

Being the “Go-To Guy”: Fatherhood, Masculinity, and the Organization of Work in Silicon Valley

Marianne Cooper

Based upon in-depth interviews with fathers who are employed as knowledge workers in Silicon Valley, this article argues that a newly constituted masculinity has emerged that coincides with the new way work is organized in the new economy. The article examines the relationship among this gendered subjectivity, processes of labor control, and fathering. It finds that the new masculinity functions as a key mechanism of control in high-tech workplaces that rely on identity-based forms of control and that the enactment of this new masculinity impacts the way fathers think about, experience, and manage their work and family lives.

KEY WORDS: fatherhood; masculinity; labor process; Silicon Valley.

INTRODUCTION

Driving down a busy freeway into the heart of Silicon Valley, one sees billboards everywhere heralding the arrival of the new economy. Ads for e-tailing, high-speed Internet connections, and dot.com job openings permeate the skyline. Even a sign for *Forbes* magazine announces “high octane capitalism ahead.” While it is undeniable that the new economy is here, it is also undeniable that this is largely a male endeavor. A recent report by the American Association of University Women (2000) found that women make up only about 20% of information technology professionals and that they receive less than 28% of the computer science bachelor’s degrees. In fact, Silicon Valley itself is often referred to as the “Valley of the Boys,” an appropriate adage now that San Jose boasts the highest number of available single men in the country, surpassing Alaska (Conlin 2000).

It is within this male-dominated, turbo-capitalism environment that the fathers I interviewed negotiate their work and family lives. The intent of my study

Direct correspondence to Marianne Cooper, University of California, Berkeley, 410 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, California 94720-1980; e-mail: coops@socrates.berkeley.edu.

was to explore the mostly ignored experiences of working fathers. What I discovered through my examination of these men's work and family lives was the emergence of a newly constituted masculinity that coincides with the new way work is organized in the new economy. Two questions addressing both sides of the work-family equation flowed from this discovery: How does this new masculinity articulate with processes of labor control? And, how does it articulate with processes of family life, particularly fathering? Thus, my findings are twofold. First, they show that as a gendered construct, this new masculinity functions as a key mechanism of control in high-tech workplaces that rely on identity-based forms of control. Second, they show that the successful enactment of this new masculinity shapes how these fathers both think about and manage their work and family lives.

METHODS

Many researchers report difficulty in recruiting men to participate in studies of this kind (Daly 1992). However, men eagerly responded to my interview request. I obtained a sample of twenty fathers through various methods. Through friends and acquaintances I sent out an e-mail message requesting one-hour interviews with fathers working in high-tech companies to discuss how they balance work and family life. I also sent the same e-mail message to the parents' list server at one large company and a university. I received over thirty e-mail responses. I ruled out those who were self-employed, since I wanted to get information about workplace culture, interactions with co-workers, etc. I ruled in knowledge workers who seemed to have significant industry experience in a variety of companies as well as those who worked for well-known companies in Silicon Valley. I conducted semi-structured open-ended interviews with the twenty participants. The interviews took place at cafés, homes, and workplaces and lasted between one and two hours. All interviews were tape-recorded and fully transcribed.

The interviewees work in all different types and sizes of high-tech companies. While some work for large companies that make millions of dollars a year, others work for small start-ups. Thirteen interviewees are software engineers, one is a service engineer, one an engineering project manager, three are in sales/business development/management, and two are computer researchers.

My informants ranged in age from thirty to forty-four; the average age was thirty-seven. Though incomes ranged from \$60,000 to \$200,000, most were concentrated in the \$80,000 to \$150,000 range. Except for one informant who was Mexican-American and did not have a bachelor's degree, the rest were white and held college degrees. Three participants had Ph.D.s, two had MBAs, three had master's degrees in computer science, and one had a master's degree in math. All fathers are currently married. Seven of their spouses work full-time, four work part-time, three are students, and six are stay-at-home mothers.

A NEW MASCULINITY FOR THE NEW ECONOMY

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the definition and practice of masculinity reflected by the emergence of the “New Men’s Studies” (Carrigan et al. 1985; Brod and Kaufman 1994; Connell 1995; Mac An Ghail 1996). Much of this scholarship draws upon R. W. Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity. For Connell (1995), hegemonic masculinity “is the configuration of gender practices which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (p. 77). While there is a hegemonic form of masculinity, which in the U.S. could be seen as a rich, good-looking, popular, athletic, white, heterosexual man, masculinity is not unitary or homogeneous. Rather, there are “multiple masculinities,” some subordinate and some dominant, which are created by differences in ethnicity, race, class, sexual orientation, age, and occupation (Connell 1987).¹ Even hegemonic forms of masculinity are historically and locally contingent. As Connell (1995) points out, hegemonic masculinity “is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is, rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable” (p. 76).

Given that the form and content of hegemonic masculinity is dependent upon the social and historical context in which it operates, it follows that the Silicon Valley context should shape the particular type of masculinity found in the high-tech world of the new economy. Indeed, scholars have already established that technical knowledge and expertise are socially defined as masculine (Cockburn 1988; Turkle 1984, 1988; Hacker 1990) and that within these male domains computing cultures possess a specific masculinity (Wright 1996; Kendall 1999, 2000). For example, Wright (1996) found that the masculinity characteristic of engineering and computer cultures is one “requiring aggressive displays of technical self-confidence and hands-on ability for success, defining professional competence in hegemonically masculine terms and devaluing the gender characteristics of women” (p. 86), and Kendall (2000) found that the masculinity enacted by young male participants in an on-line interactive text-based forum was constructed around a “nerd” identity, characterized by qualities like fascination with technology and real or perceived social ineptitude.

This nerd masculinity, common in the high-tech world, is glorified in depictions of Silicon Valley life. Even the success story of the founders of Silicon Valley is a phenomenon often referred to as “The Revenge of the Nerds.” Men

¹Though some scholars take a more essentialized view of masculinity (and femininity), believing that certain practices indicate that a person is a man or woman (Collinson and Hearn 1994), I take a less embodied viewpoint. I agree with Alvesson and Billing (1997), who see masculinity and femininity as “traits or forms of subjectivities (orientations in thinking, feeling, and valuing) that are present in all persons, men as well as women” (p. 85).

who in their youth were marginalized for being geeks and nerds came back as adults to get the last laugh. Using their intellect, they launched a technological revolution and in the process of changing the world became very rich and very powerful.

The consequence of the facts that technology is the foundation of the new economy and that those who participate in it enact a masculinity that diverges from traditional masculinity is the emergence of a newly constituted masculinity in the Valley. Here, technical skill and brilliance are more important than looks and athletic ability. In the Valley, competition isn't waged on the basketball court or by getting girls. Here men compete in cubicles to see who can work more hours, who can cut the best code, and who can be most creative and innovative. As one interviewee put it:

Guys constantly try to out-macho each other, but in engineering it's really perverted because out-machioing someone means being more of a nerd than the other person. It's really geeky. It's really sad. It's not like being a brave firefighter and going up one more flight than your friend. There's a lot of see how many hours I can work whether or not you have a kid. That's part of the thing, how many hours you work. He's a real man, he works ninety-hour weeks; he's a slacker, he works fifty hours a week. (Scott Webster)

Moreover, high-tech companies are organized in ways that deviate from traditional masculinity. Because it is believed that bureaucratically organized companies stifle creativity and out-of-the-box thinking, typical high-tech companies have a flat hierarchy and a less rigid and austere workplace culture (Kunda 1992; Burris 1998). Furthermore, these companies embrace managerial discourses that champion teamwork, adaptability, open communication, and creativity. These qualities run counter to traditionally masculine practices. Alvesson (1998) makes this point, noting that in knowledge intensive jobs,

there may be limited space for employment of many of the traditionally used sources of male power and male identity associated with bureaucracy and rationality. New discourses advocated by management theorists as well as by corporate practitioners instead construct work and organizations in terms of creativity, intuition, flexibility, flattened hierarchy, social interaction, and team building, etc. (p. 2).

Thus, the Valley is based upon a masculinity that corresponds with what the technology industry needs to satiate and expand its markets.

Ideological reasons, and in some cases biographical ones as well, also underpin this new masculinity. All of the high-tech workers I spoke with profess an egalitarian gender ideology in regard to women in the work force. They feel it is important for more women to go into the high-tech industry, and many of the fathers I interviewed wished they worked with more women. In fact, in an effort to diversify their teams, several said that they go out of their way to recruit women, extending searches longer than necessary to try to find qualified women candidates.

To be sure, the majority of my sample perceive themselves to be qualitatively different from other men in terms of their more enlightened personal attitudes

towards and relationships with women. This self-perception is evident through comparisons the interviewees make between themselves and men who they feel are sexist or stereotypically macho.

I don't drive a pick-up truck and wear tattoos. I'm very modern. I believe in sharing the household work and believe that my wife's career is important. (Rich Kavelin)

Communication is something that is important to us. So when something goes wrong, when we have a disagreement or a misunderstanding, my wife feels doubly hurt. Because she thinks, well we put such a value on trying to communicate and it failed. I think it makes it worse than if she were married to Joe Six-Pack. (Jay Masterson)

Many interviewees also separated themselves from frat boys and locker room guys, men who they think are sexist and hostile towards women; that's not what kind of men they are. Unlike stereotypical working-class men who openly degrade women and put them down, these men actually feel virtuous for not being sexist like them or completely ignorant about emotions and relationships like most men. These interviewees think of themselves as "modern," not frat boys; progressive, not stupid jocks.

Biography may also underpin this new masculinity. Though not a focal point of my study, my perception is that as nerds, approximately two-thirds of my sample were victims of traditional hegemonic masculinity in their earlier lives. Accordingly, they may also have personal as well as ideological reasons to oppose a traditionally macho masculinity.

Taken together, type of work, ideology, and, in some cases, biography, work against the form of masculinity that remains dominant in much of society. Nonetheless, there is still a hegemonic masculinity in the new economy, but one that takes on somewhat different characteristics. Though the essence of this masculinity is rooted in technical expertise, its other characteristics involve working a lot of hours and working with a small team of *great* people to get things done. James McNichol and Scott Webster, both software engineers, describe the team dynamic:

James: It's like a sports team. Not in the sense of locker room, but in the sense that there is just a natural order, and everybody gets their place and you work together. There are lots of models that boys grow up with for how that kind of team works and what you do and don't do. Like not questioning the coach and there's a lot of doing and thinking about it afterwards instead of considering the options beforehand. It's not an articulate culture.

Scott: The key element of this whole environment is the team mentality. It's an idea derived from male tradition probably. Even as a contractor you have to live with it too. You have to be part of the team, you can't fall out. If you get injured, you come back as fast as you can or you play with your injury whether it's emotional or physical.

The successful enactment of this masculinity involves displaying one's exhaustion, physically and verbally, in order to convey the depth of one's commitment, stamina, and virility.

Engineers have this idea that you are out there and you are building something and these small companies are going to do huge things and lots of people are going to get rich and it's gonna happen because we are great. Even under normal circumstances when there are no

extraordinary demands you see people working thirty-six hours straight just because they are going to meet the deadline. They are going to get it done and everybody walks around proud of how exhausted they were last week and conspicuously putting in wild hours. It's a status thing to have pizza delivered to the office. So I don't know why it happens, but I really feel like it is kind of a machismo thing, I'm tough, I can do this thing. Yeah I'm tired but I'm on top of it, you guys don't worry about me, I can get my thing done . . . The people who conspicuously overwork are guys and I think it's usually for the benefit of other guys. (Kirk Sinclair)

Theoretically, the knowledge work these men do is gender-neutral. As opposed to manual work that requires physical strength, knowledge work requires only mental ability. Therefore, either men or women can perform knowledge work. Yet, as Leidner (1993) found and the above quotations illustrate, most jobs can be constructed as either masculine or feminine by emphasizing certain aspects of the job and de-emphasizing and reinterpreting other dimensions. The gendering of jobs that are potentially gender-neutral illustrates how gender is constructed through work, how gendered subjectivities are formed. In this case, masculinity is constructed by imbuing knowledge work with a masculine sensibility that isn't intrinsic to the work. Willis (1977) found a similar trend among working-class men.

Manual labor is suffused with masculine qualities . . . The toughness and awkwardness of physical work and effort—for itself and in the division of labour and for its strictly capitalist logic quite without intrinsic heroism and grandeur—takes on masculine lights and depths and assumes a significance beyond itself. Whatever the specific problems, so to speak, of the difficult task they are always essentially masculine problems. It takes masculine capacities to deal with them . . . The brutality of the working situation is partially re-interpreted into a heroic exercise of manly confrontation with *the task*. Difficult, uncomfortable or dangerous conditions are seen, not for themselves, but for their appropriateness to a masculine readiness and hardiness. (p. 150)

The same male “readiness and hardiness” is both needed and glorified in high-tech knowledge work as well.

There's a certain glamour to heroic efforts. If you look at a well-managed company that delivers a reliable product on time with no fuss, there's no talk of it. But the release of an important product becomes lore when the engineering team worked for a week solid to get it done. Those kind of amazing efforts are talked about. (Kirk Sinclair)

Remarkably, poor planning is reinterpreted as a test of will, a test of manhood for a team of engineers (men). Sheer determination and strength of character achieve the task, releasing a product on time. Presented with an overwhelming challenge, it takes masculine capabilities to complete the mission, to overcome the odds.

A “masculine mystique” permeates descriptions of what the interviewees do at work (Collinson and Hearn 1996a). It's as if these men are digital warriors, out conquering enemies, surmounting insurmountable odds in their quest to win. The interpretation of this work in such masculine terms points to the “doing of gender” in everyday social interactions (West and Zimmerman 1987). Here, masculinity is performed and achieved by infusing the work with masculine meanings that

convey to others one's internal strength, competitive spirit, and ability to get the job done.

GENDER AND THE LABOR PROCESS

Not surprisingly, the new masculinity and the workplace practices associated with the achievement of this gendered subjectivity benefit the technology industry. Technical brilliance, innovation, creativity, independent work ethics, long hours, and complete dedication to projects are the main requirements for companies trying to position themselves on the cutting edge. This link between gendered subjectivity and labor process conditions suggests that masculinity may then be a way to control worker's participation in the labor process. Despite the likely link between gender and strategies of control, scholars have noted the absence of research about gender in organizations and about how gender works in the dynamic processes of consent and control (Kanter 1977; Acker 1990; Collinson 1992; Collinson and Hearn 1996b; Mac An Ghail 1996; Pierce 1996; Alvesson and Billing 1997; Lee 1998).

Ignoring gender, most labor process theorists have instead focused on class-based forms of worker control (Braverman 1974; Edwards 1979; Burawoy 1979, 1985). Lee (1998) addresses this lack of gender analysis and develops a feminist theory of production politics which takes account of the role gender plays in the development of control strategies. Lee's theory argues that "factory regimes are gendered institutions in which gender is a central and primary organizing principle of production politics" (p. 165).² Lee draws upon Acker's (1992) definition which states that a gendered institution is one in which "gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and distributions of power in the various sectors of social life" (p. 567). In applying feminist theory to the shop floor Lee argues that "production relations rely on gender ideology, organization, and identity, factors that also shape the terms and forms of production politics" (p. 165). Lee's addition of a gendered analysis to a literature focused on class challenges the primacy given to class in labor process accounts. In doing so she refutes Burawoy's claim that labor process activities are "independent of the particular people who come to work, of the particular agents of production" (1979, p. 202).³

With labor process scholars looking at how gender works on the shop floor (Collinson 1992; Lee 1998), it would make sense for scholars concerned with identity-based forms of control to also pay attention to gender, a key aspect of an individual's identity. Identity-based forms of control, or what Etzioni (1961)

²Lee is working from Burawoy's (1985) theory of factory regimes which entails two components: the labor process, meaning the technical and social organization of production, and the production apparatuses, meaning the institutions that regulate and shape the workplace politics (p. 19).

³Other scholars have critiqued Burawoy's disregard of the gendered dynamics on the shop floor. See Davies (1990) and Knights (1990).

termed normative control, is control which works by laying claim to the worker's sense of self, engendering in them a deep personal commitment to the goals and values of the company. As stated by Kunda (1992):

... under normative control, membership is founded not only on the behavioral or economic transaction traditionally associated with work organizations, but, more crucially, on an experiential transaction, one in which symbolic rewards are exchanged for a moral orientation to the organization. In this transaction a member role is fashioned and imposed that includes not only behavioral rules but articulated guidelines for experience. In short, under normative control it is the employee's self—that ineffable source of subjective experience—that is claimed in the name of the corporate interest (p. 11).

Thus, this type of control is a self-surveilling one which monitors work behavior by eliciting thoughts, feelings, and emotions that correspond with the interests of the company. However, research on normative control has not looked through a gendered lens (Edwards 1979; O'Reilly and Chatman 1986; Kunda 1992). Instead, it has focused on mechanisms through which organizations attain identity-based consent, like strong workplace cultures, and on the characteristics of the organizational identity without discussing what the gender, racial, or class dimensions of this identity might be.

Kunda (1992) is particularly guilty of this omission in his ethnography of normative control in the engineering division of a high-tech company. Though Kunda convincingly illustrates how the company engineered its culture so as to create a member role that was internalized by employees, his analysis omits the way in which gender intersects with corporate culture, giving rise to a particular type of normative control operating in this firm. In fact, there is no mention that men overwhelmingly dominate engineering divisions. Therefore, Kunda makes the same mistake many other labor theorists do: His argument rests on the assumption that a workplace comprised mostly of men is actually gender-neutral.

Even though Kunda's ethnography is ostensibly not about gender in organizations, it could be read as such. Mumbly (1998) provides this alternative reading, arguing that Kunda unwittingly offers an analysis of the social construction of white-collar masculinity. Through a comparison with Collinson's (1992) ethnography of working-class masculinity, Mumbly highlights the gendered dynamics that Kunda disregards. Mumbly notes that the self-identity of these engineers is so embedded in their work that there is almost no distinction between their private and public selves. Indeed, he illustrates how the acceptance and enactment of organizational membership can lead to a devaluation of family life and can, in its extreme, cause burnout. The type of masculinity constructed among these engineers is rooted in technical expertise, mental ability, and mental, emotional, and physical endurance, not physical prowess. Ultimately, Mumbly illuminates what Kunda doesn't see—that masculine subjectivities are created and constructed through participation in the labor process itself, that normative control is gendered.

Both Mumbly and Lee offer correctives to the literature on the labor process by asserting that gendered discourses, practices, and ideologies are of primary

importance in the organization of work. Moreover, they point out that conceptions of masculinity and femininity are reflected in the way work is organized. As workers enter “gendered institutions,” they come into contact with specific understandings of femininity and masculinity. They must then negotiate their own gendered subjectivity within the context of an institutional setting.

MASCULINITY—THE INVISIBLE CONTROL STRATEGY

High-tech companies rely on normative control to manage the white-collar, or knowledge, workers they employ for three reasons. First, with such a tight labor market, workers are not dependent on any one company for the reproduction of their labor power. Consequently, more coercive tactics, already thought to be incompatible with managing educated and highly skilled workers, are untenable because employees would just leave oppressive work environments. Second, normative control is seen to be well-suited to companies that want to encourage creativity and innovation, characteristics which aren’t associated with coercive, technical, or bureaucratic styles of control (Kunda and Van Maanen 1999). Third, at this point in the technological revolution, the member role and work behaviors that high-tech companies seek are so pervasive and diffuse throughout Silicon Valley itself that little articulation of these practices is needed in order to guide workers’ thoughts and actions. Dylan Fitzgerald describes this collective consciousness:

My sense is that being in Silicon Valley that [the culture] is already so much around that [description of it] isn’t needed. I mean you almost just have to refer to it and everyone goes yeah. They know what you are talking about. And everyone here knew that. They knew they were signing up for a start-up company in Silicon Valley and that was part of the expectation. It was going to involve a commitment to a small group of people whom [sic] are all counting on each other to make the thing work and there was a potentially big financial pay-off if the whole thing worked out.

These workplace practices are so entrenched that interviewees often used the term Silicon Valley as shorthand for what is to them a clearly defined way of being and of doing. Companies can then rely on the internalization of these shared understandings to regulate workers. This is particularly beneficial for smaller companies with limited resources because they don’t have to invest a lot of time or money into codifying and perpetuating the culture.

The culture of Silicon Valley is dominated by the logic of the market. A “masculine ethic” (Kanter 1977, p. 22), or the assumption that a worker doesn’t have any outside obligations that conflict with their ability to put work first, makes ten-hour days the norm. Yet, this market logic is made palatable because it is cloaked in a youthful playfulness that pervades the Valley. Indeed, young people (mostly men) with technical skills flock here in search of stimulating work and opportunities to strike it rich. But behind the flex-time and casual dress is a culture in which the viewpoint of the shareholder reigns supreme. Beneath the playfulness a serious adult game is being played, a game in which large amounts of money can

be won or lost. In order to win in this world, you have to be inventive and brilliant, you have to squash your competitors by cornering the market, and you have to do it all quickly. The pace is intense; if you stop to take a breath you might miss out.

The fast pace, frenzied lifestyle, and devotion to work are norms clearly internalized by my interviewees. This internalization process is evident when my interviewees report feeling pressure to work, but view the pressure as emanating from an internal rather than an external source. Accordingly, the interviewees more often attribute intense work ethics to individual personality traits than to management and co-worker expectations.

For example, Dylan Fitzgerald's daughter had health problems when she was born. As a principal founder of the start-up in which he currently works, he feels he was given a lot of flexibility to take care of family matters. He said that he took five months off for paternity leave and felt no pressure from his co-workers to return. Yet, as we continued the interview it became clear that he in fact had worked during this time and that he was under pressure, but in his view it was his own.

[After my daughter was born] I didn't come back to work at all for about two months and was part-time for about six months and I was just extremely fortunate to have the flexibility. I'm sure my co-workers would rather have had me back but I didn't get any pressure.

I tried to keep up with e-mail. I tried to keep up with what was going on. I probably came in once or twice a week for particular meetings. But it wasn't that people were pressuring me but my own sense of things that needed to happen, that I knew people were counting on getting done. So there was kind of a self-generating pressure.

I think what really happened was that I worked a couple hours a day, maybe even half-time towards the end. But because I was not actually meeting any of the deadlines that I had planned for myself, I kept feeling like I wasn't doing what I was supposed to be doing.

In reality, Dylan did not take time off from work. Instead, he worked less than the amount he expected of himself as a member of a start-up. This pattern of actually working when an interviewee stated that he had taken time off for paternity leave occurred several times.

When I was on paternity leave with my first child, I actually did a fair amount of work. At the time I was writing programs that really ran on a standard PC, so while Brad was sleeping I wrote. Basically I built an entire product so I had no compunction about work because I was actually working. (Alan Payne)

The desire to work all the time is seen by James McNichol as arising out of an addiction to work as well as workplace expectations:

So I think there are a couple things going on. First, if you are talking about software guys, most of these guys are just addicts. It's one of the most addictive professions that I know. And it attracts addicts so they are just strung out. They just can't withdraw from working. They can't withdraw from programming especially. Second, the level of management in high-tech companies is just for shit. I mean you've got these nerd addict engineers managing other nerd addict engineers. The managers are giving the engineers the message all the time that you've got to work and most of them don't know how to delegate, it's just pitiful, it's just awful. My god, I mean talk about sweatshops, I mean they are oblivious. The managers

have no idea what an altered state they are in all the time while they are managing these guys. So I think engineers are getting constant messages that if they are not working all the time then they will be replaced. I mean their entire self-esteem is based on the code they are cutting, it's really sad. But give an addict any free time at all and they will work.

Interestingly, though James thinks that managers pressure people to work, he believes that he works so much because of his own individual desire to work, his own addiction.

I work way more than anyone gives me the message to work. I give myself the message that I have to work all the time. I struggle with that all the time. I'm just as much an addict as the rest of these guys, but it's just intrinsic to personality types . . . I'm getting better though. It used to be just because I was an addict. I was just anxious as hell unless I was working. This sense of mastery that you have over this piece of computer software is just astounding, it's just unrivalable in the real world. The real world looks like a series of terrible mishaps that you have very little control over. So you know, the lure of spending your time in front of a machine where you just have complete control over is pretty extraordinary.

I think lately I've gotten much better. I'm working a lot right now because we are very close to bringing out a new product, but I've gotten much better. Hey, when you got here I was fixing my bike, I mean I'm not working right now. It took me a long time to realize that just because I wasn't working 9 to 5 doesn't mean I have to work all the time. I just learned that I had to take time for myself, take time away from work when things weren't busy. And I think that's taken just years and twelve-step programs literally just to learn not to fall into those traps.

Despite James' belief that he works a lot because of his own individual desire to work, it is clear that internal and external pressures go hand in hand. Internal pressure is generated through an implicit comparison to some external Silicon Valley standard of the amount of work that is necessary or required. It seems that the interviewees compare themselves to some real or mythic person (male) who works when they are asleep, who cuts code that doesn't have bugs, who scores the deal that they just lost, who takes his company public while they struggle to get theirs off the ground. The pressure they experience is internal, but it is created through a comparison to an external standard to which they feel they don't quite measure up. Thus, the force causing them to work both surrounds them and is internalized by them, creating normative patterns, understandings, and definitions about work. These normative beliefs are so shared and internalized that the control strategy has no obvious or definite point of origin. Eerily, it is coming from everywhere and nowhere at the same time. This is precisely the self-enforcing type of discipline characteristic of normative control. As Kunda points out, under normative control "discipline is not based on explicit supervision and reward, but rather on peer pressure and more crucially, internalized standards of performance" (p. 90).

High-tech companies rely on normative control, control that depends on the knowledge worker's identity. However, these identities, rooted in work and internalized by the interviewees, are not gender-neutral; rather they are suffused with masculine qualities. Therefore, behaving in accordance with them achieves a

specific gendered subjectivity. In other words, the interviewees work in order to become “real men” and become “real men” by working. The masculinity created and constructed by the labor process borrows from, but is not identical to, traditional masculinity. It does not emphasize physical strength, but mental toughness. It does not require hazing women but does require a willingness to be absorbed in one’s work that, by effect if not design, excludes both women and family responsibilities. Kunda (1992) misses this step in his examination of high-tech engineers. His analysis of the member role created by the culture of the company overlooks the gendered aspects of this identity. Hence, he misses the point that enactment of this membership role is equivalent to enactment of a particular kind of masculinity, that being a member is tantamount to being a man.

So where do these identifications with work come from? How are they created? Do organizations produce them and/or are there wider structural causes? Though my data cannot offer definitive answers since I did not study any one organization in depth, I can posit some preliminary explanations that future research should more thoroughly examine. As discussed earlier, the culture of Silicon Valley is diffuse, not organizationally bound. Consequently, organizations may not have to actively or consciously engender identities in employees by manufacturing their culture. This culture may already exist a priori, so to speak. In addition, the focus on casual and flexible workplaces eliminates bureaucratic elements. Although this can’t, on its own, produce identifications with work, it does get rid of the formal apparatuses, which could otherwise cause the organizational identity to appear external and therefore distinct from one’s own identity. Finally, in the new economy, lifetime, even long-term, employment is a thing of the past. For most workers, and particularly for high-tech workers, short-term employment and job-hopping among firms is common practice. In this new type of career structure, one’s career is one’s own possession, independent of any particular firm. Thus, concern over employability may serve as a powerful tool for creating identities rooted in work.

FATHERHOOD IN THE NEW ECONOMY

This new masculinity is primarily constructed in the public sphere, for it is only by living up to expectations at work that these men can become *genius warriors*, *tough guys* who get the job done no matter what. It is only in the public arena that they become *heroes* and *go-to guys* by delivering on the projects they *sign up for*. However, as fathers, these men have private lives and personal responsibilities which conflict with these public requirements. Moreover, as “progressive” men, most interviewees are ideologically, if not always practically, committed to fatherhood and a fairer domestic division of labor between themselves and their wives. Though most of my interviewees did less around the house and less with their children than did their wives, the majority of them expressed a sincere interest in

being active fathers. Most displayed negative feelings towards the lack of care they received from their own fathers and were consciously trying not to reproduce these distant relationships with their own children. Thus, the new masculinity contains an internal contradiction: How can anyone simultaneously be the go-to guy at work and at home?

SUPERDADS

Three ways of resolving this contradiction emerged among my interviewees. Seven of them attempt to meet all work and family obligations without sacrificing anything in either sphere. The result is that these Superdads sacrifice themselves. Superdads invest heavily in both career and family. These fathers tend to have a more egalitarian gender ideology, regardless of whether or not their wives stay home. They also possess a care orientation which engenders a strong emotional connection between them and their families.

This care orientation has two components. First, these fathers talk about being attentive to the emotional, physical, and spiritual needs of those around them. Second, this attentiveness coincides with a broader definition of care which includes emotion work and care work, as well as paid work. Superdads seem to notice when caring work like laundry or shopping needs to be done and don't appear to resent doing it. This attentiveness and broader definition of care enables them to anticipate the needs of their family and, most importantly, it enables them to empathize with their wives. Rich Kavelin, a Superdad who works in business development, illustrates this caring orientation when he describes a typical evening at home with his three-month-old son and his wife Joan, a social worker on an eight-month maternity leave:

When I get home at 6:30 p.m. the baby is essentially my child for the rest of the evening. My wife very often goes out and just hands me the baby and says here he is, he loves you, here's your daddy. She grabs the car keys and splits because she's with the child non-stop for 10 to 12 hours during the day and she needs a little personal time. So she will go out and generally she's out for about an hour or so and I'll hang out with the baby. I'll feed him, play with him, talk to him. When she gets home, it alternates. About half the time I'll make dinner, and half the time she makes dinner. If there are chores to be done like dishes or laundry, I'll pitch in and help with that. So I don't expect her to do everything.

Rich's acknowledgement that his wife both needs and is entitled to "personal time" reflects his ability to empathize with her and to recognize the actual work involved in taking care of a child. In addition, his more egalitarian philosophy is made clear through his desire to share in the caretaking of their son and through his desire to share in the domestic division of labor. The possession of such a care orientation is stressful and overwhelming for Superdads because, in addition to demands at work, these fathers feel responsible for demands at home as well.

TRADITIONALS

Three⁴ participants resolved the new masculinity contradiction by approaching work and family through a traditional male model. Despite these interviewees' ideological belief in egalitarianism, especially in the workplace, they didn't seem to practice what they preached at home. In contrast to Superdads, Traditionals divide the domestic division of labor along traditionally gendered lines. They speak about their families in emotionally disconnected ways and talk about caring for their family in a limited fashion, placing more emphasis on work and the income it provides. This curtailed definition of care coincides with an inattention to the needs of those around them. They either don't notice or overlook the work required for family life, leaving it instead for their wives. Unlike Superdads, these fathers appear to lack the ability to sympathize with their wives. They also appear to be less stressed than Superdads because their energy and emotions are less divided between work and home. Interestingly, Traditionals took the least amount of time off for paternity leave.

Unlike Superdad Rich, Edward Vicker, a traditionalist, does relinquish all the caring work to his wife. Edward, an engineering project manager, is married to Jessica, a full-time homemaker who cares for their two young sons. Edward describes their domestic division of labor:

My wife does most of the home care. Occasionally I'll do some vacuuming and I gotta make sure I pick up my own clothes and keep the closet clean or else she gets on me about that a little bit. She does the general cleaning and I do all the outside stuff, cutting the lawn, and maintenance or repairs. I do usually end up loading the dishwasher after dinner cause I normally get done first. See, my wife has it timed perfectly. I go over and I load my dishes in the dishwasher. And by that time the kids are starting to finish a little bit so she starts handing stuff over to the counter to me. So by the time I get out of there, everybody is done and I've got all the dishes to do so that's really the only inside task that I do on a regular basis.

In contrast to Rich, who doesn't expect his wife to do everything around the house and wants to do his part, Edward not only expects his wife to do everything but feels manipulated by her when he does a single domestic task.

Fathers who relinquish their part of the caring work and expect their wives to be responsible for all domestic chores sometimes encounter resistance. In Edward's case, he and his wife have fights about who does more work for the family.

We fight occasionally. She feels like she's doing more and I feel like I'm doing more. Like in the fall when football season starts, I'll sit down and watch two football games in a row, six hours worth. She isn't very happy about that. She's running around chasing the kids all day and feeding them and then she's like "You don't do anything around here." And I'll say, "I go to work for forty, fifty hours a week." And then she's like "Don't you think I'm working around here?" So it goes back and forth like that.

⁴I am invoking the typology Hochschild (1989) used as it conveys and describes the three distinct positions held by the interviewees. The terms Traditional and Transitional come directly from Hochschild (p. 16).

Ironically, Edward recognizes the work his wife does while he is relaxing on the couch. Yet he detaches himself from any obligation to share in this type of family work because he feels he has already done his part by working at the office.

TRANSITIONALS

Between the Superdads and the Traditionals sits the largest group, the Transitionals. Similar to the Traditionals, the Transitionals partially resolve the new masculinity contradiction by renegeing on their egalitarian ideology somewhat and instead leaving a lot of the family work to their wives. Yet, like Superdads, the Transitionals want to be involved fathers and are responsible for at least some of the family work. Consequently, Transitionals have a harder time balancing work and family than the Traditionals. However, they are not as conflicted as the Superdads because they hold onto the care orientation more loosely, frequently handing off duties, obligations, and emotion work to their wives. While some Transitionals lean towards being a Superdad, others lean towards being a Traditional.

Like Edward Vicker, Chris Baxter, a Transitional father in business development, also has clashes with his wife when he “backslides into assuming that because she’s home full-time she has all this extra time to clean the bathrooms and cook dinner.” Chris and his wife Emma have two children, a girl who is seven and a boy who is four. It seems that ideally Chris would like Emma to be a traditional stay-at-home mom. Yet Emma sees motherhood in more professional terms. She is at home to raise the children, not to be a homemaker or a maid. A recent clash over decorating illustrates this tension:

I think in terms of motherhood, one of the things that I see her having a greater responsibility for than I is home decorating, and sometimes she accepts it and other times she really pushes back. A part of it is that we are both terrible at it. But I think she’s better than I am so I kind of push that on her. So I’ll say, “You’re staying here at home and part of staying at home is making it a wonderful home, right?” And she’s like, “I’ll sign up for leading the brainstorming on that but I’m not signing up for doing that as well as deciding what to put here and there and finding the contractor, while you just sign up for writing the check because you are the one working.” So although at times it would be nice if she did that, in the end I think it’s better if we do it together because then we are both doing it.

Chris is caught between his wish for his wife to be traditional and his knowledge that a more egalitarian partnership is fairer and more rewarding in the long run.

Comparing Superdad Rich, Traditional Edward, and Transitional Chris, it is easy to see the degree to which each possesses a caring orientation. At one end of the spectrum we have Rich. He embraces a caring logic. He sympathizes with his wife, he wants her to have personal time off, and he wants to do a part of the caring work by cooking dinner and helping out with domestic chores. At the other end of the spectrum we have Edward. Edward is unsympathetic towards his wife’s feelings. He feels no responsibility or obligation to help with the housework. Instead, he feels that he is entitled to leisure. Chris stands in the middle. He holds

on to the care logic loosely, willing to take part in the caring work only after his wife commands him to. At her prompting, he is reminded of how busy she is at home and is then willing to help.

BEING THE GO-TO GUY

Scholars have found that a father's masculinity is called into question when his family obligations encroach upon his work obligations (Pleck 1993; Hochschild 1997; Levine and Pittinsky 1997). These findings suggest that ideas, norms, and expectations about what is and is not masculine have a regulating effect on the thoughts, choices, and actions of fathers. Indeed, an examination of the work-family practices my interviewees engage in shows that the strategies they employ to manage their work and family lives reflect a desire to personify and embody the public aspects of the new masculinity. To maintain the image and the reality that they are go-to guys, these fathers rely on a combination of the following practices: self-sacrifice, silencing work-family conflict, disguising the care they do perform, and turning to women, both at work and at home, to help them mediate between their public and private responsibilities. Moreover, even the way these fathers think about and conceptualize care reflects a desire to make family fit within the demands of the high-tech world, to make family fit within the narrow boundaries of this gendered subjectivity. Thus, the internalization of the Silicon Valley member role not only impacts how these fathers work, but also spills over into how they think about and participate in family life.

SELF-SACRIFICE

To reconcile their desire to be involved in family life with their desire to be a serious player at work, Superdads, and some Transitionals, pay a tremendous personal cost. By trying to live up to expectations both in the workplace and at home, these fathers sacrifice all personal time. Rich Kavelin articulates the stress this causes in his life:

The most difficult thing about having a kid has been letting go of personal time. I don't mind the work, it doesn't bother me . . . But now and then I'd like to be able to go play golf with my friends. My wife still has some personal life because we make an extra effort. She goes to girls' night, to ladies' night, she has a mothers' group and support groups. It's actually more important to me that she has a social life because if you think about it I'm here all day. I have people that I interact with at work, adult conversation, and I'm using my mind. Whereas she's at home with somebody who is drooling and spitting up and going "ahhh" so her need for human contact is much higher and I'm okay with that. But every now and then I get a bit grumpy and think, "Why the hell can't I just go get a beer with Neil tonight, I miss my friend Neil."

Like Rich, Dylan Fitzgerald, also a Superdad, is overwhelmed with work and being there for his two-year-old daughter Anna. Dylan feels torn every day

between the demands of his job and his desire to be at home with his child. This tension leaves him feeling as if he's underperforming in both realms.

I'm continually feeling like I'm not quite doing what I want to be doing in either place and I'm doing absolutely nothing else that isn't one of those two things. I mean the concept of free time or hobbies, well it seems kind of laughable at this point.

Not only do the Superdads sacrifice personal time, they also survive on minimal amounts of sleep in order to meet conflicting obligations. Often they work during the day, come home to help with dinner and put the kids to bed, then work more after their kids and their spouses fall asleep. Alan Payne, a software engineer, conceptualizes his workday in two shifts.

In engineering there just isn't a sharp divide between work and family. I've finally been able to turn that to my advantage but it has cost me a lot of sleep because what I do is I work two shifts. I work a shift in the day at the company starting at around 10 a.m. and ending at 6 p.m. Then I come home and spend time with my family. When the kids go to bed, I log on and work another shift from about 10 p.m. to 2 a.m.

By forfeiting sleep and personal time, Superdads constantly scramble to meet competing commitments, which leaves them feeling exhausted and overwhelmed. Rich Kavelin expresses this fatigue:

I signed up for this life, right . . . and you pay a price if you have a high-paying job or a career that you are really fulfilled by. So my price is that I'm exhausted. I hardly get any sleep.

Superdads attribute their exhaustion to career demands. Yet, what really seems to be causing their fatigue is that they possess a caring orientation within a social world so dominated by the market that there is little space, time, or energy left for care. So within this context, their attentiveness to the emotional and care needs of their families makes their work load triple that of other fathers who aren't as attentive to the needs of those around them. The Superdads' unwillingness to cut back either at work or at home, and their willingness to live a completely insane lifestyle, signify how central both home and work are to their identities. Not wanting to give up either part of their identity, Superdads completely embrace both the public and private requirements of the new masculinity. Accordingly, Superdads lead lives much bigger than a typical Silicon Valley day can hold.

SILENCING CONFLICT AND CARE

A prerequisite to being a committed team player is a devotion to work that borders on addiction. Therefore, the intrusion of private sphere issues into the public sphere shatters the image that one is an addict, that one is always ready, willing, and able to work. Addiction means you bring work home—you don't bring home to work. This devaluing of private needs and overvaluing of public needs is quite evident in the hesitancy many fathers feel about bringing up work-family

conflicts at the workplace. Instead of openly discussing conflicts, most fathers I interviewed keep problems to themselves, thereby conveying the impression that work comes first.

Rich Kavelin managed a recent work-family conflict with silence. His boss wanted him to leave on a business trip the same day that he and his wife needed to meet with their priest to discuss their son's christening. It was the only available day the priest had in months. Here is Rich's description of the incident:

So here I am talking to the VP on the phone and he's like "We need to do this now, we need to hook up with these guys from X, we need to set this up, here are my contacts, we are going on the 29th, and I looked at my calendar and literally I started to sweat. I'm going "Umm that day is difficult for me, is there any other day we can go?" and he's like "I don't think so Rich, my calendar is pretty full but check with my secretary tomorrow." So I called up the secretary the next day and I was sweating like a horse. I said, "Hey, you gotta get me out of this because my baby is getting christened and if I don't meet with the priest it's not going to happen and my family is going to kill me and my wife will divorce me and I won't have any kids, and life will be terrible." So she looked, and the only day I could replace that with was 4 weeks away so I said, "What is he doing in between?" She said, "He's going to Germany for a week, then Mexico, then to England, then to Boston, then California and then he can meet with you in New York." And the guy lives in Pennsylvania and he has two kids and a wife, and I'm going he doesn't have two kids and a wife, he has people that live in his house, that's basically what he has.

Though Rich is willing to express that the day is difficult, he's not willing to explain the real reason he cannot leave, that he has a family conflict. He told me that he didn't want to tell his boss about the christening because right now he's the VP's "go-to guy." The VP depends on him, gives him interesting assignments, and is clearly impressed with Rich's work. Despite Rich's disdain for the way his boss puts work before family, he does not want to jeopardize his position by identifying himself as someone who prioritizes both work and family. It's as if any connection with the private sphere will be a mark against him. Thus, Rich consents to the logic of the market, to the requirements of the new masculinity. He does whatever it takes to convey that he does not have other needs, that he is autonomous and independent and always ready to go when the boss calls.

Like Rich, other fathers dealt with work-family conflict with silence.

I can remember various times when I had to leave in the middle of the day to drop my son off at baseball practice. I might not have been real forthcoming about that because that may seem a little less important to somebody, particularly if they are not a parent. It would be a lot easier for them to understand if I said my son is at his school and the school is going to close in half an hour and I've got to pick him up before it closes. That's like an emergency. But when it sounds like something that is more optional, I might not be so quick to volunteer it. (Stan Espe)

The hesitancy and silence about work-family conflict maintains the idea that these fathers do not have any obligations outside of work. The above quotation also points out that the most legitimate way in which the family can come into the workplace is through an emergency: In emergency situations it is clear that

family comes before work. But when things are functioning smoothly in normal, everyday life, family is less of a priority than work.

When personal things come up in people's lives, like losing a parent or something like that, there is absolutely no question that people would get time to go take care of that. Of course there is also the expectation that when just day-to-day stuff comes up, you will be willing to rearrange your family life to put in extra hours that week or spend a Saturday doing work so we get things done on time. So in real crisis situations there would be no question that family life would get taken care of but there might be week-to-week conflict that's just kind of unavoidable given the way the company has set its goals. (Dylan Fitzgerald)

But how often do real crises come up in family life as opposed to the fairly constant crises of the high-tech industry? Though presented as such, this is not an even and fair trade. Instead, workplace demands are met at the expense of care.

In addition to the silence surrounding work-family conflict, there is also silence about paternity leave. A curious discovery is that ten fathers in my sample were given paid time off, ranging from two to three weeks. This paid leave was not an explicit policy or benefit. Rather, these leaves were secretly arranged through managers who granted the leave but didn't inform the human resources department. The other ten took vacation time and unpaid leave. The desire by some managers to give their employees paternity leave could, if discussed openly, be mobilized to institutionalize men's parenting. Regrettably, however, this countervailing force remains shrouded and untouched, a sign of just how inhospitable the high-tech world is to matters of the heart. To be sure, the silence about work-family conflict and about paid paternity leave disguises the care performed by fathers. The secrecy also devalues care by making it a taboo issue, marking it as something that is not worthy of discussion. Taken together, the silencing and disguising of care is a strategy that allows fathers to parent while preserving the idea that their parental duties do not come before their workplace obligations.

TURNING TO WOMEN IN ORDER TO CARE

Through Rich's incident with the VP about his son's christening, we can see the way in which women help men mediate between home and work without being detected. Rich feels comfortable telling the secretary the real reason he cannot leave on that date because he has no fear that she will think he is less committed to work or less of a player. He assumes that as a woman, she will understand his predicament. The secretary solves Rich's problem by finding an alternative date which enables him to keep his commitments to his job and to his family. Not only do most fathers rely on the women in their lives, namely their wives, to do much of the actual work involved in family life, but they also rely on their wives for help in negotiating the details of work and family life. A common theme that emerged was that wives often set times at which their husbands had to

be home. The wives enforce these times by telling their husbands the time they need to leave work in order to get home on schedule and by calling or paging to remind them. These reminders can also serve as “excuses” for fathers to go home, since it conveys to others that it is the wife, not the husband, who is responsible for the father leaving work. Thus, women become symbols, interpreters, and mediators of care in a world where “real” men are not allowed, or at least are not supposed, to care.

MARKET LANGUAGE

The degree to which the new masculinity is internalized and embodied by my interviewees can be seen in the way some fathers draw upon market language and market concepts to make sense of their intimate relationships and personal lives. In describing his relationship with his wife, Chris Baxter said:

Our pediatrician tells us that we are supposed to go out on a date once a month but we get busy so we go out about once a quarter. We know mentally what we are supposed to do, but whether we execute on that, well it depends.

This statement “once a quarter” reveals a temporal order dominated by the fiscal year. It also reduces an intimate aspect of personal life to a task that if “executed” can be scratched off the “to do” list, analogous to something being moved from the in box to the out box. Sadly, one gets the sense that this task is a low priority, like a non-urgent memo that becomes covered with more important papers on a desk.

Several fathers portrayed their personal lives in contractual terms. In the same way they “sign up” for projects at work, they “signed up” for a particular family life too. Dylan Fitzgerald used this contractual talk:

I’m very conscious of the fact that if I had an extra two to three hours a day to do work I could be getting more done here, improving the company’s odds of succeeding. I’m also very conscious that I’m not spending as much time around the house with my daughter as I committed to when we planned the whole thing out.

It appears that Dylan and his wife carefully planned out caring for their child, in the same way that projects are planned out at work. Like transactions in the market, the care for their child too is arranged on the basis of a contract, with each party agreeing to perform different parts. Now Dylan is caught in the “time bind” (Hochschild 1997), unable to “deliver” in the way he would like in either part of his life.

In a recent article about Silicon Valley life entitled “Running on Valley Time” (Plotnikoff 1999), Scott Epstein, a high-tech marketing executive, uses market language to explain the impact his absence has had on his two young sons. Though he is uncertain about whether or not his long working hours have hurt his children, he is certain that his absence means he has less of an influence over how they are raised.

I think if you asked my kids, "Do you see your daddy very much?" they would say no and that they want to see him more. Because I'm home less, I have less of a say on how my kids are raised. It's harder to push through my thoughts and see them put into action.

His response indicates that he views his influence upon his children in the same way that he views his influence on marketing campaigns. One imagines him sitting down with his wife and presenting her with a meeting agenda which outlines his ideas in bulleted format. He then "pushes through [his] thoughts," and sways her to his viewpoint. The end result of this meeting is that a parenting "strategy," informed by his know-how, is "put into action." Yet Scott is keenly aware from his own work experience that the only way this family project will be kept on track is through persistent monitoring and reinforcement. Such supervision is very time-consuming, so he concedes the project to his wife and instead focuses his influence on pushing through his ideas at work.

The embodiment of the new masculinity can also be seen in the way some fathers shape and curtail their beliefs about care in order that family life does not interfere with the demands of the market. By reshaping and redefining care, family life is made compatible with the bottom line. Eric Salazar expressed this sentiment when he discussed his paternity leave. His supervisor gave him a paid two-week leave when his daughter was born:

On the one hand I was very grateful that I was being paid for the leave and that I wasn't taking it out of vacation or sick time. But at the same time I honestly felt that it was something I deserved. So I was thankful, but I wasn't overwhelmed by the gift from my boss. I think that it's something that really should be the norm. It's never enough, but realistically I think two weeks would be capitalistically fair for the company to offer that.

Eric assesses the needs for his family within the constraints of capitalism. In doing so, we can see how the market creates the terms within which family policies are negotiated. Ultimately, what is fair for capitalism is by default both fair for the family and a suitable practice for a man who is both a father and a serious high-tech worker.

Chris Baxter also reveals the priority given to market needs, at the expense of familial needs, when he discussed which employees are entitled to flexibility in their job:

As a manager I have a much easier time giving extra flexibility to folks I know will get the job done and come in on the weekend because Thursday afternoon they took off to go to their child's check-up or whatever. Somebody missing deadlines, who is always over their budget, they are not going to get that flexibility. I hate to sound like a capitalist but at the end of the day, the company shareholders aren't holding shares so that we have flexible lives. They are holding the shares because they are expecting a return on them. So if you can generate some return and balance your life then it's great. But job one is the return.

For Chris, not only do market demands come before family concerns, but a worker must also earn the privilege to meet family demands by first meeting all market requirements. Interestingly, though he is obviously a free market supporter, Chris tries to distance himself from sounding like a capitalist. Sensing the coldness of

his outlook he points to real world constraints, not his own belief system, to justify his opinion about flexibility. However, it's very clear that his belief system does not stand outside of the market. His thoughts, feelings, and emotions are overlaid with a market sensibility that shapes his understanding of care and its importance relative to the market. By characterizing care needs in a way that is congruent and acceptable to capitalism, these fathers construct family life in a way that is compatible with the workplace expectations of the new masculinity. In this way, care never infringes on the market, but the market continually intrudes upon care.

Given that these fathers work in a "high octane capitalism" environment, it isn't surprising that they try to shape and curtail care practices so they fit within the capitalist paradigm. Yet, what is somewhat astonishing is how deeply the ideology and practices associated with the new masculinity infiltrate the interviewees' lives. Indeed, the use of market language and market concepts to explain one's personal life makes clear the depth to which the new masculinity penetrates. For not only does it influence work and family practice, it also acts upon the interviewees' hearts, minds, psyches, and souls. Thus, the new masculinity is an all-encompassing gendered subjectivity that impacts every part of the interviewees' existence, from work to family to everything in between.

RESISTANCE

The extent to which individual fathers will go to achieve and enact this gendered subjectivity varies. There do seem to be limits to how far some men will go for their job. Several fathers told cautionary tales about absentee fathers whom they refused to be like. Rich Kavelin will not be like his boss, the senior VP who travels all the time. He also will not be like his former boss at a start-up he used to work for:

The CEO of this start-up company had three kids, 4, 7, 10, nice kids but he never ever ever sees them because he's at work seven days a week. He does triple sevens. He works from 7 in the morning until 7 in the evening 7 days a week. He thought he was a good father because once a year he'd go camping for a week with his kids or one day on a weekend he would take them out to ice cream for two hours and he'd say it's not the quantity of time it's the quality of time. And I'm just thinking, his kids aren't going to have any idea who he is, he doesn't think these little moments matter but they do. I mean the guy was a real shit when it came to his kids, I'm sorry. He's forty and he's bound and determined that he's going to make his multimillions and he thinks he is doing the right thing for his kids, because he thinks he's doing all this for them since one day they will be rich. They will be rich with money but poor as people.

Rich recognizes that his former boss led an "emotionally downsized" life and refuses to buy into "a reduction of needs" ideology (Hochschild 1997). Yet, it remains unclear how Rich will maintain his line in the sand when he wouldn't even tell his current boss about his son's christening.

Not only are there variations among fathers, but individual fathers themselves embrace and resist this gendered subjectivity at different stages in their life course.

For example, Kirk Sinclair is a defector from the triple seven world. He works from home and is in charge of sales for a small software company, but formerly he worked as an engineer who wanted to be known in his field. After spending a year as a vice president of engineering in a struggling firm, working so much that he never saw his children, he decided to change his quality of life. Kirk has changed his priorities.

I still want to be successful financially. I still want to be respected in my field. But I'm not out for fame and glory any longer. And I think I've got a much more reasonable balance of life.

An in-depth look at the process Kirk went through in order to change his life highlights the contours of the new masculinity and its relationship to work and family life. Kirk's reputation was made through his involvement in a start-up called Innovate that was very successful. At that point in his life he personified the Silicon Valley warrior:

I worked hard at my start-up because I was Ali, that was my log-in name. I was famous at the company and I was infamous. Salespeople and marketing people would come and talk to me, they wanted me to meet with customers and really decisions didn't get made unless I got to play and I just liked it. I liked being in charge, I never had that in my life, and it was just a lot of fun. I got to make decisions that were worth huge amounts of money and I had never done that before.

When his second child Andi was born, he took only a couple of days off from work. This was and continues to be a "sore point" with his wife, who wanted him to take more time off. Kirk's quick return to work stemmed from his desire to get back to the office, not from management expectations.

I had a very supportive management structure above me. The woman who I reported to was a strong family supporter. And it would have been absolutely okay for me not to be there, which is to say, clock out . . . So I can't say that I was under any pressure from the office. I was under a fair bit of pressure from myself. Then I was mostly doing engineering work. There's this kind of machismo culture among young male engineers that you just don't sleep. So Andi was born and I went back to the office and I didn't have a lot of people saying to me "Jesus, what are you doing here?" My boss was saying "Hey, what are you doing here?" but none of my colleagues were surprised that I was there.

Even though Kirk wasn't pressured by his boss to return to work, it seems he was pressured by the cultural expectations of his peer group about the importance of work and its priority over other parts of one's life. Kirk so identified with the cultural expectations about work that he experienced the pressure to return to work as emanating from inside him, not from the environment that surrounded him. For Kirk to be Ali he had to work all the time; he had to be around so that he could participate in all aspects of the company. In his mind, the company could not succeed without him.

When his start-up went public, it was bought by a larger competitor. Unhappy with the management changes that resulted, Kirk left and went to work as the vice president of engineering at a small biotech start-up.

The company was far away and for family reasons we were not going to move. So the commute was 90 minutes each way every day. It was stupid to think that I could pull it off.

If the job had been absolutely great I would have probably toughed it out. But the job just wasn't that great. It was a little company, we weren't doing very well. It was called GS, it was a small biotech company, a very interesting market, exciting field, but we were not set up to succeed.

So the job sucked and the commute was driving me nuts. I would get up at 4 a.m. and be at the office by 6 so that I could beat the commute rush down. I didn't see the kids in the morning and then there would be a board meeting or something so I would stay until 9 or 10 at night, get in the car and drive home and I wouldn't see them when I got home. So really I went for a year seeing them almost not at all and it was a very, very tough year for my wife. I mean every time the phone rang it was me on my cell phone saying I wouldn't be home. She was supportive of me taking the job, it was clear she hated me having that job and I just was not having any fun. It took me a long time to give myself permission to quit that job, to admit that I had made a mistake. So I resigned in October of last year, nine months after I took the job, and was talked into a fairly extended transition that saw me there basically until the end of May. And at that point I was exhausted, emotionally and intellectually, I didn't have anything left so I took all of the next summer off and we traveled a bunch and just hung out with the kids.

I started looking around for other jobs, there is a lot of hiring going on. I have a good track record and know a lot of people. So lots of other vice president jobs were available at companies that was [sic] venture-backed and you know it was a chance to get on the Innovate rocketship again and make a lot of money. But the problem is that with those jobs you need to be at the office early, they need you to stay late. They need the job to come first and I had spent a year letting a real crappy job come first. The family really suffered. The kids didn't see me. And frankly I didn't want to do that again.

The reason it was so difficult for Kirk to walk away from his job was because he had "signed up" to do the job and in doing so his name and his capabilities became responsible for making it work. Thus, he committed himself mentally and emotionally to getting the job done.

We all knew walking into it that this was something that needed to be turned around, it was broken. I don't know if it's machismo or not, I mean I was committed to make this thing work. And it was very, very hard to quit 'cause I had convinced myself that I would do that job and so I had to convince myself that it was okay to fail.

In order for Kirk to allow himself to quit, he had to renegotiate aspects of his identity. He had to come to terms with the fact that he was not the person (man) to accomplish "the task." The price of success was too high, too costly. Poignantly, he derides himself for even thinking that he could rise to this insane challenge and feels that he set himself up for failure. It is interesting that Kirk's desire to quit is seen and experienced by him as acceptance of failure. In Kirk's mind, then, you either win or lose, you deliver or you don't. What has changed for him now is that his identity is no longer solely based on the paid work he performs, what his colleagues think of him, and whether or not he's the go-to guy.

Until not too long ago, a huge part of my identity was wrapped up in what I did for a living and was I famous in my field. Did people call me to solicit my opinion on developments in the industry, and now I don't care about that so much, I don't need to see my name in print, I don't need to see my papers cited in other people's papers.

Now, his identity is built more around his family and less around his work.

With the job I have now, I'm working with people who I intellectually respect, the product is outstanding, it's very easy to sell. I'm getting to do some stuff that is professionally very important and I get to see my kids every morning and be here in the afternoon when they get home. I chose this job not because it's the one that is going to make us rich. It probably won't. On the other hand, it's a good living. I'm having a fun time and I get to be around the kids all the time.

In order for Kirk to resist the organization of work in the Valley he had to reconstruct his identity, particularly his gendered subjectivity. He had to let go of the desire to outperform others, win battles, and be the best. In essence, Kirk had to let go of the public requirements of the new masculinity in order to embrace its private dimensions. He had to let go of being the go-to guy at work in order to be the go-to guy at home. In reordering his life, he revalued care and recognized that he and his family had needs.

CONCLUSION

The examination of the work-family phenomenon requires a bridging and reworking of different domains of theorizing so that instead of sitting in either the public or the private, analysis can move back and forth between the public and the private, the market and the home. Approached from this viewpoint, my study of fathers employed as knowledge workers in Silicon Valley sought to draw connections among gender, work, and family. Thus, my discovery of a new masculinity led me to question how it articulates with processes of labor control and with processes of family life.

What I found is that fathers internalize the characteristics of the new masculinity, which shapes both how they work and how they parent. To achieve this gendered subjectivity, men must be technically brilliant and devoted to work. They must be tough guys who get the job done no matter what. Fathers so identify with these qualities that their desire to work all the time is experienced by them as emanating from their own personality traits rather than from co-worker or management expectations. Consequently, the type of control these fathers experience is an identity-based one. However, this identity is not gender-neutral. Rather, because workplace practices are suffused with masculine qualities, performance of them achieves a masculinized subjectivity. To maintain this masculine subjectivity, fathers employ work-family practices, such as remaining silent in the face of work and family conflict, which serve to give the impression, if not the reality, that work comes first. Moreover, the embodiment of the go-to guy image impacts how these fathers conceptualize and experience their private lives as evidenced by their use of market language to make sense of their personal relationships as well as their desire to fit family needs within a capitalist paradigm.

These findings have important implications for labor process and work-family scholars. For labor process scholars, my findings highlight the centrality of gender in the organization of work. Therefore, research about processes of control,

particularly research on identity-based forms of control, must analyze the gendered dimensions of the phenomenon they describe in order to gain an accurate and complete understanding. For work-family scholars, my findings highlight the need to think about the ways in which gendered subjectivities explain work and family practices. For example, when taken into consideration, gendered subjectivities may account for the failure of people to make use of family-friendly policies even in ostensibly open organizations. In sum, my study illustrates the importance of studying work and family issues in a holistic manner that more accurately reflects the holistic nature of peoples' everyday lives.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society* 4:2 139–158.
- Acker, J. (1992). "Gendered institutions: From sex roles to gendered institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21: 139–158.
- Alvesson, M. and Billing, Y. D. (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Alvesson, M. (1998). "Gender Relations and Identity at Work: a Case Study of Masculinities and Femininities in an Advertising Agency." *Human Relations* 51:8 969–1006.
- American Association of University Women. (2000). "Tech-Savvy: Educating Girls in the New Computer Age." Washington, DC: American Association of University Women. Retrieved May 28, 2000 (<http://www.aauw.org/2000/techsavvybd.html>).
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1985). *The Politics of Production*. London: Verso.
- Burris, B. (1998) "Computerization of the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 141–157.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. W. and Lee, J. (1985). "Towards a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Theory and Society* 14: 551–604.
- Chatman, J. and O'Reilly, C. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71:3 492–500.
- Cockburn, C. (1988). *Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-how*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Collinson, D. L. (1992). *Managing the Shopfloor*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Collinson, D. L. and Hearn, J. (1994). "Naming Men as Men: Implications for Work, Organization and Management." *Gender, Work and Organization* 1:1 2–22.
- Collinson, D. L. and Hearn, J. (Eds.) (1996a). *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage Publications.
- Collinson, D. L. and Hearn, J. (1996b). Breaking the Silence on: On men, masculinities and managements. In D. L. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as managers, managers as men* (pp. 1–24). London: Sage Publications.
- Conlin, M. (2000). "Valley of No Dolls." *Business Week*, March 6, pp.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Daly, K. J. (1998). "Reshaping fatherhood." Pp. 384–399 in *Shifting the Center*, edited by S. Ferguson. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Daly, K. J. (1992). "The Fit Between Qualitative Research and the Characteristics of Families." *Qualitative Methods in Family Research*, edited by J. Gilgun, K. Daly, and G. Handel. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Davies, S. (1990). Inserting gender into Burawoy's theory of the labour process. *Work, Employment and Society* 4: 391–406.

- Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested Terrain*. USA: Basic Books.
- Faludi, S. (1999). *Stiffed*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Hacker, S. (1990). "*Doing it the Hard Way*": *Investigations of Gender and Technology*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The Time Bind*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Kendall, L. (2000). "'Oh no! I'm a Nerd!' Hegemonic Masculinity on an Online Forum." *Gender and Society* 14:2 256–275.
- Kendall, L. (1999). "'The Nerd Within': Mass Media and the Negotiation of Identity Among Computer-Using Men." *Journal of Men's Studies* 7:3 353.
- Knights, D. (1990). Subjectivity, power and the labour process. In D. Knights & W. Willmott, *Labour process theory* (pp. 297–335). London: Macmillan.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kunda, G. and Van Maanen, J. (1999). "Changing Scripts at Work: Managers and Professionals." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561: 64–80.
- Lee, C. K. (1998). *Gender and the South China Miracle*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leidner, R. (1993). *Fast Food, Fast Talk*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levine, J. A. and Pittinsky, T. L. (1997). *Working Fathers*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Mac An Ghail, M. E. (1996). *Understanding Masculinities*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Mumbly, D. K. (1998). "Organizing Men: Power, Discourse, and the Social Construction of Masculinity(s) in the Workplace." *Communication Theory*. 8:2 164–179.
- Perlow, L. (1995). "Putting the Work Back Into Work/Family." *Group and Organization Management*. 20:2 227–239.
- Pierce, J. L. (1996). "Reproducing Gender Relations in Large Law Firms: The Role of Emotional Labor in Paralegal Work." *Working in the Service Society*, edited by C. Macdonald and C. Sirianni. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Pleck, J. (1993). "Are 'Family-Supportive' Employer Policies Relevant to Men?" *Men, Work, and Family*, edited by J. C. Hood. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Plotnikoff, D. (1999). "Running on Valley Time." *SV Magazine*, October 31, pp. 6.
- Turkle, S. (1984). *The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Turkle, S. (1988). "Computational Reticence: Why Women Fear the Intimate Machine." Pp. 41–61 in *Technology and Women's Voices: Keeping in Touch*, edited by C. Kramarae. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wright, R. (1996). "The Occupational Masculinity of Computing." Pp. 77–96 in *Masculinities in Organizations*, edited by C. Cheng. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.