



# Recasting the Home–Work Relationship: A Case of Mutual Adjustment?

Susanne Tietze and Gill Musson

*Susanne Tietze*  
Bradford  
University School  
of Management,  
UK

*Gill Musson*  
Sheffield  
University  
Management  
School, UK

## Abstract

Advances in communication and information technologies, changing managerial strategies and changing cultural expectations about the location of (paid) work, have meant that paid work is increasingly conducted from home. Home then becomes the place where the discourse of industrial production meets with the discourse of household production. We analyse the relationship between these two traditionally separate discourses, which, through the disintegration of the time/space compression, increasingly come to bear on each other. We report on the experiences of home-workers and their families coping with the co-presence of the sometimes conflicting and sometimes competing demands and values embedded in such discourses. In doing so, we contribute to current understandings of the complexities inherent in emergent forms of organization, as the relationship between work and home is recast. Theoretically and methodologically, this empirical study is located within a discursive framework, and we emphasize the usefulness of such approaches to studying organizational realities.

**Keywords:** telework, discourse, temporal metaphors, lived experience

## Introduction

Contemporary accounts depict the future world of work as flexible, mobile, temporary and mediated by technology. Within these accounts, organizations are seen as flexible networks, virtually dispersed in time and space, so that work can be conducted with anybody, anytime, anywhere. The consequences, opportunities and fallacies inherent in such flexible organization of work have been celebrated, condemned, analysed and criticized in the accounts provided by different bodies of literatures and the media. While there is a well established, if not uncontested, body of work on flexibility from the point of view of the work organization, less is known about the consequences of such organizational flexibility from the point of view of the 'household'. To illuminate the more subtle intricacies of such flexible work, we focus here on the experience of home-based telework for a group of management professionals who had begun increasingly to work from home. The arrival of (paid) work into the private sphere of these employees and their families was a potential trigger for change in the relationship between 'home' and 'work', and it is the nature of this change that is the topic of this paper.

Organization  
Studies  
26(9): 1331–1352  
ISSN 0170–8406  
Copyright © 2005  
SAGE Publications  
(London,  
Thousand Oaks,  
CA & New Delhi)

Drawing on 'discourse' and 'discourse analysis' as topic and resource, we begin by providing the definition of discourse that we employ. Second, we explore the discourses of industry and home, unravelling their respective concepts and normative values and how these might be translated into practice and visible artefacts, including metaphoric language use. We describe and explain our research rationale and methods, following this with our interpretation of data, largely based on an analysis of temporal metaphors, although we acknowledge that space is necessarily implicated in a temporal approach. In the final sections, we explore the recasting of the work-home relationship and point to the complexities and contradictions inherent in such change.

### Using Discourse

We understand discourse as organized systems of meaning (Burr 1995) in which sets of connected concepts, terms, statements and expressions constitute a way of talking/writing about a particular theme/issue, thus framing the ways in which people feel, understand and respond to it. In particular, the existence of systematic, coherent sets of images and metaphors (Burr 1995) plays a pivotal role in sustaining particular discourses (Tsoukas 1993), and it is these metaphors that we especially focus upon here.<sup>1</sup> Human agents use such images in rhetorically constructing persuasive accounts that provide economic and social legitimacy for them (Billig 1990; Watson 1995). In this regard, metaphors in particular are 'pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action: '... [they are] the concepts that govern our thoughts [and] everyday functioning down to the most mundane details' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3). Metaphors are key constituent parts of such discursive webs of meaning, which they both express and (re)create.

Whereas metaphors have long been established as a conceptual tool in organizational analysis (Morgan 1986; Grant and Osrick 1996), there is an acknowledged dearth of studies that draw on metaphors as they are used in organizational talk (Osrick and Montgomery 1999). Here, we use metaphors as a conceptual tool, in that they provide a frame for our analysis, as well as investigating metaphors as expressed in talk and action by our respondents. We do this because metaphors can be conceived as revealing 'labels' for various discourses, and particular metaphors resonate with the values and patterns prevalent within certain discourses. This echoes the view of Tsoukas that it is 'very probable that the most popular metaphors will be those reflecting dominant ideas and biases of the pertinent social era' (Tsoukas 1993: 335).

We see discourses, then, as framing and indeed influencing the way people understand their realities and act upon them, and metaphors as having a key role to play in that process. The relationship between grand or macro (institutional) Discourses (D) and local, micro discourses (d) is a difficult one to establish and explore. Alvesson and Kärreman (2000a: 1134) comment on this relationship:

‘We think that there is a tension between those two levels ... It is not easy, we believe, to accurately account for both in the same study. This should not, however, discourage such efforts. Rigour should sometimes be downplayed for the benefit of social relevance.’

In this paper, we endeavour to capture discourse as ‘lived experience’, or micro discourses of localized practices and talk. However, we find an exclusive focus on ‘the micro’ unsatisfactory, because it can be seen as discursively ‘myopic’ (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000a: 1130). We attempt, therefore, to demonstrate how the macro Discourses of industrial and household production can be conceived as influential, and to show how they are enacted in the context of people’s lived experience. In doing so, we strike a precarious balance, and — ultimately — we cannot claim to have resolved the dilemma described by Alvesson and Kärreman. But, in exploring empirics, we make a modest claim to social relevance.

Our position, then, is that the relationship between micro discourses and macro Discourses is a mutual one: They are jointly constructed at the local and/or institutional ends that they serve. Thus, the activities of actors shape discourses, while those discourses also shape the actions of those actors (Hardy et al. 2000). We might name this complex connection ‘D/discourse’ because of this mutually implicated relationship whereby people dynamically (re)shape and develop such D/discourses. But how can we know where the influence starts and stops? How it is shaped and influenced in this iterative process? What we can say is that human actors achieve particular projects by drawing on D/discourses, because they use particular discursive resources — expressions, words (indeed metaphors), practices and symbolic behaviour informed by metaphorical concepts, the deployment of artefacts — that are made socially available to them. But this is not to say that individuals enjoy absolute freedom, following a ‘pick and choose’ approach so to speak, in assembling their identities and access to meaning making. Rather, they are simultaneously constrained (and enabled) by pre-existing D/discourses. From this perspective, individuals are seen as dynamic agents positioning themselves actively in existing D/discourses (Harré 1982; Davis and Harré 1990). These positioning actions occur in and through language (as well as other symbolic and material actions) or, to be more exact, in and through language *use*.

We do not wish to insinuate that all social actors have equal access to all meaning systems, or that all are equally equipped to draw on them, or that such utilization is a neutral and rational process, or that meaning systems exist peacefully alongside each other. People need access to symbolic and material resources and authority to make themselves heard, and legitimize their respective projects, but it is easier for some people to do so than for others (Hardy et al. 2000). For example, organization theorists in the critical tradition have invariably and consistently pointed to the silencing or distortion of voices (Harlow et al. 1995; Wolfe Morrison and Milliken 2003). Thus our thinking does not preclude the study of ideology as the route through which meaning systems can be mobilized in the interests of powerful groups (Thompson 1990).

We are aware of the controversy surrounding the use of D/discourse as a topic and resource for organizational analysis, and as a basis for theorizing (Reed 2000). Indeed, the rise of the linguistic turn in organization studies has been subject to much debate, particularly regarding the role of language in reality construction and ‘truth claims’ in research data (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000b). However, in his contribution to the discussion about the role and standing of D/discourse, Chia (2000: 513) writes: ‘The idea that reality is socially constructed, has become an accepted truth. What is less commonly understood is *how* this reality gets constructed in the first place and what sustains it.’ In choosing to analyse the metaphors-in-use of particular D/discourses, we contribute to a processual understanding of the potential recasting of home and work.

### **Discourses of Production**

We discuss here two institutional meaning systems (and therefore use the term Discourse to reflect the macro aspect) that have deeply affected the organization of life in western societies. We distinguish between a Discourse of industrial production and a Discourse of household production. These two meaning systems have become culturally different spheres: ‘The overall moral and social principle around which today’s working and living relationships are organised is that paid work of industrial production and unpaid work of household production are “separate spheres”’ (Perin 1998: 41). Industrial production has become associated with paid work and particular localities (the firm, the factory, the office) together with particular social, gender and occupational identities, and is said to follow rational, objective principles of scientific management, whereas household production has become constructed as ‘the other’ (Brocklehurst 2001), anchored into the (usually female) homemaker, located in the domestic sphere and created and sustained through the unpaid labours of love. Although we agree with Perin (1998) that such clear, dichotomous ordering is to some extent based on the myth of discontinuity, we nevertheless contend that the two Discourses can only be understood in relation to each other (see Adam 1995). We see important differences in their respective normative systems and in how they shape social interactions and provide trajectories for conduct and behaviour (Campbell-Clark 2000; Zerubavel 1991). In other words, each Discourse is defined by its ‘other’, in that the meaning of industry/home, paid work/unpaid work, breadwinner/homemaker etc. are always defined by what they are not, that is by their difference — or *différance* (Derrida 1978). In this regard, we can only understand ‘the paid work of industry’ in relation to, yet separate from, ‘the unpaid work of home’.

### **Industrial Production**

Central to the Discourse of industrial production is one particular metaphor that entails a quantifiable, reified understanding of time, which is used as a

commodity to mediate particular exchange processes, as well as a disciplinary tool to control the production process and those involved in it (Adam 1995, 2004; Nowotny 1994). ‘Time is money’ is the key metaphorical concept on which the logic of industrial production is built. The principles of scientific management (Taylor 1911/1967) involve the mastery of clock time to generate the most efficient production system for maximum profit. Time becomes a measurable resource that can be planned, controlled and efficiently administered (Sabelis 2001), and this conceptualization impacts on the experience of time. E. P. Thompson (1967: 61) writes:

‘This measurement embodies a simple relationship. Those who are employed experience a distinction between their employer’s time and their “own” time. And the employer must *use* the time of his labour, and see it is not wasted: not the task, but the value of time when reduced to money is dominant. Time is now a currency: it is not passed, but spent.’

Thus, as Thompson notes, the understanding of industrial time is based on timekeeping, time-thrift and time-discipline and, as such, ‘men’s mind became saturated with the equation “time is money”’ (Thompson 1967: 95).

Thus, time has been transformed into a currency, and ‘Time is Money’ has become one of the most dominant ‘metaphors we live by’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Encoded into this metaphorical logic are instrumental social/organizational relationships in which social actors treat each other as a means to an end, because relationships are subject to the same dictates of efficiency and subsequent standardization as the production process. Even though workers might find spaces within the domain of industrial production to escape from that logic (Roy 1960; Ackroyd and Thompson 1999), it is still one of the most dominant rationalities in the conventional workplace.

### Household Production

The household has been constructed as the opposite to industrial production (Felstead and Jewson 2000; Kompast and Wagner 1998; Mirchandani 1998) in that it presents the necessary, yet less powerful and less visible ‘other’ (Brocklehurst 2001). It is traditionally the domain of women and children. Its language is that of the labour of love, based on values of care, reciprocity and nurture. Being the complementary ‘other’ involves a different understanding of time, which draws on a plurality of temporalities (Daly 1996: 121 – 136; Davies 1990), grounded in experience of recurrent patterns and rhythms of activities. These are cyclic (rather than linear), blurred (rather than clear-cut), task-based (rather than clock-based) and embedded (rather than decontextualized). As Adam (1995: 95) puts it: ‘times for caring, loving and educating, of household management and maintenance ... are not so much time measured, spent, allocated and controlled as *time lived, time made* and *time generated*’. The metaphorical base of such temporalities is less understood and refuses to be captured in concise expressions.

We found that the notion of the Tagwerk (German: day’s work) best describes the temporalities and ethos of household production. Echoing pre-

industrial production, the Tagwerk is a measure of work that is not based on maximizing outputs through efficiency, but is grounded in experience of the variability and context-dependency of work (Adam 1990; Sennett 1998). The organizing of work, rather than being rigidly pre-given, is controlled by individual workers, who take account of changing circumstance and situational contingencies when making decisions about the fulfilment of tasks, rather than the 'clocking' of time. Events and tasks still need to be coordinated, but such coordination is achieved in a less calibrated fashion. Tagwerk — or task time — is 'less geared to standardized, bureaucratic rules and [is] more oriented to local custom' (Hochschild 1997: 47).

We do not wish to portray the household as the peaceful antithesis to the 'nasty' ways of industry and commerce. Households are 'greedy institutions' (Coser 1974) that demand undivided loyalty and commitment from their members, and individuals sometimes prefer to escape from them back to the work environment (Watson 2001). However, in the overall constellation between the two Discourses, its position is considerably weakened when viewed in relationship to the industrial Discourse, and the inequalities between these different conceptualizations of time are hardly ever questioned (Adam 1995). Activities governed by commodified work time are prioritized over those that are not convertible into exchange currency, so that 'time-generating and time-giving activities have no place in the meaning cluster of quantity, dates and deadlines, of calculability, abstract exchange values, efficiency and profit' (Adam 1995: 95). However, such Discourses and their time frames are not unalterable. Nowotny (1994), for example, points out that the advent of women in the labour market, and their 'different' temporalities, has destabilized these institutionalized structures to some extent (see also Bluedorn 2002: 26–30; McGrath and Rotchford 1983; Sirianni 1991 for discussions of dominance and ordering of different temporalities).

We should say here that, although we take the 'temporal lens' as our analytic point of departure, we acknowledge that the temporal and the spatial are mutually implicated (Karsten and Leopold 2003) if not impossible to separate (see, for example, Castells 2000). It is a moot point as to which should be privileged in the analytical process. However, in line with the renewed interest in the temporal (see, for example, Whip et al. 2002 and special issues of *Organization Studies* (2002) and *Personnel Review* (2003) on time), we draw on this as our main metaphor in the first instance. But we also acknowledge that the temporal becomes symbolized and expressed in spatial arrangements — as the enactment of the temporal order implies turning empty space into culturally coded localities and places — so that the two are mutually implicated. Conceptually, then, we draw on a binary ordering of time — clock time and Tagwerk (or task/event time) — which sees temporal orders as dualistically connected, rather than irreconcilably separated (see also Bluedorn 2002; Clark 1985; Gersick 1994; Karsten and Leopold 2003; Young 1988).

In sum, we view the two Discourses of industrial and household production as *relatively* stable institutionalized patterns accompanied by durable social relations, which are sustained through material resources and imbued with particular ideologies.<sup>2</sup> In the next section we argue that telework can

contribute to a destabilizing process, because in and through telework such discourses can meet and begin to inform each other.

## Telework

Telework literally means working at a distance. Through (information) technology it has become possible to work ‘anywhere, anytime’ (Kurland and Bailyn 1999; Tietze and Musson 2002) rather than from a particular location. Although the literature on flexibility in general and telework in particular is burgeoning (see, for example, Daniels et al. 2001), we know little about how the private sphere is affected by the advent of paid work and vice versa. While there are many forms of telework arrangements, we are interested here in home-based teleworking because it is through the relocation of paid work into the culturally different sphere of ‘home’ that the two Discourses of production meet clearly. Such meetings pose both opportunities and threats. Frequently, home-based teleworking in particular has been welcomed as the golden opportunity to reconcile work and family (Fletcher and Bailyn 1996). It is also often quoted as a key factor in accomplishing work–life balance and achieving a more holistic life (Hogarth et al. 2001).

More sceptical voices point to issues of surveillance, dominance and the rupturing of identity and autonomy of teleworkers (Brocklehurst 2001; Fairweather 1999; Felstead and Jewson 2000; Hergge et al. 1996; Hochschild 1997; Sabelis 2001; Sennett 1998). Similarly, Grey (1999: 557) warns against the dangers of interpreting diverse human activity in terms of ‘management’, in that such ascriptions are not innocent conveniences but carry ‘irrevocable implications and resonances which are associated with industrialism and modern Western terms of rationality and control’. Following this logic, we reason that through telework and the attendant increasing rapprochement between industry and household production, the private sphere has the potential to become colonized by the more dominant vocabulary and practices of industry. In other words, the time–money nexus begins to interlace with ‘the other’ temporalities, so that the D/discourse of home becomes saturated with the practices and norms of industrial production.

We would agree with Brocklehurst (2001: 462), who writes that ‘the discourse around new technology homework has yet to generate its other’. In other words, when ‘work’ comes ‘home’, definitions and boundaries blur, so that the certainties of established norms, scripts and practices become eroded and subject to change (Tietze et al. 2002). The unfreezing of clear boundaries between the Discourses of production and the household creates complexities and dynamics that are as yet not fully understood (Felstead et al. 2001). In attempting to address this knowledge gap we focus here on the following broad research questions:

*Is the relationship between the Discourse of industrial production and the Discourse of the household being recast with the advent of home-based teleworking, and if so, what is the nature of that recasting?*

*What happens to the construction of the temporal/spatial map of the household when the two discourses meet?*

*How are social relationships within the household affected?*

## **Methods**

To address these broad research questions, we used existing research contacts to visit 25 teleworkers and their families in their homes. Although these teleworkers were diverse in industrial, sectoral or functional background, degrees of seniority and career development, we chose them because they were all in a long-term employment relationship with one employer and had been working from home for some time. While some teleworked regularly (1.5–3 days a week), others did so more sporadically but for longer periods. Their ages spanned from 33 to 48 years. Eighteen were married or cohabited, four in long-term relationships, three were single, 20 had children and, of the single teleworkers, two had children from previous relationships. Of those 18 cohabiting/married households, nine had only one breadwinner (in only one case a female), and the remaining nine were dual career households, with our main contact being defined by the family as the ‘breadwinner’. Clearly then, our cohort was a disparate group, but they did have an enduring and, for us, central commonality. All the teleworkers were management professionals, with business or management education to degree level and in established careers in the middle layers of their respective organizations. As such, they were involved in high-discretion work and were self-directed in the conduct of their activities. In this sense, they all enjoyed some autonomy over the hours of their days, but paradoxically also needed to take account of another enduring characteristic of professional status: ‘a willingness to devote surpluses of time above and beyond what is formally required as a sign of trustworthiness and commitment’ (Sirianni and Walsh 1991: 424). This apparent contradiction fosters the development of particular internalized emotional and cognitive viewpoints as part of the socialization of management professionals (Watson and Harris 1999). This was the common bond shared by all our participants, and it was the management and enactment of these aspects that we were keen to explore in the context of telework.

We conducted interviews with the teleworkers and members of their families during our home visits. Prior to scheduling these visits, we negotiated with our teleworking contact that we could talk to other members of the household, and that the visit could include a ‘tour of the house’. This provided us with important insight into whether work and home spaces were kept separate, and whether boundaries were quite stringently established or whether the distinction had become blurred. There was some variation between each visit. Some teleworkers/families had established a strict protocol, which we obviously respected; others appeared more relaxed and left the management of the visit to us. Frequently, partners, spouses, children, pets, neighbours and, once, even builders interacted with us on these visits, offering their viewpoints and commenting on the viewpoints of the others. Sometimes we



were invited to stay for lunch or an evening meal, all of which we took as data-gathering opportunities, as we made clear to the families involved. Otherwise, we used the semi-structured interviews to talk about how teleworkers structured their days: where and for how long they worked, how they dealt with (unforeseen) interruptions, how they dressed, how they motivated themselves, why they liked or did not like teleworking, what they saw as the advantages/disadvantages and so on. In asking these questions, we were happy to digress and explore, attempting to increase and inform our understanding of practices and behaviour. We tape-recorded and subsequently transcribed the interviews to address issues of credibility and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba 1995). We also made notes at the end of each visit, documenting our own thoughts and understandings, especially about those parts of the process for which there was no other record.

### **Epistemological Stance**

In using discourse/metaphors as the topic and resource of this paper, we inescapably had to work with language data. We subscribe to Alvesson and Kärremann's (2000b: 151) notion of the 'framing power' of language: that although language may not be able to represent reality in toto, it 'seems capable of providing the means to communicate instructively in and on various realities'. However, the interpretation of metaphors-in-use throws open the complexities of working with such talk and symbolic data, because agents do not always use clear-cut and unambiguous metaphors. But they do use metaphorical talk, some of which we believe is more resonant with particular Discourses than with others, and thus it is possible to embark on a meaningful, though not exhaustive, process of making sense of such figurative language use (Oswick and Montgomery 1999; Watson 1995).<sup>3</sup>

Working from this perspective and taking account of our engagement with context and data, we colour-coded those data that involved the articulation of metaphors of time, assuming that when such metaphors are enacted they become visible and observable in talk and arrangement of material artefacts. We coded extracts where patterns and rhythms of time were talked about as linear or cyclic, blurred or clear-cut, task-based or clock-based, or embedded in other activities or decontextualized from other aspects of life. For example, we considered wasting time, saving time, rational planning of time and the concomitant activities as metaphors pointing to the clock-based approach to time, and the industrial Discourse, whereas expressions such as 'a good day's work', 'weighing it all [domestic and work tasks] up' and 'contingency based planning' point to a task- or event-based enactment of time, resonant with household rhythms — or *Tagwerk*. Thus, we explored explanations, contradictions and confirmations within accounts about the conceptualization and enactment of time (and space), and compared each account with every other, looking for similarities and differences in the texts.

Every researcher has to find a solution about how to make sense of and present findings. Here, we have organized the data so that they resemble a

flowing narrative, made up of words taken from the conversations that we had, which appear in *italics*; longer quotations, which are broken off and displayed; and our own words as authors of this text. As such, we fully accept our own part in the production of this piece (Alvesson and Kärreman 2000b) and the limitations of the knowledge claims that we make (Holland 1999).

## Metaphors of Time

In this section, we examine how temporal metaphors were articulated and enacted by our respondents, and explore our understanding of what these metaphors might mean for them. This articulation and enactment can take the form of routines, patterns of behaviour, symbolic behaviour, the use and deployment or artefacts and the carrying of roles, all of which can be expressed in and through talk.

### Time (and Space) Management

In all our interviews/conversations the importance of *being able to manage your time; working effectively and efficiently; not wasting too much time* cropped up. These regularly occurring expressions are based on the time/money metaphor. In such seemingly mundane terms, time is conceptualized as a valuable, but scarce, resource that must not be wasted or squandered. In the same vein, the importance of time-management skills, of being *a good time manager*, was put forward as an essential feature for maintaining professional conduct in the absence of external default mechanisms. These time-management skills were used to schedule and plan both paid and unpaid (work) activities. As one female teleworker (married, two daughters) put it:

'I'm a good time manager. Here and at work. With all our different schedules, we need to sit down once a week and devise the battle plan. This now includes me working at home. Actually, it is really beneficial to get things done efficiently.'

Thus, all activities were subject to rational planning in that they were slotted into a particular part of the overall production process. In this family, weekly meetings had become a regular material pattern through which such life management seemed to be routinely enacted. This approach also spilled over into other aspects of family life. The two daughters (aged 11 and 14), for example, found these time-management skills useful for organizing their school and social activities, since they believed that they afforded them an *advantage over those* [friends, fellow pupils] *who are all over the place*. Notwithstanding the effectiveness of such linear planning, the use of the metaphor *battle plan* indicates to us the existence of conflict and the necessity to defend one's position in the overall messy 'battle' of living.

Such time management seemed to be considered essential to maximize benefit from the working day, to get as much done as possible. In other words, mastery of time through rational planning based on clock time was often conducted in the spirit of (output) maximization. Teleworking was seen as

beneficial in achieving this, since it was easier to carve out uninterrupted work time at home than at the office. As one male teleworker put it:

‘It is easier being grumpy at home and tell someone to bugger off than telling that to a colleague let alone my boss.’

However, exploring such comments, we found that interruptions continued to exist in the home, too. Children, pets, cleaners, gardeners, partners, spouses, friends, neighbours and relatives were often described as disruptive forces which somehow had to be *managed*. This aspect of *managing* often involved others (especially wives) taking on gatekeeper roles to protect undisturbed work time — screening access, assuring silence. Some even took on unpaid typing or editing work, not unlike what a secretary at work would do. Our enquiries about whether these extra tasks were welcomed or caused any resentment always received positive responses. For example, one such (female) gatekeeper said:

‘I don’t mind doing this. We are a team, you see, and each member has a particular role. Mine is to do this.’

Turning to issues of physical space, we found this material aspect to be implicated in the enactment of temporal metaphors, for example through *hiding behind my closed door at work time*, when availability of dedicated physical space in the home was not an issue, to *building barricades with whatever I can when I’m working*, when it was. Unlike the responses to changes in role, this intrusion of work into physical space in the home did seem to cause serious resentment on the part of the social ‘others’ in some cases. Previously private spaces (dining rooms, parts of living rooms/bedrooms, guest rooms) were *occupied; taken over* by the paraphernalia of work, such as computers, printers or files. Few families with children had a spare room to furnish as an office, and their household space became occupied by work space. Although, of course, we cannot know that any of this talk necessarily reflects underlying attitudes, it did seem that the loss of physical space was interpreted as a problem, whereas people previously uninvolved with work tasks becoming unpaid ‘guardians of work time’ was not.

One family had established a white flag–red flag system to regulate access to the teleworkers, a succinct example of the intermingling of time and space. The white flag was put at the ‘office door’ when some interruptions of work could be tolerated; the red flag signified that disruptions were unwelcome. These externalized codes facilitated the separation of two discursive environments and signalled to the social ‘others’ which position was taken. One father/teleworker described this kind of management as follows:

‘It’s difficult when the boys are around, even if Mary [wife] is here. They don’t understand the boundaries as yet. When I have to get something from downstairs where they usually play, I treat them professionally, that means with some courtesy, but briefly.’

Other families invented catch-phrases such as *pretend I’m not here*, used by the teleworker whenever she did not want to become embroiled in domestic affairs, which became established as a discursive tool for all family

members whenever they wanted to avoid engagement of any kind. Similarly, a wife said:

'My friends say, "how lovely, you've got him at home three days a week. That must make things really easier". In fact, it does not, because he is not really here. He's at work. Sometimes it makes my life harder.'

These words suggest to us an absence–presence paradox. They seem to express the coexistence of the conflicting demands of two different discourses, requiring the continuous, precarious denial of one so as to make concrete the other. They also suggest the emotional effort involved in keeping the two discourses apart, both discursively and materially.

We stated earlier that the enactment of temporal metaphors can take the form of routines, patterns of behaviour, symbolic behaviour, the use and deployment of artefacts and the carrying of certain roles. But in the absence or presence of such guardians of work time, some teleworkers drew on externalized coding systems and particular scripts to manage the social relationships at home. In this sense, dress codes were used to signal the transition from one state of being to another. Of course, there were differences in the extent to which teleworkers dressed formally or informally. Some would *always dress professionally, in suit, white shirt and tie*, while others had relaxed those codes, but all had some emblematic marker that signified their being either at work or at home, for themselves and (importantly for them) for others. These included anything from dressing differently (even having daytime pyjamas as opposed to night-time pyjamas — when *still being in pyjamas* was criticized by others in the family); using different coloured lipsticks for work and home; eating or drinking habits (coffee for work; tea at home); using different phone lines; avoiding particular parts of the house (in particular the kitchen as the centre of domesticity).

Notwithstanding such normalized dominance of the temporal time/money metaphor, we also found instances when teleworkers and their families seemed adept in bending the metaphor so as to fit in with their own desires. Many teleworkers engaged intensively with (paid) work in the spirit of time-thrift to save time, but this was then *not* filled with more tasks, appointments or things to do, but described as *lazy time*; *time out* or used for leisure and family time. One teleworker referred to such time as *Gorgonzola time*, since this cheese symbolized for him culinary pleasure beyond the imagination of the disciplinary ethos. Thus, teleworkers appeared to use the very time-discipline resonant of industrial production to protect themselves and their families from it, to create spaces and modes of being outside such rational time frames. In many conversations, we discussed the importance of these *snatched moments*, or *time out* or the experience of different temporalities as a recurrent element of their lives brought about by telework. These experiences comprised increased (but not always voluntary) involvement in childcare, and gardening, walking or eating, or were more generally referred to as *playing*. For example, a single teleworker explained this experience as follows:

'I bought this new house just round the corner from the [seaside] promenade. I love going for walks there, at all times of the day. I love being a teleworker, because I can

go there every day, whenever it fits in and even when it does not! It's a reward I give myself — it's my time. Sometimes I think about work when I walk, but often I just forget what it was all about anyway and just enjoy.'

In another example, Tom, a teleworker, gave us the tour of the house, including the garden. Pointing proudly, to the beds of vegetables and borders of flowers, he said:

'They are a direct result of being at home more... I had to learn that I can do my thinking work while I am gardening. I don't have to wear a suit or sit in front of the screen.'

While these snatched moments are 'only' the 'other', they become more beautiful, because so rare. However, people often told us that they came to occur more frequently, becoming more alluring in their appeal (and therefore potentially rupturing the time–money nexus more often), tempting people to join different flows of time through modes of teleworking.

### The Tagwerk

While the time–money nexus was often reflected in the processes and practices of teleworkers' households, we also found an enacted conceptualization of time that appeared more task-based, in that the nature of the *task-to-do* or *job-in-hand* provided a different measure for the ordering of the overall day. This conceptualization existed alongside the time/money metaphor, so that none of the households we visited seemed to live by one or the other metaphor exclusively. A typical expression that suggests task-based thinking and doing was given by one teleworker, who said:

'The nine to five is gone. It doesn't exist anymore. I work more or less, it depends on the task. If possible, I structure my day around Peter [son] and Liz [wife] — sometimes this means finishing a project off after dinner. But mainly, they get priority. As I said, it all depends on the task.'

He stresses twice in this conversation that the structure of the (working) day depends on the nature of the task, as well as on household contingencies. It seems, then, that the work task is described as embedded in the domestic environment and is no longer seen to exist independently. This has the potential to change the priorities by which either work or domestic tasks are pursued, which perhaps signifies an inversion of the two D/discourses, in that the industrial discourse is not always and unquestioningly 'put above' the domestic one. We do not claim that this reordering has become the norm, but it did occur in some families quite regularly, though usually not often enough to create a complete reordering of daily life. However, in two more extreme cases, we found that teleworking triggered off a reconsideration of what life is about to the extent that career aspirations were said to be temporarily put on hold for the sake of more involvement in child rearing, and the enjoyment of a slower pace of life, respectively. Still, in many households domestic and industrial tasks were weighed up against each other on a regular basis. A female teleworker (cohabiting, no children) said:

'Well, you've got x number of things to do: from walking the dog, washing the car to checking your e-mails and working out the costing [of a project]. You've only got so much time. You weigh it all up and then you go about doing it in whatever order.'

Other teleworkers described this way of completing tasks as *pottering around from one task to the next*, or that some days are *more like a shrapnel of tasks*, so that the day began to resemble an assembly of tasks, rather than a monolith of clearly defined blocks of being either 'at work' or 'at home'. These experiences, however, sat side by side with experiences of uninterrupted engagement with tasks whenever needed.

Whereas these management professionals had always seen themselves as self-directed in the pursuit and conduct of their work tasks, as teleworkers they remained self-directed and self-controlled, but enjoyed more autonomy in the overall ordering of their time. This exercise of choice, however, also appeared to constitute a source of stress, because the co-presence of an increased number of demands and responsibilities was often described as difficult to cope with. Teleworkers expressed this metaphorically as *being stretched thin; juggling several balls; struggling to satisfy everyone or everyone gets a tiny bit of me*. This experience was for some teleworkers a concomitant side-effect of telework, finding themselves in an ontological limbo of being *neither here nor there*; of being *eternally in-between tasks or people*. This in-betweenness was also experienced as a loss of identity: On the one hand, the task-based approach to telework enabled them to make decisions about when *a good day's work was done*, sometimes resulting in a shorter working day. On the other hand, this did not always coincide with the internalized norms of industry and business, in which working long hours is visible proof of commitment and professionalism. Some teleworkers attempted to compensate for this by volunteering for more work, thus perhaps proving to themselves that they were still *true professionals*, while also demonstrating their commitment to their employer:

'I could take on some additional responsibilities because I got more done at home. It's quite important. You can't have colleagues thinking you are enjoying a cushy number at home.'

In another case, a teleworker expressed concern about loss of status and respect in the eyes of colleagues so much that, aggravated by the demands of his family, he renegotiated a return to traditional work patterns. Overall, however, partner, spouses and children talked positively about the possibilities of *sharing tasks more evenly*, found it helpful *to run the household* and to manage the vicissitudes of their everyday existence.

### **Commentary and Implications**

We use the broad research questions identified earlier to structure this section, and comment on the implications of the data presented here. Although these questions are easy to separate conceptually, the material relationships on which they focus are so intertwined that they are difficult to treat as discrete entities.

*Is the relationship between the Discourse of industrial production and the discourse of the household being recast with the advent of home-based teleworking, and if so, what is the nature of that recasting?*

Traditionally, the Discourse of industrial production has been seen as privileged over that of the household (Adam 1995; Daly 1996; Perin 1998). In many instances, we found this ordering intact in that articulations resonant of the industrial Discourse were frequently more influential than those of the household. Household roles are redefined, and gate-keeping and secretarial responsibilities become integrated into previously private roles. Drawing on the team metaphor (an image taken from the industrial Discourse if not necessarily originating there), and echoing instrumental control (Sabelis 2001), gave legitimacy to this reordering. We see these changes as far from innocent, but rather as evidence of the *potential* colonization of the private sphere with the images, practices and values of industrial Discourse (Grey 1999). Yet, demonstrating the complexity of the macro/micro D/discourse relationship, such D/discourses might also (simultaneously) empower, in that voices of children or partners/spouses were heard in family/team meetings, albeit not perhaps as ‘loudly’ (Wolfe Morrison and Milliken 2003) as those situated more centrally in the industrial D/discourse.

To an extent then, the industrial Discourse moderates the behaviour of the household, as with the mother who pretends not to be ‘here’. She experiences the paradox of conflicting demands in her roles as ‘mother’ and ‘manager’, painfully suspended between the two discourses — neither here nor there — eventually, but not always, subduing the domestic one through discursive and material practice, often accompanied by feelings of guilt (Tietze and Musson 2002). This confirms, to some degree, the concerns of the sceptics (Hochschild 1997; Kompast and Wagner 1998; Hergge et al. 1996; Sennett 1998; Sabelis 2001) that many areas of life are increasingly subject to the practices of management and industrial production. The temporal and spatial flexibility of telework enables such practices to gain a foothold in the previously distinct area of home.

*What happens to the construction of the temporal/spatial map of the household when the two discourses meet?*

The decisions made by the teleworkers and their social others about the ordering of time *and* space empirically confirms the inherent relationship between the two (Castells 2000; Karsten and Leopold 2003). Frequently, such ‘choices’ of temporal enactment, symbolized and expressed in culturally coded spaces, were made by default within the parameters of the industrial discourse, resulting in the recasting of the relationship between ‘work’ and ‘home’ in the image of paid work. In this recasting, the internalized disciplines of industry appeared to pull the strings of teleworkers. According to some commentators, we can understand this alleged self-directedness as being no more than a mask for unconscious dependence (Hergge et al. 1996; Kompast and Wagner 1998).

But, we cannot subscribe wholeheartedly to the view that ‘the private sphere seems to be increasingly dominated by the exigencies and logic of

[paid] work' (Hergge et al. 1996: 30). Rather, some teleworkers and household members occasionally appropriated the time/money metaphor, for example, according to their own needs and desires, sometimes to *snatch moments* away from its instrumental logic and sometimes to protect the home environment. We understand these snatched moments to be markers of rejection of the time–money correlation, with the potential to rupture its ethos. But it is important to stress that such moments achieved their significance for the speakers because they were *time out* and, as such, were defined as 'the other' time that exists as an ephemeral antidote to commodified time — echoing Derrida's (1978) point, that meanings are always defined by (and therefore contain traces of) their opposites. These speakers appeared to transcend the assumptions of an objective, measurable and reifiable reality into the subjective experience of the moment of being, in which the exchange relations between time and money can — momentarily — be suspended. Commodified time becomes, fleetingly, subjective experience. Nowotny (1994: 124) calls these moments 'residues of relations in which time can only be exchanged for time, and in which the norm of reciprocity determines the prevailing tone of human gatherings'. These small moments are the more valuable because they escape the time–money nexus and — because they are so rare — confirm, ironically, the economic rationale that scarcity increases value.

These data have led us to think of this appropriation of time as 'gift' time — a gift of time to oneself, to another, or even to an activity. The teleworker who gives herself the *reward* of walking on the beach each day, or the father who donates time *saved* from working more efficiently to playing with his son, or the man who uses *saved* time to tend his garden, are all evidence of a potential new economy of time. The development of this new time economy demonstrates the ability that some teleworkers have to bend, rework or perhaps remove altogether, previously immutable boundaries in pursuit of achieving a more holistic life. It emphasizes the potential (if not always the reality) of flexible/home-based work for living integrated and richer lives (Fletcher and Bailyn 1996; Hogarth et al. 2001).<sup>4</sup>

#### *How are social relationships within the household affected?*

The metaphoric 'professionalizing' of associations between family members echoes the tenets underpinning work relationships, and through this 'professionalization' the organization of the home can seem to take on industrial overtones and facilitate the development of instrumental relationships (Hochschild 1997: 48–49). But, in some of our households, telework facilitated existential question marks. In these cases, continual mutual adjustment between the two discourses emerged as a *modus vivendi*, so that the warranting of voice order was sometimes reversed and the needs and demands of children/families, gardens or pets were privileged over those of industry. This points to the possibility of at least temporarily inverting the status quo, and in two households this questioning process saw the start of a more serious unravelling of cast relationships. But, in most households, the process was more hesitant and inchoate, and sometimes such change was shunned to seek



refuge in traditional, clear-cut demarcations between paid and unpaid work, and in one case in a complete return to the office environment.

Although the employment of task time might afford degrees of reprioritizing relationships, this cannot be seen as a straightforward liberating process. In enacting task-based concepts of time, some households experienced the change in relationships as liberating and enriching, *at the same time* as stressful and exhausting. Because continuous negotiations over the use of time and space are accompanied by constant adaptation, conciliation and concession (Tietze et al. 2002), these effortful processes can begin to grind at the nerves of both teleworkers and others in their respective households, impinging on their private-life worlds in a way that paid work outside the home did not. In addition, organizing activities based on task time can tempt one to strive for completion of a maximum of tasks, which in turn opens the backdoor to the rationality of instrumentality and efficiency, because it is always possible ‘to do more’. Indeed, such speed-multi-tasking resonates with Sennett’s (1998) concern that forms of flexibility can lead to more frequent, yet more superficial involvement in a multitude of tasks and relationships. From this perspective, not only can task time be seen to accommodate clock time and the accompanying logic of the industrial Discourse, but it can also extend this reasoning into the private sphere — an ironical turn, indeed. Yet, the positive flipside of task time is that it can empower some teleworkers to create temporal niches and enclaves (Sirianni 1991) outside of and away from the dominance of the industrial Discourse, thus, potentially at least, spreading an ethos of regeneration. Task time then is not the pure and liberating conceptual counterpart to clock time. As with clock time, its functions have changed, to become more complex and possibly more problematic, and its character more ambivalent.

## Conclusions

We set out to contribute to the body of knowledge about emergent forms of (work) organization and how, through one such form — home-based telework — the relationship between the two D/discourses of industrial production and household production might be recast. We found no monolithic evidence that points to a unilateral recasting of the home–work relationship in the image of paid work. Neither have we found that ‘work’ is recast in the image of the ‘home’ with redefined roles, responsibilities and values. Rather, the case for some mutual adjustment can be made. The different temporal orders coexist in a dynamic fashion. They inform and impact on each other, but our data show that this coexistence, brought into closer focus through telework, can cause changes in the function and character of both. However, such adjustment is set within the continued influence, if not complete dominance, of the logic of the time/money metaphor.

## Notes

- 1 We are aware of current debates about further exploration of the generative capacity of metaphor and claims by some writers (Oswick et al. 2002) that it is sufficiently well understood in organization studies, and we support the claims for greater inclusivity of other tropes such as metonymy (see Musson and Tietze 2004). But further analysis of metaphors found in the field is still a fertile frame because of the relationship this trope holds with dominant ideas (Tsoukas 1993) and therefore dominant discourses.
- 2 We are not suggesting that there only two monolithic discourses. Rather, we see the two discourses of paid work and home work as particularly significant for our study, although they exist alongside (competing with, included in or including) other discourses. The discourse of gender, for example, could be considered an intrinsic part of both. Other constituent discourses might be, for example, a management, team and efficiency discourse in the industrial meaning system. The household discourse might be said to include discourses of love and/or caring, or household management (different from industrial management, we believe) and/or leisure discourses.
- 3 There are different discourse analytic approaches emanating from different traditions (see, for example, Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) for speech act theory; Fairclough (1992) for critical discourse analysis; Garfinkel (1967) and Sacks et al. (1974) for conversation analysis; Grice (1957) for pragmatics; Hymes (1974) for ethnography of communication; Hodge and Kress (1988) for social semiotics; Potter and Wetherell (1995) for psychology; Townley (1994) for a Foucauldian approach) and these might be considered mutually exclusive in their philosophical lineage, albeit sometimes similar in practice and scope. However, while we probably have most in common with Fairclough's three-dimensional approach (text, discursive practice and social practice relating to self, social relations and dominant knowledge systems, respectively), in order to achieve our aims, and following other discourse analysts, we have, in this instance, adopted an eclectic approach, focusing mainly on the analysis of metaphors.
- 4 Of course, this potential may only be realized by certain teleworkers involved in high-discretion, self-directed work. Furthermore, part-time telework is experienced differently from full-time telework in the relationships of home/work, on a conceptual, discursive and structural level. In sum, teleworking is not a monolithic concept, arrangement or activity.

## References

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Ackroyd, Stephen, and Paul Thompson<br>1999 <i>Organizational misbehaviour</i> .<br>London: Sage.   | Austin, John L.<br>1962 <i>How to do things with words</i> .<br>Cambridge, MA: Harvard<br>University Press.  |
| Adam, Barbara<br>1990 <i>Time and social theory</i> . Cambridge:<br>Polity Press.   | Billig, Michael<br>1990 'Rhetoric of social psychology' in<br><i>Deconstructing social psychology</i> .<br>I. Parker and J. Shotter (eds),<br>47–75. London: Routledge.      |
| Adam, Barbara<br>1995 <i>Timewatch: The social analysis of<br/>time</i> . Cambridge: Polity Press.  | Bluedorn, Allen, C.<br>2002 <i>The human organization of time.<br/>Temporal realities and experience</i> .<br>Stanford, CA: Stanford University<br>Press.                    |
| Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Kärreman<br>2000a 'Varieties of discourse: On the<br>study of organizations through<br>discourse analysis'. <i>Human<br/>Relations</i> 53/9: 1125–1149.                                       | Brocklehurst, Michael<br>2001 'Power identity and new technology<br>homework: Implications for "new<br>forms" of organizing'. <i>Organization<br/>Studies</i> 22/3: 445–466. |
| Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Kärreman<br>2000b 'Taking the linguistic turn in<br>organizational research. Challenges,<br>responses, consequences'. <i>The<br/>Journal of Applied Behavioral<br/>Science</i> 36/2: 136–158. | Burr, Vivien<br>1995 <i>An introduction to social<br/>constructionism</i> . London:<br>Routledge.  |

- Campbell-Clark, Sue  
2000 'Work, family border theory. A new theory for work/family balance'. *Human Relations* 53/6: 747–761.
- Castells, Manuel  
2000 *The rise of the network society. Volume 1: The information age: Economy, society and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chia, Robert  
2000 'Discourse analysis as organizational analysis'. *Organization* 7/3: 513–518.
- Clark, Peter  
1985 'A review of the theories of time and structure for organizational sociology'. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 4: 35–80.
- Coser, Lewis  
1974 *Greedy institutions*. New York: Free Press.
- Daly, Kerry, J.  
1996 *Families and time. Keeping pace in a hurried culture*. London: Sage.
- Daniels, Kevin, David A. Lamond, and Peter Standen  
2001 'Teleworking: Frameworks for organizational research'. *Journal of Management Studies* 38/8: 1151–1185.
- Davies, Karen  
1990 *Women and time. The weaving of the strands of everyday life*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Davis, Bronwyn, and Rom Harré  
1990 'Positioning: The discursive production of selves'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20/1: 43–64.
- Derrida, Jacques  
1978 *Writing and difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough, Norman  
1992 *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairweather, Ben  
1999 'Surveillance in employment: The case of teleworking'. *Journal of Business Ethics* 22/1: 39–49.
- Felstead, Andrew, and Nick Jewson  
2000 *In work at home. Toward an understanding of teleworking*. London: Routledge.
- Felstead, Andrew, Nick Jewson, Annie Phizacklea, and Sally Walters  
2001 'Working at home: Statistical evidence for seven key hypotheses'. *Work, Employment and Society* 15/2: 215–231.
- Fletcher, Joyce K., and Lotte Bailyn  
1996 'Challenging the last boundary. Reconnecting work and family' in *The boundaryless career*. M. Michael Arthur and Denise M. Rousseau (eds), 256–267. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garfinkel, Harold  
1967 *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gersick, Connie J. G.  
1994 'Pacing strategic change: The case of a new venture'. *Academy of Management Journal* 37: 9–45.
- Grant, David, and Cliff Oswick editors  
1996 *Metaphor and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Grey, Christopher  
1999 'We are all managers now, we always were: On the development and demise of management'. *Journal of Management Studies* 36/5: 561–585.
- Grice, Paul H.  
1957 'Meaning'. *Philosophical Review* 67: 377–388.
- Hardy, Cynthia, Ian Palmer, and Nelson Phillips  
2000 'Discourse as strategic resource'. *Human Relations* 53/9: 1227–1248.
- Harlow, Elizabeth, Jeff Hearn, and Wendy Parkin  
1995 'Gendered noise: Organizations and the silence and din or domination' in *Gender, culture and organizational change*. C. Itzin and J. Newman (eds), 91–107. London: Routledge.
- Harré, Rom  
1982 *The language makers*. London: Duckworth.

- Hergge, Raphael, Paul Kolm, Martin Kompast, Gerald Steinhard, and Ina Wagner  
1996 'Alternierende Telearbeit bei IBM, Forschungsbericht zu einem Pilotversuch' (Alternating Telework at IBM. Research Paper of a Pilot Study). Vienna: IBM.
- Hochschild, Arlie  
1997 *The time bind. When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hodge, Robert, and Günther Kress  
1988 *Social semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hogarth, Terence, Chris Hasluck, Pierre Gaele, Mark Winterbotham, and Vivian David  
2001 *Work-life balance 2000: Baseline study of work-life balance, practices in Great Britain*. DfEE report no. 249.
- Holland, Ray  
'Reflexivity'. *Human Relations* 52/4: 463-484.
- Hymes, Dell  
'Toward ethnographies of communication' in *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnographic approach*. D. Hymes (ed.), 3-28. Philadelphia, PA: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Karsten, Luchien, and John Leopold  
2003 'Time and management: The need for hora management'. *Personnel Review* special issue on Time and Management, L. Karsten and J. Leopold (eds), 32/4: 405-421.
- Kompast, Martin, and Ina Wagner  
1998 'Telework. Managing spatial, temporal and cultural boundaries' in *Teleworking: International perspectives. From telecommuting to the virtual organisation*. P. Jackson and J. van der Wielen (eds), 95-117. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kurland, Nancy, and Lotte Bailyn  
1999 'Telework. The advantages and challenges of working here, there, anywhere and anytime'. *Organizational Dynamics* Autumn: 53-68.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson  
1980 *Metaphors we live by*. London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lincoln, Yvonna, and Egon Guba  
1995 *Naturalistic enquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McGrath, Joseph E., and Nancy L. Rotchford  
1983 'Time and behavior in organizations'. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 5: 57-101.
- Mirchandani, Kiran  
1998 'No longer a struggle? Teleworkers' reconstruction of work-non-work boundary' in *Teleworking: International perspectives. From telecommuting to the virtual organisation*. P. Jackson and J. van der Wielen (eds), 118-135. London and New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, Gareth  
1986 *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Musson, Gill, and Susanne Tietze  
2004 'Places and spaces: The role of metonymy in organizational talk'. *Journal of Management Studies*. 40/8, 1301-1324.
- Nowotny, Helga  
1994 *Time. The modern and postmodern experience*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Organization Studies*  
2002 'Time and reflexivity in organization studies'. *Organization Studies* Special Issue 23/6.
- Oswick, Cliff, and John Montgomery  
1999 'Images of an organization: The use of metaphor in a multinational company'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12/6: 501-523.
- Oswick, Cliff, Tom Keenoy, and David Grant  
2002 'Metaphor and analogical reasoning in organization theory: Beyond orthodoxy'. *Academy of Management Review* 27/2: 294-303.

- Perin, Constance  
1998 'Work, space and time on the threshold of a new century' in *Teleworking: International perspectives. From the telecommuting to the virtual organisation*. P. Jackson and J. van der Wielen (eds), 40–55. London and New York: Routledge.
- Personnel Review  
2003 'Time and management'. *Personnel Review* Special Issue 32/4. Lucien Karsten, and John Leopold (eds).
- Potter, Jonathon, and Margaret Wetherell  
1995 'Discourse analysis' in *Rethinking methods in psychology*. J. A. Smith, R. Harré and L. van Langengrove (eds), 59–72. London: Sage.
- Reed, Mike  
2000 'The limits of discourse analysis in organizational analysis'. *Organization* 7/3: 524–530.
- Roy, Donald F.  
1960 'Banana time. Job satisfaction and informal interaction'. *Human Organization* 18: 158–168.
- Sabelis, Ida  
2001 'Time management. Paradoxes and patterns'. *Time & Society* 10/2–3: 387–400.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schlegoff, and Gail Jefferson  
1974 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversations'. *Language* 50/4: 696–735.
- Searle, John R.  
1969 *The construction of social reality*. London: Penguin.
- Sennett, Richard  
1998 *The corrosion of character. The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. London: Norton & Co.
- Sirianni, Carmen  
1991 'The self-management of time in postindustrial society' in *Working time in transition. The political economy of working hours in industrial society*. K. Hinrichs, W. Roche and C. Sirianni (eds), 231–274. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Sirianni, Carmen, and Andrea Walsh  
1991 'Through the prism of time: Temporal structures in post-modern America' in *America at century's end*, A. Wolfe (ed.), 421–439. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Taylor, Frederick W.  
1911/ 1967 *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- Thompson, Edward Peter  
1967 'Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism'. *Past and Present* 38: 56–96.
- Thompson, John B.  
1990 *Ideology and modern culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tietze, Susanne, and Gill Musson  
2002 'Working from home and managing guilt'. *Organisation and People* 9/1: 34–39.
- Tietze, Susanne, Lynette Harris, and Gill Musson  
2002 'When work comes home: Coping strategies of teleworkers and their families'. *Journal of Business Ethics* 41/4: 385–396.
- Townley, Barbara  
1994 *Reframing human resource management. Power, ethics and the subject at work*. London: Sage.
- Tsoukas, Haridimos  
1993 'Analogical reasoning and knowledge generation in organization theory'. *Organization Studies* 14/3: 323–346.
- Watson, Tony  
1995 'Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense-making'. *Organization Studies* 6/3: 805 – 821.
- Watson, Tony  
2001 *In search of management. Culture, chaos and control in managerial work*. Revised edition. London: Thomson Learning.
- Watson, Tony, and Pauline Harris  
1999 *The emergent manager*. London: Sage.

Whip, Richard, Barbara Adam, and  
 Ida Sabelis, *editors*  
 2002 *Making time. Time and management  
 in modern organizations*. Oxford:  
 Oxford University Press.

Wolfe Morrison, Elizabeth, and  
 Frances J. Milliken  
 2003 'Speaking up, remaining silent: The  
 dynamics of voice and silence in  
 organizations'. *Journal of  
 Management Studies* 40/6:  
 1353–1358.

Young, Michael  
 1988 *The metronomic society: Natural  
 rhythms and human timetables*.  
 Cambridge, MA: Harvard  
 University Press.

Zerubavel, Eviatar  
 1991 *The fine line. Making distinctions in  
 everyday life*. Chicago: The  
 University of Chicago Press.

### Susanne Tietze

Susanne Tietze is Senior Lecturer in Human Resource Management and Organizational Behaviour at Bradford University School of Management, UK. Currently, her research focuses on the exploration of flexible forms of work organization and their effects upon a multitude of stakeholders. In this context she is Principal Investigator of a study on the management of telework in four UK public sector organizations. Her methodological approach is positioned in an interpretivist tradition and concerns itself with understanding how meaning patterns are made and changed in social and organizational contexts.

*Address:* The Management Centre, Bradford University School of Management, Emm Lane, Bradford BD9 4JL, UK.

*E-mail:* s.tietze@bradford.ac.uk

### Gill Musson

Gill Musson is a Senior Lecturer in Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Management at Sheffield University Management School. She is a co-granholder, with Susanne Tietze, on an ESRC-funded investigation into teleworking in the public sector. She is interested in how people make sense of their organizational lives, and all her current projects explore how people 'manage' in virtual working environments, with a methodological focus on the language/reality relationship.

*Address:* Sheffield University Management School, University of Sheffield, 9 Mappin Street, Sheffield S1 4DT, UK.

*E-mail:* g.musson@sheffield.ac.uk