



---

## **Cold War, chilly climate: Exploring the roots of gendered discourse in organization and management theory**

*Mary Runté and Albert J. Mills*

### **ABSTRACT**

Prior to the mid-1970s, gender was virtually absent from theories of management and organization (OMT), particularly within the North American context. In recent years, four strands of research have brought gender into management theory – gender and organizations, women in management, work-family conflict, and diversity management – but largely in ways that reinforce the masculinist project. With the exception of the more critical gender and organizations approach, gender continues to be discussed in OMT in ways that privilege masculinity and problematize femininity. This is particularly true of the work-family conflict literature and, to a lesser extent, the women in management literature. In this article, we are interested in the *root* of the gendered discourse within OMT. Through a feminist hermeneutic excavation of the development of modern OMT in post-war USA, we conclude that the continued masculinist project owes much to Cold War discourses of family and work.

### **KEYWORDS**

Cold War ■ discourse ■ gender in organizations ■ management theory ■ work & family

McClelland's 1953 book on achievement motivation 'was nine hundred pages long and discussed achievement motivation as if the author's theory applied to everyone. Only one footnote informs the careful reader that data on females do not fit into the theory'.

(French, 1985: 475)

Theories of management and organization (OMT) provide the stories by which we come to understand the world and our place within it (Boje et al., 2004; Czarniawska & Gagliardi, 2003; Van Maanen, 1988). Feminist analyses of these stories reveal embedded notions of gender (Mills & Tancred, 1992) and sexuality (Hearn et al., 1989) that privilege masculinity over femininity (Hearn & Parkin, 1983). Various studies of sex/gender at work have broadened OMT stories to include women, but have barely dented the dominant narratives of masculinity. For example, sex roles studies have included sex as 'an important variable', but in a way that marginalizes and problematizes gender by positing it 'as a binary factor pertinent to specific interpersonal practices, not a pillar of organizing' (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004: xiv). Even the 'work-and-family and women-in-management literatures [which] expand the variable-analytic view by calling attention to gender as a political and systemic matter' tend to position women in organizations as 'visibly gendered "others," while men are erased as the genderless norm' (Ashcraft & Mumby, 2004: xiv). Men and masculinity remain unproblematic (Collinson & Hearn, 1996); women and femininity continue to be viewed as problematic (Calás & Smircich, 1996). Feminist interrogations of gender discourse in OMT reveal an assumed domestic-public divide, with the respective roles of women and men thereby implied (Wilson, 2003), most obvious in the work-family conflict literature (Runté & Mills, 2002, 2004) and to varying degrees in the sex-roles and women-in-management literatures. Ashcraft and Mumby (2004: 3) argue that this divide remains largely undisturbed because OMT researchers treat 'gender as a defining element of human identity and highlight how it shapes interactional tendencies'.

Feminist theory has contributed to our understanding of the gendered beginnings of management theory, through study of the development of Taylorism (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998), the early Human Relations (Acker & van Houten, 1974) and leadership studies (Mills & Simmons, 1995), the neglect of pioneering women theorists (Tancred-Sheriff & Campbell, 1992), and the development of motivation theory (Cullen, 1992, 1997). In this article, we extend the feminist project through an examination of the development of management theory in the US during the Cold War era and identify important clues for the 'neglect' of gender in OMT generally, and work-family specifically, by revealing the embeddedness of gender in the socio-political context shaping these discourses.

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: 814). Discourses frame and influence people’s understandings of the world and thus guide their behaviours. Here, we identify the contours of the gendered meta-discourse of work-family and examine how it became embedded and perpetuated in OMT. We argue that ‘work’ and ‘family’ are 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. The intersection of the discourses of work and family, the meta-discourse of ‘work-family,’ becomes its own dynamic discourse as the two disparate elements of which it is comprised exist in conflict, tension and harmony, as the definitions of ‘work’, of ‘family’ – and therefore the discourse work-family interaction – are continually redefined, even as other elements remain immutable. The 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 – are therefore examined in this article 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: 126).

Our excavation of the work-family discourses begins with an historical examination of the socio-political context in which the discourses, as reflected in OMT, emerged. We then turn to an examination of these discourses in work-family and related theories.

The first phase of our analysis focuses on the work relations of women in the Second World War and the shaping of work and family discourses in this period. We then focus on how – in spite of objective social conditions at the conclusion of the Second World War that might appear to have favoured radicalizing discontent among working women – the dominant discourses of the war intersected with the socio-political discourses of the Cold War era to pre-empt the emergence of class-consciousness among displaced female workers, thus delaying the development of an effective feminist challenge to the discourses of work-family. In the second phase of our analysis, we demonstrate how the gendered notions of work and family roles, left intact from the war period and reified by Cold War socio-political discourse, were entrenched in gendered social scientific theories that continue to dominate management thought. Only by recognizing the hegemonic nature of the dominant work-family discourses can the impact of changing

social and economic conditions on management theory and the role of women in the economy be understood, and the daily challenges of combining work and family roles be addressed.

### The discourses of work-family

#### The feminist potential of war-time employment

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 et al., 1941: 469, emphasis in the original)

As reflected in the management texts of the time (see, for example, Balderston et al., 1935; Davis, 1940; Folts, 1938) prior to the Second World War, it was assumed that women's place was in the home, that they had a 'moral injunction' to be at home and bear children (Scott et al., 1941: 475). By 1930, women constituted less than 25 percent of the US 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: 477).

With the onset of the Second World War, 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.

Analysis of the discourses of work and family suggests that the war 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: 125). New Deal legislation, wartime 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: 475).

### Constraining Cold War discourses

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: 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 grew in number from 3 to 3.5 million and there were numerous female activists across the political spectrum, but especially among the left and liberal communities (Horowitz, 1998). Yet women's participation in the US workforce fell from a peak of nearly 36 percent during the war (Horowitz, 1998) to 27 percent 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: 313).

The potential triggers for a broadening of the work discourse to include a more inclusive role for women failed to come to fruition, we would argue, for four related reasons. First, the patriarchal discourse of work was sufficiently dominant that it had become, in Gramsci's (1978) terms, 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. 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 and images of masculinity and femininity became embedded in the reconversion process (O'Connor & Jackson, 1980; Quart & 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 the role of the idealized family: as Rowbotham (1999: 312) notes, 'McCarthyism was never simply about politics; there was a tremendous emphasis upon social conformity and an ideal of the family'. As we shall show, these elements were echoed in the gendered nature of management theories of the day.

*The not so changing discourse of family: Work, war and still  
'being a woman'*

Whenever there is a shortage of male labor, as under war conditions, an influx of women into industry occurs.

(Anderson et al., 1942: 43–4)

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: 476)

The dominant discourses of work-family have 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 (Christie, 2002; Sangster, 2000). The discourse of work prior to the Second World War was mostly silent on the full and voluntary participation of women: 'the public world of production tended to be associated with men, politics and work; the private world of family, nurturing, and unpaid work, with women' (Sangster, 2000); although women's presence in the home created the conditions whereby men could engage in market-work. Women were therefore the silent, limited and marginalized partners in the work discourse – invisible and mostly disregarded. War-time employment, although potentially heralding a significant social change, was instead incorporated within the pre-existing *discourse of family* 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 their own families. Thus, the boundaries of the discourse of 'home' were extended to include the 'home front'; women never achieved status in the discourse of work.

### *Tensions at the boundaries of discourse: Keeping women 'home'*

The discursive construction of the female war worker during the Second World War had two effects that were to shape the discourse of work during the Cold War era: the extension of the discourse of home and family to accommodate wartime labour, which limited the inclusion of women in the discourse of work; and the empowerment of individual women, which created the conditions for questioning the discourse of work as masculine purview. Thus, notions of femininity and masculinity remained relatively unchallenged. The discourse of work, the privileged male purview, was shifted to the 'real work' of the war effort; the discourse of home, the female purview, was shifted to include the domestic responsibility of maintaining the home front. Women did not achieve recognition for their newfound work capabilities because their activities were not perceived to be 'work'.

To those who had, often reluctantly, accepted female labour as a temporary war measure, the role of woman as helpmate to the male meant the immediate and unquestioned return of women to family responsibilities – the place where she could now best 'help.' Part of the post-war efforts to reinforce traditional gender roles involved encouraging women to become subordinate and passive to help men reintegrate themselves into civilian life (Rosenberg, 1994). Many women, however, questioned the inevitability of their displacement given their proven ability and, in the immediate post-war era, working-class women were politically active challenging this marginalization (Cobble, 1994).

### *Post-war: Keeping women out of work*

The message that the work women were doing during the war was temporary became a major theme of the Reconversion Period; consequently, women found themselves at the end of the war in nearly the same discriminatory employment position they had faced prior to the war. Endeavours to maintain the pre-war status quo were also evidenced in the retraining programmes and the disqualification of married women from unemployment insurance (despite their having been required to pay premiums).

The labels of 'helpmate' and 'temporary worker' for women's work domain involvement were 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 (Hartmann, 1982; 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.

### *Suburbanization and the feminine mystique*

A post-war trend with significant implications for feminism and the social construction of women's role was suburbanization. The notion of 'suburbanization' took its meaning from a combination of post-war prosperity and Cold War discourse. Post-war prosperity accelerated the move away from the downtown core, which undermined the material conditions conducive to the emergence of an organized women's movement and created the social conditions to remobilize women to fight the Cold War. Women were isolated physically from locations of work and restricted in their ability to question their limited status in the discourse of work.

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 the Second World War 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: 3), who were to act as the 'front line defense against treason' (p. 33). 'Suburbia would serve as a bulwark against communism' (May, 1988: 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: 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 bounded 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 so too busy coping to provide leadership, particularly when the social-political climate made such endeavours 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). Consequently, suburbanization left these women vulnerable to the depiction of their legitimate class grievances in individual and psychological terms. In contrast with the tenement, whose paper-thin walls made privacy, and therefore the pretence of the perfect family, impossible to maintain, the prosperity of suburbia demanded that women not only keep up with the Joneses, but 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, de-skilled (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 home front as women were mobilized to fight communism.

### *Cold War images of femininity and masculinity*

Although the Second World War 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 and thus reinforced 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, 1989). Men who had displayed their masculinity doing the ‘real work’ of war fighting in the Second World War, 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: 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). The patriotic spirit that encouraged women’s work during the war years was drawn upon to reinforce women’s renewed role of homemaker. Early marriages were on an increase, in part because youth saw ‘no other true value in contemporary society’ (Friedan, 1963: 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 ‘American’ freedom and prosperity.

Friedan noted that the baby boom was permeated with the mystique of feminine fulfillment to a greater extent in the US than elsewhere. ‘The feminine mystique flourished in part because it filled a gap in what might be

described as national identity' (Grant, 1994: 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 US 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: 124). Friedan's analysis was based in part on idealized images of women in women's magazines. 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: 1558). That '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: 182). Nonetheless, even within these texts, the discourse of competence was balanced against a discourse of family – the exemplar of public success also had a beautiful home and attractive figure.

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 the Second World War lessened, the enhanced foreign programme of the Cold War also stimulated production. Coupled with a dramatic increase in consumer production, prosperity ensued.

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: 186–7).

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: 123). 'An exaggerated cult of masculine toughness and virility' (Cuordileone, 2000) legitimized conservative American foreign and domestic policies and usurped both liberal and radical agendas, which were characterized as effeminate. Through this process, the role of women was further boundaried, and gains in female labour 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: 581). Traditional concepts of femininity were emphasized to develop more 'manliness through contrast' (Grant, 1994: 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 anti-communist doer' (Cuordileone, 2000: 521).

The polarization of images becomes more graphic and obscene with McCarthy who blamed 'America's position of impotency' on liberalism. He 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 cock-sucker.' 'In much right wing rhetoric [the liberal] was feminine in principle, effeminate in embodiment, and emasculating in effect' (Cuordileone, 2000: 523). 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, effeminate.

### *Anti-communism, McCarthyism and the silencing of radicalism*

Seedlings of optimism for more inclusive policies towards women were present at the end of the Second World War, as 'many aspects of feminism flourished right after the war' (Horowitz, 1998: 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: 125). The activism of working-class women in the *immediate* post-war era is well documented (Cobble, 1994). Labour 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 mutual hostility between the US and USSR brought the threat of atomic destruction directly into American homes. The Cold War, manifested in the US as a reaction against communism, was part of a transformation in American international relations from sporadic interventionism to positioning as a sustained global power. This transformation had profound implications for gender roles and relations, which capitalized on the discourses of the war era whilst relegating females to an even more confined and limited role: 'The resurgence of a feminine stereotype in US popular culture paralleled the evolution toward superpower status and permanent global security commitments' (Grant, 1994: 120).

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).

Even liberal women's organizations, including the American Association of University Women came under attack from anti-communist 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: 140). 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: 124)

### **From discourse to theory: Women's place in management theory**

#### The chilly climate of OMT: Freezing women out

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) over the four decades following the Second World War. 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.: 3). In the post-war era many management texts reflected this 'philosophy of management' but with a new Cold War zeal. Folts (1954: 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'.

### Representation of women in OMT

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: 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 image 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: 494) but may play an important role where they are fortunate to be the wives of executives (Wickert & McFarland, 1967: 40). The potential for an increased presence of women in the discourse of work was not realized in the emerging field of OMT.

### Women at the margins of OMT: 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. The experience of female psychologists serves as an exemplar of these processes of marginalization and exclusion. In the Second World War, 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: 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: 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: 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: 168). Stressing professional ethics, the members of the SSWP were 'charged with emotionalism and lack of objectivity' (Capshew & Laszlo, 1986: 172). Even the more radical Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) failed to recognize female equity as an issue. By the end of 1945, of more than 1000 psychologists that directly served in the US armed forces, less than 40 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 onset of the Cold War the new behavioural sciences 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.

## The genesis of work-family conflict theory

### *Mainstream theories 'boundaring' work and family*

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 management 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 (Runté & Mills, 2004). 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.

Although these gendered assumptions have a long history, they became concretized in the emergent social sciences of the early Cold War years (Barnett, 1997) and were articulated in theories of role formation and function. 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: 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 (cf. Carney & Kahn, 1984). One result of the propensity to assert power is a hyper-competitive spirit, as failure to assume power over others is a defeat or 'emasculatation' (LaFollette, 1992; O'Neil, 1982). 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: 202). Consistent with, or building upon Termini and Miles's 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'. 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 studies on the workplace in the Cold War period, some exemplars of which follow, predominantly centred on the experience of men,

excluding women from analysis and frequently acting as if the non-work domain did not influence male experience. The Western Collaborative Group Study (Rosenmann et al., 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 et al.’s (1960) 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, identified role conflict as inevitable when one attempts to reconcile incompatible roles (Katz & Kahn, 1966). In their seminal study, Kahn et al. (1964) focused on the male experience. This model, as applied by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), is the basis of the most frequently cited article on work-family interaction (Mason, 2002) and has been used extensively to explain why women have difficulty in transitioning between work and home. Thus, through application of this theory to work-family interaction, the interface of the domains came to be termed ‘work-family conflict’, consistently identifying the interaction of the domains as a ‘problem’ rather than a vehicle of enhanced well-being (Runté & Mills, 2002).

### *Work-family conflict: Discourse frozen in time*

The antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict, studied through a lens of role conflict (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Hobfall, 1989; Westman, 2001), are well documented in management literature and clearly reflect Cold War discourse on work and family roles – presented as hegemonic truths.

Why did role conflict achieve hegemonic authority? The theoretical position of role conflict both reflected and reinforced the clearly delineated gendered roles of the Cold War discourses, 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 could be employed to argue for less rigidly defined boundaries) and interface theory (which allows for positive consequences of women’s engagement in market work) were more radical and potentially destructive of the status quo. The dominance of functionalism in sociology and role theory in management speaks to the power of discourse to limit critique. Since research tradition builds and tests established tenets and theory, the dominance of role theory as the foundation of the research tradition of work-family conflict effectively entrenched the Cold War discourses of work and family in the research discourse that continues essentially unchallenged to today. In this section, we

trace academic research on work-family interaction from its early emergence as a model supporting domain segregation, whereby the roles are defined and compartmentalized, to more current models that purport domain integration. This transition from compartmentalization to integration (Kirby et al., 2003) although appearing to represent a shift in the discourse of work-family that allows for more inclusive representation of women, remains predicated on Cold War discourses. The dominance of role theory as the theoretical linchpin of OMT research on work-family is one reason why research on work-family, while superficially appearing more inclusive, remains frozen in time.

Early studies on work and family build on the tenets of role conflict and focus exclusively on the experience of men as employees and women as wives and mothers. 'Organizations came to perpetuate an ideology of separate worlds, which holds that work and home are bounded in space and time, carrying out autonomous functions according to distinctive rhythms' (Kirby et al., 2003: 6). Women were not included in the work discourse and therefore had limited representation in workplace-oriented studies. Gross et al. (1958), for example, assessed time usage by male school superintendents. Werbel (1978) included women in their sample, although 96 percent 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 et al. (1979, 1980), for example, assessed the impact of men's work on their families, with wives, as the 'masters' of the domain of 'family' providing the evaluation.

As women's presence in the workplace became more obvious and enduring during the Cold War period, the research literature no longer excluded women explicitly, but instead scrutinized how their workplace involvement might create dissonance for the male in the family dyad (e.g. Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Keith & Schafer, 1980). Women were not excluded subjects; they were now an object of study, their presence a problem that needed solving. The domain of work is the primary arena of male responsibilities; that men may be expected to assume a greater role in the family domain was seen as a 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: 80). The boundaries between the work and family domain were now represented as being permeable, but this permeability necessarily created conflict.

As women continued to move into market-work, however, the discourse shifted from a theme of exclusion to accommodation: 'Men do not have to change, nor does the system, except to the extent that it must

“accommodate” women’ (Bacchi, 1990: p. xvi). Women, despite an ever increasing presence in market labour, continue to be responsible for maintenance of the family domain (Hoschchild, 1997); organizational response to deal with this time strain includes the creation of family-friendly benefit programmes, such as flex-time; flex-place and employer-supported childcare. The effectiveness of these programmes for mitigating work-family conflict and enhancing workplace commitment has been inconclusive (Goodstein, 1994). The discourse of work addresses the needs of individual employees (principally women) without addressing the structures of work and the time demands work places on these employees. If unable to commit time equivalent to a male, she is by default a bad employee. Accommodation does not mean adaptation, however, as women are expected to minimize deleterious interaction for the protection of work priorities even while ensuring that the family responsibilities are gloriously satisfied. The roles of work and family/worker and parent remain entrenched in a literature that maintains ‘role [as a] foundational construct’ (Kirby et al., 2003: 11).

A recent shift in work-family research to a more interactive model, focusing on domain integration, has been identified (Kirby et al., 2003; Runté & Mills, 2004). Edwards and Rothbard’s (2000) model, which exemplifies this trend (Kirby et al., 2003), identifies the mechanisms that link the domains. These mechanisms, however, rely on role construct that are ‘clearly definable and unchanging rather than socially constructed’ (Kirby et al., 2003: 11). Critical discussion on the persistence of roles in the shaping of self (Kirby et al., 2003) as well as family interaction (Runté & Mills, 2004) reflects the hegemony of the Cold War discourses that reinforced and reified the gendered nature of the domains of work and family and the roles imbued therein.

The discourse of mother-blame also permeates the literature on the career outcomes of work-family conflict. Many women elect to become more focused on familial responsibilities after becoming parents or when elder care responsibilities beckon. Other women are compelled to assume these familial tasks, less by choice than by default. That women spend time having and nurturing children and extended family – a rewarding and important role that we argue men should experience more fully – often means that their time commitment to work is necessarily diminished. The non-remunerated labour of the family domain, for example, is insignificant to the discourse of work. It is feminized and therefore antithetical to the masculine discourse of the work domain. In fact, familial responsibilities continue to be characterized in the mainstream literature as ‘non-work’ (see Barnett & Gareis, 2000; Thompson & Bunderson, 2001; Wallace, 1999). Hence, breaks in paid employment for the fulfilment 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 (Miree & Frieze, 1999). The time commitment to the work domain is to be open-ended and limitless; therefore engagement in familial roles and prioritizing time commitment to family, even during non-working hours, is interpreted as diminished commitment to work (Runté & Mills, 2004). A shift in time commitment to the family domain is, according to the discourse of work-family conflict, 'reasonably' penalized; women are blamed for their engagement in the family domain. Pregnancy and familial responsibilities provide the ideological basis for the exclusion of women from the workplace. The rationale for women's ideological (if not always actual) exclusion from the workplace therefore reflects both the separation of the domains of work and family, but also the privileging of the male within the boundaries of the work discourse (Blum, 1999). Mother-blame reflects the competing truth claims in the work-family discourse that requires women to simultaneously give first priority to family and to organizational needs (Kirby et al., 2003). The Cold War discourses of masculinity and femininity continue to be embedded in the work-family discourse, modified only to allow for greater movement between the domains, that is, women are 'allowed' to work, while maintaining stinging indictments of those who fail to do so seamlessly.

### Summary and conclusion

The hegemony of discourse is rooted in historical context. The emergence of the discourse of work-family conflict within OMT 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 helpmate 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 work-family conflict emerged that demarcated 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 OMT.

What conclusions can we then draw from these historical fragments? First, by examining the roots of modern management theory in their Cold War context, we reveal the role of socio-political discourse. Far from an objective scientific approach to business, what is revealed is the way that socio-political notions of gender become embedded in management theory. Second, we can also see how certain discourses (e.g. the idea of a Cold War) may act as imperatives that underwrite ways of viewing management (e.g. the interaction of work and family spheres). When those imperatives are rooted in masculinist imagery, they can have profound implications for men and women at work. Thus, as we analyse the interrelationship between socio-political discourse and management, we need to pay particular attention to the role of imperatives. Third, although the relationship between (management) theory and socio-political context is complex, OMT in the Cold War period not only *reflected* but also *reproduced* gendered notions of reality. Fourth, the masculinist character of management theory also relied on related social factors that effectively undermined the potential for resistance, with the advent of a consumerist society, the suburbanization of middle-class women and the development of a feminine mystique, and various gender identity struggles as male veterans attempted to reintegrate into post-war civilian life. This masculinist nature endures in the structure of organizational life and in the expectations placed on women's and men's priorities in the work-family interface.

Fifth, supported by socio-political imperatives (e.g. Cold War ideology), embedded ideas of gender divisions can be maintained in the face of changing social experiences and for a considerable period of time: this is the case with the roots of the work-family-conflict debate. The discourse of work-family conflict that presents work and family as incommensurable spheres remains dominant in management theory. That this conflict discourse remains rooted in the social context of 50 years past should serve to emphasize a need to challenge this hegemonic paralysis. 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 present understandings.

The context of the Cold War for the development of gendered notions of work and family remain largely unexamined in the literature: literature on the Cold War has focused on the domestic roots and processes of this transformation, yet has under-explored the nature of gender relations as both a catalyst to, and consequence of, the engagement of the US against perceived communist threat. This article has attempted to contribute to that enquiry by taking up Ashcraft and Mumby's (2004) call for analysis of how gender organizes discourse, discourse (dis)organizes gender, organizing (en)genders discourse, and discourse (en)genders organization.

## References

- Acker, J. & van Houten, D.R. Differential recruitment and control: The sex structuring of organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1974, 9(2), 152–63.
- Anderson, A.G., Mandeville, M.J. & Anderson, J.M. *Industrial management*, rev. edn. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1942.
- Archer, J. & Lloyd, B. *Sex and gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Ashcraft, K.L. & Mumby, D.K. *Reworking gender. A feminist communicology of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.
- Bacchi, C.L. *Same difference: Feminism and sexual difference*. North Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1990.
- Balderston, C.C., Karabasz, V.S. & Brecht, R.P. *Management of an enterprise*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1935.
- Barnett, R.C. How paradigms shape the stories we tell: Paradigm shifts in gender and health. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1997, 53(2), 351–68.
- Barnett, R. & Gareis, K. Reduced hours employment. The relationship between difficulty of tradeoffs and quality of life. *Work and Occupations*, 2000, 27, 168–87.
- Bell, D. (Ed.) *The new American right*. New York: Criterion Books, 1955.
- Benschop, Y. & Doorewaard, H. Six of one and half a dozen of the other: The gender subtext of Taylorism and team-based work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1998, 5(1), 5–18.
- Boje, D.M., Oswick, C. & Ford, J.D. Language and organization: The doing of discourse. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2004, 29(14), 571–7.
- Burke, R.J., Weir, T. & Duwors, R.E. Type A behavior of administrators and wives' reports of marital satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1979, 64, 57–65.
- Burke, R.J., Weir, T. & Duwors, R.E. Work demands on administrators and spouse well-being. *Human Relations*, 1980, 33, 253–78.
- Blum, L.M. *At the breast: Ideologies of breastfeeding and motherhood in the contemporary United States*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1999.
- Calás, M.B. & Smircich, L. From 'the woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W.R. Nord (Eds), *Handbook of organization studies*. London: Sage, 1996, pp. 218–57.
- Capshew, J.H. & Laszlo, A.C. 'We would not take no for an answer': Women psychologists and gender politics during WWII. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1986, 42(1), pp. 157–80.
- Carney, C. & Kahn, K. Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A self-regulatory developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 1984, 12(2), 111–19.
- Christie, N. By necessity or by right: The language and experience. *Labour/Le Travail*, 2002, 50, 117–51.

- Cobble, D.S. 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, PA: Temple, 1994.
- Collinson, D.L. & Hearn, J. (Eds) *Men as managers, managers as men*. London: Sage, 1996.
- Cooke, B., Mills, A.J. & Kelley, E.S. Situating Maslow in Cold War America: A recontextualization of management theory. *Group and Organization Management*, 2005, 30, 129–52.
- Coontz, S. *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap*. New York: Basic, 1992.
- Cullen, D. *Sex and gender on the path to feminism and self-actualization*. Toronto: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 1992.
- Cullen, D. Maslow, monkeys and motivation theory. *Organization*, 1997, 4(3), 355–73.
- Cuordileone, K.A. Politics in an age of anxiety: Cold War political culture and the crisis of American Masculinity. *Journal of American History*, 2000, 87(2), 515–45.
- Czarniawska, B. & Gagliardi, P. (Eds) *Narratives we organize by*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Davis, R.C. *Industrial organization and management*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940.
- Davis, R.C. *Industrial organization and management*, 3rd edn. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Edwards, J.R. & Rothbard, N.P. 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*, 2000, 77(2), 85–129.
- Folts, F.E. *Introduction to industrial management*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Folts, F.E. *Introduction to industrial management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- French, M. *Beyond power: On women, men, and morals*. New York: Summit Books, 1985.
- Friedan, B. *The feminine mystique*. New York: Dell, 1963.
- Goodstein, J.D. Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: Employer involvement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1994, 37(2), 350–82.
- Gramsci, A. *The modern prince and other writings*. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- Grandey, A.A. & Cropanzano, R. The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1999, 54, 350–70.
- Grant, R. The Cold war and the feminine mystique. In P. Beckman, F. d'Amico Bergin & J. Garvey (Eds), *Women, gender and world politics*. London: 1994.
- Greenhaus, J.H. & Beutell, N.J. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 1985, 10, 76–88.
- Gross, N., Mason, W.S. & McEachern, A.W. *Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency role*. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Gurin, E., Veroff, J. & Feld, S. *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Halberstam, D. *The fifties*. New York: Fawcett Books, 1994.
- Hartmann, S.M. *The home front and beyond: American women in the 1940s*. Boston, MA: Twayne, 1982.
- Hearn, J. & Parkin, P.W. Gender and organizations: A selective review and a critique of a neglected area. *Organization Studies*, 1983, 4(3), 219–42.
- Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff, P. & Burrell, G. (Eds) *The sexuality of organization*. London: Sage, 1989.
- Heenan, T. & Nyland, C. Running the McCarthyist gauntlet: The cleansing of progressivism from management thought in post war years. Paper presented at 'The Cold War and Management' Stream, of the 3rd International Critical Management Studies conference, Lancaster University, 7–9 July 2003.
- Hobfall, S.E. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 1989, 44, 513–24.

- Hochschild, A.R. *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997.
- Holahan, C.K. & Gilbert, L.A. Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual-career couples. *Human Relations*, 1979, 32, 451–67.
- Horowitz, D. *Betty Friedan and the making of the feminine mystique*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D. & Rosenthal, R.A. *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Keith, P.M. & Schafer, R.B. Role strain and depression in two job families. *Family Relations*, 1980, 29, 483–8.
- Kennan, G. *Memoirs*. London: Hutchinsons of London, 1967.
- Kirby, E., Golden, A., Medved, C., Jorgenson, J. & Buzzanell, P.M. An organizational communication challenge to the discourse of work and family research: From problematics to empowerment. In P. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 27*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003, pp. 1–44.
- Klatch, R. 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, 1990, pp. 529–52.
- LaFollette, H. Real men. In L. May & R. Strikwerda (Eds), *Rethinking masculinity: Philosophical explorations in light of feminism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1992, pp. 59–74.
- Mason, C. 100 most frequently cited articles in Social Sciences Index: A list. 2002, available at: [[http://www.bc.edu/bc\\_org/avp/wfnetwork/loppr/top100.pdf](http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/wfnetwork/loppr/top100.pdf)], accessed 25 May 2005.
- May, E.T. *Homeward bound: American families in the Cold War era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- May, E.T. Explosive issues: Sex, women and the bomb. In L. May (Ed.), *Recasting America: Culture and politics in the age of the Cold War*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1989, pp. 154–70.
- Meyerowitz, J. Beyond the feminine mystique: A reassessment of postwar mass culture, 1946–1958. *The Journal of American History*, 1993, 79(4), 1455–82.
- Mills, A.J. Feminist organizational analysis and the business textbook. In D.E. Hodgson & C. Carter (Eds), *Management knowledge and the new employee*. London: Ashgate, 2004, pp. 30–48.
- Mills, A.J. & Helms Hatfield, J.C. From imperialism to globalization: Internationalization and the management text. In S.R. Clegg, E. Ibarra and L. Bueno (Eds), *Theories of the management process: Making sense through difference*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998, pp. 37–67.
- Mills, A.J. & Simmons, T. *Reading organization theory*. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1995.
- Mills, A.J. & Tancred, P. (Eds) *Gendering organizational analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992.
- Miree, C.E. & Frieze, I.H. Children and careers: A longitudinal study of the impact of young children on critical career outcomes of MBAs. *Sex Roles*, 1999, 41, 787–808.
- Moskowitz, E. ‘Good to blow your top’: Women’s magazines and a discourse of discontent, 1945–1965. *Journal of Women’s History*, 1996, 8, 66–98.
- Nickerson, M. Women, domesticity and Cold War activism. *Organization of American Historians, Magazine of History*, 2003, 17(1), 17–21.
- O’Connor, J.E. & Jackson, M.A. (Eds) *American history/American film*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980.
- O’Neil, J. 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*. New York: Plenum Press, 1982, pp. 5–44.
- Parsons, T. & Bales, R.F. *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955.

- Pearlin, L.I. Sex roles and depression. In N. Datan & L.H. Ginsberg (Eds), *Life-span developmental psychology: Normative life crises*. New York: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 191–207.
- Pidgeon, M. Women workers and recent economic change. *Monthly Labour Review*, 1947, 65, 666–71.
- Quart, L. & Auster, A. *American film and society since 1945*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Robin, R. *The making of the Cold War enemy: Culture and politics in the military-intellectual complex*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Rosenberg, E.S. Foreign affairs after WWII: Connecting sexual and international politics. *Diplomatic History*, 1994, 18, 59–70.
- Rosenmann, R.H., Friedman, M., Straus, R. et al. A predictive study of coronary heart disease: The Western Collaborative Group Study. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1964, 189, 15–22.
- Rowbotham, S. *A century of women. A history of women in Britain and the United States*. London: Penguin, 1999.
- Runté, M. & Mills, A.J. The discourse of work-family conflict: A critique. In G. Miller (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Gender and Diversity in Organization Division of the Annual Meeting of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada*, Winnipeg, 25–28 May, 2002.
- Runté, M. & Mills, A.J. Paying the toll: A feminist post-structural critique of the discourse bridging work and family. *Culture and Organization*, 2004, 10(3), 237–49.
- Samuels, G. Why twenty million women work. In M. Dubofsky (Ed.), *American labor since the New Deal*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, 1971, pp. 183–91.
- Sangster, J. Feminism and the making of Canadian working-class history: Exploring the past, present and future. *Labour/Le Travail*, 2000, 46, 127–65.
- Schrecker, E. *Many are the crimes: McCarthyism in America*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1998.
- Scott, W.D., Clothier, R.C., Mathewson, S.B. & Spriegel, W.R. *Personnel management: Principles, practices, and point of view*, 3rd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1941.
- Tancred-Sheriff, P. & Campbell, E.J. Room for women: A case study in the sociology of organizations. In A.J. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds), *Gendering organizational analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992, 31–45.
- Termini, L.M. & Miles, C.C. *Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.
- Terry, G.R. *Office management & control*, rev. edn. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1953.
- Thompson, J.A. & Bunderson, J.S. Work-nonwork conflict and the phenomenology of time: Beyond the balance metaphor. *Work and Occupations*, 2001, 28, 17–39.
- Van Maanen, J. *Tales of the field*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Wallace, J. Work-to-nonwork conflict among married male and female lawyers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1999, 20, 797–816.
- Ware, S. *Women: A documentary history*. Chicago, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1989.
- Watson, T.J. Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense making: A reflexive tale. *Organization Studies*, 1995, 16(5), 805–21.
- Weatherford, D. *American women and WWII*. New York: Facts on File, 1990.
- Weedon, C. *Feminist practice & poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Werbel, J.D. Work and physical health. In A.K. Korman (Chair), *Management alienation*. Symposium conducted at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Academy of Management, New York, 1978.
- Westman, M. Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations*, 2001, 54(6), 717–51.
- Wickert, F.R. & McFarland, D.E. *Measuring executive effectiveness*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Wilson, F.M. *Organizational behaviour and gender: Innovative business textbooks*, 2nd edn. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Wrege, C.D. The inception, early struggles, and flowering of the Academy of Management. Academy of Management Archives. Ithaca, NY, in the Kheel Center for Labor-Management Documentation and Archives, Martin P. Catherwood Library, Cornell University, n.d.

**Mary Runté** (PhD) is Assistant Professor of Policy/Strategy at the Faculty of Management, University of Lethbridge (Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada). Her research interests focus on the intersection of work and family, nonprofit management and social responsibility.

[E-mail: mary.runte@uleth.ca]

**Albert J. Mills** (PhD) is Professor of Management and Director of the PhD in Management at the Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University (Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada). His research interests – which focus on the impact of organization and organizing on human liberation – include gender, identity and organizational culture; existentialism and management; management theory and the Cold War; and the impact of the call centre on identity in Canada and India. He is the author of over 150 scholarly publications, including *Sex, strategy and the stratosphere: The gendering of airline cultures* (Palgrave, 2006), *Reading organization theory* (with Tony Simmons and Jean Helms Mills, Broadview, 2005), and *Identity politics at work* (with Robyn Thomas and Jean Helms Mills, Routledge, 2004).

[E-mail: albert.mills@smu.ca]