is a political strategy aimed at stating the specificity of female subjectivity, sexuality, and experience while also denouncing the logic of sexual indifferentiation of phallogocentric discourse”(p.131).

I therefore do not purport to speak for all women, or even all mothers, but I do include an element of the collective “women’s voice” in my analysis (even as recognizing that it is a partial representation given the diversity of women’s perspectives.) My feminist poststructuralist analysis of work-family discourses adds a particular marginalized voice to organizational discourse, in this case (quite literally) the matriarchy, and by so doing seeks to disrupt a particular system of power, the patriarchy, as it defines the state of “knowledge” on this field of inquiry. Including “women’s voice” in the discourse of work-family, although problematic, is “a necessary step for making poststructuralist feminist analysis viable” (Calas & Smircich, 1992, p. 230).

In this dissertation, I examine multiple discourses that comprise and act upon the discursive field of work-family in the HRM literature. Within many (most) of these discourses, women and men are treated as if they are essential beings. In order to examine the context in which these discourses developed, one must acknowledge that this essentialist orientation is elemental to these discourses. By examining the characteristics of masculinity that were valued in the Cold War, for example, I am not myself essentializing men, but rather, am describing the context in which the discourse of work as masculine became entrenched.

Poststructuralist inquiry has many distinguishing characteristics. The most influential to my approach are (1) its perspective on the relationship between power and knowledge, and (2) its emphasis on the role of language and other forms of representation in constructing experience and knowledge.

Power-Knowledge

The poststructuralist perspective sees the production of knowledge as an exercise of power where only some voices are heard and only some experience is counted as knowledge. Poststructuralists challenge the notion of transcendent or universalizing truth and assert that the set of rules used to determine if something is “true” or “false” is ideologically determined and based in differential power relations (Foucault, 1977). The goal of poststructuralist inquiry is therefore to disrupt the relationship between power and knowledge by bringing “subversive stories” into the discourse (Ewick & Silby, 1995). I adopt an historical perspective on work-family to reveal ways in which we “have been trapped in our own history” (Foucault 1991, p. 45) and to illustrate the ideology that underwrites our lived experience. Resistance refers to the process of disrupting, or resisting, the unobtrusive exercise of power that occurs in the process of representing experience (Clegg, 1989; Collinson, 1994; Flax, 1990). Foucault's insistence that power is constituted and transmitted through discourse (Foucault, 1984; Gordon, 1980) means that resistance to the power of others is always possible, because “counter-discourses” can be developed that produce new knowledge and that lead to new sources of power (Ramazanoglu, 1993). Feminist poststructuralist theorizing suggests that resistance for women is linked to the personal deployment of power (Weedon, 1987).

Language and the Social Construction of Experience

Another key feature of poststructuralist inquiry is its emphasis on the role language plays in mediating the relationship between power and knowledge (Fairclough, 1989). It is a perspective that considers social reality – and its pattern of dominance – not as a given, but as something that is socially created through the process of representing experience. As ways of talking about knowledge and truth, discourses reflect sets of rules, determining what it is possible to talk about and how that talk can proceed at any one time (Ramazanoglu, 1993). Thus, language not only reflects a certain reality, it also actively creates that reality and sustains the power relationships that depend on it. From a poststructuralist perspective, then, textual and material representation, such as academic research on work family, is never neutral but is instead a powerful means of constructing an ideological world view that furthers the interest of some dominant group.

The goal of my research is to therefore to create “discursive space” where new ways of thinking can surface and dominant meanings can be resisted, thereby creating a place where new things can be said and new social structures envisioned. The writing of this dissertation is an act of resistance—a challenge to those who, like a colleague of mine, admonish that the interest of family in the work-family literature “should be left to the sociologists.”

Putting my research methodology in the language of feminist post-structuralism, it can be described as an effort to destabilize the definitions of work, family and work-family interaction in organizational discourse by telling a feminist subversive story. Foucault, explaining his choice of analyses in terms of participation in struggles around

medicine, psychiatry and penalty, argues that effective, meaningful historical work requires relevant personal engagement (1980a, 126; 1980b, 64-65; 1991, 75, 138-39,155). My dissertation calls attention to the masculine nature of the “truth rules” and knowledge production process that create commonsense definitions of concepts like work and family. These rules are reproduced in the daily experiences of women and men who attempt engagement in both work and family domains, and the struggles that many (particularly women) encounter. I add their voices, and my own, to the discursive field.

The Current Study

Despite the academic and organizational recognition of the reality of interaction between the work and family domains— and the research and organizational responses to the problems resulting from this interaction — it appears that conflict between work and family needs remains. Gender disparity regarding career and family roles and outcomes persists; women and men continue to struggle as they maneuver between the domains of work and home. This dissertation is positioned at the overlap of academic discourse and the discourses of lived experience, and is focused on questioning why (through an evaluation of HRM research) and how (reflecting story and example) movement between, and interaction of, the domains is perceived to be problematic.

This study begins with an exposure of the work-family interface as reflected in the stories of women and men whose daily attempts to maneuver between the domains illustrate the unresolved tensions. Employing a historical hermeneutic framework (Prasad, 2000), an exploration of the context in which this struggle takes place becomes the agenda of this dissertation. Each chapter addresses the questions unearthed by the previous chapter as I work my way back through time, unraveling the threads of the

discourse of work-family interaction as it is presented in HRM academic research—the text for this analysis.

This hermeneutic genealogy of the discourse of work-family interaction is a guided journey, and I am the guide. The questions gleaned from the process reflect my own experiences and biases. Rather than adopt or feign neutrality, hermeneutics demands that the researcher expose and accept her own subjectivity as a critical element of the context of discovery (Gadamer, 1989; Prasad, 2000). The stories/anecdotes shared by parents launch the process of discovery in this dissertation and frame the questions that guide the journey. I, too, am a parent. And it is my experience as a parent that gave birth to this study. Who I am as a researcher is not divorced from who I am as a mother, a wife, and a daughter. An unraveling of the discourse of work-family interaction thus requires a reflection of my own values and readings of the text.

Living within the Discourse

I live a very busy life. I am a full time student of management. I am a full time academic teaching social responsibility and ethics in a small undergraduate university. I am joyously, happily married. And, most elemental to whom I am, I am a mother. I daily engage in the balancing act between work and family, as I attempt to meet the often conflicting time and emotional pressures between school, work and my family.

I come to the text, my excavation site, exhausted. I am in intense period of work in which the demands of students must be balanced against the demands of my research. I am writing this chapter at two in the morning. My six year old is asleep; I have comforted her down after a nightmare. My infant daughter lies asleep in my arms. I watch her

battled breathing; she has a cold and an ear infection. I can feel her soft body against my arm; the heat of her fever causes me to perspire. To me, work and family balance is not just a discourse; it is my life. It is a discourse with which I struggle on a daily basis as I face conflicting messages: *Work harder; work smarter. Kids are resilient; kids are only young once.*

This dissertation is not the dispassionate analysis of an objective researcher; my voice resonates as I challenge and critique the assumptions layered within the text. The questions that I “heard” asked by the parents, who shared their stories of joy and struggle, were filtered by my own experiences and shaped by what I expected to hear. A different researcher may have heard different questions and therefore chose to answer those questions by following a different path. In the process of doing this dissertation, as I unraveled the discourse embedded in HRM literature and listened to the stories of men and women who attempt to balance work and family demands, I often became confused and more often angry as I saw an agenda of suppression and exclusion of feminine voice and concerns. The family, and with it the feminine, is defined as the problematic: How do we create environments where women will be more committed to work? How do we minimize messy negative spillover between the domains—so that work will not be resented and so that family demands do not decrease productivity? If there is a tug of war between work and family, how can we make sure that work always wins? These underlying assumptions within the dominant discourse remain unquestioned, and unquestionable; the purpose of this dissertation is to challenge these assumptions.

I argue that the ways people integrate paid work with the rest of their life reflects expectations and values operating throughout western industrial societies. Unfettered

economic expansion, the push for always greater efficiencies, and the forces of globalization raise issues that force a questioning of the extent to which the capitalist attachment to paid work, as the principal source of personal identity and the exclusive goal of daily living, is necessary. Questioning the assumptions established and reinforced by the discourse of work is essential to an understanding of the extant structures of organizations and family. The current structures of work-family are not “working”; a new approach to this issue is needed.

Parents, who shared stories of their daily struggles, rationalizations and, less frequently, triumphs, offer the research question of this study: Where did these expectations come from? The purpose of this study is, through an hermeneutic inquiry, to expose and delineate the hegemonic assumptions that created and reinforced the discourse of work-family interaction as reflected in HRM research. By looking backward, we have the ability to reinterpret the processes and assumptions that guide current practice and experience. I caution the reader: Answers are not provided; questions are asked. But, by asking questions, of myself, of parents, and of researchers, I open a dialogue, where the unquestionable is questioned and the door to new answers is opened.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The Discourses of Work-Family

The Discourse of Work

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, a primary form of economic activity involved extended families working the land on which they also lived: the concepts of “work” and “home” were intertwined and had very different meanings from how they are currently understood (Anderson & Zinsser, 1988). The centering of economic activity within manufactories and away from dwelling places was the basis of the modern schism between “work” and “home”. This discourse of the divide between public and private spheres emerged out of a myriad of activities, including the decline of the barter system and the rise of wage labour. The term “work” took on new meaning as *paid* activity that is primarily undertaken at a “work *place*”. The notions of “domesticity,” “home,” and “family” were contained within the changing work spaces but were developed with the exclusion of women from a number of workplaces through direct violence and legal action; legal prohibitions against child labour and the development of public schools, which were organized in such a way as to place competing demands on working parents; and the emergence of a “domestic idyll” whereby the “non-working wife” became a symbol of male economic status (cf. Ryan, 1979; Struminger, 1979; Weeks, 1990). Increasingly over time the workplace became associated with men and masculinity in direct contrast to the “domestic sphere” that was equated with women and femininity.

The Discourse of Family

Literature on work-family conflict and family composition has focused almost exclusively on a limited discourse of family: husband, wife and child(ren) (Hepburn & Barling, 1995; Eby et al., 2005). The role of the extended family as a moderator of work-family strain and time conflict, for example, was unexamined. This focus on the nuclear family reflects a cultural bias that overlooks the significance of various forms of extended family that characterize many cultures and may place even more demanding role expectations on its members. In cultures or circumstances where the family circle is expanded beyond the nuclear family, one might reasonably anticipate an exponential increase in demands on the individual, thereby exacerbating work-family conflict; on the other hand, practical assistance — such as childcare — provided by the extended family might mitigate an employed parent's experience of work-family conflict. Similarly, social pressure for role conformity, in either sphere, may be applied by family members not currently included in research focused only on the immediate nuclear family. Further, there are escalating demands for elder care as the baby boom generation reaches retirement age and as medical advances extend life expectancy (Aronson, 1992; Hepburn & Barling, 1996;). The care of aging parents as a source of work-family conflict has come to the attention of researchers only recently (Hepburn & Barling, 1996), although these familial responsibilities have been established norms in many cultures. Similarly, adoption, as a source of family extension, is not examined in the literature on work-family conflict, nor other changing cultural norms of family composition, including the increase in both the number of single parent families and same sex parents.

In short, the discourse of “family” limits the subject positions available to men and women, creating a dichotomy of the nuclear family and the “other.” Recognizing that in an attempt to expose the failings of the dominant discourse of work/family that I may be reinforcing this othering of alternate conceptualizations of family, I will nonetheless use a definition of family akin to that in the academic discourse, to better examine its application in the research.

The Meta-Discourse of Work-Family

The intersection of the discourses of work and family — the meta-discourse of “work-family” — becomes its own dynamic discourse. The two disparate elements of which it is comprised — work and family— exist in conflict, tension, and harmony, as their definitions, and therefore the meta-discourse work-family interaction; are continually redefined. Other elements, as will be discussed, can become rooted in unchanging hegemonic assumptions. These discourses are social constructions that act on, and are influenced by, other discourses (such as discourses of masculinity and femininity) resident in different temporal and spatial locations: the social and political context in which they reside and to which they claim ancestry. The discourses of work-family — work, family and the meta-discourse of work-family interaction (the discourse of work-family)— are therefore examined in this dissertation as representing and reflecting an “intricate network of discourses, the sites where they are articulated and the institutionally legitimized forms of knowledge to which they look for their justification” (Weedon, 1993, p. 126).

Why Discourse?

Discourses are “a connected set of statements, concepts, terms and expressions which constitutes a way of talking or writing about a particular issue, thus framing the way people understand and respond with respect to this issue . . .” (Watson, 1995, p. 14). Discourses frame and influence people’s understandings of the world and thus guide their behaviours. In this dissertation, I identify the contours of the gendered meta-discourse of work-family and examine both how it became entrenched in academic research, and how it is reflected in lived experience. I position “work” and “family” as distinct discourses that draw on different routines, involve different sets of people, and require the enactment of different norms and behaviours, even as the boundaries of work and family themselves are permeable and overlapping.

Discourse analysis is epistemologically positioned within a constructivist framework. Language is not just a reflection of reality, it is active in the construction of social reality. “The recognition of the constructive role of language problematizes the very nature of research as the objectivity, neutrality and independence of the researcher is called into question” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p.12). Work-family research has been predicated on quantitative-empirical work, which epistemologically assumes a concretized reality eminently open to analysis and measurement; qualitative and critical accounts have been suppressed, relegated to the margins, or simply not done (Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991). Discourse analysis creates space to examine the shared meanings that guide the research on this important topic. By examining the creation and experience

of the discourse of work-family interaction, I aim to create the potential to explore new meanings and experiences.

I accept, as a researcher, that my role is that of an interpretive agent of data; I contend that discourse analysis also requires that we call into question the knowledge claims of other researchers and thus I adopt a post-structural lens to the discourse analysis process, by moving beyond reflection and interpretation to critique. Focusing on the silencing and marginalizing effects of hegemonic discourses (Foucault, 1977) that conceal and perpetuate inequality and regulate behavior, the cornerstone of my methodology is the analysis of the context, subjectivities, and hegemonic ideology of other researchers, through an analysis of their representations of the “truth.” Discourse is dynamic and directive; previous analyses of discourse in institutional settings (medical, legal, educational, media) explore the intertwining of discourse and historical-material fact through the management and manipulation of mass audiences (Best & Kellner, 1991). Foucault is particularly concerned with “linking the discourse of particular subjectivities with the construction of lived experience” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 494). In this study, I aim to problematize the hegemonic nature of the dominant meta-discourse of work-family by excavating its genesis and development in the HRM research literature, a literature which serves to both reflect and direct management practice, and thus the lived experience of women and men who negotiate the boundaries.

The Discursive Field

The discourses of work and family define the interaction of the domains, as well as define the domains themselves. Discursive fields consist of competing discourses that organize social institutions and processes. The discursive field makes available space for

a range of modes of subjectivity, positioning individuals in different ways as social subjects, establishing the roles and defining the rules for interaction (Parker, 1992). Within a discursive field, not all discourses carry equal weight or power; one set of discourses that reflects particular power relationships dominates. Foucault (1972) argues that the dominance of particular discourses makes it possible for certain behaviours, and not others, to occur in particular times and places.

Thus, a dominant discourse can serve as a master discourse shaping the development of alternate discourses either directly, through mimetic pressures, or by serving as the form that alternate discourses react against. Within the discursive fields of work and family, the dominant discourse of work-family interaction establishes the settings for each domain, defines the characters and their interaction, as well as establishes the rules for integration of, or movement between, the domains. Arguably, the emergence of alternate discourses on the intersection of the work and family spheres creates space for a transformative process (Best & Kellner, 1991). This potential, however, can only be realized if a careful questioning of the assumptions and guiding principles of the master discourse is undertaken, to ensure that new discourses do not merely serve as reproductions of the original. This dissertation addresses this requirement by providing an analysis of the master discourse of work-family interaction, and thus serves as the groundwork for an extended line of research on the alternate and emerging discourses in the discursive field.

Discourse analysis, as presented by Phillips and Hardy (2002) does not have a unifying set of techniques or methods. Researchers are thus encouraged to develop their own data analysis tools; these tools vary depending upon the nature of the data and the

intent of the analysis, although the shared intent is to explore layers of meaning and interpretation in text. In this dissertation, I will analyze the dominant discourse of work-family using mixed methods. I will present the specific methods used for each layer of analysis at the beginning of each chapter, as each layer of analysis exposes new questions to be explored that require the use of different methods of exploration. I do not attempt to combine research paradigms or epistemology, although I do shift from a predominantly interpretive to a poststructural critical lens after the first layer of analysis, but instead use various methods and lenses strategically for gaining knowledge about the work-family interface (Guba & Lincoln, 1983). As the dominant discourse is functionalist, strategic adoption of a positivist lens in Chapter 4 provides data that is then critiqued in Chapter 5. This approach allows me to build upon my earlier analyses and to piece together the many elements of this meta-discourse. The overarching paradigm is post-structural; the intent of this dissertation is to explore and expose the truth claims of the dominant discourses of work-family interaction.

My unifying methodology places discourse analysis within a broader framework of postmodern hermeneutics. I expose the discourses of work-family interaction in the HRM literature using the reflective and recursive model of postmodern hermeneutics to guide the excavation into the historical roots of the hegemonic discourses of work-family.

Why Hermeneutics?

The use of critical hermeneutic analysis supports my research purpose in exploring the representations and development of work-family discourses and “the contexts of their production, the intentions of their producers and the meanings mobilized

in the process of their construction” (Kincheloe & McLaren 2000, p. 286). My study will occasion new experiences of the history of work-family as I focus on context and lived experience in this discursive field.

“According to critical theorists, the task of interpretation includes, among other things, the necessity of providing a critique of the ideological aspects of the text being interpreted” (Prasad, 2002, p. 16). Critical hermeneutics thus serves to “develop a form of cultural criticism revealing power dynamics within social and cultural texts” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 286). These power dynamics achieve hegemonic status in both mainstream management theory on work-family interaction and in the “lived experience” of men and women who attempt to maneuver daily between the domains of work and family. Linkages between the interpreter, the text and its producer, the context of its production, and its voice in shaping current social reality are explored with a goal, not to create a definitive interpretation or offer closure, but to reveal. Hermeneutics, as a method for exposing multiple layers of the work-family discourses, thus links larger social forces to the particular experiences of the individual.

Hermeneutics is a reflective process that is “always informed by one or more theoretical perspectives” (Prasad, 2002, p. 25). My model of combining critical hermeneutics with poststructuralism is in keeping with what Denzin and Lincoln (2000) label the “developing consensus in the interpretivist community” (p. 373) whereby poststructuralism has “suffused constructionism with cultural, institutional and historical concerns” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 487). Critical theory “enables us to see, for example, how the economy, polity, social institutions, discourses, practices, and culture interact to produce a social system” (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 260). “Postmodern theory

provides a critique of representation and the modern belief that theory mirrors reality, taking instead “perspectivist” and relativist positions that theories at best provide partial perspectives on their objects and that all cognitive representations of the world are historically and linguistically mediated” (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 4). Reflecting a new understanding that “refocused the analytical project (of interpretivism) on itself, viewing it as a source of social reality in its own right” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 487), critical theoretical approaches are applied within a poststructuralist framework.

The pairing of critical hermeneutics and poststructuralism also allows for a moderation of the postmodern “assault on macroanalysis” (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 260). I agree with Best and Kellner (1991) in their contention that “while it is impossible to produce a fixed and exhaustive knowledge of a constantly changing complex of social processes, it is possible to map the fundamental domains, structures, practices, and discourses of a society, and how they are constituted and interact” (p. 260).

Feminist critiques of postmodern and poststructural analysis focus, in part, on the rejection of analysis of macrostructures that have historically served to define and limit women (Ferguson, 1988; Nicholson, 1990; Weedon, 1993, 1999). Di Stefano (1990), for example claims that “feminism itself depend[s] on a relatively unified notion of the social subject ‘woman’, a notion that postmodernism would attack” (p.77). The category “woman” is essential to avoid the pluralism that would see the erasure of a “general theory of oppression and liberation” (Weedon, 1999, p. 111). The bridging of critical theoretical analysis of structure and poststructuralism is reflected in the research of many feminist poststructuralists. Structures, dependent “upon relations of power” are critiqued; the voices of marginalized groups, such as “women,” are included; and “the

representation of many competing and sometimes conflicting voices, histories and interests,” is acknowledged within the spectrum of feminist poststructural research (Weedon, 1999, pp. 112, 111). Employing a lens of poststructural feminism to this critical hermeneutic process, the discourses of work and family (work, family and work-family interaction) will be examined as gendered representations in which the positioning of the male is privileged over the female, and the voice of “women” has been ignored or silenced. Drawing on Irigaray, my feminist theoretical orientation posits that “all existing theory, all thought, all language” are “monopolized by men” (Irigaray, 1985b, p. 165, 121). This dissertation presents an analysis of the discourses of work-family through a hermeneutic “critique of the political economy” (Irigaray, 1985b, p.85) as the historical context that acts to “prescribe and define that destiny laid down for woman’s sexuality” (Irigaray, 1985a, p.129). The tellings and retellings of the master discourse will reveal the “metaphysical presuppositions of that discourse” and “of the symbolic system in which it is realized” (Irigaray, 1985b, pp. 85, 191). Therefore, although multiple discourses exist within the discursive fields of work and family, these discourses are products of the dominance of a patriarchal discourse. Since theorizing itself is an activity tainted by hegemonic assumptions, feminists such as Cixous and Irigaray adopt the devices of myth, contradiction, and hyperbole and could be said to refuse to do theory at all. The mirroring of theory in lived experience — mirroring as a speculum (as per Irigaray) that distorts as it reflects —will serve to challenge the separation of the presented “truth” in research from the “reality” of experience, particularly of women’s experience.

The Hermeneutic Circle

Historical context creates the conditions whereby a discourse is developed and reproduced. Gadamer (1989) presents the notion of historical hermeneutics where the place of prejudice in interpreting a historical event or text is considered. All historical research is the handing down of traditions where we have “a new experience of history whenever the past resounds in a new voice” (p. 284). This past echoes in current experience and creates the context for the developing future as the discourse of work-family shifts within the discursive field. Past is linked to present as one interpretation is built upon another interpretation and is thus ultimately represented as a hegemonic truth. Layers of meaning are thus excavated through a historical analysis:

For hermeneutic research, history serves as an important part of context. In other words, hermeneutic research conceptualizes context both synchronically as well as diachronically. In methodological terms, therefore, hermeneutic inquiry requires the organizational researcher to develop a thorough familiarity with the historical aspects of the phenomenon of interest (Prasad, 2002).

“The central hermeneutic of many critical qualitative works involves the interactions among research, subject(s) and these situating sociohistorical structures” (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2000, p. 288). I frame my analysis of the discourse as a process of genealogical excavation. The historical context shapes representations of work-family within the mainstream management literature; answering the question of all children: “Where did I come from?”

The hermeneutic task, as with any genealogical research project, must have an explicit end point; although of course, the text remains open for later analysis. Just as one might ask: “Is our family Hungarian?” with the implication that years of Soviet, Roman,

and other rule are not to be included in the response to the question, so too must a researcher employing hermeneutics demark an end point for her analysis (lest the analysis never ends and she never graduates). Although gendered discourses and the separation of the domains of work and home can be traced to earlier periods, the end point of my historical hermeneutic excavation, Chapter 7, will be WWII and the Cold War period, when the discourse of work-family began to appear in HRM academic research. The intent of this phase of my analysis will be to identify the context in which the mainstream HRM literature developed. Hence the role of the mainstream management literature as a cold-war discourse birthing the context in which alternative discourses of work-family developed and together act to create the social reality of lived experience will be explored.

Gadamer (1989) recognizes that every act of research is an act of interpretation. The hermeneutic circle, comprised of a forward arc and a backward arc, is used to describe the research process whereby the researcher explores the historical and social dynamics that shape the text (Heidegger, 1996). Hermeneutic interpretation is “an iterative process, which goes through a number of iterations corresponding to the different levels at which the overall context is progressively defined” (Prasad, 2002). No specific method is proscribed; no final interpretation is sought (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Prasad, 2002) although the process of traveling the hermeneutic circle structures the journey (Prasad & Mir, 2002). Typically the forward arc, projection, uses the researcher’s fore-structure and pre-understandings to understand the participants and their specific situations. An individual’s current fore-structure is based on philosophical, epistemological, and ontological frameworks. Here, pre-understandings include my

relationship to the research question and come from my own history. Hence, a representation of my own belief system regarding work-family infiltrates my study.

Gadamer (1989) presents the need for us to remain open to each other's meaning as we continue to question our fore-meanings. It is this questioning of fore-structures and pre-understandings that forms the hermeneutic task. Our openness to others "always includes our situating the other meaning in relation to the whole of our own meanings or ourselves in relation to it" (p. 268).

The forward arc also involves forming first impressions and making sense of the discursive field by considering one's fore-structures and pre-understandings within the context of the text under scrutiny. The generation of a literature summary, for example, reveals superficial themes — a surface layer of the discourse — which is presented as it appears in the mainstream literature, and then read through a reflective lens (forward arc) and interpreted through an evaluative lens (backward arc). The backward arc, evaluation, seeks to uncover contradictions, omissions, and confirmations of this initial interpretation. During this stage, I systematically examine the data building and challenge my original interpretations (forward arc) and consider alternate frameworks through multiple lenses as I explore the veiled meanings in the text. A framework for the search of additional levels of meaning is explicated as a preface to each chapter, as the method and data varies depending upon the question guiding the layer of analysis.

Outline of Study

Ellis (1998) describes the process of analysis and interpretation in hermeneutics as a series of loops in a spiral. Each loop in the backward arch of evaluation can represent

one inquiry activity in the process of understanding the research question. As one enters consecutive loops, the uncovering from previous loops helps reframe the research question. This process is both systematic and rigorous and serves to strip back layers in the discourse exposing multiple and alternative interpretations. I identified each of the layers of analysis through an iterative, reflective process whereby the reading and evaluation of each layer stimulated the questions leading to the exploration of the subsequent layer. The following outline maps the path of discovery that I undertook as I peeled back the layers of discourse, not in search of definitive answers, but to uncover the “truths” and lies inherent in any genealogical history.

Chapter 3: Text as Experienced

In this dissertation, I turn first to the men and women — and to my own experience — to give voice to the actual experience of work-family interaction. Chapter 3 draws upon data collected from participants who contributed anecdotes that describe their impressions and experiences of maneuvering between and within the domains of work and family. Themes, identified through an interpretive and recursive process, embedded consistently and collectively within these anecdotes, raise the question that guided the next layer of hermeneutic inquiry, when I turn to the HRM research on work-family for answers and more questions. I return to these themes in the conclusion, to address whether the experiences of women and men who live the interface of work and family are addressed in the academic literature.

Chapter 4: Text as read

Chapter 4 serves as the text for the thematic analysis of Chapter 5. Chapter 4 is a summary of the extant mainstream HRM literature as published by the authors/researchers. Mainstream HRM literature represents the interaction of work and family as a puzzle waiting to be solved, but attempts to do so without questioning the underlying assumptions elemental to the foundation of this research stream — the discourses that define the domains and shapes their interaction. A distillation of the central themes and issues related to work-family interface as portrayed by these researchers forms a literature summary structured according to the mainstream management tradition without critique of the problematic.

Chapter 5: Text as Revealed

Discourse is a marriage of perspectives. Some of these interpretations are represented explicitly in text; others are hidden layers of meaning, and are either assumed to be understood by the reader, or are hidden from view to suppress their exposure.

In Chapter 5 the literature summary from Chapter 4 is treated as “text” and my dialogue with the text is developed in parallel to the mainstream literature review. Gadamer (1975; see also Prasad, 2002, p. 19) discusses how meaning is revealed through a conversation between the interpreter and the text. The text created in Chapter 4 thus becomes a participant asking questions of me, the researcher — questions that serve to challenge my prejudices and biases. I, as the interpreter of the text, then act in this chapter

(Chapter 5) to challenge and critique the text's truth claims within a poststructural reflection of the assumptions inherent in this text and the discourses imbued therein. Writing the literature summary (text as read) I attempted to place myself as the objective scientist in the tradition in which these texts are written. The self emerges in Chapter 5 as I question my own rewritings of these texts. The dispassionate voice of the "objective scientist" exists in contrast to the passion of the critic, the skeptic, the mother. I figuratively (and sometimes literally) stomp my feet asking for explication, justification, validation. The text sometimes answered, but in keeping with the positivist model, tends to ignore the subjective, thus revealing the discourses that include or exclude alternate viewpoints.

As I engaged in this dialogue with the text, I would use my reflective understanding to engage in a deconstructive reading of the text evaluating the essences of meaning obviated by the illusion of objectivity in the mainstream HRM literature. These central themes are the dominant discourses that shape and guide the writings of, and experience of, work and family interaction. Questions that were unanswered in my initial questioning, that were ignored, directed me to look for patterns of exclusion or silencing. Questions that were answered, but without depth or reflection illuminated hegemonic "truths" in the text. Discourses were frequently disguised as supportive and apparently empowering interpretations of data that created heroic, unattainable, and undesirable caricatures of working mothers. A methodology for analysis of discourse from a body of literature, which is summarized in the appendix, developed as the text was engaged through a reflective and deconstructive reading.

Chapter 6: Parenting the Text

Chapter 5 exposed themes that led me to engage in an historical evaluation of the context in which the academic HRM discourse took place. The first phase of this genealogical excavation, chapter 6, is centered on an analysis of the theoretical roots of the academic literature. A citation study, followed by a content analysis of the theories applied and referenced in the most cited HRM work-family articles revealed a privileging of particular theoretical models and a limited application of alternate models.

Chapter 7: The Ancestral Home

This analysis served as the catalyst for a deeper historical analysis of the social and political context in which work-family discourse first emerged in HRM research. Through a reflective process, I identified the norms of the cold war period in North America (principally, the USA) the period and evaluated the implications of the discourses of masculinity and femininity that permeated the fields in which the academic tradition of HRM was birthed.

Chapter 8: Text as lived

The mainstream HRM literature serves to illuminate, explain and guide practice. The discourses of work-family in HRM literature, frame researchers' analysis of the dilemmas and challenges experienced by the women and men who move across and through the

boundaries of work and home. Mainstream HRM literature presents these interpretations as hegemonic truths. These truths reflect the social and political context in which the discourse gained or entrenched its sovereignty, the Cold War era. Does lived experience, however, reflect or refract the truth claims embedded from this historical context? I approach this question by evaluating continuity and discontinuity between the discourses of work-family reflected in the cold war era (Chapter 7: the ancestral home of the text) and the experiences of the participants (Chapter 3: text as experienced) who act and interact within the frame of this discourse. The engagement of these answers in further dialogue with the themes of lived experience reveals new questions regarding the root of these truth claims — which, as will be shown, do not answer but rather evade the questions posed by lived experience.

CHAPTER 3: TEXT AS EXPERIENCED -- ASKING MOM AND DAD:

The Birth of this Dissertation: An Anecdote

It was the early days of my PhD coursework. My daughter, Tigana, (who was three at the time), was walking with me to university. Her daycare was onsite and one of my great joys was walking to campus with her each morning. It often felt as if it was our only quality time together since I was so immersed in my studies. The previous night, for example, time with my family had been limited to a quick good night kiss (a warm, sweet peppermint scented kiss) snatched during toothbrushing when I happen to wander by looking for a sharp pencil. As Tigana and I walked to the university that morning, the sun was warm and Tigana nestled her hand in mine. She asked if we could go to the playground after daycare. I paused before answering. She stopped and looked up at me. She said in such a mature sounding voice, "It's OK, Mom, Daddy told me you were very busy. You can be my mom again when you're done." At that moment, I realized that I was walking around with a scarlet letter on my forehead—an "H" for Hypocrite. If I was going to research work-family balance, I was going to have to start living it. We spent an hour on the swings that evening and I rediscovered the joy and freedom of being Tigana's mom.

Let me tell you about the time....

People share their experiences of significant life events through story. One cannot stand in the check-out line of a grocery store, visibly pregnant, without hearing others' stories of childbirth, pain, and transformation. An announcement to academic colleagues of the intent to defend a dissertation opens the floodgates to stories of horrendous committees, unanswerable questions, and trial by fire. These stories are modern morality plays, designed to share a life lesson to educate, inform, inspire (and perhaps, to frighten) the listener.

Inspired by my own experiences of attempting to balance and integrate my passion for motherhood and my vocation of academia, this dissertation reflects my desire to share and to understand my own story. Hermeneutics embraces the lived experience of

the researcher as an integral element of discovery. In order to reflect upon, challenge and build upon my own experience, I turn in this chapter to my own stories and to the stories of other parents to frame the hermeneutic process as an excavation of the layers of meaning of human experience, beginning with a reflection on shared perceptions. I thus begin my hermeneutic excavation with the question: What is the lived experience of men and women who maneuver between and within work and family responsibilities?

Method

Data

Anecdotes serve as the data for the first and foundational stage of this dissertation. The stories¹, collected for this phase of my study, although sometimes humorous and always poignant in their own right, were not told to me (and now to you) merely to share the details of an event; and in reality the details of the event were likely shadowed by failed memory or enhanced to support a perspective. The stories, rather, are shared as moral narratives that serve to illustrate and influence others regarding a value, a moral, or an experience. Anecdotes are value-laden and therein rests their usefulness. Anecdotes relate, not an experience itself, but the values imbued in the experience. By centering the analysis of the work-family interface on the value-laden nature of the issue, by using value-laden data, I am attempting to force a re-thinking of the context in which the problematic of work-family conflict is studied, and thus ensure that the very personal nature of this problematic is visible.

Anecdotes are stories or tales told by individuals (the anecdote or story-tellers) to present their account of an event or experience. I have used the terms "anecdote", "story," "tale" or "account" synonymously within this context. The term "events" refers to the experiences described within the anecdote.

Operating within structures that accept the discourse as “truths”, women and men must negotiate within the “hegemonic assumptions and the social practices which they guarantee” (Weedon, 1993, p. 126). The “truth” portrayed by management literature is a reflected and distorted version of the “reality” of experience as revealed in life history as data. Lived and told stories — autobiographically oriented anecdotes associated with the research puzzle (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000) — reveal the negotiation of the boundaries defined by the hegemonic discourses of work and family. The anecdotes collected for this study expose the passion of the subjective experience in contrast to the objectivity of the research that attempts to remedy the problem.

A “life history is any retrospective account by the individual of his [sic] life in whole or in part, in written or oral form, that has been elicited or prompted by another person” (Watson & Watson-Franke, 1985, p. 2). The goal of such reflection, however, is not to present egocentric, idiosyncratic descriptions of life experiences. The aim is to document and uncover shared meaning, commonalities of human experience that lead to understanding of the lives of human beings. These shared meanings delineate the gaps and transitions between the domains of work and family, contrasting and containing the “experience” as presented in the research literature, and as the reality “as experienced” by the players who daily maneuver between these domains. Dollard states that the life history is “an attempt to define the growth of a person in a cultural milieu and to make theoretical sense of it” (1935, p. 3). I contend that life histories can also act as a postmodern challenge to the “truth” of a theoretical perspective because it highlights the disconnect between theory and experience. Put another way, as asked by a friend when I

went on about my research one day: "If researchers have come so far at explaining and guiding us to a balanced, integrated life, why do I feel so conflicted all the time?"

The anecdote is a written "lived experience description." van Manen describes the anecdote "as a methodological device...to make comprehensible some notion that easily eludes us" (van Manen, 1997, p. 116). Issues of indeterminacy, ambiguity and context lie at the centre of this narrative method. Experience is reduced to a brief, although poignant, recitation of a moment in time that captures the essence (in the perception of the story teller) of the lived meaning of an event. As a method, the reduction receives its validation precisely through the rich but indeterminate meanings and interpretations that it uncovers.

van Manen further characterizes the anecdote as "a concrete counterweight to abstract theoretical thought" (van Manen, 1997, p. 119). The stories shared are not relayed by the teller to present general principles, statistical patterns, or theoretical constructs that intend to speak to cases generally. Instead, they were very specific incidents that are intended to stand out precisely through their incidental nature, their individuality, particularity, and ambiguity. Anecdotes shared by mothers and fathers regarding their experiences regarding work and family will be provided to structure the discussion and reflections presented here. They connect theory to life. Anecdotes, therefore, are the basic means through which my research will attempt, as Merleau-Ponty (1962, p. viii). says, to "reawaken the basic experience of the world of which science is a second-order experience."

In ontological terms, anecdote reflects human experience in the way in which human beings exist in the world as selves, and it implies that the essence of this experience lies precisely in its "lived" character. Moreover, the term suggests that this

lived character consists not simply in what is felt or undergone by sentient beings in the passage of time, but of what from this passing sentience is meaningfully singled out and preserved. The fact that the expression “lived experience” sounds to us tautological may be taken as a preliminary indication that its lived quality is of the very essence of experience, and in some vague average way is always already understood within experience itself.

In further contradistinction to science and the scientific method, these anecdotes are not used in terms of their “factual-empirical” or “factual-historical” value (van Manen, 1997, p. 116). They are not used in this dissertation as empirical or historical evidence, or even as real events. Although based on actual experience, their value is not to be measured in terms of their empirical validity or factual veracity. They are not factual accounts of experience (although they may certainly be factual or contain factual elements). A life history serves as “commentary of the individual’s very personal view of his own experience as he understands it” (Watson, 1976, p. 97). Anecdotes are illustrative of an experienced truth that may not be shared by all witnesses to an event. As such they are interpretive. They are, however, *experienced* on an emotional level as representative of one’s individual experience or lived truth.

Anecdotes, in their telling and retelling are carefully crafted, above all, to create resonance in the person hearing or reading the story, because they are, above all else, a story. As van Manen explains, the ultimate aim of anecdotes is to “bring experience vividly into presence, making it immediately or unreflectively recognizable” (van Manen, 2001). To meet this criterion of recognizability, the anecdotes used in this dissertation have been subjected to processes of composition, writing and re-writing or telling and

retelling by the individual telling the story. They have also been edited by me, either to remove identifying particulars, or to focus the story more explicitly. For example, one anecdote was edited to remove details describing the macaroni and cheese thrown up by a child when the point was that the mother was struggling to balance work demands during that period. The substantive meaning was maintained. The edited anecdotes were not reviewed by the contributors, as they were often anonymous and were sometimes unidentifiable, as the stories were embedded in secondary sources. The anecdotes, however, were not edited prior to the data analysis phase and therefore thematic analysis reflects the shared, rather than edited versions of the stories. The task of revision, whether undertaken by the story-teller or the researcher, resembles much more the craft of the fiction writer than the fieldwork or data collection associated with many other qualitative research methods. And as such, anecdotes again form a sharp contrast to the emphasis on the explicit, the unambiguous, and the factual associated with data mapping and other more “objective” processing techniques.

Sample and Data Collection

This chapter employed a convenience and snowball sampling of respondents contacted through personal communication, contact with online list serves and discussion groups, and through word-of-mouth referral. The Research Ethics Board at St. Mary's University screened and approved the letter of introduction and summary of the research program and request for respondents, copies of which are may be found in the Appendix. I also reviewed secondary sources, such as popular press articles and web blogs, to identify potential respondents, and/or to abstract anecdotes published in the public domain. I also reflected on my own experience of negotiating the work-family interface

and incorporated anecdotes reflecting my own experiences. A total of 145 anecdotes were collected, of which I wrote ten based on my own experiences. Given that some of the anecdotes were submitted anonymously to me via email, it is impossible to ascertain the exact number of respondents, although a minimum of 110 discreet communications were received.

Respondents were directed to my university-administered webspace where a detailed description of the study and ethical disclosures were provided. As respondents submitted the anecdotes themselves, the opportunity for interviewer bias was mitigated, although sample anecdotes were provided. These sample anecdotes were offered on the website to illustrate required style and length. Anecdotes are abbreviated versions of stories that may be complex and multi-faceted. Although, the potential for my biasing the participant's submission of anecdotes may exist due to exposure to sample anecdotes, this is mitigated by the choice of sample anecdotes. One anecdote portrayed a positive experience of work-family interaction; another had a more negative tone. The subject of the anecdote varied, with one being a non-market employed mother (stay at home mother) reflecting on the father's work involvement and the rest from working parents of both genders. The sample anecdotes were selected to provide balance in perspective and origination. That the sample anecdotes may shape the nature of the submitted anecdotes, or create a self-selection bias of the respondents remains possible. Given, however, that anecdotes are most frequently shared in an oral context as part of a social interchange, anecdotes by their nature are socially constructed and reconstructed based on factors of audience, topic of conversation and nature of the relationship. It is likely that the majority of anecdotes submitted were stories that the respondent has told before in other contexts,

and were merely being collected through the research process, rather than created in response to the researcher's question. In this sense, anecdote is a measure of lived experience than, because the anecdote is part of the teller's existing repertoire – part of their existing definition of self or of a situation -- and exists independently from the research process.

Anecdotes were collected from a broad range of respondents—professionally educated and employed working parents, stay-at-home parents, blue and pink-collar workers. I did not collect demographic information on the respondents because analysis was exploratory, not descriptive; and interpretive, rather than inferential. Therefore, it is not possible to differentiate experience on the basis of type of employment, age, or other demographic characteristics. Gender was often disclosed through semantic representation in the anecdotes themselves, e.g. self-identification as a “mother”.

Anecdotes gleaned from secondary/public sources were identified using Internet searches for blogs and popular press or public domain publications using search terms: “work-family”; “balance”; “work-life”; “working mother”. Forty-five anecdotes were identified using this method. Again, because these anecdotes were published prior to, and independently of, the research process, they represent a more authentic data source than responses to researcher prompting. The two data sources — primary and secondary/public domain — were kept separate during the analysis stage to assess whether there were any substantive differences in content or emotional flavour, which there were not.

Content analysis

I used a three-phase content analysis procedure (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miels & Huberman, 1984) to identify common and disparate themes, thus clustering anecdotes according to their thematic similarities. These similarities were defined as the emergent themes of the first order, and included categories such as “conflicting priorities” and “guilt.” The clustering process involved comparing and contrasting each anecdote with all other anecdotes and emergent themes. Anecdotes were copied and placed into separate documents with thematic headings. The objective was to unite anecdotes with similar meaning and separate anecdotes with different meanings. Some anecdotes had multiple themes represented, in which case the anecdote was duplicated and a copy was assigned to each thematic file. This was done to detect multiple levels of meaning (i.e., connotative as well as denotative). The clustering process was repeated until all anecdotes were organized according to their first-order emergent themes. These themes were then grouped according to their own thematic similarities. These were defined as the second-order themes, and included categories such as “working at home” and “work demands during nonwork hours.” This process continued until no further themes could be abstracted. The end result was a thematic hierarchy with several levels of abstraction. Using the constant comparative method, anecdotes were compared to the existing framework at each stage of analysis. As a result some categories were filled, others were redefined, some were subsumed into other categories, and some were abandoned if redundancy was apparent. For example, the category “time demand” was abandoned when I recognized that these time demands fit into other existing categories, such as “work demands during nonwork hours.” This category, “work demands during nonwork

hours,” was subsequently combined with other categories, including “work values in homelife,” to create a new category of “invasiveness of paid work in people's lives” as all anecdotes in these categories focused on the unwelcome movement of work demands and priorities into the family domain. Throughout the analyses the overall thematic hierarchy was under constant revision. This process continued until all anecdotes were analyzed.

One problem with the constant comparative method is that the categorization process is not uniform for all anecdotes. This is because the thematic hierarchy is evolving as the analyses proceed. As a result, categories identified at the beginning of the analysis could contain anecdotes better suited to a different category, which was identified later in the analysis. To address this issue the entire data set was re-analyzed to (a) reassess the existing categories, (b) content analyze each category for thematic 'purity', and (c) fine-tune and (yet again) modify the emergent categories.

Characteristics of Chosen Anecdotes

All anecdotes received in the data collection phase of this study were subject to the thematic review process. Just as research extracting salient quotes from interview data makes explicit choices regarding which excerpt to use to emphasize a point, I also employed a set of criteria to determine which anecdotes to utilize. Two anecdotes that I wrote, which reflect my own experiences, are cited within this chapter. They were selected because they met the criteria below and because they represented the collective themes identified in the analysis. Anecdotes were selected on the criteria of richness and depth.

Richness. Detailed description of people and events are included in the anecdote with the intention of engaging the reader and providing points of connection with the reader's own experience. Anecdotes are selected for use specifically as touchstones with common experiences for the listener/reader, in order to make these connections. An anecdote is very short relative to other forms of lived experience description, such as biography, yet, if it does its work well, will make connections with readers in ways that support critical reflection on their own experiences as parents or workers. The anecdote may include details of dilemmas and internal monologue, the thoughts and feelings of the story-teller — Schon's (1983) "reflection-in-action." Dilemmas, about the relevance and appropriateness of the philosophical ideals are raised often quite explicitly, but are usually not dealt with in any final way, leaving readers to ponder their own values and beliefs on this issue, and whether, in the moment, they would have chosen to solve the dilemmas differently. The selected anecdotes are rich in detail, capture an experience and share a value or opinion on an experience or event.

Depth. The anecdote is intended to leave the reader with questions and reflections about a whole range of beliefs, values, perceptions, and ideas. It is not closed, and in some senses it is not fair or balanced either. The story-teller's perspective on the nature of work-family has its own validity, but within the scope of the tale as told, there is no real consideration of the issue from the other participants' perspectives. The reader is enabled, in part by these imbalances, to 'question the answers' presented in the narrative. If it has been well written — has 'depth' in van Manen's (1990) sense — then it will engage readers in critical reflection on their own beliefs and practices. As noted above, the anecdote also attempts to indicate that this story does not occur in isolation — the

other players are reacting in various ways. It is clearly impossible in a very short tale to capture too much more of this complexity, but the use of parallel accounts, and mentions of the reactions of other players, do go some way toward increasing the depth of the tale.

Themes

Six themes were extracted. These themes will serve two functions: first, they will be used to frame the question for the next layer of hermeneutic analysis and thereby establish the agenda for the entire hermeneutic journey; and, second, they will serve to bracket the entire dissertation in lived experience. This dissertation topic arose from my own struggles balancing work and family and therefore it is paramount that the lived experience of work-family interaction not be overshadowed by the analysis of the other layers of discourse that focus on academic research. This chapter represents the reflective arc of the hermeneutic process; in the conclusion of the dissertation, these themes will be reintroduced and serve as a focal point in the evaluation of relevance of the multiple layers of analysis to addressing the concerns of the women and men who attempt to juggle/balance/survive/enjoy their full and complex lives.

1. The increasing invasiveness of paid work in people's lives.

Increasingly, the boundaries between paid work and the rest of life are blurred (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate 2000). Technologies, such as email and call forwarding, remove work from a workplace environment and permit (encourage? require?) one to maintain a work presence regardless of physical location:

We were on vacation last winter. It was so hard to get away, but I just knew that I had to relax or I would lose it. Anyway, I told everyone that I wasn't going to be available and off we went. When we got to the resort, one of the things I read in the brochure in the

hotel room was that there was an Internet Café on site. I swore to my family that I wasn't going to work, but I just had to. I only checked my email once a day, but it helped me keep the fires out at the office so that I could enjoy the family time.

Although this permeability of spatial boundaries creates conditions whereby both family and work needs may be satisfied during both work and nonwork hours, it is most often work that spills over into nonwork time (Hochschild, 1997; White, Hill, McGovern, Mills & Smeaton, 2003). Workplace demands have claimed territory in the nonwork domain and have assumed sovereignty:

We had been careful and really thought that we had the timing perfect. Our new little bundle of joy would join our family as the spring thaw hit the city. By that, I mean the end of tax season. I remember the day perfectly. I was sitting in my office reviewing a stack of tax files when the phone rang. I could hear the anxiety in my wife's voice. She was in labour. The baby was early. Really early. I don't know if the anxiety was because of the risk to the baby coming early, or whether it was because she knew that I was in the middle of the busiest period.... Anyway, I asked her to call back when the contractions were more regular. Sadly, things happened pretty quickly after that and I never did get that call. I missed my baby being born. But, what could I do, it was tax season.

The suspicion that a home-based worker “really isn't working,” thus supporting the thesis that face time expectations have not shifted to reflect organizational structures facilitating family-friendly benefits (Perlow, 1990) is also reflected in the anecdotes of those who engage in market-work, but do so from the home. These parents shared stories that spoke to a dismissal, or lack of respect, of their working reality, which because of its location, was interpreted by others to mean endless availability to fill in the gaps of caregiving created when the majority of parents work:

As a writer, I work from home. And that's the problem. When there is something that needs to be done, everyone else says, “I can't get away from the office, so you have to do it.” Like getting mom or the kids or the neighbors' kids to the doctors, or picking up forms from the lawyers. I don't mind doing the occasional errand or favor, because I do have that flexibility. But it gets to a constant thing, until I have to put my foot down and

get bitchy about it. People think because you don't have to work 9-5 at a desk, that you don't have to work.

The work hours at the physical workplace setting have not dropped to reflect the fact that employees also conduct work at nonwork locations, such as at the home (Warren, 2003). The occupation, or taking over, of the family domain also incorporates a temporal absorption of family time into the work realm. This absorption may be coercive or made an attractive alternative, an occupation cloaked in velvet, as is the case with organizations absorbing "family-time", by becoming an "extended family" to the workers:

As a consultant, I work with a variety of companies. This last trip I was working for a company that prided itself on its excellent employee relations. I arrived early and was directed to the staff cafeteria. I was astounded to see so many people there before work, and when I joined the line-up, was even more astonished to find a gourmet breakfast laid out. I asked what the occasion was, and was told that this was standard fare: the company had hired a gourmet chef and heavily subsidized the cafeteria. "And you like this?" I asked. "We love it!" was the reply. "This is the greatest company to work for, we feel taken care of, I'd move in if I could!" The company had them coming in early and staying late, talking shop over crepes, and the employees thanked them for the privilege! And I wanted to say, "You idiots, why aren't you home eating with your families?"

The workday has become extended, to the degree that some parents shared their belief that penalties are enacted when one behaves as if boundaries did exist and workplace demands were unwelcome during family time. Indeed face time, or a physical seen presence in the workplace, remains integrally linked to career growth and work rewards (Perlow, 1995).

One of my colleagues [finance department, at a multinational] has kids. She comes in really early every morning, but leaves by 4:30 in the evening so she can have time with her kids. Even though she actually puts in the same number of hours as we do, and takes work home with her, the others in the department always comment that she is "leaving

early” because no one else leaves before 7pm. I doubt that she is going to get promoted because we all work late and she’s seen as not doing her share.

Even socially oriented activities are seen as nondiscretionary and contribute to the face- time accounting:

One kid had the flu, threw up all over me. The other seemed to see this as a sign of weakness and chose that very moment to jump off the couch onto the dog. Dog to vet. Kid to doctor. Other kid to bedroom. It was a day from hell. I kept looking at the clock waiting for (husband/kids dad) to come home. Five o’clock. Yeah, reprove. Someone to take over this disaster site and maybe a chance to breath. Then the phone rang, I could hear the bar sounds in the background. “I’ll be late. Some of the guys wanted to go for drinks. Gotta work. Sorry. Know you’ll be fine.” It wasn’t even open for discussion. Whether it is slogging beer or attending meetings, he’s the breadwinner and the one who works. What does that make me—the slave?

Global business presence has created or reinforced an expectation that employees will be available to clients and colleagues regardless of time zone. Hence, men and women continue to work a normal or extended shift at the workplace, and take more work home with them to complete in the nonwork setting of home (Cross, 1993; Leete & Schor, 1994). A temporal as well as spatial occupation of the work domain has thus occurred:

I work at the West Coast office. Head office is in New York. If someone from head office calls at 9am their time and I’m not here, I get teased later when they do connect. My daycare doesn’t even open until 7am. I thought about forwarding the work line to my cell phone so that I could pretend to be at my desk wherever I am.

Intimate relationships or institutions such as family, friendship and community are squeezed out of existence:

I am divorced. My wife claimed to a mutual friend that I didn’t even notice that we got divorced because I was at work. She is right. I do work a lot. Yes, I missed baseball games and dance recitals, but I never missed anything really important. My kids understand, that this is just what Daddy needs to do.

or are subjected to forces of commodification:

I have colleagues who have two kids. They have a nanny who looks after the kids during the day while they work, a teenage kid comes over to look after the kids and then clean up after supper, and they have a live-in helper (a university student) who takes care of the kids on weekends and helps the kids with their homework.

Caregiving is delegated, skating lessons are outsourced, birthday party planning is delegated, and self development such as personal reading (except as it relates to career development) is forgone. Family activities become scheduled into increasingly busy lives and family time becomes less about interaction and more about face time:

We have a nanny. She is great. I remember the week we decided to hire one. [Daughter] had been begging and begging for me to take her skating. For weeks. But, the timing never worked out. One time, we were actually putting on skates, when the cellphone rang. Anyway, my daughter is as busy as I am. I got her her own personal organizer. The only first grader with one! We do get family time though. Like on Saturday, I went to her swimming lesson and watched.

This commodification of family life has resulted in a fundamental shift in the structuring of family interaction that has become dominated by consumerism (Schor, 2004). Instead of entertaining each other, family members instead consume the numerous products of the entertainment industries forging bonds between family members, which are no longer shaped by working together but rather in sharing each other's leisure or consumptive pursuits (e.g., the parents in the stands at Little League competitions; family summer vacations and trips to the mall):

Each week, when my husband teaches a night class, my daughter and I have a "girls night out" together. Last week we were discussing which activity to engage in. I suggested going to a movie. She got this kind of sad look on her face and said "Mom, can't we just hang out and talk. We don't always have to do things, you know?!"

Additionally, there is an increasing necessity to organize future time, to plan ahead and prioritize future activity. This entails arranging for the purchase of services and

scheduling to maximize utility of the limited time left available after work time commitments, which are often unbounded, are satisfied.

My school gives all the children agendas. They think that it is important that the children learn how to organize their time. I think that this is an important lesson. Like last week, for example, we were so busy with games, playdates and meetings for us, that my husband and I didn't actually see each other for days. No kidding. I was asleep when he went to bed and I left in the morning before he and the kids were up. I have started to book off Friday lunchtime from work. I schedule some fake meeting and take that time to have a date with my husband. It's the only way we have a chance to talk and remember why we are married.

Work has occupied the family domain, both temporally and physically, but recognition of activities undertaken away from direct employer supervision are too suspiciously "not like real work" to count. Therefore, it is not only the work domain that is privileged, but the worksite -- that activities that take place removed from the office/factory/store do not enter into the accounting of worktime. This occupation is unquestioned, and often unnoticed.

2. The Devaluing of Care

As work increasingly dominates the priorities of the parents, time for, as well as the value of, care is diminishing. Parent-work becomes work that even a "stranger" can do:

My organization has emergency ill-child, that is they make childcare available and actually pay for a caregiver to come to your home when the kid is too sick to go to daycare or school. I know that I should be grateful for it, but I really think that when my son is sick, that he needs me, not some stranger. Like last year when [son] had chicken pox. No, he wasn't going to die, but he was feeling really awful and so desperately wanted me to be with him. He kept saying that only I could make him not want to itch. I called in to report that I wasn't going to be in. But, I lied and said that I was sick, otherwise I would have been expected to go in.

This devaluation of the family domain is, in part, a consequence of the corporate intrusion into the domestic sphere, the substitution of women's labour by corporate products (Hochschild, 2003). The family system has metamorphosed from being a unit of production to being a unit of consumption. Childcare and home-based support activities are outsourced, just as one might outsource an aspect of supply chain process in business.

In this climate, women and men report increased loneliness, eroding support networks, and falling quality of life (Bauman, 2003). Family life is sacrificed for professional or organizational advancement.

I chose not to have children. Not because I never saw myself as a mother, but because I knew that it would involve sacrifice. I know that people talk about combining work and family, but I felt that I couldn't do that. I couldn't be both at 100 percent. I was in my early twenties when I made that decision. Now, at 50, I am starting to think that I made a mistake. Our company just went through layoffs. I have worked here for decades, but they don't have a commitment to anyone. If I was laid off, what would I have? I have no husband. No kids. Just my work. And that could vanish overnight.

Care-work is perceived to be of less value than market-work (Hochschild, 1989). Parents sharing anecdotes regarding the public perception of their role as parents, in contrast to their role as employee/profession, expressed resentment and anger at the devaluing of their care function:

"What do you do?" is the line that you will find starts almost all conversations at dinner parties and other social events. Make sure that you come up with an answer different than "mom" or you will get the same deer-in-the-headlights look a man might get if he says that he's an accountant or undertaker. I stayed home with our firstborn for almost three years. I actually started to make a game of it. There was one banquet when I tracked the time it took for someone to make their excuses and run if I said that I was a stay at home mom in contrast to the response if I used my previous vocation of social worker. Men were worse. But the women did it too—unless they too had stayed home and then they would cling to me as one would a long lost friend.

Parents also expressed frustration regarding the stereotyping of mothers as lacking in meaningful skills or interest (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines & Deaux, 2004):

I will never forget the first time I discovered that the professional me had become invisible. It was just a couple of months after our first daughter was born. We were invited to a barbeque hosted by one of my husband's work colleagues. I had socialized with this group on other occasions over the years and I had always enjoyed the interaction. They knew that my work involved me in government policy decisions and I would often be drawn into conversation with them regarding political issues. Great fun. Not this time. Here I am standing by the barbeque and the wife of the host approaches me obviously really excited about engaging me in conversation. "So, what soaps are you watching now that you're at home?" I would try to join discussions about issues and the conversation invariably would stop and I would be asked about things like recipes and shopping locations. The professional/interesting me was invisible to these people. I was just a mom and therefore couldn't have meaningful conversation.

Parents are defensive of their priorities regarding families, sharing that they feel a need to argue against organizational norms that devalue the role:

We left [home city] as DINKs [double income, no kids] and became parents during my sabbatical in another part of the country. When we returned, I had to complete a report outlining my achievements during the year. I actually did get some good publications and conferences that year, but I found myself becoming really defensive. The colleague who has the office next to me kept joking that I was losing my focus and should have done more. One day, he cornered me on the way into my office and said "So tell me again what you did on your sabbatical." I stared him down and answered "Created life. What did you do on yours?"

3. Adopting the discourse of work

The assumption that the skills, competencies and practices of the work domain have inherent value in the family domain is a related theme. The standard of comparison for "effective" and "positive" family functioning is the workplace; parents report their competencies and strategies in the family domain using managerial language. This discourse was adopted more frequently in anecdotes shared by fathers:

I am a stay-at-home father and I tell my kids that I'm not just their dad, I am their boss. I set the schedules, I define the objectives. I'm a nice boss, but we all have our job descriptions. [Son]'s job is to do his homework and chores. If he does them, he is rewarded. He gets his allowance. A few weeks back, he got a new game for his Gameboy and would not stop playing. He wanted to play through dinner; he'd hide under his sheets and play in the dark. His chores didn't get done. His homework didn't get done. So I sat

him down for a performance review. I even called it that. If he doesn't shape up—well I can't fire him, it is like it's a union shop — but I did take away his allowance.

A strategy employed to revalue parental activities in the workplace was adopting the discourse of work to describe family centered activities:

I am very proud of being a father. I took parental leave when our last baby was born and it truly was the most positive experience of my entire life. I loved every bit of it, even changing diapers. I never understood the education you receive in being a parent. When I returned and was asked what I did on my leave I told my co-workers that I learned time management skills, stress management, organizational strategies. I was the family CEO. I don't mention the diapers or that I am an expert is assessing the viscosity of poop.

Anecdotes by stay-at-home mothers who had previously engaged in professional market-work also focused on this theme of valuing care-work by a comparison to market-work, but, in contrast to the anecdotes by fathers, often shared their prior career or education in the sharing of the story, arguing in essence that their professional credentials were valid.

I am a librarian. I used to be the head librarian of the local children's library. Now, I am my daughters' personal librarian. We have a specialized collection of children's literature that would serve as an exemplar for early child literacy. Other moms often call upon me to consult regarding their choices for their children's collections. I met up with the current head librarian the other day and he asked if I would be coming back someday. I told him that while I doubted it, if I did, I would expect that these years should count as professional experience because even though my client base was small, I was and am always a librarian.

Discourse, in addition to representing a shared lexicon, is revealed in the patterns of interaction. Inappropriately applied in nonwork settings, some managerial techniques thus represented an unwelcome intrusion:

I have this buddy. I mean, I had this friend. He is in the Military and served in Kabul. The week he came back, they asked if he wanted to go on a training course. He agreed. I mean, he had been away from his wife and kids for months, arrives home and then leaves again. By choice. Even though he is my friend, I thought that she should kick him out, but she didn't have the chance. He came back from the trip and sat her down to discuss their marriage. He had put together a PowerPoint presentation with charts and graphs outlining what was wrong with the marriage and why he was leaving. Now no one will

talk to him and he doesn't understand why. I mean, a PowerPoint presentation on their marriage! Treating her like an employee he was firing.

4. The individual focus of control

Despite changes in the composition of the workforce and the development of policies to make paid work more compatible with the reality of family needs, the actual structures of work have remained relatively stable (Perlow, 1998). Commitment is equated with physical workplace presence or organizational face time. Structures, scheduling, and expectations are predicated on the assumption that employees have infinite time to devote to organizational needs, as if employees have wives at home:

We have three young children. A while back, the executive in charge of our division decided that we should have weekly meetings to discuss changes in our area and coordinate tasks. No problem. Except, he announced that these would be early morning breakfast meetings. My husband commutes almost two hours in the morning, so it has always been my job to take the kids to school. The guys in the room all smiled and nodded. I now have to get a local teenager to come to my house by 7am on Fridays to get the kids ready and off to school. I didn't dare say anything.

Exceptions are made on an individual basis:

I received a phone call one morning last fall from my teenage son's school. He hadn't shown up for class that day or the day before. At first I was terrified. So, I called our home phone and he answered. He had cut school. I really laid into him, and his response was "you can't make me". I won't tell you what I said in response, but I'm glad no one was near my desk. So, I made arrangements with my boss to come in late and stay late so that I can see that he goes to school. I was told to keep this quiet, so that the others in the organization wouldn't expect the same deal.

These accommodations are often interpreted as a sign of weak commitment and result in a career cost to the employee (usually a woman) (Smithson, Lewis, Cooper, & Dyer, 2004):

I quit my job during my last pregnancy. I had gone into my supervisor's office. I was showing and there was no way that I could hide the pregnancy any longer. She smiled and nodded and assured me that they would make accommodations for my maternity

leave, especially since I would have to cut down on travel at the end. Anyway, she had pulled out my personnel folder and noted that I was pregnant and had requested leave. Then, even though I had said absolutely nothing to indicate this (nor would I have!) she wrote "committed to coming back?" on the page. Where did this come from? I knew that I wouldn't go anywhere in this company and started looking elsewhere.

Workplace initiatives address the needs of individuals without questioning the underlying assumptions that create the problem to begin with. Both problems and solutions are challenges addressed at the individual (employee, parent) or organizational level (workplace, family), with the problematic defined as the family:

When I announced to my supervisor that I was pregnant again, she was really excited for me. I don't think that the organization could have been better. I was booked into a meeting with the HR Manager who worked out a solution for me to minimize the problems because of the pregnancy and maternity leave. I was thrilled that they were willing to accommodate my needs.

Government mandated policy or rights based protocols do not remedy the situation; parents describe access to programs and legislated supports as impeded and the negotiation process placing them in antagonistic positions:

I became ill during one of my pregnancies. The university where I work is required, as any employer in Canada is, to accommodate medical issues in pregnancy. I went to my Dean with a letter from my specialist ordering me unto bed rest for the last month of the pregnancy. He said that I could only leave after I had found someone to cover my classes. I ended up hospitalized when I couldn't find someone to cover for me. Even so I kept on teaching. When I later asked why the administration hadn't found someone to cover the classes for me, like they had done for an ill male colleague that same semester, I was told that they couldn't treat my illness the same because mine was pregnancy related. My response—haven't you heard about the human rights act?!

Further, those parents who report "supportive" organizations describe access to service being treated as if it were a "perk" or a "favour" offered on an individual basis:

My child's school starts at 8:30 in the morning. This is the same time as I am expected to be at work. My employer is very understanding and lets me come in late as long as I work late to make it up. One day last week as I arrived ten minutes late, one of my colleagues commented on my tardiness. My supervisor put her in place and asked her when was the last time that I had taken lunch. I really appreciate the flexibility.

Even when access to a service is legislated, the employee may portray access as if it were a “privilege” for which they express gratitude:

I was the first one in my organization to have a baby after EI was extended [Employment Insurance coverage for parental leave was extended in 1998 from 26 to 50 weeks]. I told the office that I was going to take the entire leave and they didn't give me too hard a time about it. I was so relieved. I had prepared a long speech about how I would keep up to date in my area and come in if they needed me during busy periods. But, they were great to me and that made me even happier about the thought of coming back.

Some parents who work from home, either due to the nature of their work or by utilizing workplace programs that facilitate telecommuting, report a perception on the part of colleagues and others that they are somehow “getting away with something.”

I work for a large insurance agency processing claims. The vast, vast majority of my time is spent on the phone with claimants. When my husband was transferred to a nearby community, I approached my supervisor and asked to use the telecommuting program that I knew was on the books. She didn't want to lose me, I am a good worker, but it was a battle. I remember her exact words when she told me that my request had been approved—“OK [Name], we'll let you do this, but don't tell anyone else here that you're working from home because then everyone will want to do it.” Those who do know always tease me about working in my bathrobe and slippers and ask if I worked in a round of golf that day.

Responsibility for managing work-family interaction is placed on the individual.

Although organizations are offering services and benefits to facilitate domain movement, these benefits are offered to individuals and do not necessarily reflect shifts in organizational culture. Employees are “grateful” to their organizations for “allowing” them to participate in legislated or company-sponsored programs. These programs are “perks”—they do not reflect new ways of doing things, just ways to accommodate individuals who choose not to fit into the norm.

5. Gendered roles:

The men who shared their stories even more acutely experience this privileging of family-based accommodations. Female employees accessing parental leave provisions or caring for family is “understood” as consistent with sex roles:

I take this on willingly as a mom. When my kids need to see the doctor, I am the one who goes with them. A while back, I was double booked. I had a meeting and a doctor's appointment at the same time. I phoned the client and said that I wasn't able to be there in person. The offer was made to do a phone meeting. I had kept my reason deliberately vague, so I guess the assumption was that I just couldn't attend in person. I explained that I couldn't reliably be near a phone. Could the client come to where I was? No. Could I come half an hour later? I couldn't guarantee that I would be done and by then it would be too late to take my kid back to school. Finally, I broke down and admitted that I had to take my kid to the doctor. The laughter could be heard through the phone and down the hall. The response—of course you have to be there, you're the mom, why didn't you just say so?

Men are simply not expected to have responsibility for the family domain and, if so engaged, are seen to be deviating from their role and may be perceived as heroes:

My wife and I are both academics. When our first child was born we attended a conference together. As the baby was still just a few months old, she came with us and we took turns caring for her and attending sessions. If my wife showed up for sessions with the baby, she was asked if she minded sitting by the door and others would sympathetically support her in the challenge of not having childcare—which we hadn't even considered, nor would we have. When I went to sessions, I was enthusiastically greeted. “Don't you dare leave if she starts to cry,” said one session chair. “This is wonderful, seeing a dad so involved” said others. The polarization of the response startled us when we compared notes later that day.

On the other hand, men who assume responsibility in the domestic sphere may also have their masculinity questioned, or be seen as shirking their “real” responsibilities:

My husband took parental leave after our last child was born. I found the response fascinating. To the women in my department, he was a hero and I was the luckiest woman alive. Which I am. To the men of grandparent age, too, he was a source of envy as they talked about how much they love their grandchildren and wish that they had experienced being a dad more fully. But to the other young guys, he was a bit of a joke. Some made comments like how he was getting an early sabbatical, another asked if he was giving birth too.

A workforce that assumes a scarcity of time and emotional commitment to the dual roles of mother and employee (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) penalizes women's engagement in family-related responsibilities:

I worked part time for a while when my daughter was young. It worked really well for me, but I knew at some point that I would want to work full time again. A full time position opened up where I was working, but somehow I didn't hear about it until after it was filled. I assumed that this had been an oversight as I was perceived to be a good employee and had done well on my evaluations. When I casually asked one day about why I hadn't been considered, I was told—and I quote—“Oh, we just assumed that you wouldn't be interested because you're a mom. We didn't think that you'd want the job, so we didn't mention it.”

Men did not report stories of long term penalties for their family involvement, raising the possibility that the expectation exists that men's deviation from gender roles to be involved in childcare is a short term distraction:

We all know how much work a newborn is. And [husband] has really embraced being a dad and wants to spend all the time he can with the baby. He recently had his performance review for the last year. He was really, really worried as he had definitely scaled back in order to do more with our baby and to help me. He went into [supervisor]'s office. He sat down opposite her and prepared for the worse. She kept her face stone cold as she handed the written report to him. It was OK. One aspect of the work was highlighted as below expectation. But, the comment was made under it that, “you have over several years demonstrated your abilities and we understand that for personal reasons, you haven't been able to do perform to your normal level in this area. Now that this distraction is over, we are confident that your performance will return to its previous high standards.”

6. Invisible family

The participants who submitted anecdotes shared positive experiences of the joy of discovery of parenthood, the delight in a supportive employer, and the pride of successful negotiation between the expectations of work and home. A majority of the anecdotes, however, shared stories of their disappointment as they expressed their frustration negotiating the boundaries. With only one exception, this frustration was

focused on barriers that impeded family oriented roles. This frustration was often expressed as fear of negative repercussions if they “followed the heart” as one respondent said, and prioritized a family function.

As discussed earlier, the workplace has made itself “at home” in the family realm, in that employees routinely work extended hours and maintain availability during “non-work” hours. The parents who shared their stories with me reported that the family had little place in their work environment and that there was a “need” to conceal the very existence of their families:

A hug, a kiss and I fly out the door. Into my car. To the office. To the meeting. Here I am the doer, the fixer, the one we can all rely on to make this office machine work properly. I am the Queen of the office. I rule. And then the phone rings, the baby threw up: “Come and get her please.” I look out at the well running machine of the office and think of the broken washing machine at home. The dishes waiting to be loaded into the dish washer that may or may not work. The sick child that I must (want) to attend to. Is there any work that I can legitimately take home with me and make it look like that is what I intended to do all along? I am a pretender to the throne. I am a fraud.

Family responsibly is not to distract from workplace priorities (Osterman, 1995). Parents reported a fear (or reality) of negative consequences if they attended to family needs during work hours:

I collapse into bed. I am sick with exhaustion. I have too much to do. I am all things to all people and yet I feel like I am nothing. I am a mom. At work today I almost got caught—I tried to convince my boss that I was talking to a client rather than to my teenage daughter. My boss, she gave me the look that told me I wasn’t fooling anyone. I know that I will hear about it one of these days when she needs ammunition against me for something. But, she will be careful because we are “family friendly”. They talk about balance. Yeah, right, I am balancing on the edge of a cliff and might fall off.

Mentoring regarding the display of family photos and mementos highlighted the gender divide regarding the appearance of the family in the workplace. Women are

encouraged to obviate family commitment, with family responsibility clearly linked to nonwork time (Nippert-Eng, 1996):

I attended a seminar organized by my employer on women in management. The idea was to respond to complaints that we women weren't making it to the top in our industry by showing us what we were doing wrong. The presenter told us that one of the mistakes women make is having their offices look like their homes with pictures of the kids, kids' drawings and so on. This distracts from the impression that we are serious business people. We should limit our display to one tasteful snapshot of the family doing something recreational and fun, preferably in an exotic local.

Paternal commitment is assumed to enhance workplace commitment because the primary breadwinner role is believed to motivate achievement at work (Riggs, 1997).

Fathers are encouraged to display their family as trophies:

When I was first dating the woman that I later would marry, I had her drop by the office one day to show her off. She was so beautiful, that I wanted the guys to see what a catch I had made. I was in a meeting later that month with one of the senior partners of the firm. He mentioned having seen [my girlfriend] and told me that I was a lucky man. He then said to me that he and others in the company were glad that I was "settling down." Later, when we announced that we were expecting our first child, I framed the ultrasound picture and put it on my desk for everyone to see.

Family needs are "accommodated" or "mitigated" by the workplace and organizational needs are "understood" by the family. This distinction was very clear to the parents who shared their stories. Workplace priorities are expected to dominate their decision making. For many parents, this model of commitment has not gone unchallenged. Their voices are hoarse, although in reality their cries of protest are usually whispers, uttered in the back of a boardroom — muttered comments as the men and women around them nod silently in agreement as the power-brokers shuffle and reshuffle work schedules and priorities with no regard for the reality that many have children waiting late at daycare, dinner to cook, and life to live.

Limitation: When a limitation is not really one

Qualitative researchers are often called upon to champion the validity of their approach. Some qualitative researchers question the use of the very term “validity” whether applied to their method or to quantitative approaches — that are assumed to be valid even as subjected to an interpretive process in analysis. I offer this discussion of “validity” not to defend my choice of data, but rather to champion it. When researching lived experience, what is at issue is how the subject constructs meaning rather than the “accuracy” of their perceptions. Whether the anecdote portrays the narrator as hero or victim, the objective veracity of the details can neither be verified nor are they relevant to the essential question of how the respondent *experienced* the situation or incident. There is no purpose in, for example demonstrating that an anecdote unfairly casts an employer as over-emphasizing work priorities, because even if it could be shown that the workplace in question has a plethora of “family-friendly” policies in place, it is the employees’ perceptions of the situation that ultimately determines whether those policies will be recognized, accessed, and utilized. Lived experience is rife with misinterpretation — or at least subsequently reinterpreted events — as we come to appreciate another’s viewpoint and revisit what had been defining incidents or self-constructs. Such reconstructions in no way invalidate previous experience, but rather generate a new set of equally revealing anecdotes. Indeed, anecdotes are often the best source of illustrating both the mechanisms of false consciousness in the social construction of reality, and the moment when such false consciousness is penetrated. Through the careful collection and thematic analysis of sufficient anecdotes, one is able to establish both the dominant patterns of life as actually experienced by the respondents, and to identify the daily

contradictions or significant departures that may call those same self- and situational definitions into question. The “validity” of anecdote rests in its ability to capture an individual’s experience and reflect shared perceptions, that although not objectively “factual”, are at the heart of lived experience.

Conclusion

Common to the themes unearthed in this analysis of lived experience, is the conclusion that the current work-family interface seeks to balance commitments within a context that is already highly unbalanced in favour of the corporate sector. This imbalance is never recognized, however, because the current discourse lacks historical perspective — the focus is on the present without understanding how past assumptions shape current reality. This omission is a key one because the discourse continues to define as an appropriate level of commitment to the work domain the norms that emerged when gender roles had males as full time employees, and women full time in the home. The current work-family discourse fails to acknowledge that the home has already given up an additional 40 hours per week to the work domain. Total commitment to the workplace may be possible from a worker who has full-time backup at home, but this norm has remained unchanged even though *both* roles, are now dedicated to work. Yet any attempt to take time for family is seen as intrusion on work time by the employer, so women’s commitment is not trusted because it fails to follow male norms that were only possible because female took full responsibility for the domestic sphere.

A further line of inquiry is thus indicated by an exposure of and questioning of basic assumptions of the nature of work and family life. Conflict is an outcome of the

interaction of the domains of work and family as they exist within the dominant discourses, which define the expected behaviours of employed parents.

Several limitations to the work-family discourse, in terms of how it effects women and men who attempt to fill roles in both domains, have been raised which suggest the need for a shift in the dominant discourse — a redefinition of the domains of work and family. Although recognizing that the spheres of work and family interact, the emphasis of the experience of women and men who engage in work and family roles is placed on mitigating and managing the overlap, not on recognizing that the conceptual divide between the spheres does not reflect the reality of how most workers experience their lives. The penalties paid by employees, particularly women, reflect that the status quo is both limiting and destructive. The underlying assumption that these spheres must be separated is intact, moderated only to allow smoother movement between them.

Research agendas are typically framed on the basis of “contribution”: How does a study contribute to the understanding of a phenomenon? In hearing the voices of the men and women who maneuver between the domains of work and family, I am left wondering what 40 years of research on work-family interaction has contributed to enhancing the lived experience of parents. Surely there must be answers that will mitigate these challenges expressed by those whose stories I relate. Is there a disconnect between research and lived experience, whereby the advancements made in academia are not translated to working parents? I therefore turn my hermeneutic investigation to the question: What has academic research on work-family contributed to our understanding of work-family interaction?

CHAPTER 4: TEXT AS READ

Introduction

Women and men who attempt to maneuver or coexist in the realms of work and family face many barriers and challenges. Their stories tell us of a perceived need to limit their involvement in family, to hide their commitment to their children, and to prioritize workplace demands. This creates dissonance and a sense of futility — even as the voices reflected in the previous chapter were often veiled whispers, they were also intense in their expression of confusion and struggle. Organizational efforts to accommodate the family needs, while welcomed by many parents, are seen as limited and baring the label, “strings attached”. One may access programs and services, for example, but at a cost to one’s career advancement and to one’s account of organizational goodwill.

Work-family interaction, however, is *not* a recent or even newly acknowledged phenomenon. Research addressing the demographic shifts of the later part of the 20th century (such as the increased involvement of women, and mothers, in market work) is well established. It is interesting to note, however, that academic articles on work-family continue to identify these demographic trends as if they are a new phenomenon. Boyer, Maertz, Pearson and Keough (2003), for example, reference changing employment patterns of women as causing the work-family interface to become more significant, even though this trend has been identified by work-family researchers for decades (c.f. Pleck, 1977). Given that the work-family interface has been subject to considerable research attention for over four decades, and assuming that management academics are attempting to examine the antecedents and mitigate the deleterious outcomes of work-family

interaction, why is it that parents (as exemplified in the previous chapter) continue to struggle? Is there a disconnect between the research and lived experience?

I therefore turn my hermeneutic investigation to the question: What has academic research on work-family contributed to our understanding of work-family interaction? This chapter overviews the HRM literature on work-family interaction, thereby creating a summary of the orientation and conclusions from the perspective of mainstream HRM researchers. The subsequent chapter, Chapter 5, extends this analysis and provides a post-structural discourse analysis of this literature.

Method

Hermeneutic research is a form of textual analysis that examines language and experience for meaning and context. Often a passage or a segment of an interview is examined for layers of meaning and reflections of social and cultural context. Given that my hermeneutic excavation has led me to a questioning of a vast quantity of text — 706 articles on work-family as of June 1, 2005 (as identified in the Social Sciences Citation Index²), a deconstructive reading of all these articles is clearly untenable. Consequently the purpose of this chapter is to create a text summarizing the mainstream HRM research literature on work-family interaction that may stand in for the larger 'text' by distilling this volume of work down to its dominant themes. This summary is not intended to

² To further refine the article selection to HRM-relevant literature, this chapter focuses primarily on articles contained with the ABI Inform/Proquest Management database, since it is the premier reference database for mainstream HRM researchers.

identify gaps in the literature, or to critique the findings to support a program of research. The intent is to capture an accurate image of research on this important topic.

This chapter focused on producing the relevant articles contained with the ABI Inform/Proquest Management database.

This chapter presents the text of HRM work-family research using its own discourse and style of presentation, with a goal of minimal interpretation beyond distillation of principle themes. Positivist HRM research, relies heavily on statistical analysis, is reductionist in nature and positions itself as measuring an objective, measurable phenomenon; this chapter is therefore styled following this tradition. I focus on providing an extensive summary of research published in mainstream, academic, HRM journals. I reference non-management literature when those citations or contributing authors appear within the body of HRM research. For example, outcomes of work-family conflict for family members is infrequently the focus of study within the management literature (Ruhm, 2004, is an exception), although non-management sources are cited, and accepted without critique.

As an alternative to developing my own 'text' based on my readings of the expansive number of articles on the subject, I could have relied on a previously published literature review and analyzed the discourse of that text. Literature reviews on work-family are indeed available. Despite an exhaustive search, however, I was not able to identify one that provides sufficiently extensive coverage of the broad range of topics associated with this subject area. Williams and Alliger (1994), for example, provide a meta-analysis of the outcomes of work-family interaction, but do not discuss the

antecedents—the factors creating or mitigating the circumstances causing positive or negative work-family interaction. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) provide an interesting discussion of the interfaces between the domains of work and family, but their analysis of personal and organizational outcomes is limited. The recent monograph by Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux and Brinley, (2005) provides a very detailed review of OB/HR research on work-family, but the authors use a very narrow range of journals (15 journals) in crafting their analysis and specifically excluded review journals, such as *Academy of Management Review*, and interdisciplinary journals, such as *Human Relations*. Although in subsequent chapters I also will narrow my analysis, for this initial overview a broad reading of the research was necessary. As the purpose of this chapter is to reveal the dominant (rather than the emergent or marginalized) discourses on the subject, I did focus on the mainstream management journals, which are indexed in ABI Inform/Proquest.

I liken the research field of HRM work-family literature to the geographical domain of my ancestral home. I grew up in rural, oil-rich Alberta. Touring the highways near my home, one would see vast fields of tall grass punctuated at frequent intervals by pump jacks. Most of these pump jacks would be active, drawing out crude from within their limited domains as defined by the metal fences encompassing their borders. The pump jacks reach deep into the earth, but only deep enough to reach their destination. Other pump jacks would sit frozen in time, some for years, whereas other stations might be reactivated at a later date. The HRM literature on work family is an expansive field. Researchers mine small areas, focusing on narrow and rigidly defined dimensions of the phenomenon until satisfied (at least temporarily) that all relevant knowledge has been

extracted from a station. The researchers explore their topic area in depth, but look only deep enough to satisfy their narrowly defined research parameters. Sometimes this territory is revisited, other times it is abandoned. The text I develop in this chapter portrays the research conducted at many/most of these stations. The text is therefore necessarily quite extensive as the field of exploration is vast.

Finally, to support the develop of my own summation of the text in this chapter, it is important to note that all authorship is subjective — the stories we tell, whether or not published in top tier journals, reflect our biases. The bias in this textual summation is my own, although I attempted to shed as much subjectivity and bias as possible through an active reflective process, and by engaging the assistance of a second reader. I attempted to effect distance from the text, even as I interpreted it. I used reflection as a tool in distancing myself from the text — for example, I would write a paragraph and then ask myself “What would Dr. X say if I handed this in to him/her?” in reference to how certain positivist HR professors of my acquaintance would read this chapter. There were also times that I would find myself reading and writing as a noncritical academic. I also passed over my drafts to a colleague to assess whether the critical lens was sufficiently displaced.

Nonetheless, I acknowledge that the chapter continues to reflect a subjective lens that I could not completely shed in the act of reading and evaluation: the textual passages that I quoted in this chapter, for example, reflect passages from the original articles that seemed salient and interesting to me. I reveal this subjective lens, not to discount the chapter as an appropriate text upon which to base my post-structural discourse analysis, which follows; nor do I raise this ‘limitation’ to apologize for the subjectivity that

permeates all interpretation. Rather, I raise the issue as part of the reflective process, acknowledging that I am an active participant in gathering the data. I attempted to gain distance from the text because, in creating it, I was attempting to be true to the positivist paradigm that dominates HRM research (Burrell & Morgan, 1977) and upon which most of this research was premised. I am not, however, a positivist, and as a poststructuralist feminist (with interpretivist leanings), I found reading and writing outside my 'home paradigms' unsettling. There is a discourse on work-family that takes place within my home paradigms, although the feminist post-structural discourse on work-family remains markedly limited. Alternate discourses of work-family act as a challenge to the mainstream dominant discourse of work-family. As the intent of this chapter is, however, to capture the dominant discourse, these alternate discourses will not be represented, except as they appear at the edges of the mainstream journals.

The Text: The HRM Contribution to Work-Family Research

Over the last three decades, management researchers have drawn attention to the interactions of the work and family domains and the implications of this interaction for employee and employer wellbeing (e.g. Burke, Weir & Duwors, 1979, 1980a, 1980b, Gotlieb, Kelloway & Barnham, 1998; Gross, Mason & McEachern, 1958; Gutek et. al, 1991; Hepburn & Barling, 1996; Jones & Butler, 1980; Kanter, 1977; Werbel, 1978). The basic tenet of this research is that both work and family demand time and energy; and because the demands of the work and family domain concurrently exist (Kanter, 1977) conflict between work and family roles is inevitable (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In an

attempt to better understand this interaction, HRM researchers have focused on the antecedents of this conflict as well as the implications of this conflict for relevant stakeholders: organizations, family members, and the employee. Complementing this micro-level analysis is a meso-level analysis of organizational strategies to ameliorate the deleterious impact of work-family interaction for employees and organizations, reflecting that “family-supportive employment benefits have become increasingly popular in recent years as an employer response to the increasing labor force participation of women” (Baughman, DiNardi, Holtz-Eakin. 2003, p. 247.)

This conflict between work and family roles has been characterized as bi-directional. Gutek et. al (1991) and Frone et. al. (1992a) identified a reciprocal conflict relationship between these spheres of work and family: the actions and interactions in one domain impact upon actions and interactions in the other domain. This relationship is asymmetric: work influences family more than family influences work (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992b; Gutek et al. 1991; Hall & Richter, 1988; Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian, 1996), although domain-specific (i.e., work to work, family to family) effects appear to be stronger and more consistent (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997).

Attempts by employed parents to meet the numerous expectations generated within the domains create conflict and strain when stakeholders in one domain place expectations on the employed parent that are incompatible with the other domain. Employed parents who attempt to balance participation between the two roles may find the task challenging. The challenge, however, is a function of many variables. The HRM literature characterizes these as “antecedents”.

Antecedents

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985)'s typology of inter-role conflict in the work-family interchange forms the bases upon which most of the literature on antecedents is structured: time based conflict, strain based conflict, and behaviour based conflict. These will therefore provide the structure for this segment of the literature review. The implications of socio-demographic characteristics of the work and family domains, such as gender, number of children, age of children, having a (working) partner, work structure and educational/employment level (Eby et al., 2005) will be discussed.

Time-based conflict

Family Domain Time Stressors. The degree of conflict between work and family roles is a consequence of the expectations of each role. A dramatic growth in dual-earner households has prompted research on the interaction of the spousal dyad on work-family conflict. The "traditional" family model of employed father and at-home mother has given away to the dual earner family, which has been characterized as being composed of one family with three jobs: two market, one family (Pirotrkowski & Hughes, 1993). The number of hours spouses devote to work each week is a predictor of work-family conflict for the other parent; according to some researchers, this effect is more pronounced for women. Keith and Schaffer (1980), for example, reported that an increase in the number of hours worked by a husband resulted in higher levels of work-family conflict for the market-employed mother. Women's integration of the social role expectations of motherhood may not be precluded by engagement in market-work, or by fathers' time

commitment to the family (Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990; Major, 1994). Some researchers suggest, “homemaking is motivated by the higher levels of needs of women” (Matsui, Ohsawa, & Onglatco, 1995, p. 124). A mother may feel the time pressure more acutely because she may be trying to maximize time with family to a greater degree than attempted by fathers, reflecting the salience of social roles in work-family conflict (Lobel, 1991).

Other studies have dismissed gender differences (Duxbury and Higgins, 1991; Kinnunen and Mauno, 1998; Goff, Mount & Jamison, 1990). Duxbury and Higgins (1991) found that there were no differences between the sexes in the outcome measures of either family-work or work-family conflict, although they identified gender-based differences in the antecedents of WFC. Work involvement was a stronger predictor of WFC for women whereas family involvement was a stronger predictor for men. Moreover, work conflict was a more important determinant of family conflict among men; whereas, family conflict was a better predictor of family conflict for women. Other studies (Frone et. al 1992b; Gutek et al., 1991), however, have identified that women report interference from work to family more than men, in part due to time demands. Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) explain an absence of gender differences on the basis of cultural norms. Women in Sweden, the region of their study, are “expected to participate in working life equally with men, [so] it is quite natural that there are no gender differences in experiencing work-family conflict.” Although time commitment to family was gender determined (since women in Sweden still maintain primary responsibility for family tasks), Goff et al. (1990), who also found no gender differences for work-family conflict — although acknowledging that women maintain primary care responsibilities —

claim that women in their study displayed “superior coping strategies” (p. 806) which may have ameliorated the effect of work-family conflict. Caliguri, Hyland, Joshi, and Bross, (1998) also identify family coping abilities as a significant variable in cross-cultural adjustment and work-family outcomes. An alternative explanation is offered by Eagle, Miles and Icenogle (1997), who explain comparable rates of work-family time conflict for fathers as illustrative of social shifts whereby “men are adapting to increased family role expectations” (p. 180).

The social expectations of fathers have indeed shifted over the past three decades. The ‘new father’ now is expected to be an equal parenting partner of the mother (Goldscheider & Wake, 1991); married fathers are spending significantly more time with co-resident children than fathers did in past decades (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2003). Despite changing expectations, research shows that although the time level of paternal involvement has increased, fathers continue to devote significantly less time than mothers to the rearing of their children in intact families (Acock & Demo, 1994; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, and Hofferth, 2001).

Given the juxtaposition of this social shift for fathers with the increase in maternal employment, fathers’ involvement in parental work has been measured as a function of mothers’ time commitments to work. Researchers, however, have demonstrated only a limited correlation. Keith and Schaffer (1980) report that the number of working hours by the mothers did not heighten fathers’ perception of work-family conflict. Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, and Mossholder (1989) identified that spouses of market-employed women had decreased job satisfaction only if family responsibilities decreased their time commitment to work. Yeung et al. (2001) reported that the ‘new

father' role is emerging only on weekends in intact families. Fathers' work hours have a negative relationship with the time they spend with a child on weekdays. Mothers' work hours have no effect on children's time with fathers and mothers' relative financial contribution has a positive effect on fathers' time with children only on weekends. The number of hours worked by the mother may not be as deterministic of work-family conflict for fathers as it is for mothers in working couples, as long as the father's time commitment to work remains consistent.

The weekend-weekday difference in mothers' income effect, and the disproportionate time spent by fathers with children, suggests that psychological variables such as gender-role orientation and parenthood ideology are important factors. Eagle et al. (1997) contend that "similarity in attitudes" towards "dual allegiance" "diminished the likelihood for gender differences to exist in reported experiences of bidirectional work-family conflict" (p. 181). Fathers' *intent* to spend time in the family domain (or perception of guilt about not spending time) may not reflect *actual* time spent. Eagle et al. (1997), for example, measured one dimension of WFC by questioning: "How often does your job or career keep you from spending the amount of time you *would like* to spend with your family" (p. 175, emphasis added). Support for the potential for intent to differ from actual practice, is provided by Hofferth (2001) who found that nonworking fathers actually spend less time with their children than do employed men. Explanations for men continuing to input less time into family roles despite time availability focus on sex role adoption. One way mothers restrict paternal involvement in the family work is by 'gatekeeping' the domain of home and family (Renk, Roberts, Roddenberry, Luick, Hillhouse, Meehan, Oliveros & Phares, 2003) to maintain dominance over family roles.

There are also contradictory findings in the sociology and psychology literature cited by management texts on the relationship between number of children and the employee/parent's experience of work-family conflict. Beutell and O'Hare (1987) did not find that the number of children in a household was a predictive variable; in contrast to Judge, Boudreau, and Bretz (1994) and Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) who found the variable to be significant. The variable in these analyses causing the disparate findings may be the age of the children and the developmental life-stage of the family (e.g. Voydanoff, 1988). Younger children are, as a function of their stage of development, more dependent upon adult care; time demands on parents may therefore be exacerbated, even if transfer of care to alternate caregivers is undertaken during work hours. Family development theory (White, 1991) posits that each stage of the family (including, but not limited to new parents, school-aged family, post-parental family) is marked by different norms and expectations. The number of children under 6 (preschoolers) has been demonstrated to be a predictor of work-family conflict by Pleck, Staines & Lang, (1980), but not by Goff et al. (1990). The effect demonstrated by Pleck et al. (1980) diminishes as children age; supporting the hypothesis that age, rather than number of children, is the predictive variable. Goff et al. (1990) did not examine families with older children, hence a comparison in terms of depreciation of effect is not available.

Matsui et al. (1995) found that family role redefinition (but not work role redefinition) was an effective coping strategy for dealing with family-to-work spillover among Japanese working women, reflective of Davidson and Cooper's (1984) earlier work which proposed that women "get wives" to mitigate deleterious role interaction. Effective coping is explicitly discussed in terms of how to manage a dual-career lifestyle,

which relates to less inter-role conflict and greater problem-solving effectiveness (Steffy & Ashbaugh, 1986).

Work domain time stressors. Work time, sets the upper limit on time available for family. “Working time constitutes a starting point for understanding the shifting balance between work and family in American households” (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001, p. 40). Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, and Beutell (1996) reported that workers who spent more time at work, reported more work overload, reported greater parental demands, reported less family involvement, and spent less time in family activities, reported higher work-to-family conflict.

Increasingly, mothers are employed on a full time or part time basis, thus family working hours have been increasing, creating a net loss in time available for family. The number of hours worked each week has a significant effect on work-family conflict, particularly for women (Burke, Weir, & Duwors, 1980; Voydanoff, 1988). Aryee (1993) speculates that this sex-based disparity may reflect women’s internalized sex-role norms regarding childcare responsibilities and the stress inherent in violating those roles. The expectation that women will continue to be responsible for other domestic responsibilities, regardless of hours of market work (Hochschild, 1997), may also be a cause of this increased effect on work-family conflict for women.

Despite an increased presence in the work domain, women continue to devote less time to market work activities than do men (Dean, 1992; Pleck, 1985; Rodgers, 1992). However, the gender difference in time devoted to child care and household tasks exceeds the gender difference in time devoted to paid employment (Pleck, 1985; Rodgers, 1992). Hence, women’s cumulative time commitment to market and non-market

work exceeds that of men. Eagle et al. (1997) relate the experience of work-family conflict to choice: "People allow work to consume disproportionate amounts of their energies and attention.... It is not unusual for both wife and husband, in dual-career couples, to bring work home with them" (p. 180). Williams and Alliger report that, "juggling work and family tasks may be intentional (as when a parent attempts to read work reports while supervising a child) or unintentional (as when a parent has to make arrangements for the care of a child while at work" (p. 541). The gap between men and women's experience of work-family conflict may be diminishing as the boundaries between work and home become more permeable, and it becomes increasingly the norm for work to occupy increased time periods: "My personal life takes up time that I'd like to spend at work" (p. 174).

The number of hours worked, however, is only one factor. Also relevant is the timing of the work shift. Nock and Kingston (1988) suggest that the degree to which work interferes with family is determined in part by the particular time of day worked. For every hour worked in the late afternoon through early evening, mothers lost an estimated 42 minutes with their children; fathers lost 30 minutes. In recent years, the use of shift scheduling outside of the standard 9 to 5 workday has been increasing. Stains & Pleck (1984) and Frone, Russel & Cooper (1992a) reported a significant positive correlation between engagement in unstable work schedules and the experience of work-family conflict. Longer family work days (a combined measure accounting for the time in which at least one spouse is at work) increases work to family interference and increased domestic responsibilities for women, but not for men (Kingston & Nock, 1985).

A Marshall (1999) report that increasingly Canadian parents are lengthening the family workday to ensure that one parent is at home with the children at all times. One parent, for example may work a day shift; the other parent works an afternoon shift. The implications of this phenomenon for job and parental satisfaction are unexamined in the literature, although the importance of flexibility in work-scheduling is correlated with decreased turnover intention (Roodhouse, 1994) and heightened organizational commitment (Grover and Crooker, 1995).

Strain-Based Conflict

The second conflict inherent in work-family domain interaction, strain-based conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) arises when strain in one-role “spills over” and affects one’s performance in the other role. There is considerable evidence that work stressors can produce emotional or strain symptoms such as tension, anxiety, fatigue, depression, apathy, and irritability (Abdel-Halim, 1981; Barling & Rosenbaum, 1986; Burke & Bradshaw, 1981). Family centered responsibilities can generate similar outcomes (Lewis & Cooper, 1987).

Additive and interactive strain: The multiple role demands of the work and home domains are additive, with the strain and stresses manifested at home (work) combining with the strain experienced at work (home). Role overload results from this accumulated stress, and leads to illness and decreased personal and job satisfaction (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986; Swanson, Power & Simpson, 1998). The greatest stress arises in situations of simultaneous role pressures from both home and work (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986; Williams and Alliger 1994). “As the demands of roles increase, it is inevitable that one role will interrupt, or intrude into, the activities of the other, forcing

parents to juggle different role demands” (Williams and Alliger, 1994 p. 541). Dual career couples “allow employment stresses to affect the family domain” (Eagle et al., 1997, p. 180).

Williams and Alliger (1994) investigated strain-based conflict and spillover experienced by employed parents. “Daily involvement in family roles, distress experienced during family activities, and family intrusions into work were positively related to perceptions that family interfered with work” (p. 837). Negative spillover effects were significantly more pronounced for women.

Eby et. al (2005) discusses the dominance of a “line of research focused on interrole conflict and the coping strategies that women use to deal with stress” (p. 168). Eagle et al. (1997) suggest that “greater empathy” (180) between employed spouses for the strain of nontraditional role adoption ameliorates conflict. Galinsky and Stein (1990) also noted that the relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor was a significant source of stress for employed parents. Supervisory work-family support, evidenced by knowledge of benefits, flexibility in responding to the spill-over of family issues into work, and a perception that providing such supports is part of the role of supervisor, may mitigate spillover (Warren and Johnson, 1995). A supportive supervisor and a family-centered organization are seen as reducing work-family role strain. “Providing family friendly policies may minimize the stress from the family domain and limit the interference between work and family and allow employees to focus on work activities” (Boyar, Pearson & Keough, 2003, p. 187). Services such as childcare referral, on site childcare, flex-time, flex-place and the availability of emergency sick-child care, are examples of family-friendly benefits examined in the literature. Rotando, Carlson and

Kincaid (2003) suggest, that given the lack of individual level control of the work domain, in contrast to the family domain, “perhaps the best alternative for employers unable to funnel resources into the more costly flexible-benefit options would be to provide training or information which would help employees identify the specific sources of their work-family conflict and understand how to overcome these conflicts by focusing on the family rather than the workplace” (p. 291).

Williams and Alliger (1994) also provide commentary on factors that could mitigate deleterious spillover. In particular, they advocate “separating work and family concerns and responsibilities during the day” (p. 864) and encourage parents to divert time for personal wellness and relaxation. A redistribution of family tasks, they argue, may ameliorate the negative effects of work on family.

Behaviour based Conflict

Behaviour-based conflict refers to incompatibility between the behaviour patterns desirable for the two domains. There is a dearth of empirical research examining the incompatibility of the social roles of parent and those of employee, although evidence of the gendered nature of these roles suggests an inherent incompatibility (Major, 1993, p. 150). Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1992) review the dimensions of the stereotypical masculine ideal postulated in the literature. They uncovered the following dimensions: self-reliance, restricted emotionality, physical toughness and prowess, aggressiveness, achievement/success/status, aggressive sexuality/homophobia, avoidance of femininity, and patriarchal ideology/male dominance. Corresponding dimensions of the stereotypical

feminine ideal include dependency, emotional expressivity, physical weakness, passivity, nurturing/vicarious achievement, and female self sacrifice (Burn, 1996).

A “good” employee or manager is seen to exhibit primarily masculine traits,; the family role is seen as feminine, requiring antithetical skills, such as sensitivity and process orientation (Kanter, 1977). Difficulty in shifting between the behavioural expectations of each role can be problematic and generates dissonance and stress. Further, adoption of a masculinized worker role by mothers may also be perceived as inappropriate by employers resulting in lower approval ratings “due to negative reactions to atypical female behavior” (Gerhart and Rynes 1991, p. 260). “Deeply ingrained norms about the priority of women's motherhood and homemaker roles and men's breadwinner roles may produce internal feelings of discomfort when women and men deviate too far from their internalized norms. They may also produce external sanctions in the form of disapproval by important others when individuals deviate from social norms (Major 1993, p. 150).”

Linked to the concept of additivity in strain-based conflict is the idea of transfer or 'spillover'. Spillover also occurs in behavioural strain where attitudes or behaviour employed in one domain are carried over into and influence the other (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Near, Rice & Hunt, 1980; Staines, 1980). Women continue to be perceived as less competent managers because they are assumed to have feminine traits that are incompatible with the role, such as compassion and nurturance, and it is assumed that these traits will be displayed inappropriately (Guy & Newman, 2004). Underlying this approach is the concept of stable traits in the individual such as personality, which is not easily mutated between roles (Burke, Weir, & DuWors,

1980). Even when women do possess leadership traits, they are less likely to use them. (c.f. Carbonell, 1984; Crampton & Mishra, 1999) leading to a questioning of women's suitability for management careers (Cames, Vinnicombe, Singh, 2001; Hochschild, 1983, Kanter, 1977).

The focus of behaviourally based role conflict has been on individual or on gender group factors; organizational level factors, such as organizational culture, are not the examined to the same degree. Work-family programs may have limited benefit if employees are reluctant to use them (Allen, 2001; Perlow, 1990). The barriers to successful adoption of such programs are centered on the assumption that there is a direct relationship between presence at and contribution to work. Work is to be visible to supervisors and must always be an employee's top priority. Deviation from these norms will result in retarded career growth and remuneration. Employees working flexible shifts therefore cannot meet the behavioural expectations of the workplace because employees cannot succeed from an organizational perspective unless they are physically present in the workplace. With this type of workplace organization, Perlow (1990) suggests that it is impossible for these work/family programs to be effective and for organizations to maximize the benefit from maintaining these workers. Employees frequently do not believe that the organization's environment changes to facilitate these efforts" because "employees perceive that the organization encourages workers to devote themselves to their work at the expense of other life domains" (Allen, 2001, p. 415).

Behaviour-based conflict may also result from employers' imposition of desired familial behaviors. In the development of family-friendly HR policies, for example, many employers assume that employed parents wish to minimize the boundaries between work

and home by having on-site childcare, enabling parents to interact with their children during work breaks. Employees who prefer clearer delineation between work and family life may experience increased work-family conflict because they are required to make more frequent shifts between behaviorally desperate roles (Allen, 2001).

The literature clearly delineates the multiple roles inherent in being a market-employed parent. Incongruent expectations and responsibilities are linked to inter-role conflict. Insufficient time to devote to one's responsibilities is a significant source of conflict. Pressures and moods cultivated within the home (workplace) may spillover and effect one's interactions in the workplace (home) ameliorating (Bowles & Kington; Frone, 2003) or exacerbating (Williams & (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) conflict.

Outcomes

Employer Outcomes

The relationship between work-family conflict and employee's organizational commitment and productivity is examined in the literature. Turnover, absenteeism and productivity are central themes of this research. The prevalence of these issues will be discussed and the organizational strategies to respond to these concerns will be evaluated.

Turnover: The assumption that pregnancy and childbirth will entail withdrawal from labour force participation by women has crumbled in the face of increased labour force participation by mothers since the 1970s. Marshall (1999) reports that 90% of women in Canada return to full-time employment within two years of giving birth; the time parameters for return to work are considerably abbreviated in the US, with a

comparable return ratio exhibited within 6 months post-partum. (Glass & Riley, 1998). Variables affecting return to work decisions include the provision of maternity leave by employers (Waldfogel, 1998) and the availability of satisfactory childcare (Beaujot, 1997). A trend noted in the popular press, but untested empirically, is an increase in the number of professionally trained women who are taking extended leaves following childbirth.

Postpartum employment decisions are not, therefore, exclusively focused on whether the mother (and to a lesser degree, the father) will return to work. In fact, given that the vast majority of women will return to market-employment, a more critical question becomes *where* they will work. Job changing, rather than labour force withdrawal, is the dominant trend (Estes & Glass, 1996). Glass and Riley (1998) noted that 21% of employed mothers change jobs within one-year post-partum. Filer (1985) posits that women's employment decisions are predicated not on financial compensation, but on the compatibility of working conditions with family responsibilities. Work-family conflict is thereby mitigated by a self-imposed decrease in reward seeking behaviour through lowered expectations for financial compensation and promotion. Estes and Glass (1996) challenge this precept and report that job changes in the first year post-partum are made to satisfy both financial and work-family compatibility needs. The emphasis of employers is therefore best directed to facilitating ongoing engagement with the pre-pregnancy employee rather than addressing labour force withdrawal. Konrad, Corrigan, Lieb, and Ritchie (2000) meta-analyzed the literature on job attribute preference, identifying sex-based differences. Men attached greater importance to earnings and responsibility than women did. Women attached greater importance to, among other

things, job security, a comfortable work environment, good coworkers, a good supervisor, and good hours. These findings reflect gender roles and stereotypes pressuring men to take on the role of provider and to demonstrate success and status in the work domain, whereas women prefer positive work environments that may mitigate work-family conflict (Lobel, 1991).

Absenteeism: Women are absent from work more than men (VanderHeuvel & Wooden, 1995; Mastekaasa & Olsen, 1998). Despite this evidence, little research has evaluated the variables influencing this differential attendance pattern. Leigh (1983) identified the presence of young children in the home as positively correlated with women's absenteeism, but did not control for job satisfaction. Further, Leigh (1983) tracked absenteeism over a limited time frame (2 weeks); patterns of behaviour over a longer period of time might be different. Hackett's (1990) meta-analysis of absenteeism indicated that absence frequency escalated for women during their 30s, a time when family responsibilities are at their height. Hackett (1990) did not control for the actual presence of children in the home. VanderHeuvel and Wooden (1995) found no systematic relationship between age and absenteeism for women (age was negatively correlated with absenteeism for men.) Also of interest is their finding that job satisfaction was correlated with absenteeism only for men; women with low job satisfaction did not exhibit increased absenteeism. Marital status and presence of dependent children did not exert any significant impact on absenteeism, although age of the children was not a controlled variable. Further, care of dependents is only one measure of family responsibility. VanderHeuvel and Wooden (1995) conclude that patterns of absenteeism for males relate to pressures internal to the workplace; patterns of absenteeism for females relate to

pressures external to the workplace. This is consistent with the research showing that women maintain greater responsibility for maintaining the family sphere; responsibilities that create inter-role conflict and lead to increased absenteeism. That this spillover of family responsibilities into work time has deleterious impact is reflected in the inclusion of absenteeism linked to work-family conflict as a “counterproductive behavior” by Lau, Au and Ho (2003) in their analysis of deleterious organizational norms.

Family Friendly Benefits. The relationship between employment practices and deleterious organizational outcomes of work-family conflict is of escalating importance in employer’s personnel practices (Osterman, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999). A broad range of benefits embracing leave provisions, flexible work scheduling and child care support have been proposed as strategies to facilitate the movement of employees between the domains of work and family (e.g. Waldfogel, 1998). Research indicates that industry factors (i.e., work-family benefits are more common in some industries), structural factors (i.e., larger organizations, organizations with a greater proportion of female employees), employer beliefs (i.e., greater expected benefits) all relate to an organization’s responsiveness to work-family issues (Goodstein, 1994). Despite the presentation of the importance of family friendly human resource programs in mainstream management literature, and some limited evidence of their effectiveness in decreasing work-family conflict (Thomas & Ganster, 1995), and enhancing employees sense of organizational commitment (Scandura & Lankau, 1997), Osterman, (1995) reports that the actual adoption of a broad range of programs is not widespread and is limited to the least expensive and extensive offerings, such as provision of workshops and referrals. Osterman found that employers’ assessment of the seriousness of

absenteeism and turnover as related to family-work issues was not significant in explaining adoption of work/family benefits. Prevalence of professional workers in the organization was a significant determinant. Organizations with high involvement work-practices, such as the amount of discretion given to employees in the conduct of their work and the existence of total quality management programs, were most likely to offer work-family benefits. They are also most likely to employ a professional level workforce. Productivity gains and diminished absenteeism and turnover may be reflective of the presence of high involvement work practices, rather than the presence of family-friendly benefits. Vanderhouver and Wooden (1995) likewise correlate the presence of an employee involvement scheme with decreased absenteeism.

Research linking the provision of work-family benefits to employer relevant outcomes is quite limited and is often contradictory. Miller (1984) reported that absenteeism and turnover did not significantly decline when benefits such as childcare were available to employees. This finding contradicts an early study by Milkowitz and Gomez (1976); they concluded that participation in employee sponsored childcare decreased both absenteeism and turnover. Goff et al. (1990), assessing the interaction of job-site based childcare and work-family conflict found an indirect link between the variables. Satisfaction with childcare, regardless of location, was correlated with lower absenteeism. Lower absenteeism was correlated with lower work-family conflict. Therefore, employer provided childcare may be a mitigating variable in work-family conflict when other suitable childcare is unavailable. Thomas and Ganster (1995) identify that work-family benefits diminish stress associated with multiple role adoption. Diminished stress may in turn have health and performance implications not easily

captured in the analysis of the benefits of such programs (Bailyn, 1993; Kofodimos, 1993).

Kossek and Nicol (1992) reported that childcare benefits influenced recruitment and retention, but did not act on performance or absenteeism. Grover and Crooker (1995) explore the relationship between turnover intention and the provision of work-family benefits. Testing the effects of the provision of several work/family benefits, including parental leave, flexible schedules, child care assistance, and child care information, they found that the group of benefits as a whole effects employees' commitment and turnover intention. Maternity leave with job guarantee and availability of childcare information is associated with decreased turnover intention. Actual turnover rates were not examined. Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) reported that firms with broad-based bundles of family-friendly benefits report higher levels of productivity than do firms with more limited bundles. Grover and Crooker (1995) and Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) conclude that employees are more attached to organizations offering work/family benefits (as measured by commitment scales) although Grover and Crooker (1995) reported that the effect is strongest on turnover intention. Aryee, Luk and Stone (1998) similarly found that employed parents, of either gender, who benefit from schedule flexibility and supervisor work-family support, exhibit greater job commitment. Frone and Yardley (1996) identified that experience of work-family conflict and age of youngest child are strong predictors of the employee's perception of the importance of family benefits. Grover and Crooker (1995) also report that this effect is not only significant for employees eligible for these benefits; nonusers of these benefits within the same organization also exhibited heightened commitment. The interaction of family-friendly policies and commitment,

turnover and absenteeism may result from a symbolic association of these policies with the employer's level of commitment to his employees.

The sometimes contradictory and inconclusive results of these studies reflect measurement difficulties, disparities between benefit programs within and between organizations, and suggest the presence of intervening variables. Family-friendly policies tend to be developed and offered to employees in bundles. The compositions of these bundles vary across organizations and departments. Isolating the effects of one policy, such as childcare, from other policies, such as flexible scheduling, is often impossible and makes cross-study comparisons problematic. Further, the effects themselves are difficult to measure. Turnover, for example is impacted by variables other than work-family conflict, such as labor market conditions. Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) used multiple measures of performance to counter this confusion, including market-based measures, such as profit, and internal measures, such as retention. Given that there is a lack of consistency in how these measures are assessed by firms, comparison between firms is highly problematic and further research is required to verify these results. Isolating both the dependent and independent variables is therefore challenging.

Barriers to the success of family friendly policies may also reflect organizational factors, such as communication of the availability of these programs to workers (Galinsky & Stein, 1990), supervisor support for use of the programs (Goff et al., 1990), as well as the perceived or actual penalty in terms of promotion and salary for utilizing these benefits (Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994; Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993; Perlow, 1995; Pleck, 1993). Galinsky et al. (1993) found, for example, that less than 2% of the employees of 80 major US firms participated in work-family programs.

These variables are fluid through time and between departments within organizations and are difficult to isolate empirically. The reasons for this reluctance remains relatively unexamined in the empirical literature, perhaps because lack of program utilization is not perceived as a problem, but rather as a cost saving (Thompson et al., 1999). Nevertheless, some researchers have offered their insights into this phenomenon.

As mentioned previously, for Perlow (1990) it is the discourse of what constitutes work that is limiting the success and adoption of employer sponsored family-friendly programs. Perlow (1990) reported that the engineers in her study avoid taking advantage of programs such as flex-place, flex time and job sharing, because of a perception that participating in such programs has negative consequences for career success. Finkel et al. (1994) reported that female academics were reluctant to utilize maternity benefits because of perceived career detriment. The barriers to successful adoption of such programs are centered on the assumption that there is a direct relationship between presence at and contribution to work.

Pleck (1993) asserts that men will only use work-family programs if participation does not reduce their earnings or challenge their masculine identity. This may also apply to women attempting to operate in masculinized environments, such as the academy, in which adoption of male sex role behaviours related to the workplace are perceived as critical for career maintenance or advancement (Finkel et al., 1994). The barriers to successful adoption of such programs are thus linked to gendered role expectations on the part of employers (Westman, & Etzion, 1990) and employees (Major, 1993; Perlow, 1998). Accepting that absenteeism is linked to women's lower organizational

commitment, Major (1993), for example, contends that absenteeism in the presence of family friendly programs stems from deeply entrenched internalized role expectations that are unresponsive to family-friendly programs. "Deeply ingrained norms about the priority of women's motherhood and homemaker roles and men's breadwinner roles may produce internal feelings of discomfort when women and men deviate too far from their internalized norms. They may also produce external sanctions in the form of disapproval by important others when individuals deviate from social norms" (p. 150).

Work-family programs may therefore have limited benefit because employees are reluctant to use them either because of sanction or because of sex role adoption. The consequences of employees' participation, such as lower promotability and earnings and personal sanctions, may exacerbate work-family conflict and/or decrease job commitment.

An additional reason why these benefits are not utilized may be that some employees prefer not to use them. Employees may differ in the degree to which they wish to fortify or diminish the boundaries between the domains. Some employees, for example, may wish to have on-site childcare to better integrate their parenting and work roles. Other parents may prefer to have a flexible schedule so that they can satisfy their family role without integrating the children into the work environment, and may find the on-site presence of their children distracting or dissatisfying. Employees may not be using offered benefits because they are not the specific benefits that would best address their needs.

Further, the offered and undesired benefits may not result in increased productivity because they are actually increasing the employee's experience of work-family conflict by increasing inter-role conflict. Being present in the home with children during working hours, a benefit offered by tele-commuting programs, may increase work-family conflict. Proximity to children may be distracting to work completion and thus increase strain. Further, the desire to be with one's children, a motivator of involvement in such programs, may not be satisfied simply by being in the same house with the children, but being unable to interact with them and still completing work. The effect of employees' preference for different types of benefits on employer adoption of benefit packages, and the presence of these benefits as antecedents or exacerbators of work-family conflict, is unexplored in the literature.

Family Outcomes

Outcomes of work-family conflict for the stakeholders of the family domain, the spouse and children of the employee, are well documented in the sociology, psychology and economics literature (e.g., Belsky, 1988; Baum, 2003) upon which the management literature draws its cited sources on this topic. The demonstrated effects are contradictory and inconclusive. This lack of conclusiveness may reflect limitations in the definition of family applied in the extant literature. The definition of family in most work-family studies includes only the "traditional" nuclear family: father, mother and child(ren).

Further, the research has focused almost exclusively on the implications of maternal employment for the marital relationship and for the wellbeing of the children, rather than

correlating the degree of work-family conflict to these outcomes. The limited research on father's work-family conflict and the outcomes of inter-role conflict for marriage and children, reflects the relative recency of fathers' increased involvement in parenting; the need for fathers to focus on market-work, not parent-work, was previously unquestioned: The ideal father at midcentury was seen as a good provider who "set a good table, provided a decent home, paid the mortgage, bought the shoes, and kept his children warmly clothed" (Bernard, 1981, p. 3-4).

Even when discussed, however, paternal work involvement is not examined as a predictor of children's wellbeing because "most mothers remain home with infants for a substantial period of time. Fathers do not" (Ruhm, 2004, 168).

Children: Involvement of both parents in market-work often necessitates the placement of children in nonparental care during the hours of employment. In terms of effects on child relevant outcomes, the research literature is somewhat equivocal. Some researchers find that early maternal employment has negative implications for child social and behavioral and cognitive outcomes (e.g., Belsky & Eggebeen, 1991; Baum, 2003). Others argue that the effects of maternal employment on child behavior, if any, are minimal (e.g., Parcel & Menaghan, 1994), and that there are no net effects of early maternal employment on child cognitive outcomes; or that deleterious effects are offset by enhanced family income (Stafford, 1987), or by enhanced positive family interaction due to mothers' enhanced emotional wellbeing (Parcel and Menaghan, 1994). The findings are in conflict and inconclusive, although a growing stream of research is focusing on the enhancement effects of work-family interaction for both employers and families (Bowles & Kington, 1998; Frone, 2003).

After controlling for differences between families at the time of the children's births, Belsky and Eggebeen (1991) found that children whose mothers were employed full-time beginning in their first or second year of life scored more poorly on a composite measure of adjustment than did children whose mothers were not employed during these early years. Belsky (1986) and Belsky and Eggebeen (1991) concluded that children who experienced 20 or more hours per week of nonparental care in their first year of life (proxied by length of maternal employment) are at elevated risk of developing insecure attachments to their mothers. Desai, Chase-Lansdale, and Michael (1989) examine the effect of continuous and intermittent maternal employment during a child's first 4 years and find that maternal employment had a significant negative effect on high-income boys but did not have a significant effect on low-income boys or either high-income or low-income girls. Blau and Grossberg (1992) find correlation between the number of weeks worked by the mother during her child's first year and cognitive ability, but that weeks worked in the second year have a positive effect. Similarly Ruhm (2004) found negative effects for early maternal employment, but positive effects for employment in years two and three. Maternal employment effects, however, were moderating as social-economic status (SES) was predictive of higher achievement and employment.

Some researchers report that maternal employment compromises some children's cognitive outcomes (e.g., Baum, 2003; Desai, Chase-Lansdale, & Michael, 1989). In particular, contrary to Ruhm (2003) these studies suggest that maternal employment has the most harmful effects on the most advantaged of society's children (e.g., children from households with high incomes or high levels of cognitive stimulation). Desai, Chase-Lansdale, & Michael (1989) hypothesized that "there may be a stronger negative net

effect of maternal employment on the child in high SES families” (p. 547). Their findings confirm this hypothesis, although interpretation of the Desai et al. findings is complicated by the fact that their measure of family socioeconomic status (SES) is family income net of maternal earnings. These results were not supported by Greensteen (1995) using an income measure inclusive of maternal income or by Liebowitz (1977), who found no effect of maternal employment on the child's score on language ability.

Studies reporting deleterious effects from maternal employment have been criticized for considerable methodological weaknesses, such as the failure to consider intervening variables, such as maternal education, quality of alternate care, the family's socio-economic status (e.g. Belsky, 1986), and child characteristics (e.g. Belsky, 1986; Belsky & Eggebeen, 1991; Desai et al., 1989).

Some studies found both positive and negative employment effects upon children related to maternal and job characteristics. The personal resources that mothers bring to their childrearing — self-esteem, locus of control, educational attainment, and age — also have significant effects on children's home environments (Menaghan & Parcel, 1991; Parcel & Menaghan, 1994; McCarthy & Rosenthal, 1991.) Using the same data set as Belsky (1986) and Belsky and Eggebeen (1991), McCarthy and Rosenthal (1991) report maternal job satisfaction as well as the family's socioeconomic status were significant predictors of adjustment patterns. The actual variance of children's adjustment accounted for by maternal employment is only 2.9%. In a sample of 240 ninth graders, Paulson (1996) found that maternal employment influenced adolescent achievement only in families where mothers and fathers' attitudes toward maternal employment were not consistent with mothers' employment. This is consistent with Matsui et al. (1999) who

contend that “mothers are likely to be role models for a majority of daughters; daughters who perceive their mother as happy with her role expect the role to be rewarding for herself, and are willing to accept that role. (p. 125).

Although these researchers do not provide direct links in their research to work-family conflict, the implication is that more positive home environments and better adjusted children will decrease strain-based conflict and, consequently, family-work conflict. Time strain demands will limit a parent's ability to maximize educational and social interaction with their children.

A second body of literature explores how maternal employment affects parent-child activities. Disparate outcomes have resulted from examination of the relationship between mothers' employment and parental time spent in the direct care of children. Nock and Kingston (1988) examined the time parents devoted to children on the longest of two-sample workdays and on Sundays. They found that the time mothers spent with children depended on whether both parents work and on the day of the week (i.e., the longer of two workdays versus Sunday). Mothers with preschoolers in single-earner families devoted the most time to children on workdays. Fathers' time was not significantly effected by either dual-earner status or by the presence of preschoolers. By concentrating on the shared time on the longest workday, however, Nock and Kingston's estimates may suffer from measurement error. That is, the longest workday does not, by definition, reflect usual behavior.

Bryant and Zick (1993) report that time-based stress results in employed mothers spending less time in family care. The measures of child-related time used in this

investigation excluded any time that is shared with children in activities other than childcare. This limitation is addressed in their subsequent study (Bryant & Zick, 1996) in which they conclude that parents not only spend time in direct childcare, but they also spend time with children in other household activities. Prior to the influx of mothers into the labour market, women spent more time in the home and with children. The assumption that this time was spent in direct engagement with children, however, is untenable. Other family maintenance activities, such as cooking and cleaning, required considerable time investment, thereby limiting the time available for direct childcare. Further, cultural norms at that time may have supported less direct involvement by parents in child related activities; children play may have been more independent of parental involvement than is the current norm. Bianchi (2000) asserts that demographic changes in family composition have mitigated the effect of maternal employment on mother-child interaction. With a reduction in the size of the average family unit, the time spent per child has, in fact, remained stable. Reports on the effect of maternal employment on time spent with children may therefore be exaggerated. Bianchi (2000) cautions, however, that this conclusion does not mean that women's experience of inter-role conflict has been overstated. Ambivalence over market employment and the care of children dominates women's work experience and generates considerable stress. Examination of work-family conflict and the implications for family members is therefore not necessarily predicated on actual time spent with children, but on the desire to spend more time with children.

Marital Satisfaction. Parenting role stress has been found to impact negatively on psychological well being and marital quality (e.g., Lavee, Sharlin, & Katz, 1996). Each

individual's role stress influences, and will be influenced by, the other parent's stress, which in turn decreases marital satisfaction. Therefore, in families where women report heightened work-family conflict, marital satisfaction for both partners is lower (Lavee, et al., 1996). Time- and strain-based stressors result from women's disparate responsibility for family functioning. Empirical studies have consistently shown that wives' perceptions of the division of housework in terms of fairness (Blair, 1993) or equity (Perry-Jenkins & Folk, 1994) and wives' dissatisfaction with the division of housework (Kluwer, Heesink, & Van De Vlert, 1996) are important predictors of marital conflict.

Research focusing on the relationship between marital conflict and working hours is less conclusive; disparate results may reflect shifting societal norms regarding maternal employment. Research in the 1980s showed a relationship between wives' working hours and marital instability and dissatisfaction (Booth, Johnson, White, & Edwards, 1984; Voydanoff, 1988). More recent findings, however, showed that husbands' perceptions of marital conflict were only slightly affected by wives' working hours (Blair, 1993). In addition, Kluwer et al. (1996) found that husbands', not wives', working hours led to conflict about paid work. Rogers (1996), however, found that wives' working hours were correlated with marital conflict when the number of children in the household increased. Although women still maintain primary responsibility for childcare and housework, responsibilities that increase with the presence of more children, societal norms are changing. The shifting norms governing fathers' involvement in the family domain may intensify mothers' marital dissatisfaction when this is not enacted. This proposition is supported by Suitor's (1991) findings that satisfaction with the division of labor was

more consistently related to marital conflict than were the number of hours that wives worked.

The effect of work-family conflict on family outcomes is not directly examined in the management literature, although citations from psychology in particular are employed to support conclusions. Correlation between degree of work-family conflict and family outcomes is a significant gap in the literature, as much of the psychology literature focuses the interaction of maternal employment on child and marital outcomes rather than the experience of conflict. The results of these studies are inconclusive and contradictory. This lack of conclusivity may reflect the dynamism of societal norms (Lobel, 1991). As both mothers and fathers are increasingly accepting mothers' market-employment, strain on the marital relationship may be dissipating and therefore may be difficult to demonstrate. Inconsistent results in marital outcomes may reflect shifting societal norms encouraging fathers' involvement in the family domain and reinforcing mothers' involvement in the work domain.

Research has also been based on the assumption that maternal employment necessarily leads to decreased time spent interacting with children (e.g., Belsky & Rovine, 1988). Although time in the home may be diminished by maternal employment, time spent in direct interaction with children may not, in fact, have decreased (Bianchi, 2000). Being in closer proximity to children (by being in the home) is not a proxy for interaction with children. A lack of consistency in the reports of child outcomes may stem from the reality that maternal involvement has remained constant. Time spent in the work domain has supplanted time spent in time consuming household tasks, not time spent interacting with the children. Work-family conflict may result from ambivalence between

role commitments generating significant personal stress regardless of whether commitment to domain responsibilities actually generates negative outcomes for the family or the employer. The personal outcomes of work-family conflict are well documented in the literature.

Employee Outcomes

In the middle of the tug of war between the work and family domain is the employee. Effort made to maximize time and energy commitments to each domain, while attempting to minimize spillover of strain and incompatible behavioural patterns, may result in significant personal harm in terms of physical and mental health. Some of the common results of experienced work-family conflict are increased levels of stress, decreased performance at home and work, and decreased life and work satisfaction (Adams, King & King, 1996; Allen et al., 2000; Frone et al., 1992a). Frone, Russell and Cooper (1997) found that work-to-family conflict predicted depression and physical health complaints; whereas, family-to-work conflict predicted greater alcohol consumption. Because mothers are often assumed to be responsible for housework and child care, regardless of the fathers employment status, they are less likely to enjoy leisure time than fathers, whose status as "primary breadwinner" often allows them to use family time for diversion and self-expression (Larson & Gillman, 1997), thus mitigating negative psychological effects from work-family/family-work conflict for men, but not for women. Professional outcomes, salary and promotion, are often foregone, either by decreased work time, delayed return to employment or by (real or employer-perceived) diminished commitment to work. Empirical studies have investigated apparent patterns of professional and personal outcomes of work-family conflict, many of which have been

explicated from the perspective of the stakeholders with whom the working parent interacts: the employer, the spouse, and the children. These outcomes are related to employees' commitment to the work domain and employees' (often competing) commitment to the family domain.

Commitment: Commitment has been variously defined in the literature and the different types of commitment serve as foci of the interplay between the sources of inter-role conflict (time, strain and behaviour) and the stakeholders' outcomes. Meyer and Allen (1997) distinguish between three types of commitment that illuminate the tension between work and family in terms of inter-role conflict: affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Affective commitment refers to one's emotional attachment and identification with a role. Emphasizing the affective aspects of the concept, Pfeffer (1982) reflects that commitment implies a social contract with others as well as with self. Commitment, in Pfeffer's view incurs costs, a sentiment that reflects an assumption of limited time and energy resources. Behavioural role strain may result when one's attachment to a child (or job) results in the integration of behavioural patterns that are not easily abandoned when involved in another role, such as required by a job (or a child), that requires different behavioural patterns. Time conflicts result from a desire to maximize time in each domain because of a desire to be fully engaged in each sphere. Strain conflict can result from an absence of emotional barriers between the domains because of high levels of affective commitment to each or either role that do not diminish because of a shift in locale.

Continuance commitment indicates awareness of the costs associated with abandoning an activity and a desire to maintain commitment to mitigate these costs. A shift in commitment from work to family has significant professional costs, which will be subsequently examined. Many of these costs are associated with a decrease in time committed to the work domain, as well as perceived (or real) negative spillover due to strain-based conflict and difficulty in shifting between roles. Continuance commitment to work is therefore reinforced by salary and promotion (and the desire to provide for one's family). Continuance commitment in the family domain is reinforced by the desire to avoid negative family outcomes, such as marital conflict and a perception that children's development is compromised by a parent's commitment to work. The experience of negative work and family outcomes leads to undesirable personal outcomes for the employee in terms of mental and physical health.

Normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue an activity. An increase in leave taking, rather than withdrawal from market-work, reflects continuance commitment to the work domain for many women, although economic need, rather than commitment may be the direct cause of return. Flexible scheduling, self-employment and part-time employment may reflect market-employed parents' desire to maintain high levels of involvement with family.

An implicit link between the sources of work-family conflict and outcomes is the tension between employees' commitment to work and their commitment to family. The human capital depletion discourse posits that time and energy are finite resources and that it is untenable to maintain high commitment levels to both work and family. This thesis is consistent with empirical studies that report that high levels of commitment to both

domains attenuate work-family conflict. Also implicit is the conflict model, the assumption that the demands of each domain are not complementary and that negative outcomes for the employer, for family members, and for the employee/parent are inevitable. In the discourse on family commitment, for example, there has been considerable commentary, as well as empirical research, that focus on the consequences of a lack of family commitment for an employee's children and spouse. Research on job commitment has examined the implication of a focus on satisfaction of marital or parental responsibilities on decreased commitment to employers, as evidenced by higher turnover and absenteeism rates for individuals with high family commitment. Yet, high levels of commitment to both work and family result in even more attenuated work-family conflict, and hence, deleterious outcomes are the result for all stakeholders. The research is yet to explicate a ratio between work and family commitment that does not present negative outcomes for some or all domains, although work-family conflict is decreased for those who reduce their time commitment to work (Gottlieb et al., 1998). Most researchers maintain that personal stress and work and family problems are inevitable outcomes (Adams, King & King, 1996; Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton., 2000; Eckenrode & Gore, 1996; Frone et al., 1992a; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Voydanoff, 1988). Higher levels of commitment to work result in negative family outcomes; higher levels of commitment to family, result in negative work outcomes. Commitment to both domains, especially at high levels, results in even more exacerbated negative outcomes in both domains. The balancing of commitment to both work and family, therefore, has negative outcomes for the employed parent.

Professional outcomes: Despite the advancement of women into professional and managerial careers in the past thirty years and a narrowing of female-male differentials in hourly pay, a salary disparity between women and men remains. Parental and marital status exacerbates this difference.

Research on the relationship between marital and parental status and wages has consistently found positive effects for males (Korenman & Neumark, 1991), and little or no positive marital effects for women, as an aggregate (Korenman & Neumark, 1992), although higher salaries in husbands has been correlated with higher salaries for wives (Tangiguchi, 1999). A further pay differential exists between mothers and nonmothers, a "family gap" or "wage penalty". Waldfogel (1994) reported that the family gap broadened over the 1980s in the United States, even as the gender gap has narrowed. Nonmothers pay rose from 68% to 80% relative to a mean for males; whereas mothers' pay rose only from 63% to 70% of male salaries.

Several explanations of the maternal wage penalty have been advanced, and many follow the tenet that women with children bring less human capital in terms of effort or career continuity to market employment. Differences in male and female and mother and nonmother salaries has been attributed by neo-classical economists to mothers' decisions to engage in less demanding work because of heightened commitment to familial tasks (Becker, 1985). The implications of work-family on career planning as an explanation for salary differentials has been studied by Lips (1992) who reports that women will assess work-family interaction in career decisions and strategically limit their enrollment in male dominated programs of study because of the anticipation that the time and

commitment demands preclude family orientation. Marital and family correlates of women's intentions to leave, and actual employment decisions, have also been studied:

Hourly earnings of single women [should] exceed those of married women even when both work the same number of hours and have the same market capital because child care and other household responsibilities induce married women to seek more convenient and less energy intensive jobs (Becker, 1985, p. 54).

Estes and Glass (1996) challenge this thesis. They reported that job changing post-partum is undertaken to increase pay-levels rather than to decrease time or energy commitment to work, and argue that there is little evidence that jobs with lower salaries require less energy than jobs with higher salaries. Anderson, Binder and Krause (2003) also "cast doubts on the work-effort explanation for the wage gap" reporting that "medium-skilled mothers (high skill graduates) suffered more prolonged and severe wage losses than either low- or high-skill mothers" (p. 272).

Research on children and wages has attributed much of the family gap to women's lower levels of work experience and lower returns to experience. Mothers work fewer hours and interrupt market-employment more frequently and for longer durations than do women without children (Koren & Neumark, 1992). Hudley (2000) reported that decisions by many women to shift to part time work or self-employment, results in less time commitment to work because of the increase in household responsibilities causing time-strain. Taniguchi (1999) linked mothers' low wages to their propensity for reduced hours of paid work: an hour of paid work contributed to a 1.9% wage gain. Hill (1979) found that controlling for actual work experience eliminated virtually all the effects of children. Although, Wood, Corcoran and Courant (1993) found a 7% wage differential for mothers and women without children, this effect also disappeared when hours of work

were considered — long hours of work are a key determinant of career success (Wallace, 1997). Mire and Frieze (1999) in their study of MBAs reported that mothers who took leaves or decreased their work time following childbearing suffered a wage penalty. However, they report that mothers with young children who remained continuously in the paid workforce did not suffer a wage or promotion penalty.

These results are challenged by Koren and Neumark (1992), by Taniguchi (1999) and by Waldfogel (1997, 1998). They reported that a significant child penalty remained after accounting for experience, even when accounting for unobserved heterogeneity. Waldfogel (1998), for example, reported that only 30-40% of salary differences between men and women are attributed to experience and job tenure.

Research on the presence or degree of wage penalty is therefore inconclusive. The disparity of these findings may be attributed to the presence of exogenous variables, comprehensively assessed by Neumark and Korenman (1994), such as length of leave and the timing of childbirth.

Wood et al. (1993) reported that return to employment, at levels of time commitment consistent to that previously exhibited, did not negatively affect wages. This study, however, suffers from a small sample size and focuses on one occupation, lawyers, for whom wage-setting processes may differ from the general population. Judiesch and Lyness (1999) reported a wage and promotional penalty for mothers who took short leaves following childbirth, but in comparing these penalties to those levied against males who take leaves (for family or illness) found no gender differences. Penalties were associated with taking leaves, not with the reason for the leave. Waldfogel (1998) found

that an employer's provision of leave coverage offset about 75 percent of the wage penalty associated with having children; women were more committed to return to their previous employer. Further research should illuminate if this wage penalty remainder is constant organizationally for any employee taking a leave for any reason and therefore not directed exclusively at mothers.

Research has also been limited by an assumed homogeneity of women's childbearing patterns. Women, in particular professional women, are increasingly delaying childbearing. Taniguchi (1999) reported that the timing of childbearing was a significant determinant of the degree of wage penalty: early childbearers are more vulnerable to the adverse impact of children on wages. The family gap, which was 3.7% for women aged 20-27 at first birth, became insignificant for mothers over 28. The timing of childbearing for most women coincides with the years most crucial for career building (Blackburn, Bloom & Newmark, 1993); therefore women who delay childbearing until their career path is established may mitigate this outcome. Uncontrolled in Taniguchi's study, however, was the effect of leave provisions. Women with established careers have greater access to employer provided benefits, such as parental leave. Waldfogel (1998), who in turn did not control for timing of leave, correlated the provision of leaves with reduced wage penalties. Further, the situation is markedly different in Canada, where leave provisions are more extensive and are paid for most women. Gender discrimination, the view that women are less rewarded for market work than are men, is another variable that merits further empirical examination.

Personal outcomes. Inasmuch as women tend to be the primary caregivers in the family environment, past research has focused on the manner in which women manage

the often conflicting demands of career and family and the outcomes in terms of life satisfaction, and mental and physical health. Some women report experiencing high levels of stress (Anderson & Leslie, 1991) and guilt and shame (Sederer & Seidenberg, 1976) as a result of the interface between family and career.

Frone (2000) examined the relation between work-family conflict and several types of psychiatric disorders: mood, anxiety, substance dependence and substance abuse. Both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict were positively related to having a mood, anxiety, and substance dependence disorder; employees who frequently experienced work-family conflict were 1.99-29.66 times more likely than were employees who reported no work-family conflict to experience a clinically significant mental health problem. No support was found for gender differences, in contrast to Bird (1997), who found exacerbated mental health effects of work-family conflict among mothers. In earlier studies, Frone and colleagues correlated work-family conflict with psychological distress and alcohol abuse (Frone, Barnes, & Farrell, 1994), and poor physical health (Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1997). Barling and MacIntyre (1993) and Parasuraman, Greenhaus, and Granrose (1992) reported significant relationships between work-family conflict and various measures of psychological distress in women. The connection between women's role strain and psychological well being has been firmly established.

Work family conflict also has a deleterious effect on life satisfaction. In a recent meta-analysis of the literature, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) reported that conflict between work and family roles was a stronger predictor of life satisfaction for women than for men.

Burke and Greenglass (1995) and Carlson and Perrewe (1999) examine the role of social support in mitigating the effect of work-family conflict. Although previous research had examined social support as a promising coping mechanism (House, 1981; Kasl & Wells, 1985; Wells, 1982), questions as to whether and how social support acts upon work-family conflict remain unanswered. Burke and Greenglass (1995) found limited support for the mitigation of work-family conflict due to social support. Carlson and Perrewe (1999) examined social support as an antecedent, an intervening, a moderating, and an independent variable in the stressors to work-family conflict relationship. Social support did not intervene or mitigate the effect of conflict, after the situation was perceived as stressful. Carlson and Perrewe's (1999) results suggest that social support may be best viewed as an antecedent to perceived stressors: support reduces the likelihood that situations will be perceived as stressful, thus, indirectly affecting work-family conflict. The extant research has focused on the effect of emotional social support. Whether instrumental support, such as the provision of childcare by extended family members, assistance with household tasks, and co-workers providing direction or help with work tasks, decreases work-family conflict or mitigates the experience of negative personal outcomes is unexamined in the literature.

Inter-role conflict generates significant stress for employed parents. The manifestation of this stress in physical and psychological harm makes this an important area of inquiry. Efforts to decrease employees' stress will have positive benefits for the organization. Although the research on work-family conflict and employer outcomes such as turnover and absenteeism is inconclusive, an indirect link between personal outcomes, such as physical and emotional health, and organizational outcomes is well established

(Weiss, 1987). Interceding in this relationship will benefit the employees, their families and the employer.

Reading Beyond the Lines

This chapter provides a summary of the current state of “knowledge” regarding work-family interaction. This chapter began with the question: What has academic research on work-family contributed to our understanding of work-family interaction? Extensive research has addressed the interaction of work-family conflict as a problematic that is responsible for considerable personal and organizational angst. Outcomes and antecedents of deleterious role interaction, as well as personal and organizational strategies to mitigate work-family conflict, permeate a research stream that dates back decades, with literally thousands of articles and books addressing the problem. In response to the question framing this chapter—work and family research may have contributed to deforestation, but has not contributed meaningfully to our ability to manage our lives with greater fulfillment and less conflict. There are many reasons for the inability of the mainstream academic community to meaningfully contribute to addressing this problem. Chapter 5 presents one reason — the entrenchment of the dominant discourse that limits our ability to question the basic assumptions that guide work-family interaction and the research tradition analyzing it. “Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it” (Foucault 1978, p 101).

For the next layer of my hermeneutic analysis, Chapter 5, I restate the question that guided the development of this research summary: “What has academic research on work-family contributed to our understanding of work-family interaction?” This time, in

analyzing the contribution of the HRM research, I adopt a deconstructive lens and address how this research tradition has reinforced hegemonic “truths” that support rather than mitigate or decrease the experience of conflict.

CHAPTER 5: TEXT AS REVEALED

Introduction

Academic research wears of cloak of invulnerability. A veil of objectivity obviates the privileging of extant power relations within published research. The truth claims inherent in the text serve to reinforce a hierarchical positioning of masculine priorities by treating the biases inherent therein as hegemonic truths. Chapter 4, Text as Read, summarizes the dominant streams of analysis in the mainstream HRM literature. This text will now serve as the data source for the second layer of interpretation.

This chapter, Text as Revealed, begins with a methodological discussion of how the text is engaged in a hermeneutically framed dialogue that confronts the truth claims and challenges the empiricism that effaces other contributing discourses. I then distill, through a reflective engagement of the text and an evaluative process of critical reading of the discourse, the prevailing themes of the discourse of work-family in the HRM literature.

Method

This chapter, then, is dedicated to my own reading of the HRM work-family academic discourse as distilled in the previous chapter. As the one who edited the textual summary, I fully acknowledge that my subjective interpretation of the literature influenced which articles, for example, were emphasized in answering the hermeneutic question regarding the state of HRM academic research on work-family. Nevertheless, I believe that Chapter 4 represents the range of HRM material on this subject. I also argue that all reading of text is subjective and represents the values of the reader; in moving

between my reading of the texts upon which the summation was based, and writing the chapter summarizing those articles, my values were necessarily present. Upon completion of writing Chapter 4, Text as Read, when I was able to re-embrace my critical lens and re-read and critique the text, I experienced a physical relief. I will also note that in reading the textual dialogue, I found myself fully and fervently engaged, as if temporarily removing the lens of critique had left that part of me that is passionate about this issue, ravenous. The first level of analysis, the forward arc, was therefore a personal reflection on the themes and issues of the text. I questioned the text, I rant, and sometimes I collapse in despair.

The second level of analysis, the backward arc, was evaluative. Table 5.1 presents an exemplar of the textual engagement—both reflective and evaluative are conjoined to document the actual process of the analysis as the arcs of hermeneutic inquiry were applied throughout the data analysis phase. The evaluative component of the data analysis was based on a critical reading of the text. I returned to the segment of the text from Chapter 4 to evaluate the discursive techniques that may have ignited my critique. To do so, I employed a critical reading to identify themes, evident and shadowed, within the text. Developed further in the accompanying appendix (Appendix 5.1), the analysis seeks to identify the various assumptions underling the content of text. Consideration of the positive or negative connotations of the assumptions (revealed through the use of one signifier rather than another), and the existence of “underlying” power relations (e.g. binary oppositions such as *public/private*), focuses the analysis on the issue of why a particular signifier rather than an alternative is used in a specific context: the “absences.” Ideological absences help limit the text’s readers, through the implication that “people

like us already agree what we think about issues like that,” and uncover the intent of the author. Analyzing textual absences can help to reveal whose interests are served by their omission, creating the positioning of subject and “other”. This critical reading pays particular attention to the issue of identifying questions that were not asked within the discourse of work-family and to the use of technique to manipulate other discourses embedded in the text.

The objective of the text, Chapter 4, is also carefully examined. Beyond the stated or obvious foci, in many cases, however, a text will also indirectly advocate particular discourse paths and mask alternative discourses through the choice of constructs or concepts under development. These non-disclosed paths are symbolically sustained at the extra-discursive level.

Critical hermeneutics, according to Prasad (2002) encourages the researcher to engage in a dialogue with text in order to reflect upon, and reveal, biases and assumptions embedded within the text and adopted by the reader. The critical reading of the text was my personal engagement with the HRM discourse of work-family. Using the guidelines that I developed for this purpose (Appendix 5.1), I questioned the text, and often myself, regarding the role of women and men in family and organizational life, as represented by the HRM researchers and as reflected in my distillation of the dominant research streams. My critical reading revealed several themes at the discursive level. Two relate to the obviation of the object, through discursive techniques such as feigned neutrality. First, the text presents itself as gender-neutral; when the issue of work-family is examined as a problematic, it is the conduct of mothers that is examined. Likewise, when examining negative outcomes for family, the text discusses “parents”, when it really means

“mother.” Second, is that of blame which is embedded in a discourse of accommodation. Other themes represent a power positioning, whereby one partner in the dyad is positioned as “other.” All themes are, however, integrated in their reflection of the gendered nature of this discourse.

Results

Casting the roles: gendering the domains

Casting the roles: gendering the domains

As alluded to in Chapter 1, literature on work-family conflict has focused almost exclusively on a definition of family that is limited to husband, wife, and child(ren) (Hepburn & Barling, 1995; Eby et al., 2005). Narrowing the definition of “family” to just the nuclear family necessarily downplays the potential significance of the extended family in setting, exacerbating, or mitigating role expectations for family members, especially within a culturally diverse workforce, or in the context of the increasing demand for elder care. Nor is the increase in either the number of single parent families or same sex parents considered in the work-family conflict literature.

Implicit in the dominant discourse is the belief that unattached adults are likely to be more career-oriented, less subject to demands from their private lives, and therefore more available to the demands of the employer. That these adults may be responsible for elder care, may be seeking to establish a family, or may have other equally demanding commitments is seldom addressed (e.g. Aronson, 1992; McGowan, Morouney & Bradshaw, 2000; Hepburn & Barling, 1995). The focus of the discourse on one particular social group clearly disadvantages parents (especially women, who are assumed to take the primary responsibility for child and family welfare) in the competition for

advancement and remuneration, because the greater availability and desirability of the nonparent to the employer is simply assumed. By the same token, however, nonparenting workers are subjected to increased levels of exploitation on the grounds that there can be no legitimate claims on their time and resources from outside the workplace despite the reality that many have meaningful and demanding communities that do not fit the limited definition of “family” upon which this discourse is based.

Where the discourse does allow for a broadened definition of family equivalent commitments, they appear to privilege single males who wish to access programs such as flex-time and flex-place to facilitate access to avocational pursuits, which both trivializes and undermines the legitimate role expectations of those committed to the family and family equivalent domains.

In short, the dominant discourse of “family” limits the subject positions available to men and women. A dichotomy of the nuclear family and the “other” is created. Responding to the responsibilities of the “other” — the extended family or the “nontraditional” family forms and obligations are un-represented and therefore devalued.

Parent=Mother

Much of the academic discourse intentionally subsumes both males and females within the broad category of “parent.” This reflects a veil of gender neutrality assumed within the literature. Despite this orientation of sexless/genderless objectivity, peeling back the layer of discourse reveals clearly defined gendered roles. The family domain is characterized in the literature as being an inherently female-dominated sphere. “Deeply ingrained norms about the priority of women’s motherhood and homemaker roles....” (Major, 1994, p. 150) and “homemaking is motivated by the higher levels of needs of

women” (Matsui et al., 1995, p. 124). The interaction of fatherhood and employment is not salient as “most mothers remain home with infants for a substantial period of time. Fathers do not” (Ruhm, 2004, 168). If men experience conflict between their role expectations, they manage the conflict by assuming maternal involvement as a proxy for their own involvement (Pleck & Stueve, 2001). If a mother spends time with the children, they are being “parented,” even if the father maintains workplace commitment. The mother, however, is the “parent”. The neutrality of the use of the signifier “parent” veils the gender of the person who is indeed fulfilling those responsibilities.

This gender neutrality is dropped, however, if the agenda of explicating gender supports the discourse of work — for example, if the object of the study is to support gender-based reward differentials (the wage gap). The subject position of “working mother” is created within this discourse as a consequence of this dual role. The working mother is the “other” whose presence in the workplace is an aberration and an inconvenience. The woman is simultaneously the topic of study and paradigmatically excluded. A tension of inclusion and exclusion develops. The discourse of work is thus genderless only if work priorities are not compromised; the discourse of work is explicitly masculine if “othering” women is the object of the text. The male is the default “employee” except when the characterization of women as “employees” serves to obviate gender as a relevant variable through a veil of neutrality.

The master discourse, further capitalizes on the layering of apparently conflicting discourses. The discourses of inclusion and exclusion, for example, appear contradictory. As will be discussed, however, such discourses endeavor to legitimate normative assertion such as: “of course women are included in the work realm!” Nonetheless, this

“inclusion” is illusory as it is predicated on the persistence of exclusionary practices that undermine feminine priorities.

The following discussion highlights the objects of the text, as revealed through the critical reading of Chapter 4, Text as Read, the second layer in the hermeneutic excavation of work-family. The themes are interrelated and overlapping in that they share a representation of women, particularly working mothers as “others”. The following four layered themes serve as nexuses of the work-family literature as revealed through a hermeneutic exploration of the discourse: Scarcity of Resources/Enhancement; Incommensurability (Conflict)/Integration; WORK/family; and Accommodation/Blame.

Themes

1. Scarcity of resources /Enhancement

Inherent in mainstream HRM research is the assumption that inter-role conflict is the inevitable result of competition for the limited resource of the employee’s time and commitment. Time expended on role performance in one domain necessarily depletes time available for the demands of the other domain. Enhancement, the rewards that an employee accrues from simultaneously occupying roles in both arenas (Barnett, 1998) are not discussed in mainstream HRM research. Individuals have a finite amount of energy and when involved in multiple roles, the demands of these roles will deplete available resources (Becker, 1985). Inter-role conflict results: the incompatibility of demands from one role impedes an individual’s ability to meet the expectations of the other role

(Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Depletion of resources will lead to decreased productivity of the employee (organizational outcome), and diminished personal satisfaction, familial disruption, and increased burnout for the employee (personal outcomes.)

Scarcity: Time-based conflict

Women, more than men, experience tension between their time commitments to work and to family. The dominant discourse delineates and quantifies the experience of work-family conflict and supports that it is a problem more dominant for women and that women are more likely to modify career paths to satisfy family-based commitments (Lips, 1992; Rosin & Korabik, 1990). The discourse regarding commitment is predicated on the commonsense argument that the more committed to work one is, the more valuable they are to the employer (Koren & Neumark, 1992; Hudley, 2000). Taniguchi (1999) reported that decisions by many women to shift to part-time work or self-employment, resulted in less time commitment to work because of the increase in household responsibilities causing time-strain. Commitment requires granting an exclusive priority to employer needs. Affirming the text's object of the singular commitment to work is the assumption that time commitment to work should be limitless — an employee should be available to the employer during nonwork hours. A “good employee” is therefore someone who prioritizes work over other commitments. “Working long hours is simply inherent to doing a good job and being successful in one's chosen vocation” (Wallace, 1997, p. 229). As time commitments in the family domain necessarily challenge limitless time availability to employers, only childless employees have the potential to attain status of “good employees”; family orientation is the

“problem” that must be solved to protect the priorities of the work domain from being compromised.

A contradiction in the text becomes apparent. From the perspective of the work discourse, commitment to the work domain is predicated on face time and availability; commitment to family is predicated on skilled outsourcing of time-intensive family needs. Commitment is only associated with time when it is to the benefit of the employer. A “good employee” will ensure that family demands do not compromise work. The discourse of work therefore uses time commitment to exclude parents. “Parents” however, are not the “other” in this discourse. Concision, simple argument with strong ideological support, is embedded in the discourse to narrow the range of employees eligible for “good employee” status and exclude not on parental status, but on sex. The discourse of work does not exclude all parents — just mothers. Participation of fathers as committed employees is supported, not just childless men. In fact, parental status for men is correlated with more positive work outcomes compared to childless men (Waldfogel, 1998). In contrast, parental status for women correlates with negative work outcomes compared to childless women. The commonsense rationale for earnings differentials for women as supported by the dominant discourse is that women’s time commitment to work is diminished due to childcare responsibilities; this effect is not present for fathers (Korenman & Newmark, 1991, 1992).

The relationship between hours worked and the discourse of work also reflects women’s subject positions within the dominant discourse of family and the stress inherent in violating the role of the “good mother”. The expectation of the family discourse that women will continue to be accountable for other domestic responsibilities

regardless of hours of market work (Hochschild, 1997) creates an increased effect of work-family conflict for women. The discourse of family is female; men are exempt from many/most childcare responsibilities and therefore their time commitment to work is not impacted. The discourses of work and family fortify sex-based barriers between the domains. The naturalness of women's family commitment is paralleled with the naturalness of men's work commitment.

The question is whether this is changing. Given the increased involvement of fathers in child-care responsibilities over the past decade, the limitations of these dominant discourses are revealed. Even this preliminary shift in the expectations of the social role of father demonstrates that these roles need not be as fixed as the dominant discourses have assumed, thus leaving open the question of whether a more thoroughgoing revision of role expectations might not in fact relieve much of the supposedly inherent tensions at the work-family boundary. The decline of research on work-time as mediator of work family conflict since the 1980s, when the trend towards more father involvement in child-rearing first became apparent, suggests that work-time may no longer be sustainable as a credible factor in inter-role conflict.

2. Incommensurability (Conflict)/Integration

Considerable empirical evidence has been marshaled to show that the interaction of the domains of work and family generates conflict (e.g. Gotlieb et. al., 1998). This research is premised, however, on the subject positions of male/worker- female/mother discussed above. The work domain is characterized by the masculine—rational, logical, emotionless; the feminine characterizes the family domain—nurturing, illogical, and

emotional. Women are placed as responsible for the functioning of the family domain — even if engaged in market work, mothers are labeled “working moms” in contrast to the male who is not characterized as a “working father”. The placement of the father in the work domain is “natural” and does not require clarification. Integration of the roles is problematic; inter-role conflict is inevitable (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The discourse draws heavily upon Greenhaus & Beutell’s 1985 typology of conflict. Even assuming time availability or an enhancement orientation, the spillover of negative mood states (strain conflict) or a perceived incompatibility of behaviours between roles (behavior-based conflict) remain problematic according to the text. Regardless of the specific form of conflict, however, all conflict is identified within the dominant discourse as deleterious to the work priority. Attempts to concurrently maintain a role in both work and family lives necessarily means lesser commitment to an employer/career for which a penalty is “reasonably” enacted. The family is the “problem” and the discourse focuses on ways to either make women more committed to the work domain or to limit their participation in one of the domains. Women are either to adopt masculine traits and priorities or relinquish claim to the work domain.

Behaviour based Conflict

Behaviour-based conflict refers to incompatibility between the behaviour patterns desirable for the two domains. There is, however, little empirical research to support the incompatibility of the social roles of parent and those of employee, beyond the false dichotomy produced by the gendering of these roles. What has become hegemonic is that the behavioural incompatibilities are not resident in the domain, but in the gender.

The early discourse of exclusion focused on identifying reasons why women should not work; they were, for example, transitory employees who were hyper-emotional and needy (Kanter, 1977). When the presence of women in the workplace became more accepted (or was seen as inevitable), the discourse focused not on the behavioural incompatibility with *any* work, but on skilled or managerial labour. Women could be support staff, they just were not “management material” (Kanter, 1977). This ideological assumption shapes both the research agenda, in that the research question is whether women, not men, are suited to managerial careers (e.g. Cames, Vinnicombe, Singh., 2001), as well as the examination of women’s actual worksite behaviours: even if women have “leadership qualities” they do not assert them (e.g. Carbonell, 1984; Crampton & Mishra, 1999).

Women continue to be perceived as less competent managers because they are assumed to have feminine traits that are incompatible with the role, such as compassion and nurturance (Guy & Newman, 2004). Although increasingly feminine qualities, such as nurturance, are seen as contributory to effective leadership, they are characterized as “nice, but extraneous” (Guy & Newman, 2004, p. 291). Even if such skills are valued, women are not rewarded for these traits as they are seen as natural expressions of femininity. “The more she seems natural at it, the more her labor does not show as labor, the more successfully it is disguised as the absence of other, more prized qualities” (Hochschild, 1983 p. 169). “‘Mom’ behaviors-do not register on the wage meter” (Guy & Newman, 2004, p. 292) for women. Men are assumed to be analytical and decisive, and “masculine” traits seen appropriate for managerial roles. Nurturance and caring

behaviours are discretionary, but valued traits for male managers. As discretionary traits, they are visible and rewarded. But only for men.

Strain-Based Conflict

Strain-based conflict arises when strain in one-role “spills over” and affects one’s performance in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work stressors can produce strain symptoms such as tension, anxiety, fatigue, depression, apathy, and irritability (Abdel-Halim 1981; Barling & Rosenbaum 1986; Burke & Bradshaw 1981). Family centered responsibilities can generate similar outcomes (Lewis & Cooper 1987). Williams and Alliger (1994), who reported that role juggling, task demands, personal control, and goal progress affected moods in both work and family roles, employed role theory and drew on early analyses that did not consider women as employees. Burke et. al (1980), for example, draws on a male sample to assess impact of Type A personality (research which, as earlier discussed, focused on the male experience.) The origins of these models in gendered research, although subject to test and revision, may diminish the effect of the original discourse, but I argue does not extinguish it. Many early studies, even when exclusively analyzing the work relations of men, obviated gender in the discussion of the implications of findings, generalizing the results to “people,” “parents” or “employees.” Greenhaus & Beutell (1985), for example, in summarizing work strain associated with work-family conflict, discussed “employees” experience, without differentiating between men and women’s work experiences. As discussed, the gendering of the discourses is explicit if it serves to control women’s workplace participation and obviated if veiling gender serves workplace priorities.

The multiple role demands of the work and home domains are additive with the strain and stresses manifested at home (work) combining with the strain experienced at work (home). Role overload results from this accumulated stress and leads to illness and decreased personal and job satisfaction (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1986). Greenhaus & Parasuraman (1986) further suggest that work and home conflicts are interactive, with the greatest stress arising in situations of simultaneous role pressures from both home and work: the summative stress is greater than the stress caused by the components independently.

The major discourses assume that such strain is inevitable. At what point, however, did it become acceptable to assume that disruptive and dysfunctional levels of stress were the norm in the workplace? Even the most committed family member can plan for seasonal or occasional periods of peak work demand, and even the most draconian employer will briefly release a worker to respond to a family crises. For strain-based conflict to be a significant source of work-family conflict, however, one needs to accept that such strain is *routine*. Any work site may be subject to occasional deadline pressure, unexpected peak demand, or unforeseen crises, but where such pressures are constant, there are only two possible explanations: the deliberate exploitation of workers through unsustainable speedups, quotas, and the like or; incompetent forward planning. Competent management projects likely demand and staffs accordingly. The discourses of downsizing, global competition, profitability and the cult of efficiency are the fundamental pressures that create work environments in which stress is maintained at such high levels that any additional strain (such as spillovers from home) become unmanageable. By focusing on the problem of spillover from the family domain and on

cumulative strain effects, the dominant discourse distracts attention from the employer's responsibility to provide a humane work environment. Indeed, the very phrase "spill-over" implies that the work and family domains should remain strictly separated. Programs intended to reduce work-family conflict are thus revealed as attempts to minimize external pressures so that internal work demands may be maximized.

Of course, strain-based conflict is also operative at the level of interpersonal relationships. Galinsky and Stein (1990) noted that the relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor was a significant source of stress for employed parents. Supervisory work-family support is evidenced by knowledge of benefits, flexibility in responding to the spill-over of family issues into the workplace, and a perception that providing such supports is part of the role of supervisor. The direct effect of supervisors' support on employees' perception of work-family conflict has not been measured, however, nor has the effect of such support on organizational outcomes.

Recognizing that the spheres of work and family interact, the emphasis of the dominant discourse is placed on mitigating and managing the overlap, rather than on the integration of the domains. For example, research assessing "family-friendly" human resource policies discuss the issue's importance for facilitating or easing the transition between the domains of work and home to minimize conflict and maximize the potential of the employee as a productive agent. Although some work-family initiatives, such as on-site childcare, may seem to reinforce the integration of the domains of work and family, the nature of the interaction remains work-defined. Commitment to children must not diminish commitment to the employer, despite movement of the family into the work

domain. Embedded in discourse is the objective of the text-- to valorize and support workplace priorities over familial ones.

Rather than viewing how work and family may harm the other, a small number of researchers (e.g., Bowles & Kington, 1998; Frone, 2003) have focused on how family and work can be supportive of one another, resulting in a cumulative appreciation of commitment and energy, rather than a depletion. Obviously employment provides for housing, food, and the necessities to maintain a family. At the same time, family can also be an important source of emotional support as one tackles the myriad of potential problems related to work. Energy may be renewed through interaction with one's spouse or children in a similar manner, as health is improved by interaction with family members. Non-work demands, including family, can either add support to the person in performance of work, or deplete personal resources from one's work, such as time, energy and commitment. Work-family enrichment is defined as "the extent to which participation at work (or home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed at home (or work)" (Frone, 2003, p. 145). This emerging discourse of work-family enrichment is appearing at the margins of the dominant discourse and positions itself as a direct challenge to the mainstream orientation of negative spillover. The underlying assumption that these spheres are separated has, however, remained intact, moderated only to allow smoother movement between them.

3. WORK/family: The Superordinate positioning of work

The focus of HRM literature on work-family conflict is on reinforcing distinct roles by representing the purported inherent and inevitable challenge of combining work and family responsibilities. The discourse of work accepts as a given the incompatibility

of the work and family spheres. Also unquestioned is the assumption that, as employees maneuver between the domains of work and family, the organizational needs are superordinate to family. The boundaries between the domains of work and family are fortified by a discourse of conflict that identified femininized priorities as problematic and the home as the source of barriers to employment. Early work-family literature focused on identifying the “problem” and its carriers — women — and documenting the deleterious outcomes. The object of the text, as summarized in Chapter 4, is the valuation of the work realm. Work is prioritized and its dominance in the work-family dualism is discursively sustained. A discourse of superordinancy results.

Hierarchical power structures between work and family are evident in the following examples given by Williams and Alliger (1994): “Juggling work and family tasks may be intentional (as when a parent attempts to read work reports while supervising a child) or unintentional (as when a parent has to make arrangements for the care of a child while at work” (p. 541). The movement of work into the family domain is deemed “intentional” and therefore a natural and appropriate use of resources. In contrast, family centered activities in the work domain, such as child care facilitation, is an “unintentional” and therefore undesired practice. Work may (and should) have presence in the family; one would never plan for family tasks to erode work time.

The hierarchical positioning of work over family is also evident in the discussion of family-friendly organizational practices. The relationship between employment practices and the deleterious organizational outcomes of work-family conflict is increasingly becoming the focus of employer’s personnel practices (Osterman, 1995). A broad range of benefits embracing leave provisions, flexible work scheduling and child

care support have been proposed as strategies to facilitate the movement of employees between the domains of work and family (e.g. Waldfogel, 1998). Osterman's caution that the increase in the provision of these benefits serve as "one sided and uneven commitment that is in the narrow interest of employers" (1985, p. 699) suggests that such programs are established to maximize organizational productivity so that family does not compromise the work organization's goals. Criteria for program success as presented in mainstream literature include reduced absenteeism, decreased turnover, and increased productivity (e.g. Miller, 1984). The implications of these programs for familial outcomes is not perceived as "relevant" to the discourse and so remains unexamined. Thus, work is privileged in this stream of the research discourse. The absence of the term "work" in the label "family-friendly" does not obviate its power.

The dominant discourse defining the scope of work is still rooted in the notion that only financially remunerated activities constitute "work." Parent-work is therefore not embraced by this discourse. Hence, breaks in paid market-employment for the fulfillment of parental responsibilities are considered "gaps" in one's employment history, for which a wage penalty may be exacted because of an alleged deterioration in one's human capital (cf. Miree & Frieze, 1999). In contrast to women without children, "working mothers" are often characterized as "working" fewer hours, interrupting market-employment more frequently and for longer durations, and give less time commitment to paid work (Becker, 1985; Hundley, 2000; Koren & Neumark, 1992; Taniguchi, 1999).

The dominant discourse of work, which includes only paid work as an employee, excludes the labour of the family domain. If identity is to be found in one's work, and

parent-work is not “real work”, then those who do not engage in market-work outside of the home (predominantly women) lack identity. She is “just a housewife.” The identity of the woman is imbued in the discourse of family. Within the family domain, role expectations are most clearly defined for mothers; fathers in western culture have been socialized to exhibit less of these feminized behaviours, even when caring for children. There is a dearth of empirical research examining the incompatibility of the social roles of parent and those of employee, although evidence of the gendered nature of these subject positions as they exist within the dominant discourse suggests an inherent incompatibility. Difficulty in shifting between the behavioural expectations of subject position can be problematic and generates dissonance and stress — work-family conflict.

4. Accommodation/Blame

Early research on work-family interaction cast women solely in supportive roles, as wife and mother, supporting a segmentation model, whereby the domains of work and family were distinct and incommensurable. Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958), for example, assessed time usage by male school superintendents. Jones and Butler (1980) evaluated the family and work role incompatibilities for male sailors. Werbel (1978) included some women in their sample, although 96% of the sample was male. If women were studied at all, their experiences were typically evaluated for the implication of their husband’s work role on the family. Burke, Weir and Duwors (1979, 1980a, 1980b), for example, assessed the impact of men's work on their families, with wives, as the persons responsible for the domain of “family” providing the evaluation.

As women's presence in the workplace became more obvious and enduring, however, their place in the research literature and the work domain came under scrutiny in regards to how it created dissonance for the male in the family dyad (e.g. Keith & Schaffer, 1980; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). The domain of work being the primary arena of male responsibility, it would be problematic for men to be expected to assume a greater role in the family domain is problematic. "It is possible that women who are employed in managerial or professional positions work sufficiently longer hours to produce intense pressures on the husband to participate more heavily in family activities which, in turn may conflict with his work responsibilities" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.80). Keith and Schaffer (1980) similarly report that fathers' perception of work-family conflict was not heightened by an increase in the number of working hours by the mothers. The domains of work and family were gendered and presented as incommensurable.

As the involvement of women in market work came to be accepted, however, a theme emerged in the literature that challenged this exclusion — a theme of accommodation: "Men do not have to change, nor does the system, except to the extent that it must 'accommodate' women" (Bacchi, 1990, p. xvi). With expectations of a woman's domestic "duties" relatively unchanged (Hochschild, 1997), the focus of the work-family debate is on the task of *women* to balance home and work lives. The focus, and therefore the object, of the work-family discourse in the management literature was on the inability of *women* to seamlessly integrate into the work sphere. If unable to commit time equivalent to a male, she is by default a "bad" employee. The discourse of work individualizes the problem and focuses on ways the mother can accommodate

family concerns; solutions do not address the structures of work and the time demands work places on these employees. Women who experience less work-family conflict are, for example, characterized as having “superior coping skills” (Goff et al., 1990, p. 806). Family friendly programs focus on facilitating the transference of parental responsibilities to alternate caregivers through daycare, and childcare referral services. Telecommuting affords parents (which is implied in the literature to mean women) the opportunity to conduct work in their home setting, assuming that presence in the home is equated with involvement in the home. Embedded in the discussion sections of ostensibly objective academic discourse is value-laden commentary explicitly directing women to find individual level “solutions” to work-family conflict, such as “getting wives” (Davidson & Cooper, 1984) or directing their families to function more independently of them (Williams & Alliger, 1994).

Whereas one stream of research focuses explicitly on work-family as a problem for women (read, “women are the problem”), another stream of research obviated gender as an issue entirely — referencing genderless “employees” thus avoiding the charge and responsibility for addressing sex-based differences. This “genderless” orientation is illusory in that the focus remained on employees who had leave absences due to childbirth (women), had absenteeism in relation to childcare (women), had familial responsibilities that created time conflicts with work (women), or experienced conflict between dual roles (predominately women). As the labels became veiled, the roles and role expectations remained intact and assumed hegemonic power. A “good mother” prioritized familial responsibilities; a “good employee” prioritized work responsibilities. A good “working mother” prioritized both and therefore failed at both. A discourse of

“mother blame” thus became the nexus of much research on the outcomes of work-family conflict.

This discourse of “mother-blame” has been markedly consistent in terms of deflecting the responsibility for work-family conflict from the workplace to the mother. Recent research literature, for example, identifies that work-family conflict is more frequently experienced by women. The mainstream literature also accepts that responsibilities in the family domain rest almost exclusively with women; women assuming primary responsibility for the nonwork realm mitigates the experience of conflict for men. That this imbalance in the family domain should be addressed is not discussed in mainstream management literature, except in terms of directing employees (women, as men have a diminished role in this domain) to manage the home domain more effectively as the work domain is beyond the scope of her control (Rotando, Carlson & Kincaid 2003) and to highlight the increased (but not equivalent) involvement of men in parenting work. The object of the text, as summarized in Chapter 4, to preserve as sacrosanct the dominance of work is supported by the nondisclosed path of allowing masculine involvement in reorienting the family domain to mitigate work-family conflict, and the dismissal of the possibility of shifting feminine priorities to the workplace by calling for a re-thinking of the masculinist structural barriers in the workplace that create or exacerbate conflict.

Commodification of family life is a theme related to the exclusion of women in that it reinforces the model of segregation. One “coping strategy” to mitigate work-family conflict calls for the outsourcing of family responsibilities to the private sector. The discourse turns back on itself by claiming to mitigate deleterious outcomes for family by

advocating more complete withdrawal of women from the home and advocating nonparent childcare options. The discourse exploits value loading of “pro-family” sentiment by advocating the employment of nannies or nurses for sick children to increase working mothers’ availability to employers. A movement away from a discourse of explicit exclusion to a discourse claiming an agenda of inclusion veiled the persistent privileging of the male. Women, according to this agenda, were not excluded; they excluded themselves by choice as other options, such as daycare, were available to them. Researchers shifted from merely revealing the problems of transversing the domains to identifying remedies. “Family friendly initiatives” became a focus of research. Programs such as childcare referral services and employer endorsed/funded daycare were examined for employer outcomes such as reduced absenteeism by parents (read, “mothers”). Physical separation from family, however did not resolve work-family conflict – women still experienced conflict because of their “inability” (e.g. Major, 1994) to emotionally dissociate from the role of mother, and therefore were not capable of full commitment to an employer. Further, if a woman did disassociate emotionally, she was seen as an aberration (a bad mother and woman) and thus was subjected to marginalization on other grounds.

A discourse of conflict created and reinforced boundaries that resulted in the exclusion of women from market work because their priorities of family were either invalidated or ignored. An exclusionary strategy, veiled as accommodation, continues to dominate the work-family discourse.

Discourse on accommodation, although resulting in broader notions of womanhood and work, nonetheless leaves the idea of separate work/domestic domains

relatively untouched. The employee consequently is trapped in a metaphorical tug of war; the competing interests of each domain exacting enduring personal (e.g. Hochschild, 1997) and professional (e.g. Hundley, 2000) consequences regardless of how balance is established. The focus of this stream of literature is less on the explicit exclusion of women and on their inability to function in both domains, but on the need to personally “manage” their inclusion to mitigate the inevitable negative and destructive effects. Accommodation does not mean adaptation as women are expected to minimize deleterious interaction for the protection of work priorities even whilst ensuring that the family responsibilities were gloriously satisfied.

The dominant discourse shaping research on work-family supports the contention: if there is a problem — it is the mother’s fault. A number of studies use information about mothers’ employment as a proxy for parent-child processes and then test to see if mothers’ employment affected their children’s developmental outcomes. The results have been mixed but debate has centered on the “fitness” of the working mother as a caregiver. Belsky & Eggebeen (1991), for example, contend that early maternal employment has negative implications for children’s social and behavioral and cognitive outcomes (see also studies by Belsky, 1986; Desai, Chase-Lansdale, & Michael, 1989). Parcel & Menaghan (1994), on the other hand, argue that the effects of maternal employment on child behavior, if any, are minimal and that there are no net effects of early maternal employment on child cognitive outcomes. Studies reporting deleterious effects from maternal employment have generated considerable controversy. As important as what a discourse reveals is what it conceals. A significant limitation of these studies is the failure to consider intervening variables such as quality of alternate care, the family’s socio-

economic status (Belsky, 1986), and child characteristics (Belsky, 1986; Belsky & Eggebeen, 1991; Desai et al., 1989). The discourse of family assumes that child behaviour must be linked to the mother's behaviour. Hence the mother's engagement in market work is necessarily responsible for any negative outcome for the children. Using the same data set as Belsky (1986) and Belsky and Eggebeen (1991), McCarthy and Rosenthal (1991) reported that actual variance of children's adjustment accounted for by maternal employment is only 2.9%; the family's socioeconomic status was a more significant predictor of adjustment patterns. Social policy implications related to daycare quality or universal daycare systems are not considered in the management literature, once again focusing on the individual rather than systemic dimensions of the problem.

The subject positions adopted by the family members in relation to the discourses of work and family will also act upon children's functioning. McCarthy and Rosenthal (1991) report that maternal job satisfaction moderates the effect of mothers' engagement in market-work on children's patterns of adjustment. Similarly, Paulson (1996) found that maternal employment influenced adolescent achievement only in families where parental attitudes toward maternal employment were not consistent with mothers' employment. If such engagement is perceived to be "unnatural" and therefore aberrant, the discourse of work-family enacted within the home will reflect this orientation. Given, therefore, that the discourse of work as represented in HRM research persists in marginalizing and silencing women, the presence of women is unnatural in the work domain and working mothers are therefore aberrant. The dominant discourse of family creates subject positions that center responsibility for child development on the mother and define deviation from this normalized sex role as aberrant.

The subject position of father is unexamined in the literature in relation to the effect on children's adjustment when fathers maintain parental care when mothers are market-employed; this potentiality is silenced in the text. Further, the extant research has not differentiated between non-parental care options, further reinforcing the subject position of the good mother, the mother is the parent, all other family care options are "other" and therefore unequal. Children identified by researchers as having been placed in non-parental care may, in fact, be placed in the care of extended family members with whom the children have significant attachment. The discourse of family excludes the role of the extended family, just as it minimizes the role of the father. Care of children is the responsibility of mother or "other".

If examined at all, the experience of the father is presented as a variable linked to the market engagement by the mother. Fathers' engagement in the family domain, (workplace commitment, and marital satisfaction is measured in response to mothers' engagement in market work. Maternal responsibility is focused on the home, regardless of employment. That men, women, and children would all benefit from an increased presence of men in the family domain is not an elemental part of the management literature on work-family conflict. A discourse of maternal blame reflected the alleged deviation from the primary responsibility of women to maintain and nurture the family. The father is excluded (and therefore absolved of all non-fiscal responsibility) from the family domain.

A secondary discourse of father-hero also emerged in the analysis. Although fathers are identified as engaging in parental work to a lesser degree than mothers, that their involvement is escalating is heralded as a positive advancement: the "new father".

When a mother engages in family work, she is displaying a lack of commitment to the work domain; when a man engages in family work he is a champion for social change. Career wage penalties, however, are not significant for fathers and remain "reasonable" for women because of loss of experience

Although men are increasingly engaging in parent-work, their time and emotional commitment to the family domain still remains secondary to women's family domain commitment. One explanation offered in the text is "maternal gatekeeping" and the reluctance of women to relinquish maternal roles, even when engaged in market work. Women's subject positions related to motherhood may not be precluded by engagement in market-work. Rather than celebrating maternal attachment, however, the discourse blames women equally whether they love their children (too much) or transfer care to another (abandoning them). The theme of maternal blame is pervasive within this discourse: if there is a problem (be it at work, with the children, internal or with the father) it is the mother's fault. Fatherhood, particularly during traditional working hours, is discretionary and therefore mitigation of responsibility is assumed. The responsibilities of motherhood are neither temporally or spatially bounded. Whether present in the workplace or in the home, the mother is assumed to be responsible for the wellbeing and care of the children; and worksite presence or market involvement does not mitigate deleterious outcome. In fact, workplace involvement is identified as a causal factor in such outcomes; maternal responsibility is not diminished, but amplified.

Conclusion

Dominating the research literature, as summarized in the text of Chapter 4, are the implications of boundary crossing between the work and family domains for employers.

The academic research, however, has focused almost exclusively on the consequences of women's engagement in the work domain, and reveal the creation of the subject positions of males/employees and females/working mothers. Tension exists between the exclusion and accommodation of women in the work realm. As revealed in this chapter, however, discourses of inclusion and exclusion do not share equal status within mainstream HRM literature on work-family conflict, and women are relegated to the position of "other" through unstated but pervasive assumptions that privilege the masculine and ignore, exclude, or marginalize the feminine. These hegemonic "truths" embedded in discourse are reflections of the theoretical orientation of the researchers. It is at this point, therefore, that I turn my hermeneutic excavation of the discourse of work-family to the ancestry of the text, asking the question: "*What theory parented this discourse?*"

CHAPTER 6: PARENTING THE TEXT

Introduction

Analysis of mainstream academic discourse of work-family, Chapter 5, exposes a variety of apparently incompatible frameworks. Mirroring the tension between exclusion and inclusion of women in the work realm are discourses of incommensurability and integration of the domains of work and family. As discussed in the previous chapter, discourses of inclusion and exclusion do not share equal status within mainstream HRM literature on work-family conflict, with privilege awarded to discourses explicitly exclusionary of women and traditional feminine priorities. Further, even when a text espouses an inclusionary or integrative discourse, deconstruction of the discourse exposes the “othering” of women through tacit assumptions privileging the masculine. These hegemonic assumptions embedded in the discourse reflect in turn the biases implicit in the theoretical underpinnings of the HRM work-family literature.

Empiricism requires the acceptance of a theoretical position – theory either is extended or tested through the development of hypotheses and propositions. Indeed, the purpose of a review of literature in mainstream academic discourse is to highlight “gaps” in extant literature that a proposed study will fill. Filling these gaps often results in “incremental” advances to existing knowledge. “Most theorists do not generate new theory from scratch but, rather, improve on what currently exists” (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000, p. 179). A dominant discourse is thereby nurtured within a familial tradition of a theoretical orientation that has attained hegemonic status. This chapter will examine the theoretical tradition of the HRM work-family literature as a context for the hegemony of the discourse.

Content analyses of the work-family literature (e.g. Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley, 2005; Lpssel & Ozeki, 1999) have identified a vast literature, spanning decades, that delineate the “nature and direction of the proposed effects, and predictor, criterion and mediator variables” of the field (Eby et al., 2005, p. 124). Lacking from these analyzes, however, is an explication of the theoretical orientation embedded in the literature, in fact, Eby et al. (2005) explicitly exclude theoretical articles from their assay of the field and do not discuss the theoretical foundations of the articles analyzed.

Existing theoretical reviews in management literature (e.g. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Lambert 1990, Lobel, 1991) do not evaluate the context or assumptions that guide the theories described, although they do identify a basic lack of theoretical orientation in the literature. Edwards & Rothbard (2000), for example, analyze the “linking mechanisms” of the domains and work and family, but do so from a role theory perspective without identifying alternate theories in the extant literature. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) provide an analysis of alternate theories embedded in work-family literature, but do not offer a critique of the assumptions of these theories, nor support for the dominance of any one theory. Rothbard (2001) and others highlight the gendered role behaviours evident in the experience of working parents, but do not link these assumptions to the gendered nature of the research itself. The importance of roles and role theory is assumed and accepted by the researchers and is consistent with the contention by Poelman (2001) who states: “*it seems* that most researchers follow the rationale of the one dominant theory in the field, i.e. role theory” (p.2, emphasis added). This conjecture, however, is untested. Lacking from the research, therefore, is an

evaluation of the assertion that role theory dominates the discourse. Further, an assessment of the underlying assumptions of the theoretical frames of the work-family literature is also lacking. Theory is dynamic, but also rooted in history, because the original precepts upon which theory develops are socially constructed and temporally rooted. Some theories have a solid lineage whereby researchers will expound upon, test, or apply the precepts, thereby shaping and reinforcing the discourse to which it is applied. This chapter examines the theoretical tradition shaping the discourse of work-family.

It is at this point that I turn my hermeneutic excavation of the discourse of work-family to the ancestry of the text asking the question: “*What theory parented this discourse?*”

Method:

To answer this question, I draw upon the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) published by ISI Web of Knowledge, available online through ISI Web of Science. A citation index is a compilation of all the cited references from journal articles linked to their source article. Using a citation index, one can access a reference to a specific work and track other journal articles that have cited it. “This enables one to track trends in ideas and methods through time” (ISI, 2005) as subsequent research cites an article, either to challenge the original work, or to build upon its conclusions.

Authors, reviewers, and editors in mainstream publications may suppress or neglect writings of authors with competing theories and, through the process of theory testing and development, may stream research within a few theoretical traditions. Development of the discourse of work-family as an academic discourse (which then shapes practice and life experience) is therefore predicated on academic articles that serve

to create and reinforce the master discourse through multiple tellings and revisions. The discursive field is thus monitored and controlled by this gatekeeping function (Foucault, 1978). Given that it is the control function of academia within the work-family discursive field that is the focus of this phase of my study, an assessment of the theoretical traditions of work-family in HRM literature through citation analysis is appropriate. That said, however, there are several limitations to citation analysis; these are discussed in the limitations section of this chapter and a research design to mitigate these limitations is presented in the methodology section.

This citation study was conducted in multiple phases.

Phase 1

Citation analysis provides an important (though not exclusive) technique for assessing the relevance of a particular article to a stream of research. Mason (2001) identified, through an extensive interdisciplinary review of work-family literature including search terms such as “work-family conflict”, and “work-life, balance,” the 100 most cited articles in the field, using a ratio of number of citations to years since publication, to account for the opportunity a particular article has of being cited relative to an earlier published piece. Following a similar methodology, I accessed ISI Web of Science and searched, using the more limited topic term “work-family,” to reflect a focus on articles that explicitly examine the interface of these two domains, and identified the 100 most cited articles in this topic area within the Social Sciences Citation Index (Appendix 6.1). ISI indexes over 8,600 academic journals, although some journals where business academics publish are not included. Nevertheless, recent citation analyses have

shown that a core of approximately 2,000 journals (across all disciplines, not just business) now account for about 85% of published articles and 95% of cited articles (ISI, 2001) and therefore for the purpose of this study, ISI is an appropriate sampling frame.

As the potential exists for a non-HRM journal to be cited in HRM research and thus represent a perspective within the HRM discourse, I did not at this phase of analysis control the inclusion of cited articles, based on discipline, because this would be done at a later phase of the analysis.

Phase 2

To ascertain the articles cited by HRM journals, I then differentiated, within this initial list of 100 articles, between citations by academics publishing in different disciplines using ISI's subject descriptors; for example, "sociology", "management", "applied psychology" and so on. ISI's description of the subject area fields used is presented in Table 6.1.

As HRM draws from management, business and applied psychology disciplines (e.g. selection, recruitment, organizational behaviour), I developed a comprehensive list of 152 journals using these three subject categories (Appendix 6.2). Although HRM does draw from other disciplines, including sociology and economics, these were not included as HRM researchers are more frequently housed in management or psychology departments, than in the social sciences or economics departments. Overlap between the lists of journals for the disciplines of management, business, and applied psychology necessitated reviewing the detailed list of articles for each discipline to eliminate duplication. Although some journals on this list are clearly outside the normal boundaries

for HRM (e.g., *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*), I did not eliminate them in the initial citation counts for pragmatic reasons because it would necessitate a manual count of citations for all journals generated by the search terms of work and family. If such journals were dominant works, or were cited by the dominant works, their inclusion would be reviewed at a later phase of analysis.

Table 6.1: ISI Subject Categories

ISI Subject Category Name	Category Description
Business	This category covers resources concerned with all aspects of business and the business world. These may include marketing and advertising, forecasting, planning, administration, organizational studies, compensation, strategy, retailing, consumer research, and management. Also covered are resources relating to business history and business ethics.
Management	Management covers resources on management science, organization studies, strategic planning and decision-making methods, leadership studies, and total quality management.
Psychology, Applied	Psychology, Applied covers resources on organizational psychology, including selection, training, performance, and evaluation; organizational behavior; counseling and development; as well as aviation psychology and sports psychology.

Phase 3

Using a ratio of number of citations/years since publication, I then created a list of the 100 most cited articles across disciplines³. I also calculated citation ratios using the subject categories relevant to HRM, as described above. Each article therefore received two ratios — overall citation ratio and HRM specific ratio. I then rank ordered the 20

³ I found the contrasts between citations for different disciplines interesting. In a later study, I will return to this data and assess thematic and theoretical differences in citations between management and sociology, for example.

most frequently cited articles on work-family as they appear in the HRM journals. A ratio measure of citation rate was used to reflect the fact that older articles may have higher citation counts as a function of time since publication giving greater opportunity for citation (Ratio: Number of citations/2005-year of publication). More recent articles may have greater current influence, even though the opportunity for citation is comparably less. Given that this chapter's goal is to provide a cross-sectional analysis of the influence of particular articles (and the theory upon which they draw) correcting for opportunity for citation allows us to examine which articles are receiving the most attention by work-family researchers at this point in time.

I reviewed the articles citing these works and excluded citations from journals clearly not representative of the HRM discipline. I anticipated that this would be a lengthy process requiring considerable judgment. I was surprised to discover that these articles were not cited by many journals that I would consider marginal. In fact, only one journal was excluded at this stage — *Counseling Psychology* — and its exclusion did not impact the rankings in any way.

Four articles were excluded from the study at this phase of analysis (Stroh, Brett & Reilly, 1992; Meyer & Herscovitch, et al., 2002; Ryan, Sacco & McFarland, 2000; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). These were review articles on broad topics of turnover, commitment and women in management. Although work-family interactions are mentioned in these articles, in each case work-family formed only a minor element of the work. Allowing for the possibility that it was this element of these articles that formed the basis of its high citation rate, I convenience sampled articles citing these studies and determined that their application in work-family research is very limited. For example, of

the thirty-five articles reviewed citing Stohl et al. (1992), only two referenced work-family; the original article was principally cited to support the assertion that women continue to be underrepresented in management positions. (See Appendix 6.3 for a list of these articles and a more detailed assessment of the reasons for their exclusion.) A new list of the top 20 articles (Table 6.2) was generated after excluding these four articles. I refer to these articles as the seminal⁴ works in the HRM work-family literature.

Phase 4

I then individually reviewed the top 20 seminal work-family articles to ascertain the theory upon which each was predicated. This required three layers of analysis:

1. Authors may state outright their theoretical orientation. These statements of explicit theoretical orientation were used to establish a preliminary list of theories referenced within the HRM work-family literature. This framework was then used to facilitate the analysis of articles lacking clear reference to theoretical traditions.
2. Authors may cite landmark works delineating a particular theoretical orientation (e.g., Kahn et al., 1964 — role theory) without themselves labeling the theory explicitly. Using the list developed in Step. 1, supplemented by a review of handbooks on organizational and psychological theory, a list of significant authors associated with the various theoretical traditions within this framework was developed. Table 3 identifies the authors associated with the various theoretical orientations.

⁴ Although the term “seminal” is loaded with masculinist notions, this term is used deliberately to preview my conclusion that the work-family discourse in academia is indeed a masculine discourse, “parented” by men through an often invasive overtaking of women’s priorities and a silencing of women’s experience.

Table 6.2: Seminal Works in HRM Work-Family Literature

	Author	Source	Year	Total		HRM	Ratio
1	Kossek EE, Ozeki C	Journal of Applied Psychology 83 (2): 139-149 Apr	1998	82	13.7	54	9
2	Frone MR, Russell M, Cooper ML	Journal of Applied Psychology 77 (1): 65-78 Feb	1992	197	16.4	105	8.75
3	Greenhaus & Beutell	Academy Of Management Review 10 (1): 76-88	1985	286	15.1	158	8.316
4	Thomas LT, Ganster DC	Journal of Applied Psychology 80 (1): 6-15 Feb	1995	109	12.1	69	7.667
5	Frone MR, Yardley JK, Markel KS	Journal of Vocational Behavior 50 (2): 145-167 Apr	1997	74	10.6	47	6.714
6	Guterk BA, Searle S, Klepa L	Journal of Applied Psychology 76 (4): 560-568 Aug	1991	142	10.9	82	6.308
7	Netemeyer RG, Boles JS, McMurrian R	Journal of Applied Psychology 81 (4): 400-410 Aug	1996	71	8.88	46	5.75
8	Edwards JR, Rothbard NP	Academy of Management Review 25 (1): 178-199 Jan	2000	28	7	22	5.5
9	Adams GA, King LA, King DW	Journal of Applied Psychology 81 (4): 411-420 Aug	1996	65	8.13	43	5.375
10	Thompson CA, Beauvais LL, Lyness KS	Journal of Vocational Behavior 54 (3): 392-415 Jun	1999	44	8.8	26	5.2
11	Allen TD	Journal of Vocational Behavior 58 (3): 414-435 Jun	2001	19	6.33	14	4.667
12	Parasuraman S, Purohit YS, Godshalk VM, et al..	Journal of Vocational Behavior 48 (3): 275-300 Jun	1996	50	6.25	36	4.5
13	Goodstein JD	Academy of Management Journal 37 (2): 350-382 Apr	1994	65	6.5	44	4.4
14	Duxbury LE, Higgins CA	Journal of Applied Psychology 76 (1): 60-74 Feb	1991	100	7.69	57	4.385
15	Parasuraman S, Greenhaus JH, Granrose CS	Journal of Organizational Behavior 13 (4): 339-356 Jul	1992	71	5.92	49	4.083
16	Kinnunen U, Mauno S	Human Relations 51 (2): 157-177 Feb	1998	38	6.33	24	4
17	Williams KJ, Alliger GM	Academy of Management Journal 37 (4): 837-868 Aug	1994	72	7.2	38	3.8
18	Judge Ta, Boudreau Jw, Bretz Rd	Journal of Applied Psychology 79 (5): 767-782 Oct	1994	57	5.7	38	3.8
19	Caligiuri PM, Hyland MM, Joshi A, et al..	Journal of Applied Psychology 83 (4): 598-614 Aug	1998	28	4.67	21	3.5
20	Lobel SA	Academy of Management Review 16 (3): 507-521 Jul	1991	54	4.15	43	3.308

Table 6.3: Key Theorists and Theories

Theory	Theorists
Role theory	Adams et al., 1996; Biddle, 1979; Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Goode, 1960; Hall & Hall, 1982; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal, 1964; Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Mui, 1992; Szalai, 1972
Spillover	Crouter, 1984; Kando & Summers, 1978; Lambert, 1990; Marks, 1977; Moen, Robison, and Dempster-McClain 1995; Mortimer et al., 1986; Parker, 1967; Piotrkowski, 1979; Pleck, 1977; Staines, 1980; Sieber, 1974; Thotis, 1983; Zedeck and Mosier, 1990
Social Identity	Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Boyanowski & Allen, 1973; Deaux, 1993; Eagly, 1987; Garza & Herringer, 1987; Hogg, Terry & White, 1995; Hooper, 1985; Tajfel & Turner, 1985; Tajfel, 1978; Turner, 1984.
Self Identity	Allport, 1955; Rogers, 1951; Schlenker, 1987

From this two-stage review of seminal works, an accounting of the different theoretical traditions in the most cited HRM work-family literature was developed. These theories: role theory, spillover theory, social identity theory, and self-identity theory are discussed later in this chapter.

- 3 A more implicit statement of theoretical orientation is also possible: an author might provide a definition of the work-family interface, either adopting a particular definition without citation, or citing an author other than those explicitly associated with a theoretical tradition. In such cases, the definition or description of the interface between work and family was assessed to determine within which theoretical tradition it best fit. Had the theoretical orientation not been present in the list above, a review of handbooks of HRM,

IO Psychology and Organizational Theory would have been undertaken to identify the theory reflected in the work. This was not necessary, however, because those articles in which the theoretical orientations remained implicit were, upon close examination, consistent with one or more of the theories listed above. One article (Goodstein, 1994) was determined to be atheoretical, because it neither stated a theoretical orientation, nor provided a definition of work-family or its constructs embedding an implicit theoretical orientation. Goodstein (1994) describes and tests organizational policy regarding family-friendly initiatives without identifying or discussing the interface of the domains, causes of conflict, or the direction of effect. This article was not excluded from the study.

Therefore the list of the theories reflected in the seminal work-family HRM literature may be viewed as comprehensive. This said, however, it is important to remember that emergent discourses that challenge the dominant theoretical traditions are present in HRM literature, although their influence is not sufficient to earn them a spot on the "Top 20" list. Given that the purpose of this hermeneutic review is to expose the mainstream/dominant discourses, however, the exclusion of the alternate discourses is appropriate and not a further silencing of marginalized perspectives.

Phase 5

One limitation of citation analysis is that one cannot assume that a citation necessarily demonstrates that an author is continuing in the theoretical traditional established in the cited work: Indeed, an author may cite a work in order to refute it; or

may refer to some other aspect of the seminal work, such as its methodology or conclusions, without referencing its theoretical orientation.

To address this limitation, an additional step was therefore added to the usual citation analysis: for each of the seminal works identified in Table 6. 2, a sample of the articles citing it were reviewed to assess whether these authors were in fact using the citation to place themselves within the theoretical tradition of the seminal author, or at least could be categorized as working with the same theoretical perspective. This technique was also required when a seminal work represented more than one theoretical tradition, as was the case in some review articles.

The sampling was convenience based, and reflected articles available in full-text journal databases. Citation and content analysis studies do not offer a method for determining an optimal number of articles to sample, although certain statistical tests could be applied. Given, however, that the goal of this chapter is to examine theoretical themes, I chose to extend McCracken's long interview technique (McCracken, 1988) to document review. This approach is consistent with hermeneutics, whereby "text" whether developed through interview or secondary sources, may be engaged in a dialogue of discovery, an "interview", to expose patterning and themes. McCracken (1988) does not dictate a requisite number of interviews, arguing instead that the data should be gathered until redundancy of themes is evident. Therefore, the articles citing a seminal work were reviewed until the patterns of use became repetitious.

Results

Appendix 6.4 provides a list of the top 20 seminal work-family articles cited in HRM literature and an assessment of the theoretical orientation(s) employed by each

author. The method for determining the theoretical orientation is also provided; that is, explicit statement of theoretical orientation, citation, or researcher inference based on text — with sample supporting evidence provided. The following section provides an orientation to these represented theories and to their application within the HRM research on work-family.

Theories of Work-Family in Seminal HRM Work-Family Literature

The theoretical discourses that inform the HRM work-family literature fall into two general categories. The first category of Interface Theories, incorporate the most prevalent theories used in the work-family research--role theory and spillover theory. The second category, Identity Theories, incorporates self-identity theory and social identity theory.

Dominant Theoretical Discourses: Interface Theories

Role theory: Role theory, as applied in the work-family literature, predicts that multiple roles necessarily lead to role stress (role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload), which in turn results in role strain (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964; French & Caplan; Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980). Role strain results from the many and often conflicting demands placed on individuals, thus emphasizing the cost associated with occupying multiple roles (Moen et al., 1995). Goode (1960) originally defined role strain as the “difficulty in fulfilling role obligations” (p. 483). Sieber (1974) further pointed out that the notion of role strain comprises two overlapping constructs: (1) role overload, which refers to “constraints imposed by time,” an orientation akin to time-based work-family conflict as defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), and (2) role conflict, which refers to “discrepant expectations irrespective

of time pressures" (p. 567), an orientation related to strain and behaviour work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). Role overload, according to Mui (1992), stems from the scarcity hypothesis that people do not have enough time or resources to adequately fulfill their multiple roles. Indeed, it underscores the notion that there is a finite amount of time and energy or, as Goode (1960) stated, an individual "has limited resources to be allocated among alternative ends" (p. 487). The result of additional roles is a strain on the individual and their relationships.

Role conflict describes the inconsistency and inherent incompatibility of the various demands placed on an individual as they attempt to occupy different roles with disparate expectations. Two roles frequently identified as incompatible and salient to this discussion are the roles of parent and employee. Most reactions to role conflict between these roles are "dysfunctional for the organization . . . and self-defeating for the person . . ." (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 65).

The expectations associated with work and family roles can elicit physical and psychological strain in several ways. First, contradictory expectations within a role may provoke intra-role conflict or role ambiguity. "Ambiguity leads to increased emotional tension and to decreased satisfaction with one's job. It also contributes significantly to a sense of futility and to a loss of self-confidence" (Kahn et al., 1964, 85). Kahn et al. (1964) point out that contributing to the sense of self-confidence is the esteem with which one is viewed by his [sic] co-workers. Second, these contradictory expectations can create inter-role conflict when pressures in one role dominate or interfere with pressures in the other role — the conflict that arises from expected job functions and beliefs or memberships in organizations outside the work group (Kahn et al., 1965; Katz & Kahn,

1978). Third, the accumulation of expectations from several roles can induce feelings of overload in one or both domains (Hall & Hall, 1982; Szalai, 1972). Overload occurs when a conflict is perceived between appropriate tasks in setting priorities. To the individual, the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity are similar; “low job satisfaction, low self-confidence, [and] a high sense of futility . . .” (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 380). This has obvious implications for well being.

Role theory is used across disciplines to differentiate individual behaviour and the phenomenal processes that are presumed to underlie them (Biddle, 1979). The concept of roles has also found its way into everyday language. This complicates understanding and obscures the accuracy of terminology and concepts used (Biddle, 1979). Although, the theory has the potential to describe or explain a variety of behaviours and responses, positive and negative, in its application to the work-family interface, role theory is employed to describe a conflict situation, whereby the interaction between work and family is exclusively deleterious. Role theory, as applied in the HRM literature on work-family, essentially casts work-family conflict as a stressor in a stressor-strain model consistent with dominant theories of stress (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Karasek & Theorell, 1990), with several studies elaborating the causal link between stressors and wellbeing, although allowing for moderators such as social support (e.g. Adams et al., 1996).

Seminal Work-Family Role Theory: Role theory is explicitly described as the theoretical model for most of the seminal articles. Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1992), for example describe “role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload” (p. 340) as the

variables under examination. Thomas and Ganster (1995) note that “work family conflict is a particular type of interrole conflict” (p. 7). Several authors (e.g. Allen, 2001; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Netemeyer & Boles et al. 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), directly cite Kahn et al. (1964), researchers commonly associated with role theory. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), in their seminal review article developed, based explicitly on role theory, the definition of work-family conflict. This definition is quoted and cited by many of the seminal HRM articles (e.g., Frone et al., 1997; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Kinunen & Mauno, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999). Kinnunen & Mauno (1998), for example, reference Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) when presenting the following definition: “participation in the work (family)role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family(work) role”(p. 158).

The inevitability of conflict as a result of the interaction of the role of parent and employee is the dominant theme in the seminal articles creating indirect linkages to role theory: “it is inevitable that one role will interrupt or intrude into the activities of the other forcing parents to juggle” (Judge et al., 1994, p. 841). Even when articles drew on alternate theories, the definitions employed tend to be consistent with role theory and the inevitability and intractability of role conflict. Judge et al. (1994), for example, draw upon self-identity theory to explain the consequence of the conflict between domains for self, but uses role theory to explain the origination of the conflict: “interference of family with work, role theory proposes...” (p. 769). Edwards and Rothbard (2000) in their review article discuss multiple theories such as spillover, but “draw from the basic principles of role theory” (p. 184) in their analysis, arguing that “although these principles are anchored in role theory, they are common to theories of how people

interact with situations and how these interactions influence affect and behavior” (p. 185).

Authors explicitly or implicitly utilizing role theory to define or describe the work-family interface are therefore working on the assumption that multiple roles *necessarily* result in conflict, and therefore attempting to satisfy the role expectations of the two domains will always have negative consequences. Their research focus, therefore, is on identifying this role conflict and mitigating deleterious outcomes, through processes such as role segmentation and outsourcing of family responsibilities to “ease the burden of family role demands and enable [employed parent] to devote less time to the family role and more time to work” (Parasaramun et al, 1996, p. 282), rather than how various roles might support and reinforce each other. The roles, particularly family roles, are presented as “burdens” (Parasuraman et al., 1996, p. 282), that “impede” (Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998, p. 158) or “intrude” (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1992, p. 342) upon function and therefore need to be “accommodated” (Allen, 1999, p. 417). The competing roles are not presented as equally favored opponents; priority is placed on maintaining workplace goals. The roles are thus incommensurable and integration is unfeasible. The focus of work-family research employing role theory is therefore on supporting individuals and organizations in developing strategies such as childcare to *manage* multiplicity of roles, to *cope* by outsourcing responsibility for those family role tasks that *interfere* with the employees’ work roles, thus displacing the competing role⁵.

⁵ It is outside the scope of this study, but interesting to note, that sociological research on the work-family interface also examines this direction of influence, but a preliminary review of this research reveals that while the problematic is described, it is focused on showing how *mothers’* engagement in market-work is damaging family relationships. Is the goal of excluding women and female priorities from the work realm shared by both streams of research?

Citations of the seminal articles drawing upon role theory accurately reflect the principles of role theory employed by the original authors (e.g. Judge & Colquitt, 2004 citing Netemeyer et al., 1996, to support Kahn et al., 1964, model of role conflict) and the overarching emphasis is on deleterious role interaction.

Some seminal works discuss multiple theoretical models, because they are review essays. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), for example, summarize research to the date of publication identifying both role theory and early work using spillover theory. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) review various models of interface, albeit from a role theory perspective. These articles, however, are used either in a general sense to discuss the breadth of research on work-family (e.g., Pratt & Rosa, 2003, and Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, & Lepak, 2005, citing Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) or to exclusively portray the role conflict perspective. In the case of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), for example, who identify both role conflict and positive spillover as potential interactions, twenty cases over two decades were reviewed before determining that, without exception within this limited sample, this seminal article was used to define work-family conflict on the basis of role conflict (a dimension of role theory). No mention of the potential for positive spillover was offered. Recognizing that indeed some articles in the comprehensive list may in fact cite Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) in support of a more positive interplay between the domains, the patterning supports that mainstream text predominantly uses this source for a more limited purpose.

This theoretical orientation is therefore consistent with the superordinancy of work priorities and the research agenda of exclusion of women and traditional feminine priorities discussed in Chapter 5, Text as Revealed. The goal of this stream of research is

therefore segmentation, if it serves the workplace interest. The defining concepts of role theory, as used in this context, are conflict, scarcity and fragmentation.

Spillover Theory. Role theory focuses on the scarcity of time and personal resources in managing the dual roles of work and family (e.g. Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Gutek et al., 1991). Other work-family researchers, (e.g. Adams et al., 1996; Caligiuri et al., 1998) argue that role function in one domain can be enhanced by the transfer of skill and affect from the other domain. The apparently incompatibility of role scarcity and role enhancement are integrated in spillover theory (Lambert, 1990; Piotrkowski, 1979; Staines, 1980; Zedeck & Mosier, 1990).

Expansion theory (Marks, 1977) and role accumulation theory (Sieber, 1974; Thotis, 1983) present the idea that occupation of multiple roles can be salutary; people occupying more roles should experience higher levels of well-being thanks to the augmentation of the individual's power, prestige, resources, and emotional gratification (Moen, Robison, & Dempster-McClain, 1995). Sieber (1974) argued that role accumulation or multiple roles offers the individual four types of positive outcomes: "(1) role privileges, (2) overall status security, (3) resources for status enhancement, and (4) enrichment of the personality and ego gratification" (p. 569). Thus, the person occupying multiple roles has many avenues for positive well-being outcomes — enhancement.

Spillover, applied to the work-family interface, is based on Pleck's (1977) assertion that the boundaries between the work and family domains are "asymmetrically permeable;" that is, that stress and emotions, time and task demands, attitudes and behavior all spill over the work / family boundary to influence each other in *both* positive and negative ways (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). With the two possible directions of

spillover, a distinction can be drawn between work-family positive spillover and family-work positive spillover. Further, a distinction is also made between work-to-family negative spillover (also called work-family conflict in this research stream) and family-to-work negative spillover (family-work conflict) as conceptually and empirically distinct constructs (Duxbury, Higgins & Lee, 1994; Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus, 1988; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Gutek, Searle & Klepa, 1991). This distinction between Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict is also consistent with role theory, but is identified with spillover theory given that the interaction may be both positive and negative, whereas role theory discusses only negative interaction.

Conflict, the role interaction most associated with role theory as applied in the work-family research, is therefore only one possible outcome; positive spillover whereby the work (family) role positively influences the family (work) role is an equally viable outcome. Not only is there a focus on experiences that inform alternate domain behaviour, but it is also assumed that attitudes at work become ingrained and carried over into home life (Kando & Summers, 1978) and that these work attitudes affect a basic orientation toward the self, others, and children (Mortimer et al., 1986). Each sphere thus induces similar structural patterns in the other spheres (Parker, 1967). In other words, there are no boundaries for one's behaviors or attitudes. The focus of the work-family research employing spillover thus shifts from examining the inherently incompatible nature of roles to discussing the integrated agent who simultaneously lives in both domains and benefits and suffers from this integration.

Seminal Spillover Work-Family Research: The Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) review article, that provides a frequently used definition of work-family conflict, discuss

spillover theory to explain the positive and negative implications of role interaction. Some seminal researchers mention the permeability of boundaries and potential for positive interaction, but do not develop it as an integral element of their analyses. The studies' designs focus on examination of negative interaction or deleterious outcome. Kossek & Ozeki (1998), for example, present the possibility of positive spillover in their discussion of the spillover framework. They point out, however, that their meta-analysis examining work-family and life satisfaction presents negative spillover, given that the research upon which the meta-analysis draws does not assess positive interaction. "The prevailing assumption that the attitudinal effect of work roles on family roles is generally negative and predominantly use scales focusing on the negative implications of work demands for family" (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, p. 140). It is relevant to note that the studies citing this article tend not to present the limitation of the study design. One review article notes, for example, that Kossek and Ozeki (1998) "explored the relationship between work-family conflict and job and life satisfaction. Their findings revealed a consistent negative relationship between all forms of work-family conflict and both life and job satisfaction" (Eby et al., 2005, p 127). That the findings would document a negative relationship given that the studies incorporated in the meta-analysis tested negative relationships, is not mentioned by a single article sampled (30 articles).

This bias towards deleterious interaction and outcome as the focus of analysis is pervasive and reflected in the other seminal HRM articles. Thompson et al. (1999) present the negative spillover resulting from "conflicting responsibilities" (p. 394) between roles. Judge et al. (1998) point out that "conflict is often released on the family" (p. 769). Frone et al. (1992) and Frone et al. (1997) use negative spillover to test the

interface of the domains: "Role related distress/dissatisfaction" (Frone et al., 1997, p. 149) spillover between the boundaries of work and family. Frone et al. (1992) use identity theory, but to explain the results, they use spillover theory to predict interactions.

Three seminal HRM work-family articles test positive interaction between domains, and positive spillover is referenced by two review articles. Caligiuri et al. (1998) examine the positive spillover of attitudes and affect from the family for expatriate's adjustment to foreign assignments. Adams et al. (1996) stated that "emotional and instrumental support from family are [sic] hypothesized to be positively associated with life satisfaction and negatively associated with family interfering with work" (p. 413). Williams and Allinger (1994) include, among their tests for negative spillover, a test for positive spillover. The review articles (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) also present the potential of positive spillover.

The bias towards negative spillover as the focus of analysis is highlighted, however, in how the articles presenting positive spillover are actually used by the researchers citing them. Articles citing Caligiuri et al. (1998) predominantly use this work to support research on expatriates, and although the role of family in supporting the work endeavor is made, no references to this interaction as a spillover effect between the domains of work and family are made. Articles citing Adams et al. (1996), similarly discuss how family domain sources of support mitigate work-family conflict rather than highlighting how "relationships between work and family are characterized by both conflict and support" (p. 418). Hom and Kinicki (2001), citing Williams and Allinger (1994), note that "failure to meet non-work role demands deprives employees of non-work rewards and worsens their moods, spilling over into work moods and attitudes" (p.

977). Spillover is emphasized to support the superordinancy of the work domain priorities — family can mitigate deleterious outcomes and effects so that employees are not distracted from work goals. Even when the potential for positive spillover is highlighted by the seminal author, for example, by Williams & Allinger (1994), in application their study tends to be presented either as a general definition of spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), or to support negative spillover, without mention of the positive potential. To take just one example, Hill, Ferris & Mårtinson (2003) in citing Williams and Allinger (1994) state that “research documents that if work ↔ family interactions are rigidly structured in time and space, then spillover in terms of time, energy, and behavior is generally negative” (p. 222).

The goal of this stream of research is therefore to promote segmentation of the roles if possible, or facilitate spillover if the outcome is positive for the employer. The focus on negative spillover does not move the literature much beyond the conflict perspective of role theory. The central tenet of role theory, that the interface of the domains of work and family is conflictual is not challenged, only moderated by the argument that interaction of the domains is inevitable. Family domain elements may, at best, mitigate the conflict.

Secondary Theoretical Discourses: Theories of Identity

“The difficulty in explaining the persistence of individual action across situations beyond the narrow concept of normative expectations of role theory” has led some work-family researchers to embrace alternate theory in examining the interface of work and

family domains (Burke & Reitzes, 1991, p. 329). The two theoretical models discussed in the top 20 seminal articles are self-identity theory and social-identity theory.

Self-identity theory and social-identity theory are conceptually similar models with considerable overlap, but are rooted in the separate academic disciplines of social psychology and sociology respectively. Both models focus on the social nature of self: a multifaceted and dynamic self that mediates the relationship between social structure and individual behavior.

Self-identity theory posits that the “self” reflects social structure insofar as the “self” consists of a collection of identities derived from the individual’s roles; and that these role identities vary in their salience. It is this variation in the salience of various role identities that has been seized upon by the limited number of work-family researchers employing this model.

Social-identity theory, on the other hand, is a socio-cognitive model that attempts to account for variants of group behaviors (e.g., conformity, stereotyping, discrimination, and ethnocentrism). Behavior is influenced by the categorical structure of society via the mediation of social identity and the accompanying process of self-categorization (a process that depersonalizes perception, feelings, and actions in terms of the contextually relevant self-defining in-group prototype).

Both theories discuss the way identities are internalized and used to define self. The seminal HR articles, however use self-identity theory to explain individually-driven choice; whereas social-identity theory is used to explain the implications of social structures and social group membership in determining these choices.

Social identity theory. Social identity theory (e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1985; Eagly,

1987) is a social-psychological perspective that was developed during the late 1970s to mid-1980s that helps explain how individuals define themselves and others. According to social identity theory “people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 20). Social identity encompasses a person’s total psychological identification with social groups and roles that are deemed meaningful and important in shaping attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Deaux, 1993; Hooper, 1985; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). “Our social identity influences how we perceive and present ourselves, as well as how we perceive and treat others” (Garza & Herringer, 1987, p. 299).

According to social identity theory, individuals classify themselves as members of social groups. Individuals have multiple identities that stem from their interactions with others; the extent of identification with each role varies with the person and goals shared with the group (Turner, 1984). “The basic idea is that a social category (e.g., nationality, political affiliation, sports team) into which one falls, and to which one feels one belongs, provides a definition of who one is in terms of the defining characteristics of the category — a self-definition that is a part of the self-concept” (Hogg, Terry & White, 1995, p. 259).

Applied to the work-family context, people perceive themselves as having different roles in their daily personal and work life and some roles or identities are more important than others in how they define themselves and how much they are willing to invest themselves in a particular role (Krause, 1995; Bielby & Bielby, 1989; Lobel, 1991). Social identity theory is based on the assumptions that to define their “personal identity” and the extent to which they relate to and identify with others in their social

environment, people will behave in ways that are consistent with the norms of the social groups that are important to them (Lobel, 1991). To not do so will result in sanctions: “Men who conform to gender stereotypes regarding work and family are somewhat rewarded, whereas men who do not conform are punished. These results are consistent with Eagly’s (1987) social role theory” (Butler & Skattebo, 2004, p. 559).

Although not referenced explicitly, social identity theory is applied indirectly to work-family research to support the import of social roles, as in Lo (2003): “The extensive research on the roles of men and women in ‘a gender-stratified’ social system has shown that women tend to support family at the expense of work” (p. 378). Social identity theory is also applied in cross-cultural research to illustrate issues of cultural acclimatization (e.g. Aryee, 1993a; Aryee, 1993b; Aryee & Luk, 1996; Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Lo, 2003).

Recognition of the social construction of roles has facilitated a move away from a focus on inevitable and (almost) intractable conflict, which is the precept of role theory, to a model of balance between the social roles. According to social identity theory, a person may achieve work-family balance by (a) segmentation strategies that ensure conflicting identities (e.g., control in manager role versus nurturance in parent role) are separated; or (b) by bridging roles by applying consistent personal values across identities (Allen et al., 1983). Hence, in contrast with role theory which purports that investment in one role is by definition damaging for the other role, social identity theory proposes that people can invest in several roles and feel satisfied as long as these conditions of balance are satisfied (Lobel, 1991). As with spillover theory, social identity theory highlights the

consistent nature of behavior, but not as a positive or negative transfer of mood or conduct between roles, but as consistency between the values placed on different social roles. Segmentation of roles minimizes negative spillover when the social identities require conflicting role behaviours. A strength of this theory is that it can construe why people give priority to work or to family, or even both.

Social Identity Theory in Seminal Work-Family Research: Although spillover theory has the potential to explicate positive role interaction, in application it is afforded a much more limited function. Social identity theory, as applied by Lobel (1991), is the only theoretical model used in the seminal HRM work-family research focusing on the positive interface between work and family roles.

Lobel's argument for the importance of role salience has been discussed in the citing literature: Aryee and Luk (1996) and Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer and King (2002) cite Lobel to argue for a need to move beyond role conflict to look at self concept development in the work-family interface. Greenhaus and Powell (2003) and Williams and Alliger (1994) cite Lobel to highlight the importance of role salience specifically. Lobel is also cited, in a general context, to describe the construct of career identity salience (e.g., Major, Klein & Erhart, 2002) and to reference cross-cultural variation in work-family, generally (e.g. Yang, Chen, Choi & Zou, 2000). Lobel (1991) is also cited in cross-cultural research that does not predominately focus on work-family issues (e.g., Spreitzer, McCall & Mahoney, 1998).

Work-family articles citing Lobel (1991) do not reference social identity theory explicitly, nor do they draw extensively on social identity theory beyond role salience,

with the exception of one self-citation (Lobel & St. Clair, 1992). Blau (1994) describes Lobel's approach as "utilitarian" (p. 960) and Edwards and Rothbard (2000), who present numerous models to describe the work-family interface, only use Lobel's conclusions to identify segmentation and compensation coping strategies, rather than the more expansive model of salutary interaction proposed by the source author. "A person who assigns less importance to a dissatisfying domain may seek satisfaction by ascribing greater importance to other potentially satisfying domains" (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000, p. 187 citing, Lobel, 1991).

Although Lobel (1991) has created space for HRM research to consider issues beyond conflict in the work-family interface, Lobel's research, in application, has been applied in very limited ways. Social identity theory has been used to support, and perhaps justify, limiting women's work involvement due to salience of family social roles for women. Although Lobel (1991) challenged her readers to focus on similarities rather than conflict in the work-family interface, this challenge has not been embraced, although a growing discourse on work-family integration (that has yet to see a home in the seminal literature) may finally see a more positive orientation in the literature. To date, however, this model has been used to present the themes of compensation and segmentation when interaction between social roles creates conflict.

Self-Identity. Through social learning and personal experience, individuals develop commitments to core identities that then direct, control and reinforce their behavior in situations that draw upon those identities. Core identities may include, for example, one's occupation, parental status, etc. Individuals, through daily behaviour, seek to construct

desired images of themselves and they are more satisfied if they realize the desired self-identity. Cultural ideologies can also create commitment to core identities — being a good mother, for example, can be important to a woman who has never before experienced parenthood. Within the self-identity theoretical framework, as applied to HRM work-family research (e.g., Schlenker, 1987), it is not the actual roles themselves that individuals fill that enhance or detract from well-being, as is the tenet of role theory. Instead, wellbeing is achieved on the basis of the uniformity between internalized core identities, reflecting an individual's sense of self and the roles they engage in as part of everyday life. Conflict occurs due to the "blocking or interruption of activity that has potential implications for people's goals and identity" (Schlenker, 1987, p. 277). The focus, in contrast to social identity theory, is on the individual, one's self-schema, and the implications of the structures on individual goal achievement and choices. Thus, the mere fact that a mother is employed in market-work does not mean that she will necessarily experience conflict; rather it is the ability of a given job or particular family dynamic to facilitate the level of work and family involvement that the individual mother desires that is determinant.

Although the potential of the theory extends beyond this purpose, in application to the work-family HRM literature, self identity theory is used to describe or explain the entrenchment of gender roles. The opportunity exists for this to generate a critical discussion of gender roles, but such critical discussion is absent from the seminal articles using self-identity theory.

Self-Identity Theory in Seminal Work-Family Research: The seminal work on work-family does not draw heavily on self-identity theory. The focus of the seminal work

appears to be more on mitigating and defining the conflict, than on describing the hegemonic conditions perpetuating it. In fact, this is consistent with the enactment of a hegemonic belief — an unquestioned assumption that “this is just the way things are.” Judge et al., (1994) is the only seminal article in which self-identity theory is used to direct hypothesis formulation, “Because conflict between work and family roles constitutes an impediment to goals of self-fulfillment, threats resulting from work–family conflict likely lead to job stress. It is reasonable to expect that both work -> family and family -> work conflict will induce job stress because both represent interrole conflict and impediments to self-identification that make one’s job stressful” (p. 769). Frone et al., (1992) employ self-identity theory to clarify the results of their analysis:

Viewed from self-identity theory (e.g., Schlenker, 1987), the two forms of WFC may represent not only a source of pressure that reduces the quality of life in a given domain, but also a threat or impediment to self-identification.... Thus, F->W conflict might represent a threat to constructing or maintaining a desired job-related self-image that has direct implications for an individual’s overall sense of well-being (p. 74).

What differentiates this theoretical orientation from social identity theory is that the responsibility for managing and creating conflict is placed on the individual. One “chooses” a self-schema; the workplace is not responsible for the experience, consequences, or mitigation of conflict. Solutions are, thus, negotiated on an individual basis and do not require structural change.

Extending a focus beyond the seminal articles, ideological commitments have been used within the literature on work-family to critically assess the seemingly intractable nature of the gender division of labor. Hochschild (1989), for example, used the notion of deep ideologies of gender to explain why women continued to perform the vast majority of housework and child care despite either their economic independence or

their own exhaustion from the “second shift” of domestic labor following a long work day. Employment status does not shift the ideology of what Hays (1996) has termed “involved motherhood” whereby women will define their market involvement and nonwork activities on the basis of the needs of their children. Brines (1994) used ideological commitment to the role of father/breadwinner to explain why unemployed or under-employed men are particularly likely to eschew greater involvement in housework and child care despite their availability to do so. Use of self-identity theory can also be seen in studies that show the greatest psychological and health benefits of work and family roles when behavioral preferences and practices match, irrespective of whether the preferences be traditional or more egalitarian (e.g., Burke and Greenglass, 2000) “people strive to construct and maintain desired identity images” (Schlenker, 1987, p. 274).

Limitations

The central assumption in citation-based studies is that a reference to a particular journal article reflects the scholarly impact of that article on the author of the citing work. While widely-used, citation analysis is by no means a perfect measure and must be used with caution. The design of this study mitigates some of these limitations.

Newer articles receive fewer citations than do articles of greater tenure. This occurs for two reasons: First, researchers may have less familiarity with the most recent research; second, newer research within the master discourse serves to build on the hegemonic assumptions of earlier work rather than displace the assumptions underlying it. Older or early research in the area of work-family may also not be cited as it takes time

for a discourse to take root. Seminal work may develop as the discourse begins to flourish, thus serving a catalyst function. Works in this study are defined as seminal if they are frequently cited over a period of time, thus forming a base upon which all subsequent research develops either to reinforce or challenge (as alternate discourses are built). To offset the prejudice afforded to older articles — the greater opportunity they have to be cited as a function of time — a formula was developed to re-weight the number of citations given opportunity to be cited. A ratio of number of citations/years since publication allows for a more accurate portrayal of influence.

Within the academic discourse, certain venues of publication are privileged and others are marginalized. Citation analysis is predominantly limited to peer reviewed academic articles that are cited within other peer reviewed academic journals. This citation analysis focuses on refereed academic journals and ignores other outlets for scholarly work (such as books, monographs, proceedings) unless they are indexed by ISI/SSCI. Referred journal publications, however are considered the “ideal” of knowledge dissemination in North American academic research tradition (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992; Smyth 1999). As such, journal articles serve to define the discourse of academic knowledge.

I elected to assess the “impact” of non-HRM articles in the HRM literature regardless of their discipline of origin, because, as discussed in the previous chapter (Chapter 5), citations outside the management discipline are often employed in management literature to support “truths” consistent with mainstream management discourse without the need to test the constructs directly. I am therefore assessing, in part, which non-management “truths” have achieved hegemonic status within management

literature, thus addressing the question: "What is the impact of these seminal works in HRM?" (Rather than the question: "What are the Management seminal works?")

A further limitation of this study is the difficulty in assessing what are HRM journals. HRM draws from multiple disciplines both within and outside the management field. I chose to use a broad definition of HRM as these discipline boundaries cross frequently. I have included the ISI category of Applied Psychology, because there is considerable permeability between the research and academic fields of HRM and IO Psychology. Although some HRM researchers publish in other disciplines, such as Sociology or Economics, the vast majority have either management or psychology affiliations. I tested this hypothesis by reviewing the affiliations of the authors of 25 sociology journals that appeared on the "cited by" list of the most cited academic works on work family (Mason, 2001) and none were members of a faculty of management, faculty of commerce, or school of business. Although, some schools of business integrate economics departments, none of the 100 most cited articles were published in economics journals. Although this may be a limitation in my study, because I am not attempting to compile a definitive list of HRM researchers, the oversight of a small number of researchers will not bias this review. Further, relative to other citation studies, my list of included journals was significantly broader. Alternate and more limited lists defining HRM or management journals exist in extant literature. Eby et al. (2005), for example, limited their study to fifteen journals. Tahai and Meyer (1998) assessed the impact of management publications using seven journals; Kirkpatrick and Locke (1992) used thirty-two journals. I used the more exhaustive listing of ISI Web of Science to create a larger

data set that reflects the multidisciplinary nature of the field and the potentiality that the work-family literature may be under represented in some “top tier” journals.

Discussion

The theories currently dominating seminal work-family HRM literature are the interface theories: role theory and spillover theory. In application, these interface theories are used to explicate negative role interaction, although positive spillover is also presented in research focusing on HR practice when the work domain benefits from family role participation. Segmentation or accommodation are strategies proposed in this stream of research to mitigate interaction deleterious to workplace priorities.

Identity theories are alternate theoretical models applied to work-family. Self identity theory, although limited in application within the HRM work-family literature, is also used to support entrenched, gendered social roles and thus shift the responsibility for managing the work-family interface from organizations to individuals and also prevents questioning of social structures and norms that create and prioritize those roles. Social role theory likewise emphasizes the importance of roles, but creates the potential to examine those structures that create them. In application, however, Lobel (1991) is used in a very limited way — to describe the presence and salience of social roles — and this potential is not realized.

Historically, the worlds of work and family life were not viewed as intersecting, mainly because women remained in the home and only men participated in the workforce (Chow & Berheide, 1988). This theoretical position viewed men and women as having distinct work and family roles, with the idea of work impacting family life or family life impacting the workplace was not viewed to be important or considered feasible. With the

introduction of the spillover model, family outcomes began to be investigated as resulting from work-related factors —specifically women’s engagement in market work and the outcomes for husband and children and work outcomes began to be investigated as resulting from family-related factors: specifically, the extent of women’s commitment to the work domain. Spillover incorporates contemporary applications of role theory that identify the spheres of work and family as being interactive, but propose segmentation strategies to minimize the degree of interaction unless more integrative strategies can be strategically employed to maximize workplace priorities. Spillover, however, is not inherently negative —positive spillover is a viable outcome. This view was more consistent with modern family scholars depiction of the family as a system with boundaries, but also linked to other subsystems (Burr, 1973). Family boundaries were not viewed as static, but instead as permeable to allow transactions with outside subsystems, such as work. Spillover theory acknowledged this “permeability” and postulated a positive relationship between work and family, as a result of work (family) issues “spilling” over into the family (work) system (Frone et al. 1994).

Although the spillover effects model provides a richer explanation of work/family conflict than the unidimensional role conflict model, in application the spillover effects model does not advance study of the interface of work and family beyond a conflict perspective. Although this model acknowledges that men and women have roles in both the family and workplace spheres, the negative spillover from work to family life has, like role theory, been examined using employed mothers (even when using non-gendered terminology) to illustrate the deleterious effects work had on the family sphere and the family on the work sphere. Spillover theory, in its application, accepts gendered roles as a

given that must be managed to mitigate deleterious consequences. This has influenced research on antecedents and outcomes, as well as policy research that serves to marginalize feminine-family based priorities and prioritize masculine-work priorities. Women are encouraged to outsource family responsibilities or to withdraw from work. These interface theories are historically rooted in post-war North America and emerged as part of the explosion of the disciplines of psychology and sociology following wartime investment in the social sciences. Alternate theoretical models also serve to entrench these gendered roles, either by—as is the case with self identity theory—being used to place responsibility for the problem on individual choice rather than on structures, or by not extending their application — as in the case with social identity theory — beyond the entrenched and gendered social norms. The structures of the work and family realms and the priority given to work are unquestioned in the dominant discourse.

Conclusion

This chapter provided a step of the analysis of the dominant discourses of work-family, using citation review, to identify the major theoretical models employed in HRM work-family literature.

As illustrated in this chapter, role theory and spillover theory are the dominant theoretical discourses in HRM literature. Although alternate theoretical discourses are present in seminal HRM literature, they do not dominate the discursive field, nor do they serve in application to challenge the entrenchment of gendered roles. The interface from the perspective of all the theoretical models discussed is inherently problematic. All the theories discussed build on the existence of norms of role behaviour that are both

entrenched and gender determined. The focus on conflict and deleterious spillover between roles serves to freeze women in place — supporting women's exclusion from the workplace by highlighting barriers of inclusion.

Although gendered roles are by no means new, HRM research on work-family is relatively recent emerging as a force in the immediate post-WWII era. The implications of social context and the roles of men and women in this era are absent from research on work-family. The next chapter excavates the historical context in which the theories that came to dominate work-family research developed, and how this exclusionary discourse achieved hegemonic status — the Cold War.

The hermeneutic investigation turns to the question: *How did the gendered role conflict models come to dominate the research orientation of work-family?*

CHAPTER 7: THE ANCESTRAL HOME: COLD WAR, CHILLY CLIMATE

Introduction: Positioning Discourse in Time

My genealogical hermeneutic examination of work-family discourses was birthed by my own experience as a mother. The voices of other women and men, Chapter 3, directed the research question that initiated this research and led through layers of reflection and evaluation to an examination of the themes embedded in HRM academic research on work-family (Chapter 5). Distilling the theoretical underpinnings of this stream of research, an agenda centered on a role conflict model has left me questioning the reasons the role conflict perspective achieved seminal status in HRM research. Hermeneutics guides the researcher to question the context in which text is crafted. Hence, this next layer of analysis explores the social-historical context in which work-family research developed and why this particular theoretical frame achieved hegemonic status. If role conflict perspectives parented HRM work-family discourse, what was the ancestral home like in which the research 'grew up' and how did that context shape its development?

Within the academic HRM research the discourse of work is associated with men and masculinity; the discourse of family is associated with females and femininity. The male is privileged over the female in a research tradition that focuses on the prioritization of masculine goals associated with work and in which family needs are marginalized, even as the mother role is venerated. Women are therefore subjected to blame and

reproach for vacating their parental role, even as they are blamed for placing insufficient emphasis on organizational needs.

The gender labour divide is long standing and reflects a moral as well as spatial separation of the domains and the gendered responsibilities for them: "Since the rise of industrialism, the social organization of moral responsibility has expected women to seek personal development by caring for others and men to care for others by sharing the rewards of independent achievement" (Gerson, 2002, p. 8).

Various activities and events have entrenched the gender divide, such as the exclusion of women from a number of workplaces through legislation. "Early efforts at labor legislation can be viewed as a means of organizing gender relations when labor markets failed to facilitate appropriate behavior" (Mutari, Figart, & Power, 2001, p. 32). Increasingly over time the workplace became associated with men and masculinity in direct contrast to the 'domestic sphere' that was equated with women and femininity, such that, by the beginning of the twentieth century, "masculinity was, in part, based on the ability to provide for a family. Hegemonic femininity was associated with passivity, purity, and the need for protection" (Mutari et al., 2001, p. 32).

"Although labeled 'traditional,' this gendered division of moral labor represents a social form and cultural mandate that rose to prominence in the mid-twentieth century but reached an impasse as the postindustrial era opened new avenues for work and family life.... Changes in women's economic and social fortunes have both allowed them to work and required them to seek self-sufficiency" (Gerson, 2002, p. 8, 11), even as they continue to be expected to satisfy their gender-defined familial responsibilities.

The HRM academic discourse on work and family that continues to moderate the discourse in ways that continue to limit and exclude women and feminine priorities (which include family centered goals), is temporally juxtaposed with the opening of these “new avenues” that emerged in the cold war period. The impasse to which Gerson alludes is reflected in the lived experience of both women and men. As “new avenues” opened, I contend that the ability to walk down those avenues was “by invitation only.” And, women were not invited.

This chapter offers an unraveling of this impasse and an analysis of the context mid-century that created it. A historical hermeneutic excavation of the origins of the HRM work-family discourse in the WWII and Cold War periods will expose the development and entrenchment of the assumptions that limit our ability to move forward.

Method

According to Gadamer (1989), fore-understanding, the meaning which we bring to a text or event, will always determine our understanding of it. Gadamer's hermeneutic inquiry places the researcher in a process of tradition, or exploration of the context of an event, in which past and present are fused. Past assumption and present interpretation are inextricably linked. Gadamer favors the image of separate horizons to distinguish the world of the present from the world of the text or event. Horizons, he argues, suggests the wide, expressive view the interpreter must have. Horizons are seen as society's underlying assumptions about the way the world works, a world view, an order of things. The horizon of the past exists in the form of tradition. The hermeneutic circle then

describes the linkage of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter. In short, interpretation is always dependent on the meaning assigned a text, but this meaning is itself a product of the tradition which has given it life and the subsequent reinterpretations thereof. Tradition is not only something we find ourselves in, but is also something we in turn propagate.

In reviewing a text from an historical period, there is a sense of familiarity, but a sense of distance as well. The text/event is on the one hand historically separated from us, but on the other hand is a part of a tradition we currently experience, know and share. Gadamer places hermeneutics in the intermediate space between these two extremes of past and present. The historical distance that separates the text/event from the contemporary reader allows the reader a wider perspective from which to view it. The meaning of a text, as it is present for an interpreter, does not depend merely on the intentions of an author or of an audience with which he/she intends to communicate. Subsequent knowledge of an event, for example, might provide richer context than that offered in the original production. The distance of a text allows us to ask new questions of it. Consequent to this every age must understand a text in its own way.

Understanding, for Gadamer, is not merely reproductive but productive as well. The meaning of a text, or an historical event, is never complete, interpretation is an ongoing process. The object of historical research is not fixed. It is a unity built upon the object as it is presented to us and the mode of historical scrutiny to which we subject it.

In researching the context in which HRM theory on work-family was birthed, I examine original text from the Cold War era. Early business school textbooks, popular press and political speeches, for example, are drawn upon to offer representations of

women and work. Drawing upon the interpretations of historical researchers, the significance that is attributed to events of this era is also examined. I examine what has been said of this period; what unity of meaning has been applied to it: and with what prejudices it is presented to us. Discourse is constantly evolving; these interpretations therefore shape the discursive field of work-family and embedded notions of gender.

In examining the historical context of this period, I focus on North American, particularly American experiences and text. The reason for this is two fold. First, the psychological theories, most notably role theory, upon which work-family HRM discourse depends, developed in the United States. Second, although critical perspectives on HRM and work-family interaction are present in both North American and Euro-Asian academic literature, HRM is primarily shaped by mainstream models that developed out of American business schools, in particular Michigan and Harvard (Hollinshead & Leat, 1995). I exclude Euro-Asian coldwar experiences, not out of a disregard for their historical significance, but because of their lesser significance on the development of the predominantly American theories that shaped HRM academic discourse on work-family interaction. Further, Canadian data is not focused upon discretely. Although, as a Canadian, I am fascinated with differences between American and Canadian foreign policy during this period, Canadian data offered in this chapter provides the limited role of illustrating demographic trends similar to those in the United States. Our political history is discrete and compelling, but less relevant than American history to the development of HRM theories influencing work-family.

It should also be noted at this point that I necessarily broaden my focus from an exclusive examination of the discipline of HRM. Although the representation of women

in all academic disciplines were boundaried, I will use the emerging field of Organizational Management Theory (OMT) as the focus of my analysis of the academic context in which the role conflict perspective discussed in Chapter 6 developed. HRM as a separate discipline did not emerge until the later Cold War period (Hollinshead & Leat, 1995). OMT is multidisciplinary and my analysis will reflect this; however, my focus will principally be on psychology and sociology because it is within these disciplines that the theories discussed in Chapter 6 emerged.

In this chapter, I examine key discourses that emerged out of the Cold War period, not merely as a reflection and interpretation of specific social contexts, but as a continuing force in the social construction of the work-family interface. Discourse frames experience by creating the boundaries within which lived experience is interpreted and articulated, and may serve to obfuscate actual social relations and structures when the norms and roles contained within the discourse fail to correspond to lived experience. The discourses dominating the Cold War period constrained notions of masculinity and femininity and created the conditions whereby the discourse of work-family that dominated (and continues to dominate) management theory achieved the hegemonic status of unchallenged — and unchallengeable — ‘common sense’.

Bringing together research from multiple disciplines and time periods, I begin the first phase of my historical excavation of the discourses of work and family with an analysis of the work relations of women in WWII. I then focus on how — in spite of objective social conditions at the conclusion of WWII that might appear to have favored radicalizing discontent among working women — the dominant discourses of the war years intersected with the socio-political discourses of the Cold War era to preempt the

emergence of class-consciousness among displaced female workers, thus delaying the development of an effective challenge to the discourses of work-family. In the second phase of my analysis, I demonstrate how the gendered notions of work and family roles, left intact from the war period and reified by Cold War socio-political discourse, became entrenched in the gendered social scientific theories that continue to dominate HRM work-family discourse.

The Feminist Potential of War-Time Employment of Women

There are *problem employees* who demand special treatment. These persons usually are defective mentally, emotionally, or physically . . . There are other groups that may not legitimately be called *problem employees*, but they do create *problems* demanding special attention, namely, women, children, the aged, and the physically handicapped. A part of the difficulty arises from the restrictive legislation allegedly passed for the purpose of protecting the weak (Scott, Clothier, Mathewson & Spriegel, 1941, p. 469, emphasis in the original).

As reflected in the management texts of the time (see for example, Balderston, Karabasz and Brecht, 1935, Davis, 1940, Folts, 1938), prior to WWII it was assumed that women's place was in the home, that they were under a "moral injunction" to be at home and bear children (Scott et al., 1941, p. 475). In 1930 women constituted less than 25% of the U.S. labour force. This percentage fell steadily during the depression because, as management texts explained, "as is customary, women were being laid off to make room for men" (Scott et al., 1941, p. 477).

With the onset of WWII, US employers and government, faced with acute labour shortages, encouraged unprecedented numbers of women to enter the paid workforce. The accompanying propaganda effort, however, relied on a paradoxical appeal: Women

were encouraged to view themselves as capable of undertaking tasks previously viewed as masculine, yet they were expected to retain the idea that women's capabilities remained secondary to those of men; the new women workers were imaged as competent but temporary. Women were encouraged to join the workforce as part of the war effort, but that war effort was imaged as domestic duty (Weatherford, 1990). Thus, the discourse of work did not shift to incorporate female labour participation; the discourse of 'home' expanded to include war production.

Analyses of the discourses of work and family suggests that WWII created tensions between traditional notions of women as wives and mothers and the realities of wartime work experienced by large numbers of women. The successful movement of women into previously male dominated industries led many women to question existing notions of femininity as weak, helpless, and ineffectual; and large numbers of women looked forward to a continued role in the paid workforce in the post-war era (Pidgeon, 1947; Rowbotham, 1999). These women had reason "for cautious optimism" (Horowitz, 1998, p. 125). New Deal legislation, WWII employment opportunities, including a commitment from the National War Labor Board to the principle of equal pay for equal work, helped to give women a more powerful position in government and the economy during the war years (Horowitz, 1998). Reflecting on the new realities, one group of management educators opined that, "the old fallacy of women being the 'weaker sex' and therefore needing protection has long since been exploded, as far as its general application is concerned" (Scott et al., 1941, p. 475). Scheinberg (1994) argues that in this era of high labour demand when female labour became a valued resource, American capitalism was willing "to abandon, at least temporarily, the gender-based work structure

when economic conditions rendered it a less profitable option” (Scheinberg, quoted in Christie, 2002, p. 139).

Objectively, war-time employment created three conditions that in other contexts had often lead to revolutionary social change through shifts in discourse on the nature of work.

First, just as the shift from cottage to factory employment created conditions for the emergence of factory workers' consciousness of themselves as a separate and oppressed class (Marx), bringing large numbers of women into industrial settings from other, more typically isolated, forms of labour seems as if it should have facilitated the emergence of a feminist class consciousness. Yet this does not appear to have been the case.

Second, the successful movement of women into previously male dominated industries led many women to question existing notions of femininity as weak, helpless, and ineffectual.

During the war we did everything a man could do except fight, and after it was all over there was a lot of unrest as well as happiness and sadness all mixed together. Some women were saying to themselves, “I don't really want to have children. I don't have to be a housewife. I want my own freedom, now, because I've proved that I'm as smart as any other person....” So if people did marry, they had a different outlook because they were different women than they had been before the war (Gossage, 1991).

It is often possible to convince excluded populations that they lack the requisite knowledge, skills, attitudes, or stamina to undertake particular tasks, but once having successfully filled these jobs, how is it possible to convince the incumbent to then meekly step aside, simply because a member of a more privileged group wishes the position? Surveys taken in 1944-1945 revealed that 75 to 80 percent of women in war production

areas planned to remain in the labour force after victory was won, and they wanted to keep the jobs they were then performing (Pidgeon, 1947). Intent to remain active in market work, however, did not translate ultimately to action as the majority of women in the post war era moved from factory to home or from factory to more marginalized labour.

The potential explosiveness of this situation is clearly evident in the close parallel of the post-war anti-colonial movements: just as men came home to take the better jobs away from women, the Dutch and French attempted to return to their former colonies; but having successfully fulfilled senior positions within the colonial administration in the absence of their imperial masters, the locals now knew themselves capable, and so rebelled. Were women not in the same position for the same reasons at the same historical moment? Indeed, not only were women excluded from the jobs in which they had already proved themselves more than capable, but they also had to face going from the role of chief provider to a position of renewed dependency within the family system; from managing alone to being managed. In such situations, one could anticipate a revolution of rising expectations, but in this instance it led to neither a feminist class consciousness nor an effective feminist movement. Despite the contention by some historians that women's commitment to maternalism during WWII and in the post war era represented radicalism (Brown, 1999), the feminist literature predominantly argued that the "emancipation of women lay in overriding the inequalities created by capitalism through seeking equal employment rights with men" (Christie, 2002, p. 128). By many accounts, however, the immediate post war period was more sex segregated than any other period since the Victorian era (Barnett, 1997; Coontz, 1992; Skolnick, 1991).

Third, the inclusion of college-educated, middle-class women in war-time employment would seem ideal for the creation of an intellectual vanguard around which an activist movement could coalesce. Middle class intellectuals have traditionally been instrumental in worker movements, and while women had always worked, war-time employment was the first time such significant numbers of middle and upper class women were drawn into paid employment (Rupp, 1978). How is it, then, that the future founders of post-war feminism such as Betty Friedan were unable to articulate their grievances over demobilization as a 'class' action, and the feminist movement, and the resultant questioning of the work-family discourses, remained stalled until at least the early 1960s?

The juxtaposition during WWII of a discourse encouraging women's active labour participation and a discourse limiting their role as competent workers is well examined in the literature (e.g., Montgomerie, 1996; Smith & Wakewich, 1999). Yet, as Montgomerie (1996) argues, "we are still struggling to understand the specific mechanisms by which such ideological continuity was maintained" (p. 108). I contend that the discourse limiting women's labour participation was continuous despite the lived experience of many women during that period who experienced their roles as empowering and expansive of personal identity (Rupp, 1978). Social and political conditions in the post-war era reinforced the hegemony of the gender divide left intact during WWII and further limited any potential for expanding roles for women and men.

Constraining Cold War Discourses: From War to Post War to Cold War

Certain office jobs usually occupied by men include those of accountant, collection clerk, credit clerk, and correspondent. Other office jobs are

commonly held by women. In this category are the jobs of file clerk, machine operator, receptionist, typist, stenographer, and telephone operator (Terry, 1953, p. 14).

The post-war era witnessed a struggle by a sizeable number of women to retain their jobs, play an active role in public life, and win equal rights (Horowitz, 1998). In a short space of time women trade unionists in the US grew number from 3 to 3.5 million and there were numerous female activists across the political spectrum, especially among the left and liberal communities (Horowitz, 1998). Yet women's participation in the US workforce fell from a peak of nearly 36 per cent during the war (Horowitz, 1998) to 27 per cent by 1946 (Samuels, 1971). In 1950 Congress rejected the Equal Rights Amendment at a point when women "did not have the public visibility of the Roosevelt era" (Rowbotham, 1999, p. 313).

The potential triggers for a broadening of the work discourse to include women failed to come to fruition, I would argue, for four related reasons. First, the patriarchal discourse of work was sufficiently dominant that it had become hegemonic: unquestioned and unquestionable, a common sense understanding of the social construction of women's role, reflecting the discourse of family, as helpmate and *temporary* worker. This subject position was, as will be discussed, left intact during WWII and reinforced in the post war period. Second, post-war prosperity quickly removed educated middle class women, a source of potential leadership, from the equation through suburbanization and the creation of a secondary discourse: the feminine mystique that individualized and psychologized women's grievances (Friedan, 1963). Third, post-war America underwent a period of public gender angst, as millions of returning servicemen attempted to reintegrate (O'Connor & Jackson, 1980; Quart and Auster, 1984; Rowbotham, 1999).

Fourth, the onset of the Cold War era created a climate in which any questioning of the status quo was aggressively discouraged (Schrecker, 1998). Each of these factors became interconnected through the dynamic of emerging Cold War discourse with its focus on danger and on the role of the idealized nuclear family: As Rowbotham (1999, p. 312) notes, “McCarthyism was never simply about politics; there was a tremendous emphasis upon social conformity and an ideal of the family.” As I shall show, these elements were echoed in the gendered nature of management theories of the day.

The Social Construction of the Female as Helpmate and Temporary Worker

Whenever there is a shortage of male labor, as under war conditions, an influx of women into industry occurs (Anderson, Mandeville & Anderson, 1942, p. 43-44).

The average working girl is merely marking time until she marries, or, if married, she is planning to work only long enough to help her husband buy a home and get started (Scott et al., 1941, p. 476).

The dominant discourse of work/family had always insisted that women's first priority must be the family, and that work was appropriate only as a temporary expediency to “help out” one's husband or family (Brandt, 1981; Christie, 2002; Sangster, 2000). Although some women with families and husbands had always worked, their employ was seen as stopgap “assistance” to the primary breadwinner — even if the wife's employ endured for years. A woman's magazine article from the Depression era, for example, characterizes working women as “girls living at home; married women glad of a half-time to *help out* while their husbands are laid off or hunting for work; young widows with tiny children to support” (Sangster 1932, p. 176, emphasis added). The discourse of work prior to WWII was mostly silent on the full and voluntary participation

of women; the public world of work was associated with men and the private world of unpaid work was associated with women (Sangster, 2000).

A key element of recruitment strategies was the propaganda programs executed on the home front to bolster flagging labour markets by encouraging the entry of female workers into war-time production and support services. "Convincing women that public need should override their personal convenience became one of the biggest selling jobs of the war" (Weatherford, 1990, p. 117). War-time employment, although potentially heralding a significant social change, was instead incorporated within the preexisting discourse of home by the simple expediency of designating it an "emergency measure", and as such a natural extension of the woman's traditional role as helpmate. Women were asked to become caretakers to the nation rather than just to her own family. Just as women in the depression era were "helping out", a role compatible with femininity (Hobbs, 1993), the boundaries of the discourse of "home" were extended in the war years to include the "home-front"; women never achieved status in the discourse of work.

Tensions at the Boundaries of Discourse: Keeping Women "Home"

The discourse of the female war worker during WWII had two effects which were to shape the discourse of work during the Cold War era: the muting of resistance which facilitated the extension of the discourse of home and family to accommodate war time labour and limited the inclusion of women in the discourse of work; and the empowerment of individual women, which created the conditions for the questioning of the discourse of work as masculine prevue.

FORTIFYING A DISCOURSE. Masculinist notions of the role of women did not abruptly change during WWII, but had merely accommodated a temporary reallocation of duties in a way that continued to cast the female in a secondary and supportive function. The discourse of work remained impenetrable to women in part due to deliberate efforts of government (as discussed below), to counter public unrest over an expansion of the role of women

Dissipation of opposition of the employ of women was supported by the appeal to patriotism, emphasizing the temporary “emergency” nature of the situation. Hence for the opponents of female war participation, the undercurrent that ‘nothing would ultimately be different’ muted resistance. This was evidenced by the stability of the discourse of home that required women to maintain their domestic role even when engaged in wartime market labour. Even when emotionally supportive of a woman’s engagement in war industry work, for example, extended family and community practical assistance in day to day familial responsibilities was lacking — the discourse of family/home as a female responsibility did not shift. “There is little evidence that family members shared her housework (Weatherford, 1990, p. 164).” Women’s “helping out” through outside employment was temporary; no change of domestic responsibility was thus warranted.

Also curtailing opposition to female engagement in war industry was the reinforcement and preservation of notions of femininity within work settings — “a girl would still be girlish” in her specially designed work overalls that accentuated feminine curves. “How a woman looks is a matter of concern because it affects her efficiency” (Chatelaine Magazine, Sept 1943 — see Dempsey, 1943). “Quality production was rewarded by bonuses (a beauty kit was typical)” (Weatherford, 1990, p. 119). Hence, the

presentation of beauty remained central to the presentation of woman. At Trans Canada Airways, for example, company propaganda focused on the female employee as if to 'explain' her presence. Corporate materials tended to single out young, single and 'attractive' women to frame discussion of the role of sexuality in ensuring a (post-war) future role for women as wives and mothers (Helms Mills, 2002).

Also muting resistance was a discourse of deviance. Typical of this discourse is this war-time editorial which speaks to the deviance of the woman who would choose to maintain employ post war and places responsibility on society in viewing war time workers as helpmates to prevent women from maintaining employment post war:

Production heads agree that at least 85% of them want to [return to the home]. But they say it's up to YOU, the Public to accept them as a normal, natural part of your town or city or neighborhood, if you consider them simply as women who happened to be away from their homes while working to help win the war—if you see that they get decent living places, decent food, a chance to have their children cared for—they'll slip back easily into home life. But if you isolate them and set them apart as "those women" they might not (Dempsey, 1943, p. 180-181).

Previously established notions of masculinity were also reinforced by the war effort. Although the female was portrayed as the helpmate, the primary responsibility for the war effort was placed on the male. During the war, the government, the military and the communications industry constructed women as if they were objects of male obligation; men were to fight, not as an obligation of citizenship, but to protect their sisters, wives, mothers and daughters (Westbrook, 1990). Thus, notions of femininity and masculinity remained relatively unchallenged. The discourse of work, the male prevue, was shifted to the 'real work' of the war effort; the discourse of home, the female prevue, was shifted to include the domestic responsibility of maintaining the homefront. Women

did not achieve recognition for their newfound work capabilities because their activities were not perceived to indeed be “work.”

DISCOURSE OF COMPETENCE. As discussed, opposition to female labour was curtailed by the discourse of women as helpmates, and the dominant discourse of work did not recognize their contributions. Once opposition to their employ was abated, however, a discourse of capability was also necessary to mobilize women into wartime labour. The (albeit temporary) movement of women into male dominated industries hinged upon the reinforcement of the female worker as both physically and intellectually capable of making the necessary contribution. “You can do this” was the second message of the propaganda campaign: “They left their kitchens for [aircraft production] and other industries, learned quickly and were wonderfully successful” (Weatherford, 1990, p. 117).

Thus, while on one hand quieting opposition to female labor through a discourse that emphasized the role of helpmate and the maintenance of the status quo, female recruitment was equally predicated on the discourse of women as competent players in the work domain. Tension between these inherently inconsistent messages resulted in dissonance for those who had internalized the message of competence and experienced their own capability.

To those who had, often reluctantly, accepted the temporary female labor market as a necessary and temporary war measure, the role of woman as helpmate to the male meant the immediate and unquestioned return of women to domestic responsibilities — the place where she could now best “help.” There was no longer a “home front,” merely the “home.” After the war, when encouraged or forced out of their jobs, many women,

however, questioned the inevitability of their displacement given their proven ability. They had, in their opinion, proved their competence in the work domain and wished to remain. Part of the efforts to reinforce traditional gender roles and male leadership after the war involved encouraging women to become subordinate and passive to help heal the wounds of war and help men reintegrate themselves into civilian life (Rosenberg, 1994).

Many stories during the reconversion period dealt with relations between women and veterans wherein the focus was on male's confusion over their peacetime identity rather than on adjustment of working women to losing their war jobs.... The major theme of the post-recruitment period was that marriage and children were essential for female fulfillment (Honey 1984, p. 169).

Resistance by women to the forfeiture of their jobs was seen as surprising, unfeminine, or was simply ignored (Anderson, 1982; Rosenberg, 1994). The discourse of capability had a significant and enduring impact on individual women, demonstrated the range of competencies for women (Kaledin, 1984, p. 64), and challenged the myth that women were unreliable and incapable workers. It created a sense of personal emancipation which was not readily abandoned by all women. Engagement in war industry stimulated an "increase in self-esteem and belief in women's own capabilities [which] spilled over into more egalitarian family and marital relations in the post war years" (Gluck 1988, p. 240). This may, in part, explain the tensions noted by Meyerowitz (1993) and Moskowitz (1996) between the romanticized portrait of domestic roles and the celebration of public 'nontraditional' roles found in women's magazines of the period.

My discussion of the discourses of work and family suggests that WWII opened up tensions between traditional notions of women as wives and mothers and the realities of wartime work experienced by large numbers of women. Confusion was amplified by government and employers who heralded the obvious skills and competencies of working

women while concurrently stressing the temporary nature of women at work. This demonstration of ability “was not translated into a direct challenge of the status quo in the public realm” (Gluck, 1988, p. 240). Although on an individual level women, and some men, supported the ambitions of some women to maintain employment, on a societal level, the acceptance of gender roles remained intact for both males and females. “The key to this confusion seemed to be whether or not the questions were personalized, for discussion of women’s proper place meant one thing when viewed as an abstraction and quite another when viewed as a personal decision” (Weatherford, 1990, p. 307). The dominance of the male-stream discourse of work was sufficiently pervasive to overshadowed the potentials of alternate discourses of work which were more reflective of women’s experiences in war labour. The role of women had not substantively changed and, after the war, it was time for women to “go home.”

Post War: The Boys are Back

The dominant discourse of work, as North America moved into the post war, was thus consistent with the prewar discourse: women only worked if a male partner was not available to them or due to patriotic ambitions to support men in their endeavors. The message that the work women were doing during the war was temporary became a major theme of the Reconversion Period (the term used to define the period of reintegration of returning male soldiers); consequently, women found themselves at the end of the war in nearly the same discriminatory employment position they had faced prior to the war. Whereas in the U.S., 45.3% of women were employed in higher paying durable goods production in 1943, only 25.0% were in such jobs in 1946 (Schloss & Polinsky, 1947). The situation was similar in Canada; at Trans Canada Airways (TCA), for example, a

massive recruitment policy aimed at female workers stressed patriotism and temporality: female employees were praised for their ability to fill a vital but temporary employment gap (Helms Mills, 2002). Endeavors to maintain the pre-war status quo was also evidenced in the retraining programs and the disqualification of married women from unemployment insurance (despite their having been required to pay premiums). The U.S. Employment Service referred white women to clerical jobs and low-paying unskilled work in manufacturing while channeling black women into domestic service and laundry (Anderson, 1982). In Canada, retraining programs emphasized domestic/familial responsibilities or clerical tasks, similarly ensuring that movement of women into male dominated industries was only temporary (Pierson, 1983).

The discourse of competency, however, was not completely overshadowed. The dominant presentation in the media of women readily embracing the return to domesticity was not reflective of many women's reality in the post war era. Friedan (1963) contends that this was exacerbated by an idealized notion of domesticity that dominated women's magazines of the time. No doubt such an idealized notion of the family is to be found. However, other studies of women's magazines during this era suggest that in a number of cases "domestic ideals co-existed in ongoing tension with an ethos of individual achievement that celebrated nondomestic activity, individual striving, public service and public success" (Meyerowitz, 1993, quoted in Horowitz, 1998, p. 182). "Far from imagining the home as a haven," women's magazines often "rendered it as a deadly battlefield on which women lost their happiness, if not their minds" (Moskowitz, 1996, quoted in Horowitz, 1998, p. 182). Nonetheless, the discourse of competence was always

balanced against a discourse of family and femininity — the exemplar of public success also had a beautiful home and attractive figure.

The discourse of helpmate was also challenged by the reality that, although many women did leave paid employment post war and return to the home, the majority simply returned to poorly paid employment, rather than to a protected domestic nest with a (financially) supportive husband (Ware, 1989). The discourse of work at the beginning of the post war years, a discourse that did not allow for nor recognize female labour participation, was blind to the reality that women were undeniably engaged in market work (Hartmann, 1982). It is indeed arguable that those blinders are still worn today (Runte & Mills, 2004).

Suburbanization and the Feminine Mystique

Suburbanization limited the development of a radical feminist questioning of the discourse of work as exclusionary of female participation and experience in at least three ways. First, suburbanization created opportunities for conservative political activism. Just as WWII extended the home-front to the factory, the home-front in the post-war era was relocated to the suburbs. The post war conception of the nuclear family was predicated upon “a bread-winning father, and an appliance-dependent, housekeeping mother of four” (Coontz, 1992, p. 3), who were to act as the “front line defense against treason” (p. 33). “Suburbia would serve as a bulwark against communism” (May, 1988, p. 19-20). The cold-war discourses valorizing “family” resonated with many women, leading them — with their families’ support — to join the political organizations of the New Right (Nickerson, 2003). Called upon to defend America from the threat of communism — and the feminist values associated with it — some middle class women overcame the isolation

of the suburbs through home-based activism. “Out of the political limelight, housewife activists transformed the domestic sphere into the grassroots sphere” (Nickerson, 2003, p. 21). Suburban political action was therefore limited to practices that reinforced and valorized the dominant discourses of work and family supported by the New Right (Klatch, 1990), and therefore could be engaged in without breaking the barriers of these boundaried discourses.

Second, suburbanization acted to entrench the discourses of work and family by decapitating the women's movement by isolating a potential source of leadership (college-educated, middle-class women) from both the physical sites of paid employment and from their still employed working-class sisters. Suburbanization rapidly reversed the war-time potential for collaboration between different strata of women within the workplace. Middle-class women did not just leave paid employment, they were physically removed from even casual contact with potential employers by a significant commute. Middle class males could undertake this daily commute on the understanding that their wives remained at home to cover any emergent family or household responsibilities. Consequently, the more articulate and educated a woman, the less likely she was to be found in physical proximity to work, and so the less able to enter — let alone challenge — the discourse of work. Those women still in paid employment, on the other hand, were more likely to be living within the inner city and thus too busy coping to provide leadership, particularly when the social-political climate made such endeavors problematic.

Third, suburbanization isolated the feminist movement's potential leaders from each other. Whereas war-time employment, or even tenement housing, brought women

together to compare the objective conditions of their lives, allowing for the emergence of class consciousness and collective action, isolation within the single family dwelling made this more difficult. Often newly separated from their extended families and old community ties, they were living lives different from those of their parents, with new and quite different expectations on the part of their husbands (Friedan, 1963; Horowitz, 1998). Everything had to be learned (Halberstam, 1994, p. 590). Consequently, suburbanization left these women vulnerable to the depiction of their legitimate class grievances in individual and psychological terms:

At this particular moment, it was impossible to underestimate the importance and influence of the women's magazines – the *Ladies Home Journal*, *Redbook*, *McCall's* and *Mademoiselle* – on middle class young women. ... The magazines explained their new lives to them: how to live, how to dress, what to eat, why they should feel good about themselves and their husbands and children. Their sacrifices, the women's magazines emphasized, were not really sacrifices, they were about fulfillment. All doubts were to be conquered. ... Those women who were not happy and did not feel fulfilled were encouraged to think that the fault was theirs and that they were the exception to blissful normality. That being the case, women of the period rarely shared their doubts, even with each other. If anything, they tended to feel guilty about any qualms they had: Here they were living better than ever – their husbands were making more money than ever, and there were even bigger, more beautiful cars in the garage and appliances in the kitchen. Who were they to be unhappy? (Halberstam, 1993, p. 590-592).

In contrast with the tenement, whose paper-thin walls made privacy, and therefore the pretense of the perfect family, impossible to maintain, the prosperity of suburbia demanded that women not only keep up with the Jones, but also project a family image of absolute contentment, consistent with the image of Americanism portrayed by the New Right. The reality was often otherwise, as women found themselves isolated, deskilled (thanks to various 'labour saving devices' in the home) and alienated, but unable to articulate their collective grievances. Anti-communist, "pro-family" political activism reflected and reinforced what Friedan (1963) was to label "the feminine

mystique” — how could one feel discontent in such a noble pursuit? The suburban front porch became the new homefront as women were mobilized to fight communism.

Cold War Images of Femininity and Masculinity

Although WWII had once again privileged the notion of man as warrior, it had nonetheless opened space around the notion of woman as domestic helpmate by shifting the emphasis from “home” to “home-front” (i.e., workplace). The Cold War was different. The new, undeclared war — despite the hot Korean War — did not demand large numbers of female workers. Indeed, part of the discourse of the Cold War was built around the notion of women as the bedrock of the new American family, reinforcing traditional notions of femininity. The Cold War also entrenched particular images of masculinity — the male as tough, resilient, unwavering (Robin, 2001). This was in large part a response to defining images of the enemy as ruthless, uncompromising, intent on domination (Robin, 2001) – images that also reflected prominent masculine traits. Shifts to more clearly drawn notions of masculinity also dovetailed with a sense of masculine angst and ambiguity that marked the post-war era (May, 1989a). Men who had displayed their masculinity doing the ‘real work’ of war fighting in WWII, became warriors in the Cold War. The trenches of the Cold War were the workplaces and boardrooms of America, where men were doing the ‘real work’ of this war — protecting democracy. The discourse of the work domain was definitively masculine.

Likewise, the discourse of family became even more feminized. In contrast to the godless communist, a new discourse of Americanism developed that had at its core

political conservatism, religious conviction, and commitment to the traditional family. In this emergent discourse women were viewed as dedicated wives and mothers. Working and intellectual women became suspect, enemies of the status quo.

In *The Feminine Mystique*, Betty Friedan (1963) exposed the repressive stereotype of femininity that had gained prominence in popular culture in the post war/Cold War era of the 1950s. This stereotype called for women to embrace domesticity as “the fulfillment of their femininity” (Friedan, 1963, p. 43). The war years’ lessons of female strength and competence was repressed; career development through education had come to be viewed as “strange and embarrassing” (p. 19) and women’s educational goals were redirected from career to “graduat[ing] with a diamond ring” (p. 153). Both men and women reported to pollsters that they wanted large families, with the woman at home with the kids (Weatherford, 1990). The patriotic spirit that encouraged women’s work during the war years was drawn upon to reinforce women’s renewed role of homemaker: “Surely our magnificent young brides of today who have grown up during a tragic period will get together with their husbands [have children] and help the country out of this dilemma [of declining population growth].... Three children per married couple should be a minimum goal” (Franks, 1946, p. 101). Early marriages were on an increase, in part because youth, male and female, saw “no other true value in contemporary society” (Friedan, 1963, p. 188) and thus the “mystique of feminine fulfillment [through family and home] became the cherished and self-perpetuating core of contemporary American culture” (p. 19). The discourse of family was paralleled with the discourse of ‘Americanism’ inculcating freedom and prosperity.

Although many women remained employed in the post-war era, the challenge of their employment to prevailing norms of gender escalated despite the demonstration of competence during the war years. "Why could she not be contented with her flat and household tasks" (Franks, 1946, p. 101). The baby boom of the immediate post war era spoke to the relief of survival and a desire for normalcy. The presence of young children, and the resultant time demands, necessarily quieted rumblings of discontent regarding women's limited functions.

Friedan noted that the baby boom was permeated with the mystique of feminine fulfillment to a greater extent in the U.S. than elsewhere. "The feminine mystique flourished in part because it filled a gap in what might be described as national identity" (Grant, 1994, p. 123). Just as during the war years, when soldiers were called to fight to protect wives, mothers and children, the Cold War era eased the transition of the U.S. into a global power by extolling the values of family. But this time the battlefield was America; men would fight for the "American way of life" from their own hearths. "The image of the woman as ultrafeminine and dependent invigorated the need to protect her and what she stood for. The feminine mystique, then, was part of an image of gender relations that provided legitimacy for the state's activities abroad" (Grant, 1994, p. 124).

Anxiety post war that a return to economic depression was inevitable also mitigated some of the resistance to a return to domesticity for women; that jobs would be limited necessitated prioritizing employment for males (Weatherford, 1990). Although the dramatic increases in production necessitated by WWII lessened, the enhanced foreign program of the Cold War also stimulated production. Coupled with a dramatic increase in consumer production, prosperity ensued.

Women, however, were no longer the producers; they were the consumers. The purchasing power of women and the return of women to traditional roles (whether in the home or in traditionally female labor markets) are illustrated by advertising campaigns of the early post war era. 7-up, for example, ceased claiming it could produce a good disposition in women in order for them to win a better job, and switched to boasting that it could help them be happy homemakers (Honey, 1984). Friedan (1963) quotes an American educator as arguing that women be excluded from college because “the education which girls could not use as homemakers was more urgently needed than ever by boys to do the work of the atomic age” (p. 23). Her patriotic duty was to maintain the home: “there is much you can do about our crisis in the humble role of housewife.” The mystique was also reinforced by a societal apathy in the early post war period: “part of what happened to all of us in the years after the war... it was easier, safer, to think about love and sex than about communism, McCarthy, and the uncontrolled bomb” (Friedan, 1963, p. 186-187).

In addition to legitimizing war losses, Cold War ideation of American family also “buttressed the image of masculinity and eased the remilitarization of American society in the early 1950s” (Grant, 1994, p. 123). “An exaggerated cult of masculine toughness and virility” (Cuordileone, 2000, p. 515) legitimized conservative American foreign and domestic policies and usurped both liberal and radical agendas, both of which were characterized as effeminate. Through this process, the role of women was further boundaried, and gains in female labor participation further repressed.

The role of the male also became more clearly boundaried and tied to patriotic duty. Men were the “breadwinners” — their support for capitalism a patriotic duty. The

policy of containment relied on masculine imagery, requiring America to “muster up the political manliness to deny Russia either moral or material support” (Kennan, 1967, p. 581). Traditional concepts of femininity were emphasized to develop more “manliness through contrast” (Grant, 1994, p. 125). Polarization of images of hard/masculine and soft/feminine dominated the discourse of the Cold War era (Bell, 1955). Femininity was heralded as an ideal *if* it was exhibited by women, and as a “real or potential threat to the security of the nation” if exhibited by men. “The lines were thus drawn... between being a soft wailer or a manly anticommunist doer” (Cuordileone, 2000, p. 516).

The polarization of images becomes more graphic and obscene with McCarthy who blamed “America’s position of impotency” on liberalism. “In much right wing rhetoric [the liberal] was feminine in principle, effeminate in embodiment, and emasculating in effect” (Cuordileone, 2000, p. 516). McCarthy confronted opposition to his anti-communism with the dualism, “if you want to be against McCarthy, boys, you’ve got to be either a communist or a cocksucker” (Cuordileone, 2000, p. 516). To rally against the status quo, whether the cause be more inclusive policies for women or an anti-racist agenda, was to be deemed a Communist or, worse, an effeminate male or homosexual.

A concern for masculinity through this era was also evident in the popular press. “The Decline of the American Male” was caused by a repressive collectivist society that “smashed the once-autonomous male self, elevated women to a position of power in the home and doomed men to a slavish conformity not wholly unlike that experienced by men living under Communist rule” (Cuordileone, 2000, p. 518). Women were chastised for exhibiting strength in the domain over which they were mistress — the home. A

discourse of maternal blame appeared in both popular and mainstream academic text. “Uncertainties about the hardness of the nation’s Cold Warriors hovered over the manhood debate” (Cuordileone, 1989, p. 520), but responsibility was not placed on political policy, but rather on the mother who had created “immature” men through excessive mothering. “The gravest menace” and “threat to our survival” came in form of the mother (Strecker, 1946, p. 219). Men were therefore victimized by overbearing women in the workplace and in the home. American women’s attempts to develop independence or a position of power whether within or outside the boundaries of home were therefore ‘Un-American’ and represented a move towards communism. To deviate from established sex roles was to undermine American ideals fought for so recently.

The feminine mystique and the image of masculinity were therefore partnered. The ‘proper’ orientation of women as passive and submissive mother (responsible for the homefront) was exploited as the prototypical American ideal. Males were to respond, yet again, to protect this ideal as warriors engaged in battle in the work domain. Under Cold War discourse the boundaries between male and female roles, which had potentially experienced some softening during World War II, were refortified. Male ‘impotence’ as a threat to the ‘free world’ resulted from an allegiance of men with feminine values, caused by too assertive females. The exaltation of the nuclear family and domestic ideals constrained the personal gains made during the war when women experienced relative autonomy.

Anti-communism, McCarthyism and the Silencing of Radicalism

Nonetheless, many women had ended the war years having experienced the benefits of employment in male-dominated industries. The post war exclusion of women from many industries and the maintenance of the work domain as a masculine preserve did not necessitate the dismantling of personal/individual level gains. Many women had emerged from the war years with a sense of competence that challenged masculinist notions of work. That these personal gains did not necessarily translate into a shift of the dominant discourse speaks, as discussed, to the strength of the dominant discourses of the war and post-war eras.

Seedlings of optimism for more inclusive policies towards women were present at the end of WWII, as “many aspects of feminism flourished right after the war” (Horowitz, 1998, p. 124) among women workers in industrial and service jobs. “They experienced more fully the forces of racial and sexual discrimination and dealt with the challenge of combining employment with the obligations of motherhood and domesticity earlier than their suburban counterparts” (Horowitz, 1998, p. 125). The activism of working-class women in the *immediate* post war era is well documented (Cobble, 1994). Labor radicalism in the late 1940s, however, was to be extinguished in the Cold War era with the emergent dominance of the discourse of anti-communism.

The wartime alliance between America and the Soviet Union was giving way to mutual hostility, and the possibility of atomic weaponry added a new dimension of terror to warfare, bringing the threat of destruction directly into American homes. The Cold

War, manifested in the U.S. as a reaction against communism, was part of a transformation in American international relations from a model of sporadic interventionism to a positioning of sustained global power. "The resurgence of a feminine stereotype in U.S. popular culture paralleled the evolution toward superpower status and permanent global security commitments" (Grant, 1994, p. 120).

Although not the only casualty of McCarthyism, gender issues were to be treated in the Cold War era as subversive, Un-American and reflective of communist goals. Women's career aspirations were to be systematically suppressed by the emergent discourses of the post war era, which reinforced the gendered boundaries of work and home by reinventing them in new political discourses. The dominant discourses of work and family did not shift to reflect individual women's personal level of development until the rebirth of radicalism in the post-Vietnam era (and even then gains were tenuous) due to the strength of the emergent discourse of the Cold War with its attendant discourse of masculinity, whose necessary corollary was a highly constrained view of femininity.

With the emergence of McCarthyism, gender issues that threatened entrenched norms of masculinity and femininity were treated as subversive and Un-American. Women's career aspirations were systematically suppressed by the emergent discourses of the post-war era, which reinforced the gendered boundaries of work and home by reinventing them in new socio-political discourses.

McCarthyism had a chilling effect on women's activism, drying up middle-class support for trade unions, especially militant ones; turning most unions against radical activity by women; and scaring many in the rank and file from commitment to progressive causes. For example, in 1948 the *Congress of American Women* was placed

on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, and in 1949 HUAC carried out an investigation (Horowitz, 1998, p. 149).

Even liberal women's organizations, including the *American Association of University Women* came under attack from anticommunist forces, and Mary van Kleeck and other left-leaning management theorists were purged from leadership of the former Taylor Society (Heenan & Nyland, 2003). Organizations such as HUAC contributed to the curtailment of feminist ideas and activism, particularly through repressive measures, but also through its gendered language "as it conflated women, homosexuality, Communism, and progressive politics" (Horowitz, 1998, p. 140).

Likewise, the discourse of family became even more feminized. In contrast to the godless communist, a new discourse of Americanism developed which had at its core political conservatism, religious conviction, and commitment to the traditional family. In this emergent discourse women were viewed as dedicated wives and mothers. The working and intellectual women became suspect, and an enemy of the status quo. Within that context the popular television show, "I love Lucy", serves as a manifestation of idealized values. Lucile Ball, the television producer is hidden from sight as Lucy, the star of the show, makes audiences laugh with her many failed and irrational attempts to enter the workforce, only to be thwarted by her own inadequacies and the intervention of husband Ricky.

Ironically "I Love Lucy" was nearly taken off the air when red baiters accused Ball of being a one-time member of the Communist Party. Ball, along with her grandfather and brother, had been a member of the Communist Party in the 1930s but under pressure recanted and declared herself a god-fearing loyal American who had only

joined to please her grandfather. That Ball took this extraordinary step was due to the widespread introduction of government loyalty oaths, legislation against Communist Party membership, the curtailment of trade union rights, blacklisting, and the use of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) and other bodies to threaten the liberty and livelihood of those deemed to be displaying un-American values. The use and outcomes of anticommunist legislation became known as McCarthyism by its victims. It had a powerful impact on progressive social movements in the 1940s and early 1950s, including feminism, “which it forced underground” (Horowitz, 1998, p. 12).

Women in unions and housewives’ leagues knew that their hard-won gains of the early and mid-1940s were tenuous and reversible. By the late 1940s, their worst fears were realized. McCarthyism had a chilling effect on women’s activism, drying up middle-class support for trade unions, especially militant ones, turning most unions against radical activity by women, and scaring many in the rank and file from commitment to progressive causes. It is hardly surprising that the government focused its energy on driving the Congress of American Women out of existence. In 1948 the government placed it on the Attorney General’s list of subversive organizations, and in 1949 HUAC carried out an investigation. (Horowitz, 1998, p. 149)

Thus, arguably, “the Cold War linked anti-communism and the dampening of women’s ambitions. The connection between women, anti-communism and conformity appeared in many forums With men dedicating themselves to specialized bureaucratic work in a nation engaged in a fight against a Soviet Union that suppressed individualism, it fell to women to restore value, integrity, and wholeness to American life” (Horowitz, 1998, p. 124).

From Discourse to Theory: Women's Place

By inculcating this burgeoning discourse of work-family conflict with a patriarchal agenda, which served to fortify the boundaries between work and home, Cold War discourses of masculinity and femininity influenced research on work and family in a number of ways. The exclusion and discipline of female academics resulted in a general veiling of women's roles in organizational life. The Cold War era and the images of masculinity are then linked to the emergent disciplines and theories that parented work-family HRM discourse.

The Chilly Climate of Organizational Management Theory: Freezing Women Out

Universities were hard hit by the anti-communist/McCarthy agenda with a number of progressive scholars losing their jobs (Schrecker, 1986). Significant as well to my discussion of the role and representation of women in academic discourse on work-family is the role and representation of women within the disciplines from which the role conflict perspective emerged. As will be discussed, women's position within these disciplines was, while limited to begin with, even more curtailed during the post-war period when the foundational theories upon which work-family literature is based gained dominance. The representation of women in academic life mirrors the representation of women in work discourse.

The fortification of gendered roles during the Cold War period was linked to developments within the broader field of the social sciences. For one thing, the

universities remained bastions of male dominance. During the onset of World War II universities such as Harvard, Yale, Amherst, and Williams were still only admitting men as undergraduates, and “had no women with regular professorial appointments” (Horowitz, 1998, p. 34). Very few women were employed as management theorists and the contribution of those who were, such as Mary Parker Follett and Lillian Gilbreth was hidden from history until quite recently (Tancred-Sheriff & Campbell, 1992). In the field of psychology, few of the growing number of women were involved in industrial research which later informed HRM research, or held university teaching positions. Female Ph.D.s in psychology “were usually tracked into service-oriented positions in hospitals, clinics, courts, and schools” (Capshew and Laszlo 1986, p. 160).

The masculine character of the social sciences was strengthened by warfare — at first World War II and then the onset of the Cold War. According to Ball (1998, p. 76), “the welfare-warfare state that emerged in the Depression and Cold War eras created the conditions which the various social sciences . . . became valuable, if not indispensable, adjuncts of corporate and state power.” In fact, the perceived character of WWII contributed to a militarization of the university, as vast sums of money was poured into research by the armed forces, who, in turn, required applied results to be developed in an atmosphere of secrecy. These trends were intensified in the post-war era and the notion that un-loyal Americans could betray, what had become, military secrets. Thus, what emerged was “a vast institutional infrastructure – government granting agencies, private foundations, and the modern university, in which the increasing professionalization of the social sciences proceeded apace – for supporting research and training” (Ball, 1989, p. 77). These trends therefore accelerated the development of the behavioral sciences,

which emphasized applied, objectivist research focused on the control of individual behaviour (Cooke, Mills & Kelley, 2004; Robin, 2001). Perhaps unsurprisingly the behavioral sciences, and in particular psychology, came to dominate post-war HRM theory. As Raymond A. Bauer expressed it in a 1958 edition of the *Harvard Business Review*, “the social sciences are an especially pertinent subject for businessmen to consider, for they deal . . . with the organization of people and the control of behavior” (quoted in Ball, 1989, p. 80).

Women at the margins: Disciplining the Boundary

Organizational researchers did not merely reflect their social-political context in academic discourse, they were also active agents in the entrenchment of those norms by serving as gatekeepers to the discipline. I use here an exemplar from psychology as a discipline foundational to HRM. In WWII, for example, the newly established Emergency Committee in Psychology (ECP) “rapidly assumed primary authority for mobilization plans, and through its quasi-independent Office of Psychological Personnel served as an employment agency for psychologists seeking military and government positions” (Capshew & Laszlo, 1986, p. 162-3). Female psychologists quickly realized that they were being excluded from the process. “As the list of activities and persons rolled on, not a woman’s name was mentioned, nor was any project reported in which women were to be given a part” (quoted in Capshew & Laszlo, 1986, p. 163). Female psychologists formed the National Council of Women Psychologists (NCWP) to agitate for change. Initially, when females protested their exclusion, they were told by the ECP “to be good girls . . . wait until plans could be shaped up to include [them]” (quoted in

Capshew & Laszlo, 1986, p. 163). Eventually the ECP shifted gears by forming a Subcommittee on the Services of Women Psychologists (SSWP). The SSWP, far from dealing with the problem, appealed to female psychologists' sense of professional identity, calling upon them to "rise above divisive polemics" (Capshew & Laszlo, 1986, p. 168). Stressing professional ethics, the members of the SSWP were "charged with emotionalism and lack of objectivity" (Capshew & Laszlo, 1986, p. 172). Even the more radical SPSSI failed to recognize female equity as an issue. By the end of 1945, of more than 1000 psychologists that directly served in the U.S. armed forces, less than forty were women. Gender politics and a stress on professionalism limited the role of women to create consistency with dominant notions of masculinity and femininity.

With the emergence of the Cold War in the immediate post-war period, the new behavioral sciences that pre-dated HRM were thus informed by discursive practices which stressed warfare, objectivism, career, professionalism, and instrumental outcomes (Cooke et al., 2005). On their own, these factors were enough to favour masculinity over femininity, but in the context of Cold War imagery they appear to have overwhelmed not only the potential of the female academic but also images of women at work.

Representation of Women in OMT Discourse

Images of women at work were all but absent from OMT textbooks (Mills, 2004, Mills & Helms Hatfield, 1998) and management theorizing in general (Hearn & Parkin, 1983) during the four decades following WWII. In the late-1940s through to the early

1960s, much of the emergent OMT discipline focused on business leadership as an essential contribution not only to the individual companies, but also to the United States and Western civilization. In the late 1930s, for example, the fledgling Academy of Management saw the development of “a philosophy of management” as necessary to inspire “public confidence in a competitive system of free enterprise” and to ensure that that economic system did not “succumb eventually to Socialism” (Wrege, n/d, p. 3). In the post-war era, many management texts reflected this “philosophy of management” but with a new Cold War zeal. Folts (1954, p. 3), who warned of “a few powerful men who seem bent on the destruction of our Western society”, argued, “the future of ‘Western civilization’ today rests in part squarely on the ability of factories in the United States of America to produce.”

Cold war discourses of masculinity and femininity are embedded in these texts. The narrative of the business leader as defender of the faith referenced masculine notions of the father figure and military commander: in the words of Davis (1957, p. 75), the executive needs “authoritative direction. This is the right of command.” Written as practical accounts of how to manage and organize, business texts of the day were aimed at men who would lead other men. The underlying assumption is that women do not lead. So dominant is this discourse of masculinity that women at work are almost totally ignored. On the rare occasions that women do appear, it is in photographs whose primary aim is to illustrate different forms of technology. None of the pictures are accompanied by discussion of the role of women at work, but the reader could be forgiven for thinking that women workers were few and far between and confined to the lower echelons of the workplace. The few textual glimpses of women suggest that they “are interested in

working for only a limited period of time” (Terry, 1953, p. 494), but may play an important role where they are fortunate to be the wives of executives (Wickert & McFarland, 1967, p. 40). The potential for an increased presence of women in the discourse of work was not realized in the emerging field of OMT.

Masculinizing HRM Research on Work-Family:

The emphasis on the temporary nature of female employment that emerged out of the Cold War discourses has an obvious implication for the gendering of HRM research regarding work and family. "Because most wives in the 1950s and 1960s responded to the demands of child rearing by leaving the labor force, employers assumed that women must have a weaker attachment to paid work than men" (Krahn & Lowe, 1988, p. 128). The new domestic ideal, predicated on clearly delineated gender roles imbued in the Cold War discourses of work and family, was reinforced through the development of an academic discourse examining work and family roles. The influence of Cold War theorizing and the restrictive discourses of masculinity/femininity are therefore particularly evident in the discourses of work-family, which are not only reflected in representations of male and female roles in OMT texts (mirroring the reality that women were relegated to certain types of work), but made explicit in the academic discourse of 'work-family *conflict*' which made its debut during this era. The authors of the academic discourse of work-family conflict and its contributing theories were the very men who had facilitated, or permitted, the silencing of women's voices and experience in representations of organizational life and had restricted the role of women within their own disciplines.

The Genesis of HRM Work-Family Research

Although these gendered assumptions have a long history, they became concretized in the emergent social sciences of the early Cold War years (Barnett, 1997, p. 351) and were articulated in theories of role formation and function. I have focused on psychology, specifically, and OMT generally, but similar examples can be found in other disciplines, such as sociology and economics. For example, founding sociologists such as Parsons postulated that correct sex role identification in children was predicated on the demonstration of clearly delineated roles in the home; roles that were immutable. "Even if, as seems possible, it should come about that the average married woman had some kind of job, it seems most unlikely that this relative imbalance would be upset" (Parsons & Bales, 1955, p. 12-13). Parsons focused on the perpetuation of the system as an important goal and articulated how individuals fulfilled system functions by taking on roles that maintain order in the system. Termini and Miles (1936) delineated gender-based norms, placing masculinity and femininity on opposite ends of a bipolar model. Opposing attributes consistent with masculine and feminine roles were assigned whereby masculinity was associated with traits such as courage and self reliance; and the female was associated with their opposite -- timidity and dependence (Archer & Lloyd, 1985). According to some researchers the exertion of male power over females is an important aspect to male's self-definitions (e.g., Carney & Kahn, 1984). One result of the propensity to assert power is a hyper-competitive spirit, as failure to assume power over others is viewed as a defeat or "emasculatation" (O'Neil, 1982; LaFollette, 1992). To be equated with (or equal to) women is intolerable.

This view of gender roles both influenced and reflected the development of subsequent theories that perpetuated the assumption that sex role divisions were immutable. "The workplace and its events, in our society, more closely regulate the psychological fate of men than of women" (Pearlin, 1975, p. 202). Following Termini and Miles' work, Cold War role theorists attempted to describe male identity by constructing models attributing specific characteristics to men; these models often rely on a presentation of the feminine to characterize the opposing, less desirable, or 'other'. David and Brannon (1976), for example, identified themes that "seem to comprise the core requirements for the role" (p. 12). Notably, association with feminine characteristics and roles defines a stigma of great shame and significance. "This terror of being a sissy apparently leaves a deep wound in the psyche of many males (p. 14)." "The Big Wheel," according to David and Brannon, is the requirement of the male role "to command respect and be looked up to for what one can do or has achieved" (p. 19). This can be accomplished in a variety of ways with wealth and fame being the most desired identifiers of masculine success — identifiers unattainable in the 'home.' This positioning of masculine and feminine as opposing and hierarchical is mirrored in the roles ascribed to the work and family domains: The male occupies the work sphere; the female 'gets the house.'

Empirical psychological studies on the workplace in the Cold War period predominantly centered on the experience of men, excluding women from analysis and frequently acting as if the non-work domain did not influence male experience. For example, the Western Collaborative Group Study (Rosenmann & Friedman, 1964) that identified 'Type A' personality sampled 3500 men and not one woman, and did not

question family status as a relevant variable. Work was emotionally relevant only to men and the primary source of identity and location of role. Gurin, Veroff and Feld's (1979) study of mental health questioned male participants about their work experiences; women were questioned about their home lives. Kahn et al's, (1964) study on stress, from which the theory of role conflict developed (Chapter 6), identified role conflict as inevitable when one attempts to reconcile incompatible roles. In their seminal study, Kahn et al (1964) focused on the male experience.

The absence of women from the field of psychology is also evident in the discipline of economics. Albelda (1995), for example, provides a comprehensive review of the "dearth of women in the profession" (p. 253) and the relative silence of feminist perspectives in the research. Strober (1994) identifies C.S. Mill's classic text, *On the Subjection of Women*, as a foundational feminist economic text and discusses the agenda of feminist economic scholars in the post-war era. Although the theories based on role conflict discussed in the previous chapter developed principally within the psychology discipline, it is crucial to note that many of their foundational, and hegemonic principles are based in economic theory, such as scarcity. Adam Smith, for example, predicated his theory, that remains hegemonic in economic theory, on a model of scarcity, selfishness and competition (Strober, 1994, p. 146). These "truths" "are each half of a dichotomy: scarcity/abundance; selfishness/altruism and competition/cooperation.... One could argue that these dichotomies have masculine and feminine sides... and that economics has chosen to make central to its analysis the masculine while ignoring the feminine" (Strober, 1994, p. 145). Strober rejects the essentializing nature of this position. Although I agree with Strober that there is nothing inherently masculine or feminine in these

values, it is consistent with my thesis that these categories have been gendered in terms of how they are used within the dominant discourses discussed in this dissertation. Although Strober and I may agree that these are not essential categories, I contend that the discourses discussed do essentialize men and women. A poststructural analysis of work-family economic research would examine the role of these essentializing discourses within a field that privileges mathematical models over critical theory (Strassman, 1994).

Conclusion

In earlier chapters, I discussed the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict and the limited theoretical orientation in this research. The vast majority of the HRM research on work-family conflict is based on selected tenets of role theory (Kahn et al., 1964; Katz and Kahn, 1978). The dominant theoretical position employed in work and family research within the mainstream management tradition is role conflict (whether centred in discussions of role theory or negative spillover between roles) and consequently the interactions of the domains continue to be perceived as primarily negative and conflictual. There is therefore an enduring, and almost exclusive, support for the position of inherent and inevitable conflict — the idea of the ‘incompatibility’ of the roles of parent and employee.

This chapter addressed my questioning as to why role conflict (which emerged in Cold War America) achieved hegemonic power such that theoretical positioning of this discourse is almost unifocal in the HRM research on work-family? The theoretical position of role conflict, I contend, both reflected and reinforced the discourses of the

Cold War that clearly delineated gendered roles and therefore was most compatible with the discourse of the era in which this research emerged. Alternate theories, given root during the Cold War, such as role enhancement (which potentially could be employed to argue for less rigidly defined boundaries) and positive spillover (which, it could be argued, presented opportunity for positive consequences of women's engagement in market work) were more radical and potentially destructive of the status quo. The dominance of functionalism (Parsons, 1949) in sociology and role conflict theory (Kahn et al., 1964; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) in management speaks to the power of a discourse limiting critique. Given that research tradition builds and tests established tenets and theory, the dominance of role conflict in the establishment of a research tradition of work-family conflict effectively entrenched the discourses of work and family from the Cold War era in the research discourse that continues essentially unchallenged to today.

Gendered discourse, reflective of Cold War positionings of masculinity and femininity, permeating the 'seminal' research on work-family (Chapter 6) reinforces the analysis, Chapter 5, which tracks the themes of exclusion, accommodation and mother blame through four decades of research. The domain of work was seen by the seminal authors as the primary and appropriate arena of male responsibility. "It is possible that women who are employed in managerial or professional positions work sufficiently longer hours to produce intense pressures on the husband to participate more heavily in family activities which, in turn may conflict with his work responsibilities" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 80). These roles remain gendered in lived experience (Chapter 3) although — perhaps because women could not be kept out of work — there has been an

increased recognition both within academia (Chapter 5) and experience (Chapter 3) for the permeability of the domains. Permeability, however, is perceived to be primarily negative, although it is recognized that family domain permeability to work needs benefits employers. Responsibility and blame for negative outcome rests, explicitly or implicitly, on the woman as the family domain responsibilities remain predominantly female. Role enhancement, the notion that multiple roles can have a positive effect (e.g., Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974), achieved minimal reference in mainstream management literature. It is accepted that men and women adopt roles in their work and nonwork experiences that are inherently incompatible. The fortification of delineated and gender defined boundaries between work and family and between men and women during the Cold War era created the conditions whereby the notion of role conflict was obvious and enduring.

The hegemony of discourse is rooted in historical context. The emergence of the discourse of work-family conflict within HRM research and practice in the Cold War era reflects the dominant discourses of that era. The potential for a radical shift in the labour market positioning of women was curtailed as a deliberate post-war policy to support the repatriation of the male warrior. This policy reflects an entrenchment of the positioning of the male as worker, the female as help-mate that did *not* in fact shift during the war period despite an increased presence of women in market work during the war. How women enacted their responsibility to 'help out' changed during the war, not their actual role. Not all women readily embraced a return to domesticity or to more poorly paid and less prestigious positions. To subvert challenges to this discourse, a companion discourse

of conflict emerged in management theory that demarked the spheres of work and family as incompatible and the experience of boundary crossing as destructive.

Post-war prosperity also contributed to the demarcation of the boundaries of work and home by creating the perception that, not only was the place of women in the home, but also that the home was a desirable place to be. Suburbanization isolated women, thus effectively shutting down opportunity for collective action. The marriage of social conditions and the persistence of pre-existing roles to a context of suppression of dissent characterized by McCarthyism served to limit the role of women in market work and suppress the potential for challenge to the dominant discourses of work-family within management theory. Interpretation of the past has serious consequences for the present. In the ongoing circular process of interpreting past event through present assumption, the interpreter is in effect understanding the present through the past. Present assumptions and world views, our knowledge of ourselves, are modified as a result of the questions that the past has pressed on our pre-understandings. In fact, Gadamer claims that hermeneutics necessarily involves not simply interpretation and understanding, but application of the understanding raised in hermeneutical inquiry to the political and social matters of the present as well. This leads to the final layer of analysis. I ask:

How does one live within this discourse?

CHAPTER 8: TEXT AS LIVED — CONTINUING COLD WAR CHILL ON WORK-FAMILY

“Such dynamics often tie interpretation to the interplay of larger social forces (the general) to the everyday lives of individuals (the particular)” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 286-287).

Introduction

The social and political context of the cold war encouraged the reification of gendered discourse and the linking of gender roles explicitly to the domains of work and family. As discussed in the previous chapter, conceptions of femininity and masculinity, based in cold war discourse, became entrenched in gender roles, which saw exclusion of females from the work domain and limitations placed on the involvement of males in the family domain.

The exclusion of women from large areas of the workforce in the postwar period was achieved in two distinct ways. On the one hand, there were a number of direct barriers to female employment, including employers who were unwilling to hire women, husbands unwilling to ‘allow’ their wives to work, and legislation that prohibited female labour from certain categories of work. Concurrently, a powerful and growing discourse of valuing women’s role as housewife and mother existed alongside an equally powerful discourse that valued men’s role as the ‘breadwinner’. Each discourse came with a particular lexicon (e.g., “work”, “home”, “employee”, “mother”) and set of reference points (e.g., work as a public place where men go; home as an idealized place that women tend and men return to) that linked them together. While prohibitions served to exclude

women from the workplace, emphasis on the domestic idyll served to rationalize the process through a discourse of inclusion and accommodation whereby women were encouraged to literally feel at home being outside of the workplace (Weeks, 1990). This speaks to what Betty Friedan (1963) labeled “the feminine mystique.”

The discourse of exclusion of women and family from the workplace became embedded in the HRM research on work-family, which defined the interface of these domains on the basis of incommensurability, and prioritized work over family; masculinity over femininity. As discussed in previous analysis (Chapter 5, 6) these gendered subject positions persist in HRM research. The Cold War, when it comes to work-family interaction, is not over.

In moving between the domains of work and family, tolls are exacted based on historically defined gender roles and the prescribed and unquestioned (but questionable) nature of the dominant discourse. These hegemonic “truths,” which are embedded within the HRM literature (Chapter 4, 5 & 6), are reflective of cold war ideology (Chapter 7). Operating within structures that accept the discourse as “truths”, women and men continue to negotiate the “hegemonic assumptions and the social practices which they guarantee” (Weedon, 1993, p. 126). This dissertation has centered on a hermeneutic excavation of the HRM academic research on work-family. It was, however, the lived experience of men and women who attempt to cross or bridge the divide between the domains of work and family that was the first layer of analysis. I bring forward their stories, their voices, again to “bring the text home” to illustrate the continuity of the discourse through time and place, thus closing the hermeneutic arc by evaluating the influences of HRM work-family discourse, as a cold war discourse, on lived experience.

In this concluding chapter, I link the layers of hermeneutic analysis undertaken in this dissertation, by focusing on how these “truths” are embodied in women and men’s experiences (Chapter 3).

Although subject to revision based on changing social and political context, the embeddedness of Cold War discourses of masculinity and femininity in lived experience and in academic HRM discourse speaks to the hegemonic power of discourse. This hegemonic positioning of role conflict and the echoes of this discourse in current lived experience is the focus of the first part of this concluding chapter. The second part of this chapter will bring into the discussion two emergent discourses in the HRM literature. The challenge to the conflict discourse in HRM is embryonic; the emergent discourses of work-family balance and work-life will be presented to support my contention that the Cold War discourse has yet to lose its influence.

Bringing the Discourses “Home:” A Toll Bridge

Increasingly, the last half of the twentieth century has witnessed a broadening of the discourse of work to include an increased role for women and mothers. During the Cold War, women’s negotiation of social structural constraints and opportunities steered them away from homemaking towards paid employment, or led them to embrace homemaking and reject employment (Gerson 1985). As increasing numbers of women joined the “workforce” throughout the last century, the role of women and the nature of work and family has been under examination (Weeks, 1990). This resulted in broader notions of womanhood, family, and work, but left the idea of separate work/family

domains intact. Significantly, it was not until a substantial number of women had joined and became a permanent part of the workforce that the notion of work-family conflict began to appear in the HRM research literature. The domains are represented within the early HRM discourse on work family, as incompatible. Choices were required — employees (women) could not expect to simultaneously achieve success in both domains and were therefore required to sacrifice family goals (by forgoing having a family altogether or by limiting family size) or sacrifice work goals (by moving onto ‘the mommy track’ and achieving more limited career progression): *“I chose not to have children. Not because I never saw myself as a mother, but because I knew that it would involve sacrifice.”*⁶ Sacrifice of family was preferable to sacrifice of career. In academic discourse, women’s issues of commitment are raised both in regards to their presence at work and continuity after childbearing. Men’s level of commitment is not linked to these variables. Work is therefore prioritized over family, both in academic discourse and lived experience, but the need to choose remains gendered as men’s commitment to work is unquestioned and the forgoing of family as proof of commitment is only required of women.

Paralleling the movement of women into management and other career positions, many women are attempting to engage concurrently in both mother-work and market-work, attempting to ‘have it all’ and rallying against calls for compromise. Further, men have been increasingly embracing family roles (although women continue to satisfy the bulk of family needs). The women and men who shared their stories with me in the initiating layer of hermeneutic analysis, poignantly describe the struggle. They shared

⁶ Excerpts from anecdotes are italicized to give emphasis to their “voice.”

stories of the increasing invasiveness of work in the family domain, through direct intrusion as well as through the adoption of workplace priorities and discourse. They spoke to the devaluing of family and the climate of blame and the need to create facades limiting the presence of family in work settings — even if those settings are the family home. These stories reflect the privileging of work over family; masculinity over femininity, and speak to the ‘tolls’ demanded of those who engaged in both work and family roles. These stories reflect immutable gendered roles based in Cold War discourse.

Speeding Across the Toll Bridge

From Home to Work:

The HRM discourse reports that time commitment and continuity to work is lower for women than for men; hence, penalties regarding wage and opportunity are reasonable. Scarcity of resources, time and emotional, generates conflict when one attempts to satisfy both demanding roles. Women pay this toll, as it is assumed that family will necessarily distract them from work priorities: “*She wrote ‘committed to coming back?’ on the page.... I knew that I wouldn’t go anywhere in this company....*” The toll paid for decreased work commitment is exacerbated by an escalation in the time commitment required by work for at least some segments of the labour market.

Schor (1991) contends that time on the job, which declined steadily from the early days of the factory system until 1940, when 40 hours became the standard schedule, has risen in recent decades. Robinson and Godley (1997), in contrast, argue that leisure time, not working time, is increasing. Green (2001) argues that it is the dispersion of working

hours, with concentration of these hours into fewer households that has created the perception by many that work time demands are increasing. Jacobs and Gerson (1998; 2001) support this thesis and demonstrate that only those workers at the top of the labor market, such as managers and executives, have experienced an increase in work hours. Workers at the bottom of the labour market, struggle to maintain sufficient working hours. For those in between, there has been little increase or decrease in the number of hours worked. "Working time is increasingly bifurcated" (Jacobs and Gerson, 2001, p. 42).

The dominant discourse, as represented in mainstream HRM research presented in Chapter 4, has marshaled considerable empirical evidence in support of the position that the interaction of the domains of work and family generates conflict. As my analysis in this dissertation has revealed however, this research is premised on role expectations as defined within the dominant discourses, and is therefore ultimately reinforcing of the status quo. Inherent in this research discourse is the assumption that such conflict is the inevitable result of competition for the limited resource of the employee's time and commitment — a scarcity of resources (Chapter 5): "*[Daughter] had been begging and begging for me to take her skating.... But the timing never worked out.*" Time expended on role performance in one domain, it is argued, necessarily depletes time available for the demands of the other domain, hence the number of hours worked each week has a significant effect on reports of work-family conflict, particularly for mothers who continue to be responsible for family roles, even when engaged full time in market work. Although the HRM discourse *presents* as inherently gender neutral, it is primarily women who maintain responsibility for familial 'work' when engaged in market 'work'; the

designation 'employee' is a proxy for 'female employee', or more particularly, 'working mother'. This obscuring of the role of women and family reflects parents' experiences of the need to render the family invisible in the work site: "*I almost got caught—I tried to convince my boss that I was talking to a client rather than to my teenage daughter.*"

Unless, that is, such a display is strategic, which from the anecdotes is experienced or discussed more by males: "*he and others in the company were glad that I was settling down.*"

Although women are expected to maintain responsibility for the family domain, it is the work domain that is seen as of primary importance. The work-family HRM discourse is predicated on the assumption of the dominance of the work domain: the goal may be to achieve balance between work and family, but such balance must never be achieved at the expense of the employer's profitability. Consequently, the discussion in mainstream HRM literature is necessarily framed in terms of maintaining or increasing worker productivity and commitment, while accommodating the needs of and mitigating the negative consequences for family. Although such research may produce innovative reforms designed to increase workplace flexibility and mitigate the most obvious conflicts, it serves to reinforce the status quo regarding gender roles and prioritization as embedded in discourse. Parents experiences of work-family interface also reveal a privileging of work priorities: "*I missed my baby being born. But what could I do, it was tax season.*" Accommodations for family needs, even when legislated, are perceived as perks: "*I was thrilled that they were willing to accommodate my needs [related to pregnancy].*" Accommodations within the family domain for work goals, however, are accepted: "*I thought about forwarding the work line to my cell phone so that I could*

pretend to be at my desk wherever I am.” Work ‘accommodates’ family; family ‘understands’ work: *“My kids understand, that this is just what Daddy needs to do.”*

From Work to Home:

The relationship between hours worked and perception of work-family conflict also reflects women’s subject position within the dominant discourse of family and the stress inherent in violating the role of the ‘good mother’. A discourse of blame permeates discussion of accommodation strategies in the HRM research discourse, which is linked to the sense of personal responsibility assumed by parents for the negative outcomes and stresses: *“I take this on willingly”*. Although the employer may claim support for family priorities, any negative outcomes at work or home are blamed on the female employee. Although many studies have argued for comparable levels of work-family conflict across gender (others have different conclusions), the negative outcomes — absenteeism, turnover, diminished child learning outcomes — are principally, almost exclusively, examined as they relate to mothers employment patterns, not fathers. To maintain the myth of the ‘good mother’, the female must satisfy either her work commitment or her family commitment in fewer hours, or sacrifice sleep: *“I collapse into bed. I am exhausted. I am all things to all people and yet I feel like I am nothing.”* The theme of blame in HRM discourse is also reflected in the theme of individual responsibility identified in the anecdote analysis whereby women feel that the duty to accommodate is a favor, not a right, and an exception to policy for which they should be grateful: *“I really appreciate the flexibility”*; *“they were great to me and that made me even happier about the thought of coming back”*.

The discourse of work and family assumes, and therefore supports, the maintenance of the mother as the agent responsible for the family domain (see also Greenstein 1995; Leibowitz 1977), even as the priority must ultimately be the worksite. Family domain requirements are to be satisfied, by mothers, in the off hours, even if the long hours culture means that these nonworking hours are abbreviated.

The anecdotes reflect the hegemonic assumption of maternal responsibility for family domain. Although less involved in family, men who displayed atypical sex role behaviour by taking parental leave upon the birth of a child, did not report long term penalties for family commitment; rather it was perceived to be a short term 'distraction.' One father, for example, reported that his performance review following his child's birth read: "*Now that this distraction is over, we are confident that your performance will improve.*" Although there is support for penalties when either gender deviates from social norms, whether that deviation is perceived as an aberration or permanent change has not been examined in HRM research, nor has it been examined whether this is gender defined.

The imbalance of work and home hours created by the absorption of women into market work leads to significant speedups in homework and the commodification of family life. Within the long hours culture, with shrinking workforces and increasing time commitment, scarcity is discussed in the work-family HRM literature as it applies to the need to limit family demands. As parents are encouraged to use childcare options, the value placed on care is diminishing: [*when responding to the question 'what do you do?'*] "*Make sure that you come up with an answer different than 'mom'.*" One parent, discussing the new emergency childcare offering in her firm's family-friendly resource

bundle, spoke of her reluctance to leave an ill child with a stranger: *"But I really think that when my son is sick, that he needs me, not some stranger."*

Although the concept of speedups is widely understood in relation to paid employment, it is seldom applied to the family domain. On the contrary, the introduction of labour saving devices into home work and professionalized childcare into motherwork is generally applauded in mainstream discourse as liberating women from the more tedious aspects of housework, thus freeing them to seek more rewarding market employment or leisure activities (Horowitz, 1998). Indeed, even the parenting function has become subject to commodification and deskilling.

Increasingly, two career couples have to place very young children in daycare or risk career penalties. As childrearing is commodified, it is also deskilled and devalued: a few trained teachers develop curriculum and direct a host of cheaper assistants. Childcare is difficult to professionalize because competition from dayhomes (stay at home moms who add one to four other children to their own child-rearing responsibilities) keeps wages low, and because it remains work 'any mother could do'. Female gender is the necessary and sufficient qualification for childcare. What this appears to have done is to undermine the credibility of 'family work', suggesting that women should, in fact, have little or no reason to complain of a 'double burden', particularly when the employer provides benefits to lessen the burden: *"I know that I shouldn't complain"*.

Housework used to be a more highly skilled, and therefore more valued, role. Baking a cake from scratch in a wood or coal stove, for example, was not only labour intensive, but also a highly demanding technical and artistic achievement. In contrast,

today's prepackaged cake mix or microwave-ready pizza renders most cooking completely deskilled. Indeed, marketers recognized early on the need to preserve the *illusion* of skill by requiring the addition of the egg or milk to the cake mix, not because such ingredients were needed or difficult to prepackage, but because housewives needed to feel as if they were still involved in the process. In reality, there is a significant difference between cooking food and heating prepackaged meals, but for most families today, meal preparation is about opening packages. Few cook from scratch any more, except as a hobby activity. The trend towards prepackaged meals has now advanced so far that most grocery chains label their aisles by meal ('breakfast', 'lunch', 'dinner') rather than by foodstuff ('vegetables', 'jams', 'baking'), and one has to actively hunt to locate individual ingredients with which one could actually cook. As speedups in the family sphere force consumers to cut corners to achieve their minimum daily goals, formerly valued tasks like cooking become so severely deskilled that they lose their value. This devaluation of woman's work is, then, a direct consequence of the corporate intrusion in the domestic sphere, the substitution of women's labour by corporate products. The family system has metamorphosed from being a unit of production to being a unit of consumption.

If anyone can care for a sick child, cook gourmet meals (from a prepared package) then the role of homemaker is assumed to no longer be a significant source of self-esteem or influence. Parents, who had adopted family domain responsibilities as their primary orientation, related how others came to see them as diminished: "*I tracked the time it took for someone to make their excuses and run if I said that I was a stay at home mom in contrast to the response if I used my previous vocation of social worker*"; "*The*

professional/interesting me was invisible to these people. I was just a mom....” This devaluing of care within worksites (and general society) was also reflected in parents’ stories of how they championed their parent role. Anecdotes from individuals, who self identified as fathers, reflected a privileging of work, even as they supported their role of father. Stay-at-home fathers spoke of the managerial skills they employed in their roles and adopted work discourse in their anecdotes: *“I tell my kids that I’m not just their dad, I am their boss”*; *“I learned time management, organizational strategies. I was the family CEO.”* Whether the absorption of work discourse into the family discourse results in a valuing of family roles, or just renders their uniqueness invisible, is not addressed in the literature. If, as Deborah Tannen (1995) suggests, women and men have different ways of communicating, with unique sets of jargons and meanings, does the use of masculine work terms within the work domain act to move women from a position of ‘other’ to one of ‘invisibility?’

Despite the attempt to lend credibility to the family domain, by using work domain discourse, the privileging of work is clearly evident in the HRM research and in the lived experience of those who shared their stories. The conclusion of diminished identity and worth, however, is only valid if one accepts the discourse that privileges work over family. Whereas the conflict discourse views the introduction of labour saving devices as freeing women from unpaid labour in a devalued role to enter more prestigious market employment, it is equally reasonable to view the process in reverse: Women’s homework was devalued as they were drawn into market employment and forced to accept speedups in the family sphere to cope with their dramatically increased workloads, which in turn led to increasingly high levels of commodification and deskilling.

The movement into paid employment thus serves the capitalist project in two fundamental ways. First, it significantly lowers wages by creating a reserve army of un(der)employed who are willing to accept lower pay — because they are the home's second earners, or because any wage appears as an advance over their previously unpaid labour. Second, the inevitable speedups in homework — that result from the newly created work-family imbalance when both partners are employed outside the home — create the conditions that allow global capital to insert itself into the domestic sphere. This commodification of family life has resulted in a fundamental shift in the structuring of family interaction, which has become dominated by consumerism. Rather than entertaining each other, family members instead consume the numerous products of the entertainment industries forging bonds between family members, which are no longer shaped by working together but rather in sharing each other's leisure or consumptive pursuits (e.g., the parents in the stands at Little League competitions; family summer vacations and trips to the mall): *"We do get our family time. Like on Saturday, I went to her swimming lesson and watched."*

The prioritization of work over family and the scarcity model of the HRM discourse are thus clearly reflected in lived experience. There is an increasing necessity to organize future time, to plan ahead and prioritize future activity. This entails arranging for the purchase of services and scheduling to maximize utility of the limited time left available after work time commitments are satisfied: *"My school gives all the children agendas.... I think that this is an important lesson"* and the need to ensure that work needs are satisfied. This also, I would argue, creates the potential for employees to accept the need for escalation of work time commitment and a willingness to accept that the

structuring of boundless work tasks is the employees' responsibility. An expectation of, "time management" places work structure responsibilities on employees. The employee (mother) is culpable if unable to "manage conflict" between work and family. And, the employers' needs must take priority. This struggle to maintain work and family roles is referred to, in popular press and HRM research, as "balance."

Emergent Discourses or Same Old Story?

Emergent discourses have the potential to contest the hegemonic position of the dominant discourse (Weedon, 1987). Two emergent discourses in HRM academic research are "work-family balance" and "work-life balance." No longer describing the interface between the domains as predicated on "conflict", this stream of research describes the efforts to negotiate between work and home commitments as seeking "balance". In the second discourse, "life" supplants "family" allowing, potentially, for broader notions of nonwork commitments and priorities. I label these two discourses as emergent discourses because they are relatively new in HRM research, emerging in the past decade, and because articles using these descriptors have yet to achieve significant presence in the body of published HRM research on work-family. Although I broadened the search terms in Chapter 6's citation analysis to include the terms "work-family balance" and "work-life," only one of the most frequently cited articles used either of these descriptors, Lobel (1991). As discussed in Chapter 6, Lobel (1991) although highly cited was cited in ways that supported role conflict perspectives. I will review the presence and utility of these emergent discourses to assess their potential for challenging the hegemony of the dominant discourse predicated on conflict. As will be revealed, these emergent discourses

do not live up to this potential. The discourses of “work-family balance” (also referred to as “balance”) and “work-life balance” (also referred to as “work-life”) continue to give primacy to the work domain and do not address the hegemonic positioning of family time as discretionary, feminine, and open to occupation (pun intended).

Work-Family Balance

The term “balance” is applied in nonacademic writing to describe the attempts of men and women to respond to the demands of multi-roles, particularly those of work and family. This is comparable to William & Alligner’s (1994) reference to “juggling.” The popular press is replete with guidance on “having it all” by maintaining a (male) mode of efficiency and rational decision making.

The term “balance” is also increasingly being used in HRM research to describe more positive models of role integration. I searched ABI Inform/Proquest for articles with citations or abstracts featuring the term “work-family balance.” Ten of the twenty-eight articles in ABI Inform/Proquest using the term in their citation or abstract were published in the last two years alone. Within this stream of research there is some debate over the definition of balance with primarily sociological texts being cited, e.g. Barnett (1998) and Hill, Ferris & Weitzman (2001). Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999) in attempting to define the term, refer to balance as the ability to be equally involved and equally satisfied in work and family domain responsibilities. Balance is the absence of conflict. Barnett (1998) defines work-family balance as the lived experience of combining work and family and the resulting multiple dimensions of compatibility and conflict. Work-family

balance has also been defined as “the degree to which an individual is able to simultaneously balance the temporal, emotional, and behavioral demands of both paid work and family responsibilities” (Hill et al., 2001, p. 49). That the women and men who participated in my study described this “balancing act” in exclusively negative raises the possibility that of these “multiple dimensions” one dimension dominates experience—conflict. The participants in my study did not experience the balanced state described by Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999). They experienced work-family balance as inherently unattainable and the source of either/both humour and stress.

The parents' lived experience of conflict as the “real world” outcome of attempts to “balance” work and family is also reflected in the research that, while using the term “balance” as a key word, search descriptor or abstract term, proceed to describe their study explicitly within the framework of conflict. Clancy and Tata (2005), for example, use the term of “balance” in the title of their article, but the text starts off with a definition of work family conflict predicated exclusively on role conflict. Balance is addressed in the paper, but is used to refer exclusively to deleterious outcomes. “When asked how they balance work and family, working mothers often say that they tend to sacrifice their own personal time or time with their mate” (Clancy & Tata, 2005, p. 240).

Aryee, Srinivas, and Tan, (2005) state that a “*balanced life* conceives of work and family as mutually reinforcing with family experiences as part of what workers bring to enrich their contributions to work and organizations and vice versa” (p. 132 emphasis in the original.) Work is elemental to the equation. Life is balanced between work and family roles, leaving little room for other priorities or goals.

I contend that rather than creating a reconceptualization of the work-family interface, this emergent discourse, as it appears in HRM literature, entails a recasting of the discourse of conflict in terms that, although more palatable, are nonetheless equally patriarchal.

The separation of work and family spheres and their gendering as male and female roles respectively had at least one redeeming characteristic: for all that it was devalued compared to market employment, the housewife's role ensured that at least half the couple's working hours were devoted to child care and family. With the increasing number of women entering the workforce in the post-war period, this balance was severely disrupted. With both adults taking paid employment, the hours available for family have been severely reduced. Even if women are still expected to maintain their traditional family duties, it is obvious that the elimination of the full time housework role shifts the work-family 'balance' from a 50/50 division within the couple, to 100% of normal working hours now going to market employment. Whether the homework is now shared by both genders or remains entirely the responsibility of the woman, it is obvious that this work is now addressed as 'overtime', and represents, therefore, a significant speed up in the couple's (predominantly, the woman's) overall working hours.

This emergent discourse of balance is also reflective of the agenda of feminists such as Freidan (1963) and Firestone (1970). Balance may be achieved through acceptance of a second shift or through the commodification of childcare. The agenda remains one of gaining admittance into the male bastion of work (necessarily privileging this admittance as desirable) and mitigating deleterious impact (particularly for work, but also for the children through preservation of 'quality time'). This positioning is not

disrupted in the balance discourse that could be more appropriately described as “having it all without compromising your job.” It is this hierarchical positioning that renders the concept of “balance” misleading. Framing an agenda of the oppression of the feminine in more palatable terms does not render it less destructive (Iriguay, 1985b).

As mentioned earlier, balance was often referenced in the parents’ anecdotes, but was exclusively used to describe unsuccessful or frustrating attempts to meet multiple roles: “*I’m balancing at the edge of a cliff and might fall off*”; “*Others might balance, I stumble*”. Calls for women, as the ones most likely to fulfill multiple roles, to “balance” work and family commitments within a context that has already shifted the scales so heavily in favor of the work domain is, I would argue, more than a little misleading.

The current work-family discourse thus seeks to balance commitments within a context that is already highly unbalanced in favour of the corporate sector, with the privileging of work over family needs. This imbalance is never recognized, however, because the current HRM discourse lacks the historical perspective offered by this dissertation. This omission is a key one, because the discourse continues to define as an appropriate level of commitment to the work domain the norms that emerged when gender roles had males as full time employees, and women full time in the home. The balance discourse fails to acknowledge that the home has already given up an additional 40 or more hours per week to the work domain. Total commitment to the workplace may be possible from a worker who has full time backup at home, but this norm has remained unchanged even though *both* roles are now dedicated to work. Yet any attempt to take time for family is seen as intrusion on work time by the employer, so women’s commitment is not trusted, because it fails to follow male norms that were only possible

because female took full responsibility for the domestic sphere. The current work-family discourse therefore clearly disadvantages women in the workplace.

Further, the mainstream discourse on work-family “balance” reinforces the very imbalance that it purports to address. For example, research assessing ‘family-friendly’ human resource policies discusses the issue’s importance for facilitating or easing the transition between the domains of work and home to minimize conflict and maximize the potential of the employee as a productive agent. Although some work-family initiatives, such as on-site childcare, may be seen to reinforce the integration of the domains of work and family, the nature of the interaction remains work-defined. Commitment to children must not diminish commitment to the employer, despite movement of the family into the work domain. The underlying assumption that these spheres must be separated has remained intact, moderated only to allow smoother movement between them.

That we could organize work and family in alternate ways is seldom raised in HRM research or by those who attempt to balance the multiple roles. The nuclear family (which emerged during the Cold War period as the dominant form, and so is nuclear in both senses of the word) is taken for granted, even as elder care and increasing cultural diversity are beginning to again change the “family” context for many employees (Aronson, 1992). Although alternate or emerging discourses are not the focus of this dissertation, I raise the example of the discourse of “balance” and “work-life” to caution readers away from the assumption that emergent discourses are necessarily “improvements” over the dominant discourse of conflict.

Work-Life Balance

The work-family discourse in HRM research is increasingly being recast as a discourse of “work-life.” A review of ABI Inform articles revealed over 500 papers using “work-life” in their citation or abstract, the vast majority in practitioner oriented journals. It could be argued that this is an emergent discourse that will allow for broader conceptions of nonwork priorities and definitions of family. It is my contention, however, that this emergent discourse 1) allows male entrance into the family domain without feminizing their placement therein, given that family is a highly feminized construct; and 2) to broaden the dimensions of the domain to include primarily masculine non-work commitments, to the detriment of commitments consistently perceived as feminine.

“Dissenting views questioning the value of familyfriendly policies and benefits have emerged in the business presses” since the 1990s (Rothausen, Gonzalez, Clarke & O'Dell, 1998, p. 686). Burke and Black (1997) define backlash as “any form of resistance men exhibit towards policies, programs and initiatives undertaken by organizations to promote the hiring and advancement of marginalized employees” (p. 934). This definition can also be extended to the provision of benefits other than in selection systems. These dissenting views have been termed a “familyfriendly backlash” (Jenner, 1994; Rothausen et al., 1998), where childless workers and older employees become resentful about family related benefits.

Kirkpatrick (1997) suggests that as companies establish flexible schedules, childcare or paid parental leave, childless workers are increasingly asking what equivalent benefits are available to them. Given the reluctance of men to access such

family friendly initiatives, “inequitable distribution” of benefit means “distribution that doesn’t benefit men.” “There have been many such attempts to reframe the issue of work/family as a gender neutral one, but in practice family-friendly policies tend to be regarded by employers and employees as largely policies for women (Lewis, 2001, p. 30). The backlash is directed against those who maintain commitment to the family domain — mothers — and to those who are perceived to be naturally allied with the family domain, all women.

In response to the perception of inequity, some organizations have begun referring to these benefits as “work/life” benefits. This is, in part, a reaction against perceived privileging of women in the “family-friendly” workplace. It reflects that the debate for men is not about women’s difference, but one of women’s inferiority. To accept a role in the feminine family domain is not acceptable to a male model that has historically assumed a position of absolute superiority. As will be discussed, recasting the family as “life” is more tenable to masculine agenda.

Further, as the discourses of work-family are predicated on male superiority and advantaging, attempts to grant females privileges from which males are effectively excluded are likely to be resisted. If the discourses of work-family were predicated on “difference”, then differential treatment would be seen as appropriate (especially if, as is the case, utilization of these programs resulted in diminished career opportunities—the mommy track). It is a discourse of superiority because he who is in the position of privilege cannot cope with benefit being afforded his lesser. Asking men to assume a position which is of less value in our society has not been particularly successful as evidenced by research supporting that males’ responsibilities in the family domain have

increased only so much as they do not compromise the primary role of worker (Goldscheider & Waite, 1991).

The discourse of “work-life” allows for a broadening of the nonwork dimension in this binary positioning of work and “other”—an employees “life” outside of work. Employees, whether male or female, have the opportunity to pursue leisure activities with facilitated support from the workplace. “Indeed, employees with few or no family responsibilities who can forgo commuting times to work at home, or who can use compressed schedules to gain periodic days off to pursue leisure time, might very well be the primary beneficiaries of such family-friendly policies” (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001, p. 39). Employees, who work within organizations with such systems, who attempt to access services for family related activities must compete for access with those employees desiring the benefits for access to non-family related activities. Recognizing the empirical support of the existence of a “second shift” by women because of family and elder care responsibilities, this position that “work-life benefits” dispel inequity is naïve. The broadening of the discourse does allow for a broadened definition of family equivalent commitments, but is a move that privileges males who wish to access programs such as flex-time, flex-place to facilitate access to avocational pursuits. Given a) that the majority of women have children, and b) that women are disproportionately to men responsible for childcare, and c) that even those women without children are disproportionately to men responsible for elder care (Aronson, 1992; Eaton, 2005; McGowan et al., 2000), exactly when are most women going to find time for golf? The discourse of “work-life” both trivializes and undermines the legitimate role expectations of those committed to the family and family equivalent domains.

Nonetheless, work-life benefits are portrayed as inclusive and equitable in the mainstream HRM discourse. Federico (1998), for example, conceptualizes work family benefits as “only the first of four distinct developmental stages of these benefits” (p. 19). The immature stage of benefit provision would see services offered to families. As a program “matures”, services are extended to those employees who did not previously benefit from the offerings. Expanding programs to allow men more leisure time is characterized as “evolution.”

This adoption of the male-standard of equality is reflective of Iriguary’s position that women’s attempts to formalize equality have led instead to a loss of the feminine through a movement into “sameness” as the remedy for “otherness.” I contend that “life,” as component in the work-life discourse, is also a male purview and that the movement from work-family to work-life serves to subsume the feminine in a masculine system, thus rendering the feminine invisible. Woman, says Irigaray, is “bound up in the cultural systems and property regimes that dominate the West” (Iriguary, 1985a, p. 110). “The modern individual family is founded on the open or concealed domestic slavery of the wife”; the husband “is the bourgeois and the wife represents the proletariat” (Engels qtd. in Iriguary, 1985, p. 121). Women are the creators of life, but they do not have the time to have one of their own. “Already, we face the dilemma of how the concept of ‘woman’ can even be thought. As things stand, ‘femininity’ is a role, an image, a value, imposed upon women by male systems of representation” (Iriguary, 1985b, p. 84). “Life,” in this context, is a masculine discourse, predicated on masculine needs and priorities. “The enigma that is woman will therefore constitute the target, the object, the stake of a masculine discourse, a debate among men” (Iriguary, 1985b:13).

If family is devalued in the discourse of work-family and the rewriting of the discourse as one of work-life, the inescapable demands of the work sphere are even more entrenched. It is the dimension of nonwork that is being rewritten, even if this rewriting is further privileging to the masculine. To question the current structure of the work sphere or to see the status quo as anything other than the inevitable end product of market forces — which are themselves elevated to the level of natural law — does not occur. It is seen as tantamount to questioning the basic tenants of capitalism. The worker needs to adjust to the role demands imposed by the work sphere because it is literally unthinkable that the work sphere should adjust to the worker.

Ironically, this insistence on the immutability of the current social relations of production echoes the economic determinism of the Marxist economics that Cold War America so thoroughly rejected. Suggesting that conflict between spheres need not be inevitable, or that the spheres may interpenetrate, still leaves the fundamental nature of those spheres unquestioned and the status quo safely intact. Only by breaking out of the hegemonic discourse which privileges the work sphere, the project of this dissertation, and beginning from the understanding that fundamental change to the way we construct work is both feasible and desirable, can women hope to begin to achieve real change.

The first stage in that rethinking is to peel away the first layer and to expose the debilitating effects of the work-family discourses on 'family life'. That is to say, efforts to improve 'family life' will be hindered, not helped, through engagement in a debate about balancing work-family commitments. However, the process of analysis undertaken in this dissertation also raises questions about the discourse of family and its role in the construction of different subjectivities. This is not an abstract question. Beneath the

discourse of 'family' are embodied persons engaged in meaningful relationships. Those relationships are defined in large part by discourses of work and family and the use-time we are all expected to devote to each. To the extent that we are able to disconnect 'work' from 'family' we may open the possibility of a genuine rethinking of what it is we want from sexual-emotional relationships and a related sense of self.

Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have argued that far from being distinctly separate spheres, the work domain has thoroughly intruded on, and compromised, the family domain. By arguing about the dominance of "work" over "family" I acknowledge that I am in danger of reifying and/or idealizing "family". On the other hand, if I were to question traditional notions of "family," I would be in danger of being accused of devaluing enduring human relationships. My argument is essentially this: The discourse of work-family conflict only works at the level of other layers of discourse (e.g., domesticity vs paid employment) that remain relatively unchallenged. By challenging the dominance of work in the work-family debate my intent is not to argue for a greater stress on "family," but to rethink what we care about and value, including the type of paid work in which we engage.

This dissertation exposed and questioned basic assumptions of the nature of work and family life. Conflict is an outcome of the interaction of the domains of work and family *as they exist* within the dominant discourses, which define the expected behaviours of employed parents. Several limitations to the work-family discourse have been raised that suggest the need for a shift in the dominant discourse — a redefinition of

the domains of work and family. Although recognizing that the spheres of work and family interact, the emphasis of the dominant discourse is placed on mitigating and managing the overlap, not on recognizing the conceptual divide between the spheres that does not reflect the reality of how most workers experience their lives. The penalties, or tolls, paid by employees — particularly women — reflect that the status quo is both limiting and destructive.

Future Research

Exposure of the hegemonic nature of the discourses of work-family that dominate HRM has opened space for a further study. Interwoven threads of research that I am currently following are based on my understanding of work-family that developed through this dissertation process. The following four studies are currently underway:

1. Colonization of the Private Sphere (Corporate Volunteerism): The adoption of a work discourse in the family domain has, I argued allowed for a colonization of the family domain by capitalist priorities. Work discourses and priorities script private (nonwork and family) decisions and behaviours. I recently received, with my colleague Dr. Debra Basil, a \$50,000 grant from Imagine Canada, to study corporate volunteerism in Canada. One component of corporate volunteerism that we are studying is the extent to which corporations are shaping employees' volunteer activities during nonwork hours. For example, if an employee is rewarded for volunteering during or outside of work hours, will this employee divert personal volunteer initiatives towards those activities more endorsed or sanctioned by the employer. This study, which we launched in June, 2005

involves focus groups, depth interviews, and two nation-wide surveys of employers and employees. In part, we hope to address the research question: Has the work domain colonized personal volunteer activities?

2. Just down the hall from each other. As discussed briefly in Chapter 6, HRM literature on work-family has drawn most extensively from psychological theories. The most frequently cited articles cite psychological theories, are published in psychological journals, and cite other articles published in psychological journals. My preliminary analysis, however, revealed a vast sociological literature, and a smaller but equally critical literature among economists, that is effectively ignored by the HRM researchers. Given that the functionalist paradigm, that has dominated much of the field of sociology to date, came to dominance during the cold war, I plan to conduct a citation analysis of the sociological work-family literature and compare and contrast it to the work-family literature that developed out of the psychology field. A preliminary analysis reveals that alternate and critical discourses, which include a questioning of gender roles, have achieved greater status in sociology literature (based on citation counts). Does Organizational Behaviour literature (which is multi-disciplinary, drawing on sociology, psychology, philosophy, economics (McShane, 2004)), draw more on sociology than does HRM? What theories dominant the sociology literature? What hegemonic “truths” shape this literature in contrast to psychology/HRM? Why, even though the departments might be

located “just down the hall” from each other, did these disciplines ask different questions or reach different conclusions.

3. Work-Life Balance--The Invisible Family. A line of research that I will pursue is the examination of emergent discourses of work and family and the continuity/discontinuity of the Cold War discourses therein. “Balance” is a term frequently employed in the popular press to describe the need to maintain multiple roles and identities. My review of the literature and citations of work-family literature revealed a present, but limited positioning of an alternate discourse of “balance” in the management literature. Further, as discussed, a discourse of work-life is achieving status alongside the dominant discourse of work-family conflict. Although referenced in this dissertation, they merit further analysis. Extending my analysis, I intend to assess how these discourses serve to open up new ways of conceiving the work-family interfaces or serve as reproductions of current discourse (in a more palatable form). Using Iriguary, I contend that the recasting of work-family as work-life has served to move the feminine priority of family from a position of other to a position of invisibility.
4. The Missing Parent. Extant work-family conflict literature draws upon samples of working women and men to examine the extent to which they experience conflict as they move between the work and family spheres. Many studies report no gender differences and limited conflict. Silenced in this literature, however, is the experience of women and men who have elected to remove themselves from the

work domain because the degree of conflict was untenable. Many families require full time market employment from both parents for economic reasons. Based on my collection of anecdotes, however, many women (and some men) have chosen to leave market-work in order to spend more time with family. These individuals were not explicitly included in any sample in any study I examined in Chapter 4, although some parents considering this choice may have been included. I am currently developing interview protocols, revising indexes, and seeking funding for survey research to examine the extent to which work-family conflict is experienced by stay-at-home parents.

Contribution

To work-family literature.

Mainstream HRM Research:

That work-family interaction generates conflict has been documented in the extant literature; positive outcomes have been largely ignored by researchers. In this dissertation, I have proposed that this nearly exclusive focus on conflict outcomes is the result of societal norms that were influential in the foundational research agenda of the emerging field of human resources in the cold war period. My exposure of the conflict thesis as a historical artifact rather than a fundamental reflection of lived experience creates the potential for a reexamination of the dominance of role conflict theory as foundational to work-family research.

An emergent stream of research in HRM focuses on positive role interaction and explores balance and integration as possible outcomes and goals. Although seeming to redress the norms inherent in the conflict thesis, I would suggest that focusing on the positive aspects of role interaction, without benefit of a prior dismantling of hegemonic assumptions regarding the roles themselves, offers little in terms of changing the status quo. As revealed by the analysis in the early chapters of this dissertation, work-family interaction is stressful. This reality should not be dismissed, even as we finally recognize the positive aspects of role interaction, the potential for individual satisfaction, and the joys of the act of successfully juggling multiple roles.

The “balance” and “integration” theorists’ emphasis on the individual’s ability to maneuver between the domains absolves organizations and the greater society from responsibility for the structural norms that create conflict. By exposing and focusing on the structural foundation of the conflict thesis -- the prioritization of work and masculinity over family and femininity, reflective of cold war gender norms -- my dissertation reveals the limitations of these emerging streams of research. I accept the tenet of the balance and integration researchers that a more positive orientation to role interaction is necessary. I believe, however, that we are not yet ready. The patriarchal influences of the cold war still echo in this new research stream. The foundation of the research is necessarily faulty. If the aim is to better reflect and support women and men who live and work within both domains, a new foundation needs to be built before this emergent and often critical agenda can be effectively pursued. It is only when we recognize, first, that there is a problem (conflict), and then identify that the problem is structural rather than the result of individual women's success or failure at finding

balance/integration, that we will be able to contemplate restructuring work, family, or the research agenda of HRM.

Feminist Research:

As discussed earlier in this chapter, feminist perspectives on the work-family research agenda in HRM have been limited. The liberal feminist agenda, for example, has made significant contributions in terms of highlighting the barriers to women's career positioning, and by attending to individualistic accounts of coping within existing structures. The feminist agenda, however, has had only peripheral and/or limited influence in HRM literature, as evidenced in the citation study in Chapter 6. This dissertation, one of very few feminist poststructural analyses of work-family (Calas & Smircich, 2006), is thus a significant contribution to feminist research on work-family interaction. A thoroughgoing dismantling of the truth claims of the mainstream HRM discourse of work-family has not previously been undertaken. These truth claims, while inherently challenged by feminist research, have not previously been exposed as historical relics of the patriarchy embedded in discourse.

Historical Research:

My dissertation traces the ancestry of work-family HRM research to the cold war era and reveals the influence of cold war gendered discourse in this research stream. The potential for a challenge to this agenda is offered through an examination of the wartime labour experiences of women whereby women entered into market work in significant numbers due to wartime male labour shortages. The movement of women into offices and

factories in this period is often portrayed as having been a significant opportunity for women in work. My dissertation reveals, however, that the acceptance of women in the realm of work was entirely illusory. Women's "workplace" presence was seen as a temporary measure consistent with feminine norms of woman as helpmate to the male, as men did the "real work" of war. The discourse of "work" did not shift to allow for the presence of women; rather, the discourse of "home" expanded to include the "home(front)". Providing an explanation as to why women's supposed advancements into work were not maintained in the post-war period thereby makes a significant contribution to historical management theory.

For organizations:

We have seen, particularly in recent years, an increased emphasis on social responsibility within the corporate sector. This growing concern with social responsibility is a response by businesses to consumer pressure, the need to provide quality service and to attract quality employees, and changing social values whereby the corporate sector is being held increasingly responsible for the wellbeing of society. Indeed, there is increasing evidence that shows that a positive relationship between corporate social performance and corporate financial performance (c.f. Roman, Hayibor & Agle, 1999).

Many organizations have adopted a reactive/defensive position to this movement by the development of ethical codes and formulaic policies that serve to protect the organization from its employees' actions (Betsy, 1996), or that clearly define and limit the responsibility of an employer to respond to, for example, work-family issues. As evidenced by Perlow (1998) even efforts to provide services to employees that are

reflective of current family-employment structures tend to fail, in part because organizational culture remains fixated on established norms, such as prioritizing facetime as a measure of performance. The linkage between work-family and historically rooted cold war gender norms has not previously been studied.

This dissertation therefore highlights one reason why work-family initiatives have been largely unsuccessful in reducing the experience of work-family conflict. The prioritization of work over family in HRM research reflects the entrenchment of patriarchal norms of the post WWII consumerist boom. Organizational responses to work family conflict, even when they superficially present as reflecting changing gender roles, have remained unsuccessful because they remain rooted in norms of social responsibility that assume that business contributes to the social wellbeing merely through the self-interested production of goods, services, and profit. (Weedon, 2000).

Increasingly, however, this modernist approach has been giving way to a more proactive, progressive approach guided by a focus on collective responsibility and virtue (Arjoon, 2000; Marchese, Bassham & Ryan, 2002; Weedon, 2000). In this view, the ultimate purpose of business is “to serve society’s demands and the common good and [to] be rewarded for doing so” (Solomon 1992, p. 110). Organizations, for example, are accepting a greater responsibility for environmental concerns, social welfare and the impact of globalization on developing nations. Even within this progressive movement, however, the issue of work-family conflict is overlooked and the value of care at the employee/family level has been subverted to the value of work as profit maximization, even when this profit is diverted to social causes.

Work-family issues have been examined within HRM literature as “problems” that need to be remedied at the individual or organizational levels because of their implication for personal or organizational wellbeing. They have not been extensively examined within terms of organizational social responsibility (for an exception see Marchese, Bassham & Ryan, 2002 who relate work-family to virtue theory) . Although this dissertation does not directly examine social responsibility movement or related literature, it contributes to this discussion by revealing the extent to which patriarchal norms have been embedded in discourse; this dissertation thus provides a reference point for those organizations and researchers who wish to foster organizational responsibility for the common good. This dissertation is therefore a call to action for the examination of the core assumptions of organizational practice and how these assumptions impact a key stakeholder group -- employees and their families. To be truly socially responsible, I would argue, businesses (and the academics who support business endeavors) must come to accept what the women and men who experience stress as a result of maintaining their focus on family needs whilst engaged in market work already know: work should not matter more than family.

For individuals

Individuals are often the unit of analysis in empirical research on work-family. As discussed, the individual is often seen as the site of conflict as well as the source of remedy for negative outcomes on both the personal and organizational levels. As revealed in Chapter 5, researchers often obviate the presence of women in the work-family interface. As the persons most responsible for the family domain, however, the demands

placed on women who engage in market work are significant. The personal accounts of women (Chapter 3) that workplace needs are to be prioritized is also reflected in a research agenda (Chapter 5) that focuses on preservation of organizational interests even as it portrays an interest in family priorities. For women and men who attempt to satisfy both work and family domain priorities, the expectation that work should be prioritized over family has become sufficiently hegemonic that it is unquestioned.

Weedon (1997) argues that when a discourse becomes hegemonic, it becomes as real to those engaged in the discourse as lived experience. In essence, it *becomes* lived experience. As revealed in the anecdotes (Chapter 3), workers struggle to support their organizations' needs and feel guilt if they withdraw their support of this agenda even temporarily. "(I)nstitutions discipline the body, mind and emotions, constituting them according to the needs of hierarchical forms of power" (Weedon, 1997, p117). The exercise of power is largely invisible: "...silence and secrecy are a shelter for power, anchoring it" (Weedon, 1997, 117).

Just as Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* allowed a generation of women to reinterpret the implications of gender roles in the 1960s, this dissertation is my first step towards allowing a generation of women and men, 40 years on, to recognize their experience of work-family conflict as legitimate. Whereas the dominant discourse attempts to legitimate the status quo and to individualize difficulties as a result of personal inadequacies and failings (particularly of mothers), this dissertation demonstrates that parents share legitimate concerns over the continuing encroachment and colonization of the family sphere by the work sphere.

Resistance to the dominant discourse of work-family is evident in the individuals' accounts shared through anecdote in Chapter 3. My first reading of the anecdotes highlighted the degree of conflict experienced by women and men -- the daily struggle to meet the often disparate demands of work and family. Also embedded in these stories, however, are the strategies employed to mitigate the negative outcome or experience of this conflict -- themes of resistance and compliance. That the effort to satisfy work and family priorities is stressful cannot be questioned; however, extant approaches to the examination of this stress at the domain interface has focused almost exclusively upon the need to eliminate or mitigate this stress, whether it be through personal coping mechanisms or organizational restructuring. This focus is reflective of the conflict model rooted in cold war gender normed priorities. This dissertation undermines this basic precept of the field and thereby creates the potential for an examination of these core assumptions. Work-family role conflict need not be seen as a stressor that should be removed. The stress of work-family role conflict is evident of battle fatigue. We do not need to eliminate work-family conflict by helping women, men and organizations to "cope" better. We need to levy our resources to rethink the prioritization of work in our society at the expense of family and give support to individuals.

Reflection on a journey

And since you know you cannot see yourself,
so well as by reflection, I, your glass,
will modestly discover to yourself,
that of yourself which you yet know not of.

(Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, Act1, Sc2)

My sense of self is an important element of this study; it was my own questioning of work-family within the context of my own experience that was the catalyst for its inception. In editing this dissertation, I recently re-read the introduction written over a year ago. Reflecting my findings that work-family is an enduring and largely immutable discourse, my life situation has not changed significantly. I am still happily married, despite the statistics on divorce among PhD candidates. I am still incredibly busy dealing with student demands, which despite end of term, never seem to wane. It is still two o'clock in the morning, even though time has indeed passed, and as I write this chapter, my baby — now a toddler — lies sleeping beside me, snoring slightly through her congested nose (could it be the same cold from a year ago?). My older daughter, now seven, has just asked if she can cuddle with me when I finally do go to bed, which in her precocious way, she reminds me that I should have hours ago. My life has not changed much. The research on work-family has not changed much. Parents continue to struggle. I continue to struggle.

What has changed, however, is that I now have an answer for those who, like me, wonder why we — despite all the attention given to given to work-family issues — find the dealing with work and family responsibilities so difficult. I note that in all the academic articles that I read, not one mentioned the most animating aspect of parenthood — that we love our children and want to be with them. I discovered that the discourses of work-family in HRM academic text seek to “manage” work family interaction to *protect the worksite*, a goal that runs contrary to the drive in all parents to *protect their children*. In this context, conflict is indeed, inevitable. Work-family discourses have not addressed

our daily struggles because we persist in valuing family, even as the priorities and privileging of the work domain make this increasingly difficult. Why do we continue to struggle? Because academia and HRM practice have been intent on fixing the problem by diminishing the family, and we — collectively; consciously or unconsciously — refuse to concede the battle. We *resist*. Mainstream academic HRM discourse presents work-family conflict as a problem that individuals and organizations need to eliminate. Work-family conflict should not just be viewed as a “problem”--- work-family conflict can also be viewed as an act of resistance.

Our experiences are the mirror image of those of cold war women. The feminine mystique exposed the struggle of women who felt trapped in suburbia and chastised for wanting more. The mirror image shows women who feel trapped in workplaces, having ‘it all’ and chastised for wanting less. We look in the mirror and see a fractured reflection. In this dissertation, I have exposed that it is not the views and experiences of the women (or men) which are distorted, but rather the mirror — the lens through which our experiences are defined — the discourses of work-family. The mirror of discourse has not been replaced since it was designed over 40 years ago. It is time that it was shattered.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Halim, A. A. (1981). Effects of role stress job design-technology interaction on employee work satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(2), 260-273.
- Acock, A. C., & Demo, D. H. (1994). *Family diversity and well-being*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Adams, G. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 411-420.
- Addams, Jane. 1914. "Women and Public Housekeeping", In *Women and Public Life*. Ed. James P. Lichtenberger, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, v. 56.
- Albelda, R. (1995). The impact of feminism in economics—beyond the Pale? A Discussion and survey results. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 26, 253-273.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278-308.
- Allport, G. (1955). *Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (1996). Critical Theory and Postmodernism Approaches to Organizational Studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 191-217). London: Sage.
- Anderson, A. G., Mandeville, M. J., & Anderson, J. M. (1942). *Industrial Management* (Revised edition ed.). New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Anderson, B. S., & Zinsser, J. P. (1988). *A History of Their Own. Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Anderson, D. J., Binder, M., & Krause, K. (2003). The Motherhood Wage Penalty Revisited: Experience, Heterogeneity, Work Effort, and Work Schedule Flexibility. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 56(2), 273-294.
- Anderson, E., & Leslie, L. (1991). Coping with employment and family stress: Employment arrangement and gender differences. *Sex Roles*, 24, 223-237.

- Archer, J., & Lloyd, B. (1985). *Sex and gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arjoon, S.: 2000, 'Virtue Theory as a Dynamic Theory of Business', *Journal of Business Ethics* 28, 159-178.
- Aronson, J. (1992). Women's Sense of Responsibility for the Care of Old People: "But Who Else is Going to Do It?" *Gender and Society*, 6(1), 8-29.
- Aryee, S. (1993a). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations*, 45(8).
- Aryee, S. (1993b). Dual-earner couples in Singapore: an examination of work and non-work sources of their experienced burn-out. *Human Relations*, 46(12), 1441-1468.
- Aryee, S., & Luk, V. (1996). Balancing two major parts of adult life experience: Work and family identity among dual-earner couples. *Human Relations*, 49, 465-488.
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., & Stone, R. (1998). Family-responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents. *Human Relations*, 51(1), 73-87.
- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of Life: Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Balance in Employed Parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-35.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). Patterned chaos in human resource management. *Sloan Management Review*, 34(2), 77-83.
- Balderston, C. C., Karabasz, V. S., & Brecht, R. P. (1935). *Management of an Enterprise*. New-York: Prentice-Hall, inc.
- Barling, J., & MacIntyre, A. T. (1993). Dally work role stressors, mood and emotional exhaustion. *Work & Stress*, 7, 315-325.
- Barling, J., & Rosenbaum, A. (1986). Work stressors and wife abuse. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 348-351.
- Barnett, R. C. (1997). How Paradigms Shape the Stories We Tell: Paradigm Shifts in Gender and Health. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(2), 351-368.
- Barnett, R. C. (1998). Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature. In *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs* (pp. 124, 125-182).

- Baughman, R., DiNardi, D., & Holtz-Eakin, D. (2003). Productivity and wage effects of "family-friendly" fringe benefits. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(3), 247-260.
- Baum, C. L. (2003). Does Early Maternal Employment Harm Child Development? An Analysis of the Benefits of Leave Taking. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21(2), 490-448.
- Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beaujot, R. (1997). Parental preferences for work and childcare. *Canadian Public Policy*, 23, 275-288.
- Becker, G. (1985). Human capital, effort and the sexual division of labor. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3, 33-38.
- Bell, D. (Ed.). (1955). *The New American Right* New York: Criterion Books.
- Belsky, J. (1986). Transition to parenthood. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, 20, 56-59.
- Belsky, J. (1988). The Effects' of Infant Day Care Reconsidered. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 3, 235-272.
- Belsky, J., & Eggebeen, D. (1991). Early and extensive maternal employment/child care and 4-6 year olds socioemotional development: Children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 1083-1099.
- Belsky, J., & Rovine, M. (1988). Nonmaternal care in the first year of life and the security of infant-parent attachment. *Child Development*, 59, 157-167.
- Bernard, J. (1981). The good provider role: Its rise and fall. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1-12.
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Betsy, S.: 1996, 'Using The Competing Values Framework to Assess Corporate Ethical Codes', *Journal of Business Communication* 33(1), 71-84.
- Beutell, N. J., & O'Hare, M. M. (1987). Work-nonwork conflict among MBA's: Sex differences in role stressors and life satisfaction. *Work and Stress*, 1, 35-41.
- Bianchi, S. (2000). Maternal employment and time with children: dramatic change or surprising continuity. *Demography*, 37(4), 401-414.

- Biddle, B. J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bielby, D., & Biebl, W. (1988). *Women's and men's commitment to paid work and family* (Vol. 3). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bird, C. E. (1997). Gender differences in the social and economic burdens of parenting and psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 59, 809-824.
- Blackburn, M. L., Bloom, D. E., & Newmark, D. (1993). Fertility, timing, wages and human capital. *Journal of Population Economics*, 6, 1-30.
- Blair, S. L. (1993). Employment, family, and perceptions of marital quality among husbands and wives. *Journal of Family Issues*, 14, 189-212.
- Blau, F. D., & Grossberg, A. J. (1992). Maternal labor supply and children's cognitive development. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, 474-481.
- Blood, R. O. J., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., White, L., & Edwards, J. N. (1984). Women, outside employment, and marital instability. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 567-583.
- Bowles, J., & Kington, R. S. (1998). The impact of family function on health of African American elderly. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 29, 337-347.
- Boyanowski, E. I., & Allen, V. L. (1973). Ingroup norms and self-identity as determinants of discriminatory behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 408-418.
- Boyar, S. L., Jr., C. P. M., Pearson, A. W., & Keough, S. (2003). Work-family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(2), 175-190.
- Boyar, S. L., Maertz Jr., C. P., Pearson, A. W., & Keough, S. (2003). Work-family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(2), 175-190.
- Bradshaw, P. (1996). Women as Constituent Directors: Re-reading Current Texts Using a Feminist-Postmodernist Approach. In D.M. Boje, R. P. Gephart, Jr., & T. J. Thatchenkery (Eds.), *Postmodern management and organization theory*: 95-125. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brandt, G. C. (1981). 'Weaving It Together': Life Cycle and the Industrial Experience of Female Cotton Weavers in Quebec, 1910-1950. *Labour/Le Travail*, 7, 113-125.
- Brown, Helen. (1992). *Women Organising*. London: Routledge
- Brown, M. (1999). *Race, Money and the American Welfare State*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bryant, W. K., & Zick, C. D. (1996). An examination of parent-child shared time. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 227-337.
- Burke RJ. (2001). Managerial women's career experiences, satisfaction and well-being: A five country study. *Cross Cultural Management*, 8, 117-133.
- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1991). An identity theory approach to commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 239-251.
- Burke, R. J., & Bradshaw, P. (1981). Occupational and life stress and the family. *Small Group Behavior*, 12, 329-375.
- Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1995). A longitudinal study of psychological burnout in teachers. *Human Relations*, 48, 187.
- Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. R. (1999). Work-family conflict, spouse support, and nursing staff well-being during organizational restructuring. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 327-336.
- Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & Duwors, R. E. (1979). Type A behavior of administrators and wives' reports of marital satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 57-65.
- Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & DuWors, R. E. (1980). Perceived type A behavior of husbands' and wives' satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1, 139-150.
- Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & Duwors, R. E. (1980). Work demands on administrators and spouse well-being. *Human Relations*, 33, 253-278.
- Burn, S. M. (1996). *The social psychology of gender*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Burr, W. (1973). *The theory construction and the sociology of the family*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. Aldershot: Gower.

- Butler, A. B., & Skattebo, A. (2004). What is acceptable for women may not be for men: The effect of family conflicts with work on job-performance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(Part 4), 553-565.
- Calás, M. and Smircich, L. (1991), "Voicing seduction to silence leadership", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 567-602.
- Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1997), "From 'the woman`s' point of view, feminist approaches to organization studies", in Clegg S., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage, London, pp. 218-57.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1992). *Rewriting Gender in Organizational Theorizing*.
- Calas, M., & Smircich, L. (1996). The Woman's Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Studies* (pp. 218-257). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Calas, M.B., Smircich, L. (forthcoming, 2006), "From the women's point of view ten years later: feminist approaches to organization studies", in Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C., Nord, W.R. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage, London. (page numbers reflect pages in draft document and will not correspond to published work).
- Caliguri, P. M., Hyland, M. M., Joshi, A., & Bross, A. S. (1998). Testing a theoretical model for examining the relationship between family adjustment and expatriates' work adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 598-614.
- Cames, I., Vinnicombe, S., & Singh, V. (2001). Profiles of 'Successful Managers' held by Male and Female Banking Managers across Europe. *Women in Management Review*, 16(3), 108-117.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., J.R.P., F. J., Van Harrison, R., & S.R., P. J. (1980). *Job demands and worker health main effects and occupational differences*. Ann Harbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research.
- Capshew, J. H., & Laszlo, A. C. (1986). "We would not take no for an answer": Women Psychologists and Gender Politics During WWII. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(1), 157-180.
- Carbonell, J. L. (1984). Sex roles and leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 44-49.
- Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, 25, 513-540.

- Carney, C., & Kahn, K. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A Self-Regulatory developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12(2), 111-119.
- Carnicer, M, Perez, M., Sanchez, A., Jimenez, M., (2003). Human resources mobility management: A study of job related and non-related factors. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*. Vol.3, Iss. 4; pg. 308
- Chodorow, Nancy (1978). *The reproduction of mothering : Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Gilligan has focused on differences in women's moral development
- Chow, E. N., & Berheide, C. W. (1988). The interdependence of family and work: A framework for family life education, policy, and practice. *Family Relations*, 37, 23-28.
- Christie, N. (2002). By necessity or by right: the language and experience. *Labour/Le Travail*, 34, 117.
- Clancy, M., & Tata, J. (2005). A Global Perspective on Balancing Work and Family. *International Journal of Management*, 22(2), 234-242.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Cobble, D. S. (1994). Recapturing working class feminism: union women in post-war America. In J. Meyerowitz (Ed.), *Not June Cleaver: women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 310-357.
- Collinson, D. (1994). Strategic resistance – power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In J. Jermier (Ed.), *Resistance and Power in Organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2000). *Narrative Enquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooke, B., Mills, A. J., & Kelley, E. S. (2005 (in press)). Situating Maslow in Cold War America: A Recontextualization of Management Theory. In *Group and Organization Management*.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984). Stress and strain from family roles and work-role expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 252–260.
- Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap*. New York: Basic.

- Crampton, S., & Mishra, J. (1999). Women in management. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(1), 87-106.
- Cross, G. (1993). *Time and Money: The Making of Consumer Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations*, 37, 425-442.
- Cuordileone, K. A. (2000). Politics in an Age of Anxiety: Cold War Political Culture and the Crisis of American Masculinity. *Journal of American History*, 87(2), 515-545. www.historycooperative.org/darius.uleth.ca:80/journals/jah/87.2/cuordileone.html >.
- David, D., & Brannon, R. (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Davidson, M. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1984). She needs a wife: Problems of women managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 5(3), 3-30.
- Davis, R. C. (1940). *Industrial organization and management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Deaux, K. (1993). Reconstructing social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 4-12.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition* (P. Patton, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dempsey, L. (1943). What they found out about us. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *A Women's Place: seventy years in the lives of Canadian women from the pages of Chatelaine Magazine* (pp. 178-180). Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Derry, R. (1997) Ethics of care in Patricia H. Werhane & R. Edward Freeman (eds.) *Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Business Ethics*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.: 254-257.
- Desai, S., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Michael, R. T. (1989). Mother or market? Effects of maternal employment on the intellectual ability of four-year-old children. *Demography*, 26, 545-561.
- Di Stefano, C. (1990). Dilemmas of Difference: Feminism, Modernity, and Postmodernism. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 63-82). New York and London: Routledge.
- Dinnerstein, D. (1976) *The Rocking of the Cradle and the Ruling of the World*, London: Souvenir Press

- Dollard, J. (1935). *Criteria for the life history*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 60-73.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 449-466.
- E.J., H., M., F., & V., M. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(2), 220-241.
- Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., & Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Interrole conflicts and the permeability of work and family domains: Are there gender differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 168-184.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., & Douthitt, S. S. (1999). The role of nonperformance factors on job-related relocation opportunities: A field study and laboratory experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 79*, 29-55.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). A twenty-year retrospective on work and family research in IO/OB: A review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 124-197.
- Eckenrode, J., & Gore, S. (1996). Stress and coping at the boundary of work and family. In J. Eckenrode & S. Gore (Eds.), *Stress between work and family* (pp. 1-16). New York: Plenum.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77*, 85-129.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 178-199.
- Eggebeen, D. (2002). The changing course of fatherhood. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 486-506.
- Ellis, J. L. (1998). Interpretive inquiry as a formal research process. In *Teaching from understanding: Teacher as interpretive inquirer*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Elshtain, J. (1981) *Public Man, Private Women*, Oxford: Martin Robertson

- Estes, S. B., & Glass, J. (1996). Job Changes following childbirth: are women trading compensation for family-responsive work conditions. *Work and Occupations*, 23(4), 405-436.
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1995). Subversive stories and hegemonic tales: Toward a sociology of narrative. *Law and Society*, 29(2), 197-226.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Federico, R. F. (1998). Work/life benefits from the multiemployer perspective. *Benefits Quarterly*, 14, 18-23.
- Ferguson, K. (1984). *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ferree, M. M., & Martin, Patricia Y. (1995). *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new women's movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fielding, N. G., & Lee, R. M. (1998). *Computer analysis and qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Filer, R. K. (1985). Male-female wage differences: The importance of compensating differentials. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 38, 426-437.
- Finkel, S. K., Olswang, S. G., & N., S. (1994). The implications of childbirth on tenure and promotion for women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(3), 259-270.
- Firestone, S. (1970). *The Dialectics of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.
- Flax, J. (1990). *Thinking Fragments: Postmodernism, Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. University of California Press: Oxford.
- Folts, F. E. (1938). *Introduction to Industrial Management* (2nd ed. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Folts, F. E. (1954). *Introduction to Industrial Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *An Introduction [Fr 1976]* (Vol. 1). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980a [1977]). 'Truth and power'. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (pp. 109-133). New York: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. (1980b [1976]). 'Questions on Geography'. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (pp. 63-77). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1991 [1981]). 'Questions of method'. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 73-86). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Franks, R. M. F. (1946). A Note to Brides: Don't delay parenthood, *Chatelaine Magazine*. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *A Women's Place: seventy years in the lives of Canadian women from the pages of Chatelaine Magazine* (pp. 101-102). Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Freeman, C (2003). Recruiting for diversity. *Women in Management Review*. Bradford: 2003. Vol. 18, Iss. 1/2; p. 68-76.
- French, R. P., & Caplan, R. D. (1972). Organizational stress and individual strain. In A. J. Marrow (Ed.), *The failure of success* (pp. 30-66). New York: Amaco.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The Feminist Mystique*. New York: Dell.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology*. Washington, DC.: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 351-366.
- Frone, M. R., Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, N. P. (1994). Relationship of work-family conflict to substance use among employed mothers: Examining the mediating role of negative affect. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 56, 1019-1030.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 723-729.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1997). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 325-335.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 145-167.

- Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., E., H., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: how gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(4), 737-754.
- Gadamer, H. (1989). *Truth and method*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies: Balancing work and family life. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 368-383.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J., & Friedman, D. (1996). The Role of Employers in Addressing the Needs of Employed Parents. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*, 111-136.
- Ganster, D. C., & Schaubroeck, J. (1991). Work stress and employee health. *Journal of Management, 17*(2), 235-271.
- Garza, R., & Herringer, L. (1987). Social identity: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*(3), 299-308.
- Gerhart, B., & Rynes, S. (1991). Determinants and consequences of salary negotiations by graduating male and female MBAs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 256-262.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1898. *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relation between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution*. Boston: Small, Mayard and Co.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL.: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Glass, J. L., & Riley, L. (1998). Family responsive policies and employee retention following childbirth. *Social Forces, 76*, 1401-1436.
- Gluck, S. B. (1988). *Rosie the Riveter Revisited: Women, the War and Social Change*. Boston: Twayne.
- Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K., & Jamison, R. L. (1990). Employer supported child care, work-family, and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 793-809.
- Goldman, Emma. 1969. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. New York: Dover.
- Goldscheider, E. K., & Waite, L. J. (1991). *New families, no families?* Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Gomez-Mejia, L. R., & Balkin, D. B. (1992). *Compensation, organizational strategy, and firm performance*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.
- Goodstein, J. D. (1994). Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: Employer involvement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(2), 350-382.
- Gossage, C. (1991). *Greatcoats and glamour boots: Canadian women at war (1939-1945)*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Gottlieb, B. H., Kelloway, E. K., & Barham, E. J. (1998). *Flexible work arrangements: managing the work-family boundary*. London: Wiley.
- Gramsci, A. (1978). *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*. New York: International Publishers.
- Grant, R. (1994). The Cold War and the Feminine Mystique. In P. Beckman, F. d. A. Bergin & Garvey (Eds.), *Women, Gender and World Politics*. London: Bergin & Garvey.
- Green, F. (2001). It's been a hard day's night: the concentration and intensification of work in late twentieth-century Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 39, 53-80.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1986). A work-non-work interactive perspective of stress and its consequences. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour and Management*, 8, 37-60.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391-412). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2003). When Work and Family Collide: Deciding Between Competing Role Demands. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 90, 291-303.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1995). Are the "Most Advantaged" Children Truly Disadvantaged by Early Maternal Employment? Effects on Child Cognitive Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 16(2), 149-169.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. (1958). Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. In (pp. 50-56). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family responsive human resource policies: The impact of family friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 271-288.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing The Work-Family Interface: A Ecological Perspective On The Correlates Of Positive And Negative Spillover Between Work And Family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 111-126.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, & Holstein. (2000). Analyzing Interpretive Practice in Handbook of Qualitative Research. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), (Second Edition ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gurin, E., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role-explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 560-568.
- Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional Labor. *Public Administration Review, 64*(3), 289-298.
- Hackett, R. D. (1990). Age, tenure, and employee absenteeism. *Human Relations, 43*, 601-619.
- Halberstam, D. (1994). *The Fifties*. New York: Fawcett Books.
- Hall, D. T., & Hall, F. S. (1982). Stress and the two-career couple. In C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), *Current concerns in occupational stress* (pp. 254-266). New York: Wiley.
- Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive, 3*, 213-223.
- Harding, Sandra. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Cornell Univ. Press, 1986.
- Hartmann, S. M. (1982). *The Home Front and Beyond American women in the 1940s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of women's lives*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heenan, T., & Nyland, C. (2003, July 7-9). *Running the McCarthyist Gauntlet: The Cleansing of Progressivism from Management Thought in Post War Years*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at "The Cold War and Management" Stream, 3rd International Critical Management Studies conference, Lancaster University.

- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and time: A translation of sein and ziet*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Helms Mills, J. C. (2002). Employment Practices and the Gendering of Air Canada's Culture during its Trans Canada Airlines Days. *Culture and Organization*, 8(2), 117-128.
- Hepburn, C. G., & Barling, J. (1996). Eldercare responsibilities, inter-role conflict, and employee absence: A daily study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 311-318.
- Hersch, J., & Stratton, L. S. (1994). Housework, Wages, and the Division of Housework Time for Employed Spouses. *The American Economic Review*, 84(2), 120-125.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive effect of job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49-58.
- Hill, M. (1979). The wage effects of marital status and children. *Journal of Human Resources*, 14, 579-594.
- Hobbs, M. (1993). Equality and Difference: Feminism and the Defence of Women Workers during the Great Depression. *Labour/Le Travail*, 32, 201-223.
- Hochschild, A. (2003). *The Commercial Spirit of Intimate Life and Other Essays*. San Francisco and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Women's Employment and Care of Children in the United States. In T. V. d. Lippe & L. V. Dijk (Eds.), *Women's Employment in a Comparative Perspective* (pp. 151-174). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Hogg, M., Terry, D., & White, K. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 255-269.
- Hollinshead, G., & Leat, M. (1995). *Human resource management – an international and comparative perspective*. London: Pitman.
- Hom, P. W., & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 975-987.
- Honey, M. (1984). *Creating Rosie the Riveter : class, gender, and propaganda during WWII*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Hooper, M. (1985). A multivariate approach to the measurement and analysis of social identity. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 315-325.
- Horowitz, D. (1998). *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Hundley, G. (2000). Male / Female Earnings Differences in Self-Employment: The Effects of Marriage, Children, and the Household Division of Labor. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 54(1), 95-114.
- Innello, Kathleen P. (1992). *Decisions Without Hierarchy*. New York: Routledge.
- Irigaray, L. (1985a). *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Irigaray, L. (1985b). *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations: An International Sociological Journal*, 28, 40-63.
- Jacobs, J. A., & K., G. (1998). Who are the overworked Americans? *Review of Social Economy*, 56, 443-460.
- Jacobs, J.A. (1999), "The sex segregation of occupations: prospects for the 21st century", in Powell, G.N. (Eds), *Handbook of Gender and Work*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp.125-41.
- Jacobsen, S., & R., J. (1997). Destabilizing the field. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 6(1), 42-59.
- Jones, A. P., & Butler, M. C. (1980). A Role Transition Approach to the Stresses of Organizationally Induced Family Role Disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 367-376.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational Justice and Stress: The Mediating Role of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 395-404.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 767-783.
- Judiesch, M. K., & Lyness, K. (1999). Left behind? The impact of leaves of absence on managers' career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(6), 641-651.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.

- Kaledin, E. (1984). *Mothers and more American women in the 1950s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Kando, T. M., & Summers, W. C. (1971). The impact of work on leisure: Toward a paradigm and research strategy. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 14, 310-327.
- Kanter, R. (1977a). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. (1977b) *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy*. Russell Sage, New York.
- Karasek, R., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kasl, S. V., & Wells, J. A. (1985). Social support and health in the middle years. In S. Cohen & S. Syme (Eds.), *Social support and health*. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.
- Kathleen, G. (2002). Combining Work and Motherhood. In P. J. Dubeck & D. Dunn (Eds.), *Workplace/Women's Place* (pp. 146-162). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Keith, R., & Schaffer, R. (1980). Role strain and depression in two job families. *Family Relations*, 29, 483-488.
- Key, Ellen. 1914. *The Renaissance of Motherhood*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Second Edition ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kingston, P. W., & Nock, S. L. (1985). Consequences of the family work day. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47, 619-629.
- Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (2001). Dual-earner families in Finland: Differences between and within families in relation to work and family experiences. *Community, Work and Family*, 4, 87-107.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1992). The development of measure of faculty scholarship. *Group & Organization Management*, 17(1), 5-23.
- Klatch, R. (1990). The Two Worlds of Women of the New Right. In L. A. Tilly & P. Gurin (Eds.), *Women, Politics and Change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, J. A. M., & Van De Vlert, E. (1996). Marital conflict about the division of household labor and paid work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 958-969.
- Koedt, Anne; Levine, Ellen; Rapone, Anita Eds. (1973). *Radical Feminism*. New York: Quadrangle Books.
- Kofodimos, J. (1993). *Balancing act: How managers can integrate successful careers and fulfilling personal lives*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Konrad, A. M., Corrigall, E., Lieb, P., & Ritchie, J. E., Jr. (2000). Sex differences in job attribute preferences among managers and business students. *Group and Organization Management*, 25, 108-131.
- Korenman, S., & Neumark, D. (1991). Does Marriage really make men more productive? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 26, 282-307.
- Kossek, E. E., & Nichol, V. (1992). The effects of on-site child care on employee attitudes and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 485-509.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior--human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139-149.
- Krause, N. (1995). Stress, alcohol use, and depressive symptoms in later life. *The Gerontologist*, 35(3), 296-307.
- LaFollette, H. (1992). Real men. In L. May & R. Strikwerda (Eds.), *Rethinking masculinity: Philosophical explorations in light of feminism* (pp. 59-74). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Lambert, S. J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations*, 43, 239-257.
- Larson, R. W., Gillman, S. A., & Richards, M. H. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers, mothers, and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29, 78-97.
- Lau, V., Au, W., & Ho, J. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behavior in organizations *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(1), 73-99.
- Lavee, Y., Sharlin, S., & Katz, R. (1996). The effect of parenting stress on marital quality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 114-135.
- Leete, L., & Schor, J. B. (1994). Assessing the time-squeeze hypothesis: Hours worked in the United States, 1969-89. *Industrial Relations*, 33(1), 25-42.

- Leibowitz, A. (1977). Parental Inputs and Children's Achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 12, 243-251.
- Leigh, J. P. (1993). Sex differences in absenteeism. *Industrial Relations*, 22, 349-361.
- Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1987). Stress in two earner couples and stage in the life cycle. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 289-303.
- Lips, H. M. (1992). Gender and science-related attitudes as predictors of college students' academic choices. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40, 62-81.
- Lo, S. (2003). Perceptions of work-family conflict among married female professionals in Hong Kong. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 376 -391.
- Lobel, S. A. (1991). Allocation of investment in work and family roles: Alternative theories and implication for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 507-521.
- Lobel, S. A., & St. Clair, L. (1992). Effects of Family Responsibilities, Gender, and Career Identity Salience on Performance Outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(5), 1057 (1013 pages).
- Lyness KS, Thompson DE. (1997). Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 359-375.
- Major, B. (1993). Gender, entitlement, and the distribution of family labor. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 141-159.
- Major, V. S., Klein, K. J., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2002). Work Time, Work Interference With Family, and Psychological Distress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 427-436.
- Marchese, M., G. Bassham and J. Ryan: 2002, Work Family Conflict: A Virtue Ethics Analysis, *Journal of Business Ethics* 40, 145-154.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936.
- Marshall, K. (1999). Employment after childbirth. *Perspectives on labour and income*, 11(3).
- Martin, Patricia Yancey (1990). Rethinking feminist organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4, pp 182-206.
- Mason, C. (2002). 100 most frequently cited articles in Social Sciences Index: A List.

- Mastekaasa, A., & Olsen, K. M. (1998). Gender, absenteeism and job characteristics: A fixed model approach. *Work and Occupations, 25*, 195-228.
- Matsui, T., Ohsawa, T., & Onglatco, M. L. (1995). Work-family conflict and the stress-buffering effects of husband support and coping behavior among Japanese married working women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47*, 178-192.
- May, E. T. (1988). *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books.
- May, E. T. (1989). Explosive Issues: Sex, Women and the Bomb. In L. May (Ed.), *Recasting America. Culture and politics in the age of the Cold War* (pp. 154-170). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McCartney, K., & Rosenthal, S. (1991). Maternal employment should be studied within social ecologies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 1103-1108.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Menaghan, E. G., & Parcel, T. L. (1991). Determining children's home environments: The impact of maternal characteristics and current occupational and family conditions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 417-431.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.
- Meyerowitz, J. (1993). Beyond the Feminine Mystique: A Reassessment of Postwar Mass Culture, 1946-1958. *The Journal of American History, 79*(4), 1455-1482.
- Meyerson, D. (1998). Feeling stressed and burned out: A feminist reading and re-visioning of stress-based emotions within medicine and organization science. *Organization Science, 9*, 103-118.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis - An Expanded Sourcebook* (Second Edition ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Gomez, L. R. (1976). Day care and selected employee behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 19*, 111-115.

- Miller, R. I. (1984). The effects of employer-supported child care on employee absenteeism, productivity, recruitment or job satisfaction: What is claimed and what is known. *Personnel Psychology*, 37, 212-226.
- Mills, A. J., & Hatfield, J. C. H. (1998). From Imperialism to Globalization: Internationalization and the Management Text. In E. I. Clegg & L. Bueno (Eds.), *Theories of the Management Process: Making Sense Through Difference* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mills, A.J. and P. Tancred (1992) *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.
- Miree, C. E., & Frieze, I. H. (1999). Children and careers: A longitudinal study of the impact of young children on critical career outcomes of MBAs. *Sex Roles*, 41, 787-808.
- Moen P., M. A. E., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1997). Their Mothers' Daughters? The Intergenerational Transmission of Gender Role Orientations in a World of Changing Roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 281-293.
- Moen, P., Robison, J., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1995). Caregiving and women's well-being: A life course approach. *The Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 259-273.
- Montgomerie, D. (1996). Reassessing Rosie: World War II, New Zealand women and the Iconography of Femininity. *Gender and History*, 8.
- Mortimer, J. T., Lorence, J., & Kumka, D. S. (1986). *Work, family and personality; Transition to adulthood*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.
- Moskowitz, E. (1996). 'Good to blow your top': Women's magazines and a discourse of discontent, 1945-1965. *Journal of Women's History*, 8, 66-98.
- Mui, A. (1992). Caregiver Strain Among Black and White Daughter Caregivers: A Role Theory Perspective. *The Gerontologist*, 32, 203-212.
- Mutari, E., Figart, D. M., & Power, M. (2001). Wages as a Living, Price, and Social Practice: Implicit Wage Theories in Equal Pay Debates in the United States. *Feminist Economics*, 7(2), 23-52.
- Near, J. P., Rice, R. W., & Hunt, R. G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: A review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 415-429.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work- family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.

- Nicholson, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- Nickerson, M. (2003). Women, domesticity and cold war activism. *Organization of American Historians, Magazine of History*, 17(1), 17-21.
- Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Home and work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nock, S., & Kingston, P. (1988). Time with children: the impact of couples' work-time commitments. *Social Forces*, 67(1), 59-85.
- O'Connor, J. E., & Jackson, M. A. (Eds.). (1980). *American History/American Film*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- O'Neil, J. (1982). Gender-role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human-service providers. In K. Solomon & N. Levy (Eds.), *Men in transition: Theory and therapy* (pp. 5-44). New York: Plenum Press.
- Osterman, P. (1995). Work/family programs and the employment relationship. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 681-701.
- Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Granrose, C. S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two-career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 339-356.
- Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., Rabinowitz, S., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1989). Work and family variables as mediators of the relationship between wives' employment and husbands' well-being. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 185-201.
- Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., Godshalk, V. M., & Beutell, N. J. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 275-300.
- Parcel, T. L., & Menaghan, E. G. (1994). *Parents' Jobs and Children's Lives*. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics. Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Parker, S. R. (1967). Industry and the family. In S. R. Parker, R. K. Brown, J. Child & M. A. Smith (Eds.), *The sociology of industry*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

- Pearlin, L. I. (1975). Sex roles and depression. In N. Datan & L. H. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Normative life crises* (pp. 191-207). New York: Academic Press.
- Perlow, L. (1995). Putting the work back into work/family. *Group and Organization Management, 20*, 227-239.
- Perlow, L. (1998). Boundary control: The social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 43*, 38-357.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., & Folk, K. (1994). Class, couples, and conflict: Effects of the division of labor on assessments of marriage in dual-earner families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 165-180.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Blum, T. C. (2000). Work family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1107-1117.
- Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organization theory*. London: Pitman.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis. Investigating Processes of Social Construction* (Vol. 50): Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pidgeon, M. (1947). Women workers and recent economic change. *Monthly Labour Review, 65*, 666-671.
- Piotrkowski, C. (1979). *Work and the family system*. New York: Free Press.
- Piotrkowski, C. S. (1978). *Work and the family system: A naturalistic study of working-class and lower-class families*. New York: Free Press.
- Piotrkowski, C., & Hughes, D. (1993). Dual-earner families. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes* (pp. 107-141). New York: Guilford Press.
- Pleck, J. (1993). Are "family supportive" employer policies relevant to men? In J. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 217-237). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pleck, J. H. (1977). The work-family role system. *Social Problems, 24*, 417-427.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working wives/working husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pleck, J. H., & Masciadrelli, B. P. (2003). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed. ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Pleck, J. H., Staines, G. L., & Lang, L. (1980). Conflicts between work and family life. *Monthly Labor Review, 103*, 29-32.

- Poelman, S. (2001). Individual and Organizational Issues in Work-Family Conflict. Retrieved July 10, 2005
- Posig, M, Kickul, J. (2004). Work-role expectations and work family conflict: gender differences in emotional exhaustion. *Women in Management Review*, 19, (7/8) pg. 373
- Prasad, A. (2002). The contest over meaning: Hermeneutics as an interpretive methodology for understanding texts. *Organization Research Methods*, 5, 12-33.
- Prasad, A., & Mir, R. (2002). Digging deep for meaning: A critical hermeneutic analysis of CEO letters to shareholders in the oil industry. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 9(1), 92-116.
- Pratt, M. G., & Rosa, J. A. (2003). Transforming work-family conflict into commitment in network marketing organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), p395, 324p.
- Quart, L., & Auster, A. (1984). *American Film and Society Since 1945*. London: MacMillan.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (1993). Introduction. In C. Ramazanoglu (Ed.), *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism* (pp. 1-25). London, UK: Routledge.
- Rasmussen, B. (2001). Corporate Strategy and gendered professional identities: Reorganization and the struggle for recognition and positions. *Gender, Work and Organization* (3), pp 291-310.
- Renk, K., Roberts, R., Roddenberry, A., Hillhouse, M. L. S., Meehan, C., Oliveros, A., et al. (2003). Mothers, fathers, gender role, and time parents spend with their children. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 305-316.
- Rich, A. (1979). *On lies, secrets and silence: Selected prose (1966-1978)*. New York: Norton
- Riggs, J. M. (1997). Mandates for mothers and fathers: Perceptions of breadwinners and caregivers. *Sex Roles*, 37(7/8), 565-581.
- Robin, R. (2001). *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Robinson, J. P., & Godley, G. (1997). *Time for Life: The Surprising ways Americans use their time*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rodgers, C. (1992). The flexible workplace: What have we learned? *Human Resource Management*, 31, 183-200.

- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. London: Constable.
- Rogers, J. (1996). Mothers work hours and variations by quality. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 58, p606, 612p.
- Roman, R., S. Hayibor and B. Agle: 1999 The Relationship Between Social and Financial Performance, *Business and Society* 38(1), 109-125.
- Rosenberg, E. S. (1994). Foreign affairs after WWII: Connecting sexual and international politics. *Diplomatic History*, 18, 59-70.
- Rosener, J. (1990), Ways women lead, *Harvard Business Review*, pp.119-25
- Rosener, J. (1995), Women: a competitive secret, *Business Quarterly*, Vol. 60 No.2, pp.79-88.
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 655-684.
- Rotondo, D. M., Carlson, D. S., & Kincaid, J. F. (2003). Coping with multiple dimensions of work-family conflict. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 275-296.
- Rowbotham, S. (1999). *A Century of Women. A History of Women in Britain and the United States*. London: Penguin.
- Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., Panzer, K., & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), p369, 318p.
- Ruhm, C. (2004). Parental employment and child cognitive development. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(1), 155-192.
- Runte, M., & Mills, A. J. (2004). Paying the Toll: A Feminist Post-structural Critique of the Discourse Bridging Work and Family. *Culture and Organization*.
- Rupp, L. (1978). *Mobilizing women for war: German and American Propoganda, 1939-1945*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: .
- Ryan, A. M., Sacco, J. M., McFarland, L. A., & Kriska, S. D. (2000). Applicant self-selection: Correlates of withdrawal from a multiple hurdle process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 163-179.
- Ryan, M. (1979). *Womanhood in America*. New York: Viewpoints.
- Samuels, G. (1971). Why Twenty Million Women Work. In M. Dubofsky (Ed.), *American Labor Since the New Deal* (pp. 183-191). Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

- Sangster, H. N. (1932). City Order, *Chatelaine Magazine*, Sept 1932. In S. Fraser (Ed.), *A Women's Place: seventy years in the lives of Canadian women from the pages of Chatelaine Magazine* (pp. 174-176). Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Sangster, J. (1995). *Earning Respect: The Lives of Working Women in Small-Town Ontario, 1920-1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sangster, J. (2000). Feminism and the making of Canadian working-class history: exploring the past, present and future. *Labour/Le Travail*, 46, 127-165.
- Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1997). Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexibly work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 377-391.
- Scheinberg, E. (1994). The Tale of Tessie the Textile Worker: Female Textile Workers in Cornwall During World War II. *Labour/Le Travail*, 33, 153-186, and 180.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1987). Threats to identity, self-indentification and social stress. In C. R. Snyder & C. E. Ford (Eds.), *Coping with negative life-events*. New York: Plenum.
- Schloss, C., & Polinsky, E. (1947). Postwar Labour Turnover among women factory workers. *Monthly Labour Review*, 64, 411-419.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. London: Temple Smith.
- Schor, J. (2004). *Born to Buy: The Commercialized Child and the New Consumer Culture*. NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Schrecker, E. (1986). *No Ivory Tower. McCarthyism & the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schrecker, E. (1998). *Many Are The Crimes. McCarthyism in America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Scott, W. D., Clothier, R. C., Mathewson, S. B., & Spriegel, W. R. (1941). *Personnel management; principles, practices, and point of view* (3rd ed. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, inc.
- Scruton, S. (1994). The changing world of women and leisure: Feminism, "postfeminism" and leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 13, 249-261.
- Sederer, L., & Seidenberg, R. (1976). Heiress to an empty throne: Ego-ideal problems of contemporary women. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 12, 240-251.
- Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 567-578.

- Skolnick, A. S. (1991). *Embattled paradise: the American family in an age of uncertainty*. New York: Basic.
- Smithson, J., & Stokoe, E. H. 2005. Discourses of Work-Life Balance: Negotiating 'Genderblind' Terms in Organizations. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(2): 147-168.
- Smithson, J., Lewis, S., Cooper, C., & Dyer, J. (2004). Flexible working and the gender pay gap in the accountancy profession. *Work, Employment & Society*, 18(1), 115.
- Smyth, R. (1999). A Citation Analysis of Australian Economic Journals. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, 30, 119-133.
- Solomon, Robert C.; 1992 Corporate Roles, Personal Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach to Business Ethics *Business Ethics Quarterly* 2, 317-339
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spreitzer, G. M., McCall, M. W., & Mahoney, J. D. (1997). Early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1), 6-29.
- Stafford, F. (1987). Women's Work, Sibling Competition, and Children's School Performance. *American Economic Review*, 77(5), 972-980.
- Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations*, 33, 111-129.
- Staines, G. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1984). Nonstandard work schedules and family life. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 515-524.
- Steffy, B. D., & Ashbaugh, D. (1986). Dual-career planning, marital satisfaction and job stress among women in dual-career marriages. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1, 114-123.
- Strober, M. H. (1994). Can Feminist Thought Improve Economics? Rethinking Economics Through a Feminist Lens. *The American Economic Review*, 84(2), 143-147.
- Stroh, J. M., Brett, J. M., & Reilly, A. H. (1992). All the right stuff: A comparison of female and male managers' career progression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 251-260.
- Struminger, L. S. (1979). *Women and the making of the working class: Lyon, 1830-1870*. Vermont: Eden Press.

- Suitor, J. J. (1991). Marital quality and satisfaction with the division of household labor across the family life cycle. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 221-230.
- Swanson, V., Power, K. G., & Simpson, R. J. (1998). Occupational stress and family life: A comparison of male and female doctors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 237-260.
- Szalai, A. (1972). *The Use of Time: Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations in Twelve Countries*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 61-76). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 2-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Takeuchi, R., Tesluk, P. E., Yun, S., & Lepak, D. P. (2005). AN INTEGRATIVE VIEW OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), 85-101.
- Tancred-Sheriff, P., & Campbell, E. J. (1992). Room for women: A case study in the sociology of organizations. In A. J. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 31-45). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Taniguchi, H. (1999). The timing of childbearing and women's wages. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 1008-1019.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking 9 to 5*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Terry, G. R. (1953). *Office Management & Control* (Revised ed. ed.). Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Thoits, P. (1983). Multiple identities and psychological wellbeing: a reformulation and test of the social isolation hypothesis. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 174-187.
- Thomas, J. 1999 Everything About Us Is Feminist: The Significance of Ideology in Organizational Change. *Gender and Society*. 13(1), pp. 101-119.
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.

- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392–415.
- Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles, 27*, 573-607.
- Tong, R. P. (1998). *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd Edition. Boulder: Westview Press,
- Turner, B. (1984). *The body and society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, Ontario: SUNY Press.
- Van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd Ed. ed.). Cobourg, ON: Althouse Press.
- Van Manen, M. (Ed.). (2001 (in press)). *Writing in the Dark: Phenomenological Studies in Interpretative Inquiry*. London, Ont: Althouse Press.
- VandenHeuvel, A., & Wooden, M. (1995). Do explanations of absenteeism differ for men and women? *Human Relations, 48*(11), 1309-1330.
- Voydanoff, P. (1984). Economic distress and families: Policy Issues. *Journal of Family Issues, 5*(2), 273-288.
- Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work role characteristics, family structure demands, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 50*, 749-761.
- Waldfogel, J. (1998). The family gap for young women in the United States and Britain: Can maternity leave make a difference? *Journal of Labor Economics, 16*(3), 505-545.
- Wallace, J. E. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(2), 227-248.
- Ware, S. (1989). *Women: A Documentary History*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Warren, J. A., & Johnson, P. J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. *Family Relations, 44*, 163-169.
- Warren, T. (2003). Class and Gender-based Working Time *Sociology, 37*(4), 733-752.
- Watson, L. (1976). Understanding a Life History as a Subjective Document: Hermeneutic and Phenomenological Perspectives. *Ethos, 4*, 95-131.

- Watson, L. C., & Watson-Franke, M. B. (1985). *Interpreting life histories: An anthropological inquiry*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Watson, T. J. (1995). 'Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense making: A reflexive tale. *Organization Studies*, 16(5), 805-821.
- Weatherford, D. (1990). *American women and WWII*. New York: Facts on File.
- Weedon, C. (1983). *Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory* (1st ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (1993). *Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, Theory and the Politics of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (2000). *Feminism, theory and the politics of difference*. London: Blackwell.
- Weeks, J. (1990). *Sex, Politics & Society*. London: Longman.
- Weiss, R. M. (1987). Writing Under the Influence: Science Versus Fiction in the Analysis of Corporate Alcoholism Programs. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 341-356.
- Weitzman, E. B., & Miles, M. B. (1995). *Computer programs for qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wells, J. A. (1982). Social support as a buffer of stressful job conditions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2, 218-226.
- Werbel, J. (1998). Intent and choice regarding maternal employment following childbirth. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 372-385.
- Werbel, J. D. (1978). *Work and physical health*. Paper presented at the Management Alienation. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the Eastern Academy of Management. Retrieved.
- Westbrook, R. B. (1990). I want a girl, just like the girl that married Harry James: American women and the problem of political obligation in World War II. *American Quarterly*, 42, 587-614.
- Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (1990). The career success/personal failure phenomenon as perceived in others: Comparing vignettes of male and female managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 209-224.
- White, J. M. (1991). *Dynamics of Family Development: A Theoretical Perspective*. New York: Guildford.
- White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C., & Smeaton, D. (2003). 'High-performance' Management Practices, Working Hours and Work-Life Balance. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(2), 175-196.

- Wicke, J., & Ferguson, M. (1992). Introduction: Feminism and Postmodernism; Or, The Way We Live Now. *boundary 2*, 19(2), 1-9.
- Wickert, F. R., & McFarland, D. E. (1967). *Measuring executive effectiveness*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Wicks, D & Bradshaw, P. (1997). Women in the Academy: The Cycles of Resistance and Compliance, In *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, ed. by P.Prasad, A. Mills, M. Elmes and A. Prasad, Sage Publications, 1997
- Williams, J. K., & Alliger, M. G. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 837-868.
- Wood, R., Corocran, M., & Courant, P. (1993). Pay differentials among the highly paid: the male-female earnings gap in lawyers' salaries. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 11, 417-441.
- Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 113-123.
- Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's Time With Fathers in Intact Families. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63, 136-145.
- Zedeck, S., & Mosier, K. L. (1990). Work in the family and employing organization. *American Psychologist*, 45, 240-251.

APPENDIX 5.1

METHODOLOGY GUIDELINE

Questioning the Authorship of the Text:

Does the text deal exclusively with a particular social group? - As actors within a societal framework, many social groups may be ignored, while others are directly or indirectly referenced, e.g. white western male, professional classes.

What tacit reader knowledge is assumed? - It is beneficial to read the text with regard to specific knowledge expectations that the text can use for both the purposes of inclusion and exclusion. Does the authorship draw upon the principles of *concision* in validating discursive claims (Herman & Chomsky, 1988)? The premise is simple arguments with strong ideological approval within society need little in terms of explanation or empirical data to lend them credibility. Conversely, arguments with a low approval rating, that is arguments that are not “commonsensically” held, require significantly more attention on the part of the author.

Does the authorship feign neutrality? - Ask how the authorship relates to the text. Is the author present to the reader or does s/he distance self claiming or positioning self as a neutral observer of the phenomenon under study. Often the mechanism of feigning neutrality is used to legitimate certain knowledge claims.

Questioning the Readership:

To whom does the text appear to be addressing? - It may be acknowledged by many that professional journals limit readership in ways which other texts do not, e.g. vocabulary, assumed background knowledge, targeted narration. However, all discourse is delimiting by constructing specific subjectivities that the reader must assume if he or she wishes to partake in the communication process. Determining textual subjectivity can aid in its deconstruction.

How does the text exclude? – In what specific ways does the text limit readership. Language, class, theoretical approaches can all be exclusionary factors in a text. Resistance is often generated at the threshold of exclusion in a process of signification that many cannot adhere to. One might expect meaning regimes to shift significantly in a text given a feminist reading. Whom must the reader become to be included?

What must the reader know? - Knowledge expectations underwriting textual discourse can shape both political and philosophical contexts as well as delimiting readership in quantitative ways. In certain cases the reader is not only excluded, he/she is never in the "game".

Questioning the Object of the Text:

What is the object of the text? - What is the phenomenon upon which the study focuses (Phillips and Hardy, 2002)? – Descriptions of concepts and constructs under analysis are often explicitly included in text structures. Beyond the stated or obvious foci, in many cases, however, the text will also indirectly advocate particular discourse paths and mask alternative discourses through the choice of constructs or concepts under development. These non-disclosed paths are symbolically sustained at the extra-discursive level. The

object of any text pertains to those discourses. It remains vital in the fulfillment of an analysis to focus on the discourses themselves and not only on the explicitly denoted statements overtly represented in a discursive situation. For example, a townhall discussion facilitated by a manager reminding employees of the organization's work-family benefits may arguably be addressed more at the level of suspension of unrest than of support for engagement of these actual policies. One cannot assume because an intention is stated that it is in fact the intention.

How is the object legitimized within the text? - Here it is necessary to question or examine any contradictions that occur in establishing the object. Contradiction remains inherent to the legitimation process and assumes a relationship with both the object and the other of any discourse.

Who is the "Other"?

What assumptions underwrite contributing paradigms or premises? - Are philosophical assertions made without adequate qualification? In economics assumptions often manifest themselves as principles or laws. In other declared disciplines the methods may vary. However, by necessity, all knowledge claims predicated on particularized background assumptions remain bound by the validity and soundness of those assumptions. Human Resource Management literature, for example, is predicated on the assumption that a "good employee" is principally work-centered in terms of his/her identity. Accountability for nonwork identities is, thus, diminished, responsibility is waved, and nonwork identities thus achieve the position of "other".

Any assertion offered as knowledge or truth claim requires qualification to some degree. One cannot make the claim that engagement in market work and personal happiness are always positively related or that one-parent families are in some state of imbalance without significantly qualifying that assertion empirically, philosophically, or otherwise.

Does a discourse turn back on itself? - This event frequently occurs in passages through the means of contradiction, e.g. "don't get me wrong, I am not prejudiced". The "other" is exposed here at the point of contradiction.

How many perspectives or explanations are given? - If an argument or text is advanced from several perspectives some of which conflict, it becomes more difficult to accuse that particular source of portraying bias. Most matters of text chosen for inclusion in a review of literature grounding the purpose of an academic study are of a complicated enough constitution to warrant an evaluation that examines more than one perspective.

Does a discourse use technique to manipulate other discourse? - Listed below are several types that are used.

Judicial Satisfaction: use of language that supports its own position, e.g. "undoubtedly."

Common Sense Argument (Burton and Carlen, 1979): discourse will appeal to a universal culturally understood sensibility within a society, or what is deemed one's common sense, e.g. "employers recognize the importance of their employees' nonwork lives."

Positivist Empiricism (Burton and Carlen, 1979): is the use of certain data derived historically then superimposed on a specific discourse situation in the attempt to infer a

conclusion, e.g. "The relocation of women from the factories to the home created dissonance for those women used to having their own income and identities" infers that identity is linked to the work domain.

Fraternal Critique (Burton and Carlen, 1979): is often used as a form of justification in discourse whereby the narrative identifies with a subject out of fraternal sentiment, e.g. "she had been dealt a terrible blow that day with her dismissal and all, so she should not be blamed."

Affirmation of the Object (Burton and Carlen, 1979): usually occurs as the restating of the "object" in an attempt to validate a truth claim, e.g. "we reject such an idea as being preposterous."

Negation: the denial of a particular perspective or discourse as a possibility, e.g. "such an advancement could never have been offered to a man of his education."

Narrative Neutrality: is a narrative attempt through the authorship to occupy a neutral position attempting to lend the discourse a validity that is ill deserved, e.g. "thus, it appears as if gender advancement is predicted by women's lack of work history."

Temporal Neutrality: reflects an attempt by a discourse through metadiscourse or some other means to suspend a text beyond the stream of events that occur in historical dimensions. A discourse is then free to review historically placed events or epochs without drawing dimensional links to the here and now of the text. Governments frequently release disturbing information a set period after the occurrence of the event(s) on the pretence that there is no substantive connection to be made between the "then and now," e.g. "never before had we seen such advancement by women into the work domain."

Value Loading: represents the choice of specific associations through word choice or connotative reference. Included here are the juxtapositioning of discourses that alter textual meaning. This can occur through the superimposition of a picture or quotation on another discourse with significant contextual differences, e.g. linking of the suffragist movement with the commodification of family.

Exnomination: is the evacuation of a concept from the linguistic system as no alternative meaning or interpretation appears to exist. An exnominated signifier then carries one meaning granted a natural or universal status or that, which cannot be challenged (Barthes in Fisk, 1997, p. 290). For example, the term "labour dispute" is used to explain conflict as it occurs within a working environment. Interestingly, the role of management is exnominated from the equation, the assumption being that management positions are universally understood across social context. A total exnomination sees management as a neutral actor, partial exnomination holds managerial interests to be partially at fault but never censurable in the ways of labour. The language of accountability does not exist as it is exnominated.

Metaphor: are non-literal decoration or stimulants to the individual's imagination (Fisk, 1997, p. 291). War, sports, religion and drama provide the fodder for metaphors commonly printed in electronic texts. Metaphors alter context and draw on alternative discourses not directly associated with the principle discursive structure of a sentence or argument. For example, "right off the bat" alters sentence meaning (unknowingly on the part of the consumer) by introducing a barrage of signifiers associated with sports e.g. male, competition, and domination. Metaphors are so pervasive and ubiquitous in language use that we use them constantly without acknowledging their presence.

Unfortunately, the ideological meanings that these discourses carry with them are felt and drawn upon when meaning is constructed.

E. DISCOURSE AS A HISTORICAL PROCESS

1. Does a discourse approach a subject historically? (Parker, 1992) - This issue is discussed in some detail above. A discourse that fails to acknowledge a text's responsibility to treat subject matter historically alters meaning in significant ways.

2. Does a discourse reflect back on itself as a historical creation? - All discourse is the product of historical processes and should reflect on itself as such. Any bid for neutrality as exercised through the authorship is misleading and inaccurate.

3. Does a discourse create and recreate other discourse forms ahistorically? - Some discourses may establish a prominence that so profoundly affects other discourses as to historically alter those discourses. The result is a discourse that actually rearticulates itself (*transcendental signified*). Freudian theory is a fitting example to use here, e.g., in some ways Freud's theories have done more to alter the human psyche than explain it.

4. How does discourse draw on other discourses? - All discourse historically incorporates other discourse forms which, when examined, can help one better understand the transference of meaning structures within the text.

F. THE ROLE OF POWER

1. Does the discourse appeal to an external authority for legitimation? - If a discourse does not make such an appeal, whose authority will endorse the discourse?

Shareholders, governments, interest groups and corporate firms all to varying degrees hold vested interests in the publication and distribution of academic discourse. It is, therefore, important to weigh the potential influences these parties hold for the average knowledge consumer. Do specific paradigms, images, or attitudes reflect the particularized interests of these parties? It is vital that one's research remains in touch with the specifics of how the intersecting lines of power are aligned and played out in discursive and extra-discursive ways.

2. What truth claims are made within a discourse? - The sanctioning of particular truth claims within a discourse will often indicate potential abuses of power or power/knowledge within that context.

3. Is the discourse exclusionary? - Discourses always make prerequisite demands on the individual. Discourses that unfairly make demands on the specific "culture capital" or knowledge base of the reader are disempowering and exclusionary.

4. Are discourses used to build or convey hierarchical structures within a text? - Texts that select or establish normative based nomenclatures emphasize some discourses while diminishing others. History texts are often guilty of this transgression by holding some events or actions as significant while others are rejected, downplayed or ignored.

5. Does a discourse practice editorial bias? - Here one normative position is promoted over another overtly without significant qualification. These occurrence are sometimes blatant and easily noticed, but other times not. Sometimes such indiscretions may be used to mask more insidious abuses of power.

6. Is a discourse underwritten by other discourses? - Ideological slogans and definitions are often used to legitimate a discourse or conceal the "Other" from emerging. These discourses may be laden with contradictions if scratched below the surface, e.g. the heavily loaded connotations that words like "communist" or "feminism" bring in the United States.

7. Is the language used within a discourse appropriate? - Language selection, connotation, and the use of binary opposition all successfully alter meaning within a text. Overcoding or ideology can be the result, a direct product of unequal power differentials as manifested in discourse.

8. Is one social group advanced over another? - This question deals more often with exclusion than more overt forms of discrimination. It is important here to ask who the discourse is about and why.

9. Is bias and discrimination hidden under the veil of empiricism? - Discourses are often conveyed through carefully chosen empirically based narratives that conceal contrasting perspectives. Many newspaper articles are written with the pretence of objectivity, but downplay or efface other contributing discourses that are vital in establishing context, e.g. it was reported in the North American press that Chilean civilian riots "disrupted" Santiago as the people denounced the "oppressive" Allende regime. But the papers failed to mention that the marchers numbered less than 500, the majority of which were spouses of high-ranking members in the Pinochet administration.

APPENDIX 6.1

ISI Web of Science: Journals in subject areas Management, Business, Applied Psych

ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVE
ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL
ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW
ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY
ADVANCES IN CONSUMER RESEARCH
ADVANCES IN SERVICES MARKETING AND MANAGEMENT
ADVANCES IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT : A RESEARCH ANNUAL
AMERICAN BUSINESS LAW JOURNAL
APPLIED & PREVENTIVE PSYCHOLOGY
APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY-AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW-PSYCHOLOGIE APPLIQUEE-REVUE INTERNATIONALE
BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES & THE LAW
BETRIEBSWIRTSCHAFTLICHE FORSCHUNG UND PRAXIS
BRITISH JOURNAL OF GUIDANCE & COUNSELLING
BRITISH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT
BUSINESS ETHICS QUARTERLY
BUSINESS HISTORY
BUSINESS HISTORY REVIEW
CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW
CANADIAN JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES-REVUE
CAREER DEVELOPMENT QUARTERLY
CORPORATE GOVERNANCE-AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW
COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGIST
CYBERPSYCHOLOGY & BEHAVIOR
DECISION SCIENCES
EMERGING MARKETS FINANCE AND TRADE
ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ENTREPRENEURSHIP THEORY AND PRACTICE
ERGONOMICS
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT
FORTUNE
GROUP & ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT
GROUP DECISION AND NEGOTIATION
HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW
HUMAN FACTORS
HUMAN PERFORMANCE
HUMAN RELATIONS
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT
INDUSTRIAL MARKETING MANAGEMENT
INFORMATION & MANAGEMENT

INTERFACES
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AVIATION PSYCHOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FORECASTING
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT REVIEWS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANPOWER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MARKET RESEARCH
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OPERATIONS & PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN MARKETING
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SELECTION AND ASSESSMENT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SERVICE INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT
INTERNATIONAL MARKETING REVIEW
INTERNATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS JOURNAL
JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING
JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING RESEARCH
JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF APPLIED SPORT PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL DECISION MAKING
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS VENTURING
JOURNAL OF CAREER ASSESSMENT
JOURNAL OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT
JOURNAL OF COLLEGE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT
JOURNAL OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
JOURNAL OF CONSUMER PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF CONSUMER RESEARCH
JOURNAL OF COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT
JOURNAL OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT
JOURNAL OF EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING
JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY-APPLIED
JOURNAL OF FORECASTING
JOURNAL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS STUDIES

JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL MARKETING
JOURNAL OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT INQUIRY
JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
JOURNAL OF MARKETING
JOURNAL OF MARKETING RESEARCH
JOURNAL OF MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT
JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR
JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF PRODUCT INNOVATION MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF PRODUCT INNOVATION MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF PRODUCTIVITY ANALYSIS
JOURNAL OF PUBLIC POLICY & MARKETING
JOURNAL OF RETAILING
JOURNAL OF SMALL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
JOURNAL OF SPORT & EXERCISE PSYCHOLOGY
JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY OF MARKETING SCIENCE
JOURNAL OF THE OPERATIONAL RESEARCH SOCIETY
JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR
JOURNAL OF WORLD BUSINESS
LEADERSHIP QUARTERLY
LONG RANGE PLANNING
MANAGEMENT LEARNING
MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
MARKETING LETTERS
MARKETING SCIENCE
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION IN COUNSELING AND DEVELOPMENT
MEDIA PSYCHOLOGY
MIS QUARTERLY
MIT SLOAN MANAGEMENT REVIEW
NEGOTIATION JOURNAL
NEW TECHNOLOGY WORK AND EMPLOYMENT
OMEGA-INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
ORGANIZATION
ORGANIZATION SCIENCE
ORGANIZATION STUDIES
ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN DECISION PROCESSES
ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS
ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH METHODS
PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY
PERSONNEL REVIEW

PSYCHOLOGY & MARKETING
PUBLIC RELATIONS REVIEW
R & D MANAGEMENT
RESEARCH POLICY
RESEARCH QUARTERLY FOR EXERCISE AND SPORT
RESEARCH-TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT
RESEARCH-TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT
REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
REVIEW OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION
SERVICE INDUSTRIES JOURNAL
SPORT PSYCHOLOGIST
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT JOURNAL
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT-AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
SYSTEM DYNAMICS REVIEW
SYSTEMIC PRACTICE AND ACTION RESEARCH
SYSTEMS RESEARCH AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING AND SOCIAL CHANGE
TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT & BUSINESS EXCELLENCE
TOURISM MANAGEMENT
TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PART F-TRAFFIC PSYCHOLOGY AND BEHAVIOUR
TRAVAIL HUMAIN
WORK AND STRESS
ZEITSCHRIFT FUR ARBEITS-UND ORGANISATIONSPSYCHOLOGIE

Author	YRS	2001	2005	All Ratio	Mgt Ratio	Bus	Mgt	AP	Total	RANK
Greehaus & Beutell, 1985	19	197	286	15.05	8.316	38	61	104	158	
Frone et al 1992	12	105	196	16.33	8.667	21	29	79	104	
Baruch et al 1987	17	163	185	10.88	1.412	4	3	20	24	
Thompson 1991	13	96	129	9.923	0	0			0	
Harris KM 1996	8	45	14	1.75	0.375	2	0	0	3	
Doherty WJ et al 1998	6	27	68	11.33	0	0			0	
Pleck, JH 1977	27	215	239	8.852	2.111	10	19	37	57	
Blau FD 1998	6	26	69	11.5	0	0			0	
Barnett RC & Barach GK 1987	17	115	142	8.353	0.294	0	0	5	5	
Oppenheimer VK 1994	10	57	98	9.8	0	0			0	
Brines 1994	10	55	98	9.8	0	0			0	
Guttek et al 1991	13	78	142	10.92	6.308	18	24	60	82	
Biernat M & Wortman CB 1991	13	77	107	8.231	0.692	0	3	6	9	
Stroh et al 1992	12	68	104	8.667	5.417	19	29	38	65	
Arber S 1997	7	30	72	10.29	0	0			0	
Presser HB 1994	10	52	92	9.2	0.3	0	0	2	3	
Thomas LT & Ganster DC 1995	9	42	109	12.11	7.667	15	18	51	69	
Phares V 1992	12	62	89	7.417	0	0			0	
Mederer HJ 1993	11	54	72	6.545	0.273	0		2	3	
Duxbury & Higgins 1991	13	66	100	7.692	4.385	17	18	51	57	
Edgebeen DJ & Lichter DT 1991	13	66	92	7.077	0	0			0	
Mui AC 1992	12	59	82	6.833	0	0		2	0	
Frone et al 1997	7	26	73	10.43	6.714	7	9	41	47	
Lennon MC & Rosenfield 1994	10	44	78	7.8	0	0			0	
Williams KJ & Alliger GM 1994	10	44	71	7.1	3.7	10	15	22	37	
Kaplan et al 1996	8	31	58	7.25	0	0			0	
Crouter AC 1984	20	104	131	6.55	2.5	4	16	36	50	
Kopleman et al 1983	21	109	147	7	4.238	17	19	69	89	
Simon RW 1995	9	35	59	6.556	0	0			0	
Allen SM & Hawkins 1999	5	11	33	6.6	0	0			0	
Duncombe J & Marsden D 1993	11	43	61	5.545	0.364	0	4	0	4	
Lennon MC & Rosenfield S 1992	12	48	76	6.333	0.417	0	2	3	5	
Wright EO et al 1995	9	32	62	6.889	0.444	0	4	0	4	
Moen P et al 1994	10	37	59	5.9	0	0			0	
Fielding JE et al 1994	10	37	52	5.2	0	0			0	
Adams GA & King & King 1996	8	26	64	8	5.25	9	11	30	42	
Judge TA et al 1994	10	36	57	5.7	3.8	7	10	28	38	
Barnett et al 1992	12	46	59	4.917	0.333	0	0	4	4	

Bielby WT & Bielby DD 1989	15	61	83	5.533	0.8	0	2	10	12
Demo & Acock, 1993	11	40	51	4.636	0	0			0
Erickson RJ 1993	11	40	54	4.909	0.182	0		2	2
Good GE et al 1995	9	30	44	4.889	0.111	0		24	1
Parcel TL & Menaghan EG 1994	10	35	68	6.8	0	0			0
Marsiglio W 1991	13	49	73	5.615	0	0			0
Demo DH 1992	12	44	51	4.25	0	0			0
Cooke, RA & Rousseau DM 1984	20	82	98	4.9	2.5	8	16	38	50
Hofferth SL & Wissoker, DA 1992	12	43	61	5.083	0	0	0	0	0
Menaghan EG & Parcel TL 1991	13	47	68	5.231	0	0			0
Voydanoff P 1988	16	61	84	5.25	1.875	4	8	21	30
Belsky J Woodworth S Crnick 1996	8	23	41	5.125	0	0			0
Larson RW & Almeida DM 1999	5	9	37	7.4	0	0			0
Scharlach AE 1994	10	31	48	4.8	0	0			0
Greenstein TN 1996	8	22	46	5.75	0	0			0
Higgins CA et al 1992	12	39	64	5.333	3.25	12	18	23	39
Williams J 1991	13	43	48	3.692	0	0			0
Lundberg U et al 1994	10	30	72	7.2	0.3	0			3
Feldman DC 1994	10	30	40	4	2.4	4	8	17	24
Netemeyer RG Boles JS et al 1996	8	21	70	8.75	5.625	6	14	33	45
Parish WL et al 1991	13	42	53	4.077	0				0
Osterman P 1995	9	25	57	6.333	2.333	7	15	6	21
Pugliesi K 1995	9	25	43	4.778	0				0
Billings AG & Moos RH 1982	22	79	82	3.727	0.727	4	3	12	16
Brayfield AA 1992	12	37	54	4.5	0.167	2			2
Ross CE & Mirowsky J 1992	12	37	58	4.833	0.167			2	2
Bartley M Popay J & Plewis I 1992	12	36	60	5	0	0	0	0	0
Ellwood DT 2000	4	4	27	6.75	0	0	0	0	0
Hanushek EA 1992	12	36	76	6.333	0	0	0	0	0
Hyde JS, Klein MH et al 1995	9	24	52	5.778	0.222	0	0	2	2
Iverson RD & Roy P 1994	10	28	40	4	2.6	6	14	10	26
Major B 1993	11	32	55	5	0.273			3	3
Bacharach SB et al 1991	13	39	62	4.769	2.615	9	10	24	34
Barnett RC Marshall NL et al 1993	11	31	65	5.909	0.545	2	2	4	6
Ku L Sonenstein FL & Pleck JH 1995	9	31	53	5.889	0	0	0	2	0
Horrell S & Humphries J 1995	9	23	26	2.889	0	0	0	0	0

Glass J & Camarigg V 1992	12	34	55	4.583	0.167	0	2	0	2
O'Driscoll MP Ilgen Hildreth 1992	12	34	52	4.333	2.833	9	10	25	34
Blustein DL 1997	7	15	30	4.286	0.714	0	0	27	5
Gornick JC et al 1997	7	15	47	6.714	0	0	0	0	0
Holahan CJ & Moos, RH 1983	21	37	79	3.762	0.048	0	0	2	1
Goodstein JD 1994	10	26	63	6.3	4.3	20	36	11	43
Scharlach AE, et al 1991	13	37	46	3.538	0	0	0	0	0
Blaisure KR & Allen KR 1995	9	22	32	3.556	0.667	0	0	0	6
Chappell NL & Novak M 1992	12	33	38	3.167	0.167	0	0	2	2
Kossek EE & Ozeki C 1998	6	11	82	13.67	9	16	17	37	54
Kramer BJ & Kipnis S 1995	9	22	36	4	0	0	0	0	0
Waldfogel J 1998	6	11	38	6.333	0	0	0	0	0
KlonoffCohen HS et al 1996	8	18	28	3.5	0	0	0	0	0
Lobel SA 1991	13	36	54	4.154	3.308	12	23	24	43
Parasuraman S et al 1996	8	18	50	6.25	4.5	8	8	27	36
Barnett RC et al 1991	13	35	41	3.154	0.154	0	0	2	2
Grover SL & Crooker, KJ 1995	9	21	52	5.778	4	8	21	18	36
Mokhtarian PL & Salomon I 1997	7	14	36	5.143	0	0	0	0	0
Stokols D 1995	9	21	30	3.333	0	0	0	2	0
Thompson CA et al 1999	5	7	44	8.8	5.2	6	7	21	26
Baruch GK & Barnett RC 1986	18	52	62	3.444	0.167	0	0	3	3
Parasuraman S Greenhaus JH et al 1992	12	31	71	5.917	4.083	11	14	36	49
Barnett RC 1994	10	24	39	3.9	0.7	0	3	4	7
Sanchez L 1994	10	24	34	3.4	0	0	0	0	0
Pyke K & Coltrane S 1996	8	17	27	3.375	0	0	0	0	0
Risman GJ & Johnson-Sumerford D 1998	6	1	33	5.5	0	0	0	2	0
Bedeian et al 1988	16		16	1	2.875	8	9	36	46
Greenhaus Parasuraman 1989	15		55	3.667	3.067	5	8	33	46
Goff et al 1990	14		53	3.786	2.786	9	10	28	39
Bietz et al 1994	10		45	4.5	4.5	7	15	28	45
Hill et al 1998	6		23	3.833	2.333	3	7	9	14
Grandey & Cropanzano 1999	5		22	4.4	2.8	3	2	12	14
Matsui et al 1995	9		20	2.222	1.667	0	0	15	15
Aryee 1992	12		35	2.917	1.833	4	5	16	22

APPENDIX 6.3

Excluded	Title	Journal and Rationale for exclusion	Year	Total Citations	Ratio	HRM Cit	Ratio
Stroh, LK; BRETT JM, REILLY AH	ALL THE RIGHT STUFF - A COMPARISON OF FEMALE AND MALE MANAGERS CAREER PROGRESSION	JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY 77 (3): 251-260 JUN describes the systemic and individual barriers impeding women's advancement. Concludes that despite doing "all the right stuff" women still aren't advancing. Not included as review of articles citing does not reveal extensively used in WF lit nor is it used to support a contention of discrimination in the HRM literature	1992	104	8.6667	65	5.41667
Meyer JP, Stanley DJ, Herscovitch L, et al.	Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences	JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR 61 (1): 20-52 AUG 2002 cited regarding commitment, discusses WF and commitment. Not included in review as articles citing does not reveal extensively used in WF lit	2002	35	17.5	22	11
Ryan AM, Sacco JM, McFarland LA, et al.	Applicant self-selection: Correlates of withdrawal from a multiple hurdle process	JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY 85 (2): 163-179 APR cited regarding turnover. Not included in review as articles citing does not reveal extensively used in WF lit	2000	26	6.5	26	6.5
Hom PW, Kinicki AJ	Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover	ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL 44 (5): 975-987 OCT cited regarding turnover. Not included in review as articles citing does not reveal extensively used in WF lit	2001	16	5.3333	14	4.66667



**Saint Mary's
University**

Halifax, Nova Scotia
Canada B3H 3C3

Patrick Power Library
tel 902.420.5534
fax 902.420.5561
web www.stmarys.ca

Research Ethics Board Certificate Notice

The Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board has issued an REB certificate related to this thesis. The certificate number is: 04-108

A copy of the certificate is on file at:

Saint Mary's University, Archives
Patrick Power Library
Halifax, NS
B3H 3C3

Email: archives@smu.ca
Phone: 902-420-5508
Fax: 902-420-5561

For more information on the issuing of REB certificates, you can contact the Research Ethics Board at 902-420-5728/ ethics@smu.ca.

w h e r e t r a d i t i o n m e e t s t h e f u t u r e