



A new phase of activism: women's occupational organisations and married women's paid work after the Second World War in Britain

Helen Glew

To cite this article: Helen Glew (14 Jul 2024): A new phase of activism: women's occupational organisations and married women's paid work after the Second World War in Britain, *Women's History Review*, DOI: [10.1080/09612025.2024.2373505](https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2024.2373505)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2024.2373505>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 14 Jul 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

A new phase of activism: women's occupational organisations and married women's paid work after the Second World War in Britain

Helen Glew

School of Humanities, University of Westminster, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the National Union of Women Teachers (NUWT) and the National Association of Women Civil Servants (NAWCS), this article looks at activism and campaigning for married women workers after the abolition of the marriage bar in both teaching (1944) and the Civil Service (1946). The article outlines the types of campaigning undertaken as well as the philosophical and ideological underpinnings in envisioning the married woman worker. Finally, the article places the campaigning both in the context of these two organisations' longer histories and the distinctiveness of the late 1940s and 1950s in the history of (married) women's employment in Britain.

KEYWORDS

Married women's employment; marriage bar; women teachers; women civil servants; postwar Britain; feminism

Between 1944 and 1946, women teachers and women civil servants were granted the right to stay in permanent employment after they married. Although marriage bars—clauses in employment contracts which dictated that women should resign their employment when they married—had been temporarily removed for much of the Second World War, they had been staples of women's employment experiences in the interwar years in teaching, the civil and public service, and a range of other institutions and occupations. Although there were increasing proponents of the idea that a married woman's decision to work should be a choice made by herself and her husband, and the experience of the Second World War had taught many in society that married women could indeed successfully work outside the home,¹ the removal of these marriage bars in the mid-1940s came not as a recognition of the fairness and justice of allowing married women to work if they wished. Instead, both marriage bars were removed in large part as a concession to labour supply issues, though also with a nod to the fact that times were changing. The National Union of Women Teachers (NUWT) and the National Association of Women Civil Servants (NAWCS), both feminist-identifying associations representing women in their professions, had fought hard through the interwar years for the abolition of the marriage bar, often working with each other and alongside several other prominent

CONTACT Helen Glew  h.glew@westminster.ac.uk  School of Humanities, University of Westminster, 309 Regent Street, London, W1B 2HW, UK

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

feminist groups and female MPs.² With the rescinding of the marriage bar—in the case of teaching via clause 24(c) of the 1944 Education Act, and in the case of women civil servants by Treasury Circular 28/46 arising from a Whitley Committee decision in 1946—both organisations knew they had to remain vigilant about breaches and underhand or covert discrimination against married women.³ This article looks at the new phases of activism for married women civil servants and teachers to ease both the direct and indirect discrimination that remained once the marriage bar had been abolished until both organisations—coincidentally—wound up their operations by the early 1960s. It brings to our attention the work the NUWT and NAWCS did in this period to support married women workers, highlighting the forms of social and political activism available to these organisations and the important work of maintaining a watching brief on the circumstances of married women's employment as well as finding and pursuing areas of tangible, beneficial policy change. In so doing, this article also provides one of the first in-depth looks at women's occupational/professional organisations in this period—or, as Jessica Thurlow has helpfully termed them, 'specialist' organisations.⁴ To date, much of the scholarship on such organisations has focused on the interwar years and the specific context of women's single-sex organising in the immediate post-enfranchisement years, and much of the scholarship on the period between 1945 and beginnings of the Women's Liberation Movement, with a few exceptions, is about larger, non-occupational and mass-membership women's organisations.⁵

Whilst there is a growing historiography of the marriage bar,⁶ there is, to date, little work on what we might refer to as the adjustment or consolidation period after many—but not all—of the marriage bars were removed.⁷ This was a period in which significant numbers of middle-class married women adjusted to peacetime work outside the home, perhaps feeling that they had to prove themselves, and having to adjust, where applicable, to the lack of mass provision of childcare that had characterised the war years. Census and other data demonstrate the significant increases in the numbers of wives in paid employment in the postwar years. Recent work by Helen McCarthy has explored the specific issues faced by mothers who worked, and Dolly Smith-Wilson discusses the discourses surrounding the significant postwar changes in women's employment.⁸ Caitriona Beaumont's work, in particular, on the 1950s and 1960s has explored how mass-membership women's organisations, who did not necessarily perceive or present themselves as feminist, sought nonetheless to address issues faced by women who made the choice to combine paid employment, housewifery and often motherhood.⁹

However, beyond the issues of childcare and the pressures of housework and household management in an era where these firmly fell on women, there were significant other issues stemming from practices by employers and government which disadvantaged married women or treated them unequally to single women. It was these, in particular, that the NUWT sought to address. Given both organisations' insistence that marriage would not affect a wife's ability to do her job as a long-term argument against the marriage bar, it was logically more difficult in the postwar years for the NUWT and NAWCS to talk about the pressures of what became known as the 'double burden' of combining paid work and family responsibilities. However, it is equally plausible that this was seen as an issue too big, amorphous and ever-present to really be tangibly changed quickly and instead, the decision to focus on other issues with a clear path to resolution was a prudent and pragmatic one.

This article, then, considers the activism of these two organisations up until the early 1960s on issues relating to married women in the workplace. It looks at the work these organisations undertook—single-handedly or with other organisations—until each decided to disband by the early 1960s, having achieved the passage of equal pay legislation in their respective professions. Although a fair amount is known about these organisations in the interwar years alongside the interwar feminist movement and about their participation in the equal pay campaign in the 1940s and 1950s, there is far less known about their other aspects of post-war campaigning.¹⁰

Moreover, though we know something about the broader processes and trends at work in this period—the increases of married women in the workplace year-on-year, the changing perspectives and narratives in print culture and sociological literature around part-time work for wives, for example—there is still much work to be done to consider both the practical and institutional obstacles in women's way in this period and the work undertaken by organisations to confront these. Indeed, Helen McCarthy has argued that for mothers who worked, 'the abolition of marriage bars heralded a false dawn' because of the remaining constraints, particularly around childcare and the lack of flexibility in working hours, that meant that mothers largely had to exit the workplace when their children were born and not return until the youngest child had started school.¹¹ By presenting this case study of women's occupational organisations' work on these and other relevant issues, we can start to understand not just *what* happened over the middle and later decades of the twentieth century, but *how* it happened and the extent to which the status quo regarding expectations of gender roles was contested and often ultimately maintained.

Discussions of married women's paid work in the late 1940s and 1950s

The presence of married women in the workforce was now far less unusual than it had been. However, there was still much resistance to middle-class wives, in particular, undertaking paid work when it was perceived that they did not actually need the money in the way a working-class household might and still a sense that in times of labour oversupply (or unemployment) married women should step aside from the workforce. There were still some marriage bars in place in the late 1940s and, as we will see, some attempts to reinstate them. In 1945 and 1946, too, before the new need for increased women's labour was apparent, there was some subtle and not-so-subtle pressure for married women to leave the workforce. As a member of the NUWT itself remarked, 'women, especially married ones, are being dropped from the industry which they have so ably helped maintain during the war, and are being told to return to their homes, if any, and to resume the narrow lives the majority of them led before the war.'¹² As the issue of doing paid work outside home was now perceived to affect middle-class women, whereas in the past it had been perceived as a norm for working-class women only, middle-class and professional women's work was widely discussed in the press, in current affairs journalism and by sociologists and the women's movement. It was an issue which preoccupied a number of feminist and women's associations, including the Women's Institute and Women's Co-operative Guild,¹³ and organisations such as the British Federation of University Women (BFUW), the Six Point Group, and the Open Door Council. It was also becoming a feature of coverage in women's magazines and of sociological research by academic sociologists such as

Viola Klein (who worked in association with the BFUW) and by, amongst other commentators, the former teacher Judith Hubback.¹⁴

This was, then, the significant backdrop against which the NUWT and NAWCS campaigned for fair and equal conditions for married women. There were also occupation-specific conditions that were important in this period. In particular, there were increasing shortages of teachers in the late 1940s and into the 1950s which became especially acute by the early 1960s. This meant that the issue of encouraging married women back into, or to remain in, teaching had increasing purchase in policy-making circles and arguably meant that the NUWT was in the relatively unusual position, for a feminist organisation, of making statements and suggestions that were at least in broad sympathy with policymakers' aims, even if those policymakers would rarely have used the same language and ideology. Although there were occasional concerns about too many civil servants, there were far fewer issues with numbers and civil service recruitment, though, as we will see, the displacement owing to evacuated departments for wartime continued to have an impact in the late 1940s.

This article thus draws largely on the records of the NAWCS and the NUWT. The former are less extensive for this period than the latter, largely because the NAWCS stopped producing *Opportunity*, their public-facing journal, in 1940 and never resumed it once the constraints of wartime had passed.¹⁵ They did, however, produce a members' newsletter but this was no more than three or four pages and far less professionally produced than *Opportunity* had been. The NUWT continued producing *The Woman Teacher*, fortnightly at first and then monthly throughout this period, and the publication was delivered to members, to likeminded organisations and to education policymakers more widely.¹⁶ Correspondence from these organisations is considered, as are internal minutes of meetings and press coverage of conference and publicity events.

Women's occupational organisations in the 1940s and 1950s

The NUWT and the NAWCS had become well-known in the interwar years in both feminist and trade union circles. The NAWCS originated from the Association of Post Office Women Clerks, formed in 1901 as the first white-collar women-only occupational organisation, which in turn joined with equivalent organisations in other Civil Service departments to form the Federation of Women Civil Servants, before merging with the Civil Service branches of the AWCS in 1931/1932.¹⁷ The NUWT emerged from the National Federation of Women Teachers, formed 1904 and initially a separate group affiliated to the National Union of Teachers, and became an independent entity in 1920.¹⁸ Both organisations had had the experience, by the early 1920s, of trying to work with male-dominated organisations and realising that issues which women workers faced would always be deemed less important than those which affected men. Thus, they remained single-sex when the trend in the wider trade union movement was to combine with male-led or male-dominated organisations.¹⁹ In the interwar years and beyond, both organisations demonstrated staunchly feminist commitment to issues such as equal pay, equal opportunity and the elimination of the marriage bar. On the latter issue, for example, both supported the 1927 Married Women's Employment Bill, drafted by the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship, and took part in numerous public meetings and demonstrations about married women's right to work in the 1930s.²⁰ As

a result of being single-sex organisations and networking with the wider feminist movement, they had become well-acquainted with one another as organisations, collaborated on a number of issues and campaigns, and shared knowledge and networks. Indeed, both the NAWCS and NUWT arguably became the central focal point for the interwar feminist movement's campaigning on workplace issues in large part because of their significant numbers and because they were paid from public funds so representations could be made to Ministers and Parliament. Both played formative roles in the creation of the Equal Pay Campaign Committee which made a pivotal contribution in the final push for equal pay for both women civil servants and women teachers, granted in the mid-1950s with implementation by 1961.²¹

In the postwar years, the NUWT and the NAWCS continued working with equality and/or professional-focused organisations in the wider women's movement. This alliance stemmed not just from the shared feminist perspective, and the understanding of the need for separate women's organisations in order for goals to be adequately pursued, but also from the fact that neither the NAWCS nor the NUWT had formal recognition as bargaining or consultative organisations with their respective Civil Service departments.²² The repeal of the 1927 Trades Dispute Act in 1946 allowed the NAWCS to consider formal affiliation with a wider range of women's organisations, an option that had previously been barred to them because of the strictures of the act. In 1946, for example, members unanimously agreed to affiliate to the British Federation of Business and Professional Women (BFBPW), having previously attended meetings as observers only.²³

Both the NUWT and the NAWCS were connected with the campaigns of the Status of Women Committee (SWC) and its predecessors. The SWC remains under-researched in post-war British history but had emerged from the 1943 Joint Standing Parliamentary Committee of Women's Organisations.²⁴ By 1950, it represented sixteen British women's organisations and fed directly into the UN Commission on the Status of Women. Both the NAWCS and the NUWT had personnel involved with the running of the committee, though the NAWCS withdrew from membership in 1949 on the grounds that they felt the committee's aims were already adequately covered by the BFBPW.²⁵ Mabel E Faulkner, the NAWCS President, served as Vice Chair of the SWC and in effect regularly chaired meetings when other commitments meant that the more high-profile chairs—often current or former women MPs—could not be present. The Joint Standing Parliamentary Committee of Women's Organisations' General Secretary from 1943 to 1950 was Beatrice M Pearson, who later became editor of *The Woman Teacher*. Muriel Pierotti, the NUWT's General Secretary from 1940 to 1961, also served as SWC General Secretary from 1945 to 1978. As the pages of *The Woman Teacher* and Pierotti's own archive at the Women's Library at LSE make clear, Pierotti's dual secretaryships helped with alliance-building and particularly with awareness of how the wider women's movement was dealing with practical issues and questions to improve women's lives. These connections allowed the NUWT to tap into the campaigns and devise fruitful ways forward with their own objectives as well as to feed into wider campaigns where they were able. Over time, the BFBPW fulfilled a similar function for the NAWCS, providing connections to a wider women's movement and support and further awareness for the NAWCS's campaigns. Both Hilda Hart and Mabel E Faulkner of the NAWCS held executive committee memberships of the BFBPW

and other NAWCS executive committee members attended meetings from time to time.²⁶

Equal pay was the key issue for the NUWT and NAWCS in this period and it dominated their campaigning, particular from the early 1950s. However, it was far from the only issue that they focused on. As part of a broader feminist movement, they advocated for a vast range of issues which would make women more equal with men. They defined equality as a state where there would be no differentiation between men and women and where, in practice, women would be brought up to men's level and status. As a whole, the NAWCS's campaigns were narrower and more focused specifically on injustices resulting directly from the ways in which the marriage bar was removed for women civil servants and the implications of this for promotion for example; they were generally less interested in the wider aspects of married women's paid work and how there were other factors—such as taxation, costs of and access to childcare, and maternity leave—that in practice made married women's paid work unequal or less easy to carry out. This relative narrowness of focus may be down to three issues. The first is the 'overhang' from the interwar years in terms of the restrictions on the Trades Dispute Act which restricted how women civil servants could campaign on wider issues not directly related to their own working conditions, which in effect meant that as an organisation the NAWCS was less used to embracing issues in wider terms. The second issue relates to membership numbers. Although there are no definitive figures in this period, the NAWCS membership had diminished during the 1930s and the financial implications of this would have had a bearing on the time and resources the NAWCS could spend on issues not very directly related to women in the Civil Service.²⁷ The other issue is membership composition. The marriage bar at the level of the Civil Service that the NAWCS represented had been absolute, meaning that even by the 1940s—and despite married women being temporary civil servants in wartime in particular—the majority of members would have been single.²⁸ This would have changed over time, of course, but relatively slowly, and there are no detailed membership records which include marital status for historians to analyse. A survey of the minute books reveals that although there were women with the prefix 'Mrs' on the executive committee (thus indicating their being married or widowed), they were never more than ten per cent of the committee at any one time.²⁹ Therefore, even in the 1940s and 1950s, we can surmise that the longer-term implications of the marriage bar would have had an effect on membership composition. By contrast, the NUWT had a much broader and holistic approach to supporting and equalising married women's paid work and addressed issues such as superannuation, taxation, part-time work (which functionally did not exist for civil servants in this period unless in extremely special circumstances) and maternity leave. Importantly, women teachers had not been subject to the same organising and campaigning restrictions as women civil servants in the interwar years and marriage bars had been applied by local authorities rather than by a 'blanket' application by the Board of Education. Although there were definite peaks of marriage bars in teaching in the late 1920s and early 1930s and very high-profile cases of women teachers affected by the marriage bar,³⁰ the locally-specific application of marriage bars meant that there had always been women teachers who were married and there was a history of membership of the NUWT amongst married women teachers.

The NUWT, the NAWCS and the end of the marriage bar

Although the marriage bar in teaching was formally ended by the 1944 Education Act, the end of the marriage bar in the Civil Service was less certain; it took until August 1946 for a definitive decision to be made. Although a Civil Service Whitley Committee had been convened from early 1945 and deliberations undertaken over many months, the NAWCS kept up the pressure where they could between the end of the war and the eventual decision. Indeed, it is important to note that there was every indication, right until merely a few weeks before, that the marriage bar might stay.³¹ As such, the NAWCS approached the Labour MP Alice Bacon to ask a question in the House about the marriage bar, though it seems she ran out of time to be able to do so.³² At their 1946 annual conference, therefore, the NAWCS passed a resolution by 44 votes to 7 to push for married women's right to work in the Civil Service. The resolution was framed around the fact that the government 'ha[d] not scrupled to make full use of the services of married women' in the war, the argument that 'restriction upon the entry of any section of women ... into paid employment automatically lowers the market value of the services of all other women' and because 'it is in principle wrong to restrict the freedom of the individual.'³³ Furthermore, as the waiting period to determine the future of the marriage bar continued, the NAWCS were told in late 1945 that no further married women on the clerical assistant grade would receive promotion. This had been instituted because there were no more single women who could be promoted. Clearly, single women were prioritised and in anticipation of the retention of the marriage bar, married women were effectively being refused promotion.³⁴

When the end of the marriage bar was announced in late August 1946, the NAWCS were obviously jubilant but also keen to ensure that the removal of the bar would apply fairly and to as many people as possible. The NAWCS wrote to the Treasury asking if the abolition of the marriage bar could be made retrospective—i.e. to apply to women who were already married and in the Civil Service temporarily owing to wartime work. The Treasury refused, on the grounds that there was no way to apply this to women who had married and left before the war, when they largely could not be kept on temporarily. They did, however, concede that women who had resigned before the abolition of the marriage bar and were subsequently successful in competing in the reconstruction examinations would not have to refund their marriage gratuity, though their pre-gratuity service would not count for superannuation.³⁵ For women who had married during the war, been paid a marriage gratuity but maintained employment on a temporary but continuous basis, and were therefore now eligible for permanent employment post-marriage bar, the situation was complicated: because the marriage gratuity was given as, effectively, recompense for not receiving a pension at age 60, coming back into the service permanently and therefore requalifying for a pension meant that they would need to repay the marriage gratuity with interest, a significant financial burden and one not necessarily easily overcome when not previously planned for. This requirement, as we will see, effectively became the defining factor in how much women who married before the war wanted, or were able, to rejoin the service on a permanent basis.

There was a similar celebration and careful watchfulness among the NUWT too with the abandonment of the marriage bar. In a January 1945 message to members, Helen Kay Allison, NUWT President, wrote that.

The Education Act has a clause forbidding the dismissal of teachers because of marriage. Here, at last, is something solid—at least, we hope it is solid, and is not just a method of meeting the urgent need for teachers. At least some Members of Parliament believe in the right of married women to engage in paid employment, and if the emergency meets the principle, and a wrong is righted as a result, we can but rejoice at the result.³⁶

The NUWT executive remained vigilant, however, about the ways in which the abolition of the bar might be ignored or circumvented.³⁷ Although the Education Act outlawed the dismissal of married women teachers simply because of their marital status, there were both apparent attempts to ignore this entirely and dismissals of married women teachers because of the technicality that they had been on temporary contracts only (although the underlying reason for this was often that they were married and therefore not previously entitled to permanent contracts). In Merthyr Tydfil, for example, a number of married women teachers had been employed temporarily for the duration of the war and the local authority planned to go ahead with dismissal because of the temporary contracts.³⁸ This situation was replicated in local authorities all over England and Wales. In June 1946 it was noted in *The Woman Teacher* that despite the marriage bar having been removed, ‘discussions on the dismissal of married women teachers are already taking place in some local education committees and the anticipated complaints against married women keeping ex-servicemen out of jobs are beginning to appear in the national and local press.’³⁹ In addition there was some variance in the speed and willingness of local authorities to adhere. Indeed, clause 24(c) seems to have been interpreted as permissive rather than compulsory by some education authorities and central government appears to have been either too busy or not minded enough to enforce the legislation. It was 1950, for example, before South Shields Education Committee passed a motion declaring that married women could be employed on the same terms as other individuals, despite the existence of the legislation.⁴⁰ More worryingly still, there was evidence of local authorities, who were often in charge of teacher employment, finding ways to dismiss married women. In 1947 Monmouthshire County Council was taken to court by the National Union of Teachers for giving one month’s notice of the termination of employment of over twenty married women teachers who had first been employed during the war.⁴¹ There was a significant case in Flintshire in the late 1940s which garnered press attention, during which it was revealed that even though the marriage bar had been outlawed in teaching by the 1944 Education Act, certain teachers had been classed as ‘immobile’ by the local authority on the grounds that they were married and therefore presumed to be unable to easily relocate.⁴² As Muriel Pierotti remarked, ‘[d]uring the past two or three years, the Ministry of Education has been devising ways attracting or cajoling women to become teachers. It might have been worth while for them to consider how many fully-trained women teachers have been lost to the profession because some Local Education Authorities have failed to observe the spirit of the 1944 Education Act.’⁴³

Indeed, it was realised early on by the NUWT and others that although marriage had been removed as a reason for which to dismiss women, it was still possible for local authorities to remove married women from their posts as long as it gave something else as a reason.⁴⁴ As it noted in September 1946, ‘[i]t is unlikely that any local authority would openly flout the law by giving as a reason for the dismissal of a woman teacher the fact that she was married’ but pointed to the problem of temporarily employed married women teachers who had earlier been victims of the marriage bar who would

now potentially miss out on the chance for permanent contracts because they were being dismissed due to the end of their temporary contracts.⁴⁵ Although the specifics were different, this issue mirrored the circumstances of temporarily employed married women civil servants.

The NUWT were particularly attuned to practices such as appointing married women teachers to temporary contracts only. In 1947, Muriel Pierotti wrote to George Tomlinson, the Minister of Education, pointing out that 'the action of some Local Authorities in discriminating against married women by offering temporary appointments only, thus leaving the way open for the cessation of their employment' was likely to in effect be an infringement of the 1944 Education Act.⁴⁶ A few weeks later, the NUWT wrote again to Tomlinson, reporting that the Cumberland Education Committee had not yet made a decision with regard to the employment of married women and that 'although some are employed, in no case has a permanent appointment been offered to an incoming married woman teacher.' Just as importantly, the NUWT noted that the practice could be more widespread than anyone realised, arguing that '[t]here is a difficulty in reporting these cases because married women teachers fear that, if they do so, they may lose the opportunity of securing temporary work. It is, however, clear that there is a fairly widespread discrimination against the appointment of married women teachers.' The NUWT asked what action could be taken to stamp this out.⁴⁷ There were still clear issues in 1949, with NUWT committee reports detailing the ongoing work in identifying and trying to combat discrimination against married women teachers.⁴⁸

By mid-1954, the NUWT had written to Florence Horsbrugh, Minister of Education, pointing out that the continuing actions of local authorities such as Flintshire were in contravention to the intentions of the Clause 24(c) of the Education Act. The reply advised that Horsbrugh was unable to act unless local authorities were in clear contravention of the Act, but noted that the 'attention of all Local Education Authorities has been drawn to the importance of employing married women teachers' though it could not guarantee that that employment might not take the form of temporary or supply work in some cases.⁴⁹ This was clearly a carefully-worded reply, given that it was not clear how much non-permanent work might also apply to other groups of teachers or the extent to which married women might particularly continue to be placed in these disadvantaged and marginalised positions.

The NAWCS executive continued in the late 1940s to push for the removal of the marriage bar to be applied retrospectively, but there seems to have been less enthusiasm for this amongst the women's organisation for higher grades in the Civil Service, the Council of Women Civil Servants, and amongst the NAWCS' own membership. The technicalities around retrospectiveness—the fact that it could only apply to women who had been permanent employees at the start of the war, who subsequently married and remained employed temporarily, and would necessitate the repayment of the marriage gratuity with interest—meant that there were both very few women to whom the opportunity could apply, and even fewer women who wanted to take it up.⁵⁰ The NAWCS tried to use the Joint Committee of Women Civil Servants (JCWCS)—an informal alliance set up in 1919 under the auspices of the London and National Society for Women's Service and led by Ray and then Pippa Strachey—as a means to push for wider retrospective applicability of the abolition of marriage bar but ultimately to no avail, though they did arrange for Freda Corbet MP to ask a question to this effect in the House of

Commons.⁵¹ In addition to the Council of Women Civil Servants not being particularly keen to push for retrospective applicability and the lack of enthusiasm amongst the NAWCS's own membership, the JCWCS seems not to have met between 1947 and January 1954, although there is no indication that the marriage bar was any sort of a factor in this circumstance.⁵² In 1950, independent of marriage bar discussions, the Treasury took a decision to allow all temporary service to count towards pension, which would clearly benefit married women amongst others, and the NAWCS passed a conference motion pressing for this to also be made retrospective.⁵³

However, the NAWCS worked, too, on newer issues thrown up by the abolition of the marriage bar coinciding with continuing dislocations due to the war. In 1947, for example, there was a case in the Post Office where an evacuated woman civil servant wanted to return to London in order to get married but had been refused permission to do so. Her case was taken up by the NAWCS who pushed for the fact that she should be allowed to return without having to lose the benefits that 'established' service provided.⁵⁴ In 1950, the NAWCS stepped in to ensure that a woman civil servant marrying over the age of fifty and wishing to leave knew that at that age she was entitled to her pension and not the deferred pay allowance.⁵⁵

Like women teachers, women civil servants in the early 1950s faced repeated calls to reinstate the marriage bar or public commentary that as there was apparently redundancy in the civil service, married women's employment should not be prioritised—which effectively amounted to the same thing. In both 1950 and 1953 there were motions at the conferences of the Civil Service Clerical Association (CSCA) and the Society of Civil Servants respectively for the reinstatement of the marriage bar. Both were roundly defeated, though the vote split in the CSCA case—7,348 against reinstatement and 5,454 for it—was perhaps not as robust as feminist organisations might have liked.⁵⁶

Whereas the NAWCS's actions tended to focus on ensuring that named women civil servants were not discriminated against in their workplace, the NUWT's actions in this period were broader and thought about the issue of married women's employment holistically. In the 1950s, successive NUWT conferences addressed the issue of the lack of childcare for married women who worked in any type of employment. Conference motions argued, for example, that whilst childcare out of school was primarily the responsibility of parents (and the choice to use 'parent' as opposed to 'mother' was clearly significant), employers should be encouraged to consider flexible working hours and the government needed to adequately staff nurseries.⁵⁷ The NUWT also campaigned on the requirements about confinement, or maternity leave. It was concerned that there were plans to treat a period of maternity leave differently from sick leave absences in terms of benefits and that there were to be mandates as to how long women should be absent from the workplace on account of pregnancy, childbirth and recovery.⁵⁸ Similarly, it worked with the Open Door Council and Open Door International to object to the International Labour Organisation's framing of the 'protection of maternity' as it argued that this extended restrictions on women.⁵⁹ This was another way in which the NAWCS activism largely contracted. In 1948 it was invited by the BFBPW to help compile data on NAWCS' members use of, and experiences of, maternity leave but executive members decided not to because 'it would entail a disproportionate amount of work on a subject not closely affecting all members.'⁶⁰ Again, the effects of the

numerical size of the NAWCS and the legacy of being an organisation of largely single women, were perceptible here.

In this period the NUWT developed a particularly strident determination to re-define how married women teachers were seen: it wanted them to be seen as teachers only, without the implication that the qualifier 'married women' made them seem lesser. In March 1946, for example, it had asked in print why the Ministry of Education had indicated that employing married women indicated a worsening of the staffing position of schools.⁶¹ It also called out the Ministry's April 1946 request for information on employed teachers which asked for specifics on married women teachers and for the data to be segmented by age. 'If there is any substance to Section 24 of the Education Act, what business is it of the Ministry of Education whether a woman, any more than a man, is married, single or widowed? Is it the intention of the Ministry to suggest to Local Education Authorities that married women do, in fact, form a separate category of teacher?' it asked.⁶² During a conference motion about the training and supply of teachers, NUWT members themselves had voted to change their own motion about refresher courses for 'married teachers long absent from the profession' so that it referred simply to 'teachers', thus again moving away from the idea that it was only married women who might need and benefit from such training.⁶³

At the same time, the NUWT was careful not to be seen to be privileging the needs of married women over single women. It expressed concern about instructions given by the Minister of Education to Local Education Authorities for giving married women teachers preferential treatment, such as 'placing them near their homes, and not expecting extraneous duties from them' as a means to try to attract them back to teaching in the midst of shortages. The NUWT argued that single women teachers often had comparable domestic schedules and responsibilities to manage and that the way to attract women in sufficient numbers to the profession was to grant equal pay and to allow single women to have tax allowances for housekeeping just as single men did.⁶⁴ Similarly, the NAWCS were concerned about the perceived preferential treatment given to married women civil servants who were permanently transferred to another office or area compared to single women, and the issues single women with dependents faced because they could not afford domestic help due to the lack of equal pay.⁶⁵

The NUWT remained clear though that the status of, and attitudes towards, married women workers would effectively act as a bell-weather. In 1946, Muriel Pierotti reported on Hugh Dalton's assertion that married women could be used as temporary full-time or part-time teachers or civil servants to help with the 'manpower' issues the country was experiencing. She caustically remarked that 'Presumably, when the present urgent need for their services is over, they may go back to the homes and reflect on the three K's [a reference to the Nazi policy of *Kinder, Kirche, Küche*] as the sphere of women's peace-time activity.'⁶⁶ In 1950, an issue of *The Woman Teacher* argued that 'the status of women as a whole is bound up with that of the married woman. Until the special restrictions on her civil and economic rights are removed, there can be no question of women having reached their goal of equality.'⁶⁷ This perspective chimed with that of women's organisations both in Britain and the USA, as well as more widely.⁶⁸

The NUWT's stance that attitudes to married women were indicators of the acceptance of women's rights more widely is borne out by some of their wider activism in this period. They were, as we will see, active in campaigns about the ways in which

the National Insurance Bill proposed to differentiate between married women and others, and at their annual conference in 1946 they passed a motion to revive and pass through Parliament the Equal Citizenship (Blanket) Bill. This would, among many other things, have allowed for married and single women to be treated in the same way for income tax purposes, an important factor—as we will see—in equalising in practice the opportunities for married women in the workplace.⁶⁹ However, by 1949, the NUWT had withdrawn its support for the Bill.⁷⁰ They were also outspoken over the fact that married women were not permitted into the Foreign Service because of the decision to erect a marriage bar⁷¹ and wrote directly to the Attorney General in 1949 to propose an amendment to the Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act, 1935 which removed the anomalies which applied to married women.⁷²

Campaigning on practicalities: the NUWT on income tax, national insurance, superannuation and part-time work

After the initial concerns about the observance of the abolition of the marriage bar, the NUWT became increasingly concerned to overturn several of the structural obstacles in employment practices that had an impact on married women's ability or willingness to rejoin or remain in the workforce. These became all the more prominent as time went on and they were not fixed. The NUWT argued, of course, from a position of fairness and equality but as teacher shortages grew in the context of the high postwar birth rate, many of these issues also became significant obstacles in successive governments' attempts to recruit more teachers.

As well as critiquing how the national insurance scheme and state pension operated for married women and pushing for married women's treatment as separate persons under the legislation rather than being dependent on their husbands, the NUWT argued for many years for changes to the teachers' superannuation scheme to take account of both breaks in service and part-time work, two facets of employment which disproportionately affected married women. They were also among the prominent advocates in this period for separate taxation of married women. This was brought up by women's organisations and by sympathetic MPs in the House of Commons throughout this period. In May 1957, for example, Jean Mann raised the tax burden for married women workers on professional salaries in the House of Commons.⁷³ In 1959, the Open Door Council, among other women's organisations, called for separate taxation of husbands and wives.⁷⁴ The NUWT brought resolutions to its annual conference on this issue repeatedly and it was one of the issues it particularly asked its members to continue campaigning on when it disbanded in early 1961.⁷⁵

In the 1950s there was increasingly intense discussion in the wider women's movement about the wisdom and suitability of pushing for part-time work as a solution for married women who wanted to work outside the home. For all of the obvious benefits and flexibility, there were growing concerns that as it was only ever identified with married women and mothers it would become another means of cementing gender discrimination against women workers.⁷⁶ Indeed as the NUWT remarked about a meeting in which Judith Hubback discussed her *Wives Who Went to College*, it was 'a matter that requires careful dealing if the remuneration and status of women workers are not to be impaired.'⁷⁷

However, as part-time work, and an employment history with career breaks, were a reality for considerable numbers of women teachers, the NUWT gathered data and campaigned on these issues. In 1948, the NUWT's 'legal and tenure' committee began investigating the position of superannuation in relation to part-time work which began a years-long programme of arguing for the qualification period—currently at thirty years' full-time service—to be lessened to allow women with career breaks or part-time service to qualify. There was a further issue for married women who had previously been forced to quit owing to the marriage bar. Any teacher returning after having left the profession and therefore the superannuation scheme had to repay all of her previous contributions at a 3.5% interest rate at the point of her return if she wanted her previous service to count again for pension purposes. This was a mirror, in effect, of the issue faced by married women civil servants with temporary service. In 1952 the NUWT advocated for 'provision for repayment to be made by instalments over a limited period, say, within four years.'⁷⁸

In 1949, the NUWT's annual conference passed a motion unanimously which called for part-time and supply teaching to count for pension if the same work done full-time would be pensionable, for part-time and supply work to be aggregated for pension purposes, and for supply teachers, the legal minimum number of school days in a year to be counted for pension purposes rather than the 365 days as at present.⁷⁹ There were several attempts at legislative change to the teachers' superannuation scheme in the 1950s. In 1954, a version of the bill was before Parliament and the NUWT continued to speak out about its deficiencies, including the fact that married women had fewer rights than married men to make provisions for their husbands and children in the event of their death or inability to work and that the Bill contained no advancement in securing better pension rights for part-time and supply teachers.⁸⁰ The bill was eventually withdrawn as there was so much opposition to it from a range of quarters.⁸¹ By 1960, there was some small progress on the pension issue. In April, the Ministry of Education announced that as an incentive to married women to return to teaching once their family responsibilities permitted, the qualifying period of service for a pension—normally thirty years—was reduced to twenty years of at least half-time service. This would then enable them to meet the criteria of at least ten years' pensionable service to be paid a pension.⁸² For the NUWT this did not go far enough. The executive remarked that 'whether the prospect of such a meagre pension will, in fact, have any effect on the readiness of married women to return to the teaching service is a matter for conjecture' and wondered whether the scheme would be of more benefit to single women who had to leave teaching with almost thirty years' service in order to care for relatives.⁸³

The success or otherwise of married women being able to combine a teaching career with marriage and likely motherhood, and the need for the NUWT's activism on these issues, might be measured by government actions from 1960 onwards. David Eccles, the Education Minister, announced in July 1960 a range of measures to help with the shortage of teachers that would occur in the academic year 1962–63 because of the switch from the two-year to three-year training course. Three of the five proposed measures, to supplement some initiatives already undertaken, involved the greater inclusion of married women. The first was a recruitment campaign to encourage married women teachers to return, arguing that '[t]eachers were themselves the best recruiting agents and women's organisations would also be asked to help with the

campaign.’ The second measure was an amendment to the quota scheme to allow local authorities to hire married women, some of whom would be extraneous to the normal quotas of teaching staff. The third was a scheme to offer paid refresher courses for married women teachers who were still early in their working lives and able to return.⁸⁴ It was clear that the NUWT’s early postwar aim of having married women teachers reclassified in officials’ minds as simply ‘teachers’ had not worked. The differences and attitudes were still entrenched, as were obstacles that made it more difficult for married women to continue in this occupation or indeed many others. Furthermore, correspondence between Civil Service departments about the ‘married women returners’ campaign’s launch and reception reveals the extent to which the issues raised by the NUWT and other women’s organisations particularly around pensions and taxation were broadly understood and acknowledged, but that there was ultimately insufficient willingness to, for example, make allowances in the taxation scheme for help with child-care or domestic work.⁸⁵ To do so would effectively have meant acknowledging the outdatedness of the male breadwinner model and the gendered nature of expectations around care and household management. Questions in the Commons in 1964 revealed that it was still difficult to offer part-time work for women teachers in some cases and that the issue of part-time work counting for superannuation purposes for teachers was still ongoing.⁸⁶

Conclusions

The postwar period was a new era for campaigning by the NAWCS and the NUWT in that the marriage bar, against which they had campaigned so vigorously, had gone. Their activism initially took the form of vigilance against breaches of the regulations or covert discrimination against married women employees. As professional organisations who had always argued that marriage (and the childbearing and childrearing assumed to come with it) was not an impediment to a woman’s ability to do her job, it was harder for them to engage in some of the wider—and indeed often newer—discourse from women’s and feminist organisations and sociologists about the practical difficulties of combining paid work and home duties in what would eventually become known as the ‘double burden’. Instead, the activism of the NUWT and NAWCS was defined by both their own organisational cultures and histories and by the work cultures of which they were part. The NUWT, drawing on their longer-term tradition of outward-facing campaigning and strong egalitarian feminist sentiment, as well as the links with the Status of Women Committee and other organisations, focused on very practical issues which, when resolved, would make a tangible difference to married women teachers. The philosophy of wanting to remove the fact that married women teachers were seen, negatively, as both *married* and *women*, guided union principles and indeed, when the NUWT wound up in 1961, Muriel Pierotti was still warning against married women not inadvertently becoming a ‘third sex’.⁸⁷ The NAWCS, although allied with the BFPBW in particular, had fewer married members and took a far narrower and more defined approach to supporting married women’s work and focused on the Civil Service issues directly affecting them.

This article thus provides an important case study of the continuing work needed to assure women’s position when an issue was nominally ‘won’. The examination of these

organisations' work also reminds us of the significance of the organisations' roots and origins in determining or influencing their outlook and campaigning strategies. As organisations which had had their grounding and their formative period in the interwar years, the principles of egalitarian feminism and pushing for non-discrimination in employment conditions continued to be the basis of their campaigning strategies. This long-standing, and to a significant extent, generational organising experience had a clear impact on the focus and shape of these organisations' campaigning in the immediate post-war period.

Notes

1. See, for example, the responses to the question 'What are your feelings about married women going out to work after the war?' in the January 1944 Mass Observation directive. See Mass Observation Archive, Mass Observation, responses to January 1944 directive.
2. For discussions of this, see Helen Glew, 'In a Minority in Male Spaces: The Networks, Relationships and Collaborations between Women MPs and Women Civil Servants, 1919–1955', Special Issue: Nancy Astor, Public Women and Gendered Political Culture in Interwar Britain, *Open Library of Humanities* 6, no. 2 (2020); Helen Glew, *Gender, Rhetoric and Regulation: women's employment in the Civil Service and the London County Council, 1900–55* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), 178–215; Alison Oram, *Women Teachers and Feminist Politics 1900–39*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 166–219.
3. *Education Act 1944*, ch. 31, 1944 (HMSO, 1944). For an account of the impact of the Act as a whole, see Harriet Samuels, 'Education Act 1944', in *Women's Legal Landmarks*, ed. Erika Rackley and Rosemary Auchmuty (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 219–26. For a discussion of the decision-making process to end the marriage bar in the civil service—and the fact that it was not a foregone conclusion—see Helen Glew, 'Regulating Marriage: Gender, the Public Service, the Second World War and Reconstruction in Britain and Canada' in *Gender and the Second World War: Lessons of War*, ed. Corinna Peniston-Bird and Emma Vickers (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 88–100.
4. Jessica Bronwyn Thurlow, 'Continuity and change in British Feminism, c.1940–1960', (PhD thesis, University of Michigan, 2006), 77.
5. On mass membership women's organisations in the post-war period see, especially, Cairtriona Beaumont, *Housewives and Citizens*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013) and Maggie Andrews, *The Acceptable Face of Feminism: The Women's Institute as Social Movement*, second edn., (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 2015). On organisational or 'special issue' women's organisations in this period, see Linda Perriton, 'Forgotten Feminists: The Federation of British Professional and Business Women, 1933–1969', *Women's History Review* 16, no. 1: 79–97; Helen McCarthy, 'Feminism, selfhood and social research: professional women's organizations in 1960s Britain' in *Precarious Professionals: Gender, Identities and Social Change in Modern Britain*, ed. Heidi Egginton and Zoë Thomas (London: University of London Press, 2020), 287–304; Sharon Thompson, *Quiet Revolutionaries: The Married Women's Association and Family Law*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2022).
6. Oram, *Women Teachers*; Kate Murphy, *Behind the Wireless: A History of Early Women at the BBC*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Glew, *Gender, Rhetoric and Regulation*; Glew, 'Regulating Marriage'.
7. For a discussion of changing rhetoric of campaigns by international women's organisations on the rights of employed wives, see Helen Glew, 'Embracing the Language of Human Rights: International Women's Organisations, Feminism and Campaigns Against the Marriage Bar, c.1919–1960', *Gender & History* 35, no. 3: 780–94.

8. Denise Riley, 'Some Peculiarities of Social Policy concerning Women in Wartime and Postwar Britain', in *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*, ed. Margaret Randolph Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel, Margaret Collins Weitz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 260–271; Helen McCarthy, *Double Lives: A History of Working Motherhood*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2020); Dolly Smith-Wilson, 'A New Look at the Affluent Worker: The Good Working Mother in Post-War Britain', *Twentieth Century British History* 17, no. 2: 206–19.
9. Beaumont, *Housewives and Citizens*, 189–214.
10. For the organisations in the interwar years see, in particular, Oram, *Women Teachers*, and Helen Glew, '“A Stronger Position as Women Alone”?: women’s associations in the British civil service and feminism, 1900–1959', *Women’s History Review* 30, no. 4 (2021): 669–87. For the equal pay campaigns, see Harold L Smith, 'The Politics of Conservative Reform: The Equal Pay for Equal Work Issue, 1945-1955', *The Historical Journal* 35, no. 2 (June 1992): 401–15; Allen Potter, 'The Equal Pay Campaign Committee: a case-study of a pressure group', *Political Studies* 5, no. 1, (1957): 49–64; Glew, 'In a Minority in Male Spaces'.
11. McCarthy, *Double Lives*, 221.
12. *The Woman Teacher*, 'In retrospect', April 5, 1946, 102.
13. On this, see Beaumont, *Housewives and Citizens*.
14. On women’s magazines, see, amongst others, Rachel Ritchie, 'The Housewife and the Modern: The Home and Appearance in Women’s Magazines, 1954–1969' (PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2011); for Viola Klein, see Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, *Women’s Two Roles: Home and Work*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1956); Viola Klein, *Working Wives: A Survey of Facts and Opinions Concerning the Gainful Employment of Married Women in Britain*, (London: Institute of Personnel Management, 1960); E Stina Lyon, 'Viola Klein: Forgotten Émigré Intellectual, Public Sociologist and Advocate of Women', *Sociology* 41, no. 5: 829–42; Emily A Steinhauer, 'Time, labour and the “dual role”': Viola Klein’s study of Professional Womanpower as a feminist archive', *Women’s History Review*, 2023 [ahead of print]. Judith Hubback, *Wives who went to college*, (London: Heinemann, 1957).
15. Helen Glew, 'Providing and Taking the *Opportunity*: Women Civil Servants and Feminist Periodical Culture in Interwar Britain', in *Women’s Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1918-1939*, ed. Catherine Clay, Maria DiCenzo, Barbara Green and Fiona Hackney (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), 370. Interestingly there was a suggestion that *Opportunity* amalgamate with the *Woman Teacher*, but this did not come to fruition.
16. Joyce Goodman, 'Internationalism, empire, and peace in the *Woman Teacher*, 1920–1939', in *Women’s Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1918-1939*, ed. Catherine Clay, Maria DiCenzo, Barbara Green and Fiona Hackney (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), 348.
17. Glew, "[A] stronger position as women alone"?:
18. For an early history of the NUWT see Hilda Kean and Alison Oram, '“Men Must Be Educated and Women Must Do It”: the National Federation (later Union) of Women Teachers and contemporary feminism, 1910-30', *Gender and Education* 2, no. 2 (1990): 147–67. For discussion of the NUWT in this period, see Oram, *Women Teachers and Feminist Politics* and for the role of *The Woman Teacher* in shaping and presenting the NUWT’s public identity, see Goodman, 'Internationalism, Empire, and Peace in the *Woman Teacher*', 349–52.
19. For a detailed discussion of the NAWCS and its predecessors, see Glew, '“[A] stronger position as women alone”?:'. For discussions of the interwar women’s trade union movement and the move towards mixed-sex organisations, see Sarah Boston, *Women Workers and the Trade Unions*, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1987).
20. Sarah King, 'Feminists in Teaching: the National Union of Women Teachers, 1920-1945', in *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching*, ed. Alison Prentice and Marjorie Theobald (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 190; Glew, 'In

- a minority in male spaces'; Erika Huckestein, 'From Cradle to Grave: The Politics of Peace and Reproduction in the Anti-Fascist Campaigns of British Women's Organisations', *Contemporary European History* 33, no. 1 (2024): 67.
21. For the EPCC and its impact, see Smith, 'The Politics of Conservative Reform'; Potter, 'The Equal Pay Campaign Committee'; Glew, *Gender, Rhetoric and Regulation*, chapter 5, and Glew, 'In a Minority in Male Spaces'.
 22. For the NUWT's defence of single-sex organisations in the postwar period, see *The Woman Teacher*, October 18, 1946, 3. The position of the NAWCS and its predecessors on the vital nature of single-sex organisation is discussed in Glew, "'A Stronger Position as Women Alone"'?
 23. The Women's Library at LSE, 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee Minutes, 29 April 1946.
 24. Thurlow, 'Continuity and Change in British Feminism, c.1940–1960', 80–89. For a brief discussion of the SWC's campaigning on international representation of British women's interests, see Helen Laville, 'Woolly, Half-Baked and Impractical'? British Responses to the Commission on the Status of Women and the Convention on the Political Rights of Women 1946–67' *Twentieth Century British History* 23, no. 4 (2012): 486.
 25. 6NCS/1/A/1/15, NAWCS Executive Committee Minutes, 24 January 1949; 6NCS/1/A/16, NAWCS Executive Committee Minutes, 20 February 1950.
 26. 6NCS/1/A/1/14–16. For an overview of aspects of the BFBPW's work, see Perriton, 'Forgotten Feminists'.
 27. In the late 1940s and 1950s, the NAWCS regularly put in orders of around 2,300 for their annual diary, which was available for members to purchase. Assuming that the diaries were also intended as 'corporate gifts' to other organisations, or for members to buy more than one to give some as gifts—but at the same time, that not all members might buy one—this might give us an indication of total overall membership of somewhere around 1,800–2,000. See 6NCS/1/A/1/14–16.
 28. For higher-ranking women civil servants, exemptions were sometimes possible to the marriage bar after the mid-1930s. See Glew, *Gender, Rhetoric and Regulation*, chapter 6.
 29. 6NCS/1/A/1/14–19, NAWCS executive committee minutes.
 30. For more on this, see, in particular, Dina Copelman, *London's Women Teachers*, (London: Routledge, 1996), 176–195 and Oram, *Women Teachers*.
 31. 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee, 21 January 1946.
 32. 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee, 20 August 1946.
 33. 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee, 21 January 1946 and Annual Conference.
 34. 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee, 19 November 1945.
 35. 6NCS/1/A/1/13, NAWCS Executive Committee, 16 December 1946.
 36. *The Woman Teacher*, 'A Message from the President', January 12, 1945, 33.
 37. On the local level, see branch reports as follows as examples: *The Woman Teacher*, May 26, 1944 (Sheffield), June 7, 1946, 140 (Swansea).
 38. *Merthyr Express*, September 29, 1945. See also *The Woman Teacher*, 'Legislation Pitfalls', December 21, 1945, 25.
 39. *The Woman Teacher*, 'In Parliament: Dismissal of Married Women Teachers', June 28, 1946, 151.
 40. *The Woman Teacher*, January 20, 1950, 63.
 41. *The Schoolmaster*, 'Union wins case for married women teachers', November 15, 1951.
 42. UCL, Institute of Education Archives, UWT/D/11/6-1, Married Women Teachers—part 1.
 43. *The Woman Teacher*, January 20, 1950, 63.
 44. Percival Sharp, writing in the *Teachers' World and Schoolmistress*, August 1946, as quoted in *The Woman Teacher*, September 6, 1946, 170.
 45. *The Woman Teacher*, September 6, 1946, 170.
 46. UWT/D/11/6-1, Married Women Teachers—part 1, Letter from A M Pierotti to George Tomlinson, 7 June 1947.

47. UWT/D/11/6-1, Married Women Teachers—part 1, letter from A M Pierotti, 8 July 1947. See also *Woman Teacher*, ‘Employment of Married Women Teachers’, April 18, 1948, 126.
48. *Woman Teacher*, January 21, 1949; *Woman Teacher*, May 6, 1949.
49. UWT/D/11/6-1, Married Women Teachers—part 1. Letter from NUWT to Florence Horsbrugh, 5 May 1954, and reply, 26 May 1954.
50. 6NCS/1/A/1/14, NAWCS executive committee minutes, 19 May 1947.
51. The Women’s Library at LSE, 2LSW/A/4/3/4/1, Minutes of Joint Committee on Women Civil Servants, 25 July 1947. *Hansard*, Commons, Oral Answers to Questions, ‘Married Women (Civil Service)’, August 5, 1947, c.1294.
52. 2LSW/A/4/3/4/1, Minutes of Joint Committee on Women Civil Servants
53. 6NCS/1/A/1/16, NAWCS annual conference, 1950.
54. 6NCS/1/A/1/14, NAWCS executive committee minutes, 19 May 1947.
55. 6NCS/1/A/1/14, NAWCS executive committee minutes, 27 March 1950.
56. These issues were widely discussed in the press in this period. See *Liverpool Daily Post*, 26 May 1950, 5; *Scotsman*, 14 May 1953, 6; *Yorkshire Evening Post*, 14 January 1952, 6; *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 25 May 1950, 1; *Western Mail*, 23 May 1952, 1.
57. See, for example, *The Woman Teacher*, January 1959, 56 and *The Woman Teacher*, May 1957, President’s Conference Address, 116 in which the President, R R Goodlatte, argued that ‘[i]t must be made possible for able adult members of the community to work, which means finding somewhere for the youngster of two years old to go while the family is occupied.’
58. *The Woman Teacher*, May 17, 1946, 124.
59. *The Woman Teacher*, February 1955, 69–70.
60. 6NCS/1/A/1/15, NAWCS executive committee minutes, 30 June 1948.
61. *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Staffing of Primary and Secondary Schools’, March 15, 1946, 88.
62. *The Woman Teacher*, April 5, 1946, 100.
63. *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Training and Supply of Teachers’, January 18, 1946, 46.
64. *The Woman Teacher*, May 6, 1949, 145. See also *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Do Single Teachers Need Homes?’, February 22, 1946, 77. Although the piece focuses on Australia, the NUWT’s retort in response is telling of their position. For tax allowances for housekeepers for single women, see amongst many, *The Woman Teacher*, January 1959, 56.
65. 6NCS/1/A/1/15, Annual conference minutes, May 1948; executive committee meeting, 30 June 1948.
66. *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Married Women Workers Wanted—Temporarily’, April 5, 1946, 101.
67. *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Woman’s Place’, June 16, 1950, 192.
68. See, for example, Glew, ‘Embracing the language of human rights’. The context of the USA is also discussed amply in Kristen Swinth, *Feminism’s Forgotten Fight*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018).
69. *The Woman Teacher*, Equal Citizenship (Blanket) Bill, January 18, 1946, 48. For more on the Equal Citizenship (Blanket) Bill, see Samantha Clements, ‘Feminism, citizenship and social activity: the role and importance of local women’s organisations, Nottingham 1918-1969’, (PhD thesis, University of Nottingham 2008), 182–83; Harold L. Smith, ‘British Feminism and the Second World War’ in *Gender, Labour, War and Empire*, ed. Philippa Levine and Susan Grayzel (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 100–101;
70. *The Woman Teacher*, July 15, 1949, 210.
71. *The Woman Teacher*, ‘Equality—New Style’, April 5, 1946, 100; *The Woman Teacher*, July 1956, 163. For more on the admission of women to this work and the decision to impose—and keep—a marriage bar, see Helen McCarthy, *Women of the World*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2014) and Helen McCarthy, ‘Petticoat Diplomacy: The Admission of Women to the British Foreign Service, c.1919–1946’, *Twentieth Century British History* 20, no. 3 (2009): 285–321.
72. NUWT Archives, UWT/D/11/3, correspondence regarding Married Women (Restraint upon Anticipation) Act, 1949, 30 May–1 July 1949.
73. *Hansard*, HC Deb, Finance Bill, 7 May 1957, c.880.

74. Report of the British Open Door Council to the Open Door International, 7–11 June 1959, 88.
75. See, for example, *The Woman Teacher*, February 1958, 71–72; November 1958, 25; November 1960, 24.
76. See, for example, Atria, Amsterdam, International Federation of University Women Archives, IFUW minutes. 47th Council Meeting, September 1964, Kiffisia, Greece; International Alliance of Women, *Report of the Sixteenth Congress*, 1955, 49; Report of the Sixth Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women, 1952, 10. Open Door International, *Report of the Ninth Conference*, 1954, 53.
77. *The Woman Teacher*, December 1955, 126.
78. *The Woman Teacher*, December 1952, 36–40.
79. *The Woman Teacher*, May 6, 1949, 159.
80. *The Woman Teacher*, February 1954, 70. See also *The Woman Teacher*, Annual Report, May 1954, 138.
81. *The Woman Teacher*, April 1956, 119–120.
82. *The Woman Teacher*, April 1960, 212; The National Archives (TNA), T227/2320, Measures to encourage the return to schools of qualified married women teachers.
83. *The Woman Teacher*, 'Pension Arrangements for Part-time Teachers', April 1960, 212.
84. *Woman Teacher*, July 1960, 281. See also TNA, ED 86/346 'Married Women returners; preparations for the year of intermission, 1962/1963.
85. TNA, T227/2320, Measures to encourage the return to schools of qualified married women teachers
86. *Hansard*, Commons, 18 March 1964, col. 1369; 9 April 1964, col. 1189.
87. *The Woman Teacher*, December 1960, 33.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ruth Davidson, Farah Hussein, Lyndsey Jenkins and Anna Muggeridge for their encouragement, patience and guidance through the writing and editing process of this article. Ruth and Anna were also great fellow panellists at the original conference at QMUL in 2022. Thanks, too, to the anonymous peer reviewer for their perceptive comments and suggestions. Corinna Peniston-Bird read an earlier version and gave feedback which helped enormously with later drafts.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Helen Glew is a historian of women's work and feminism in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She is the author of *Gender, Rhetoric and Regulation: women's work in the Civil Service and London County Council, 1900–55* (Manchester University Press, 2016). She is currently writing a social and cultural history of married women's paid work in Britain, c.1870–1960.