

Best of the Best 2001

Nominees for the Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award
for Excellence in Work-Family Research



A partnership of
The Center for Families
at Purdue University
The Center for Work and Family
at Boston College

**Best of the Best:
The 2001 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award
for Excellence in Work-Family Research**

by

Shelley M. MacDermid

A partnership of
The Center for Families at Purdue University
The Center for Work and Family at Boston College

MacDermid, S. M. (2002). Best of the best: The 2001 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for excellence in work-family research. West Lafayette, IN: Center for Families at Purdue University.

© Center for Families at Purdue University

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Biography of Rosabeth Moss Kanter	6
Excerpts from <i>Work and Family in the United States</i>	7
Commentary	9
The Winning Articles	17
Bianchi	
Presser	
Summaries of Finalist Articles	23
Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer & Robinson	
Erickson , Nichols & Ritter	
Hinze	
Perry-Smith & Blum	
Summaries of the Kanter 20	29
Bernas & Major	
DiPrete & McManus	
Doucet	
Greenstein	
Hersch & Stratton	
Kaufman & Uhlenberg	
Lee, MacDermid, & Buck	
McGraw, Zvonkovic, & Walker	
Moen & Yu	
Perry-Jenkins & Gilman	
Secret	
Szinovacz	
Trappe & Rosenfeld	
Zylan	
First-Round Nominees	44
Award Procedures	46
Kanter Award Committee	47
Journals Reviewed	48
Award Partners	49
Order Form	51

Introduction

Welcome to the inaugural volume of “Best of the Best.” This publication makes it possible for work-life practitioners to quickly become familiar with the best the world of scientific research has to offer them.

Over the past few decades there has been an explosion of research on the relationships between work and nonwork life. Researchers studying these issues come from many disciplines and professions, resulting in fragmented awareness of one another’s work. In addition, exchanges of research information among scholars, consultants and corporate practitioners are limited. Many research studies are not well-grounded in theory, slowing the generation of new knowledge. As a result, it has been difficult to develop shared standards for research quality and to avoid redundancy in the research literature. Some excellent studies have failed to have impact because of lack of awareness.

The Kanter award raises awareness of high quality work-family research among the scholar, consultant and practitioner communities. It fosters debate about what the standards of quality for work-family research should be, and ultimately will raise those standards. And it identifies the “best of the best” on which to base future research.

The award is named for Rosabeth Moss Kanter, who has been identified by leading scholars as the person having the most influence on the modern research literature on work and family. The proposals contained in her 1977 monograph *“Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy”* remain timely a quarter-century later.

In this report you will find summaries of the 20 best scientific research articles published during the year 2000 and nominated for the 2001 Kanter award. These articles were selected after reviewing more than 400 studies published in peer-reviewed journals. You also will find a list of all the articles nominated, email addresses for the authors, and a commentary giving an overview of the nominees. We appreciate very much the work of the authors and the reviewers who produced and selected these wonderful studies – hopefully you will too. Enjoy!

Rosabeth Moss Kanter

Biography

Rosabeth Moss Kanter is an internationally known business leader, award-winning author, and expert on strategy, innovation, and the management of change. She holds a chaired professorship at the Harvard Business School, advises major corporations and governments worldwide, and is the author or co-author of over 200 articles and professional published papers, and 13 books, including such bestsellers as *The Change Masters*, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, *When Giants Learn to Dance*, *The Challenge of Organizational Change*, and *World Class: Thriving Locally in the Global Economy*. Her latest books are *Rosabeth Moss Kanter on the Frontiers of Management* and the co-edited collection *Innovation*.

At Harvard Business School, in addition to her teaching and administrative responsibilities, she conceived and leads the Business Leadership in the Social Sector (BLSS) project, involving to date over a hundred national leaders (including U.S. Senators, Governors, corporate CEOs, national association heads, and the First Lady) in dialogue about public-private partnerships, and resulting in the launch of a BLSS video series initiated with 9 new products and the pilot for a national television series. She also served as Editor of *Harvard Business Review* from 1989-1992, which was a finalist for a National Magazine Award for General Excellence in 1991.

Named one of the 100 most important women in America by the *Ladies Home Journal* and one of the 50 most powerful women in the world by *The Times of London*, she has received 19 honorary doctoral degrees and over a dozen leadership awards. She has served on many corporate boards, is a Fellow of the World Economic Forum, and serves on the Massachusetts Governor's Economic Council (for which she was co-chair of the International Trade Task Force).

Her public service activities span local and global interests. She is a judge for the Ron Brown Award for corporate leadership in the community (established by President Clinton to honor the late Secretary of Commerce), has served on the Board of Overseers for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, co-chaired the Youth Service Advisory Board for General Colin Powell's America's Promise organization, and led the effort to establish a Year 2000 Commission for legacy projects for Boston (on which board she serves, along with numerous other national and civic boards such as City Year, the national urban youth service corps).

(excerpted from www.goodmeasure.com)

Excerpts from

Work and Family in the United States:
A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy

by Rosabeth Moss Kanter
Russell Sage Foundation, 1977

Whatever one's definition of "normal" family life and optimal individual development, it is at least clear that poor economic position places undue stress on personal relations. There would seem to be little need to further document this association. However, it would be valuable in an area, such as this, to specify the conditions under which people cope most effectively with stresses introduced into their lives by work conditions, so that people can be supported in their own attempts to create satisfying lives. An emphasis on coping mechanisms, rather than only documenting statistical associations, would help alleviate the assumption of "pathology" introduced into discussions of the family life of the disadvantaged in the 1960s. We would learn about the sources of personal strength which social policy can help reinforce. Research, in short, should not contribute to foreclosing the options for people's private arrangements by assuming only a limited number of "healthy" or permissible life-styles.

(p. 91)

I have argued throughout this report that work and family are connected in many subtle and unobvious, social, economic, and psychological ways belying the simplified version of the myth of separate worlds with which I began. If anything, the literature surveyed here makes evident the fact that separateness itself might be seen as a variable and a dimension, rather than a fixed aspect of social structure. We need to pay attention to the variety of patterns of separateness and connectedness between working and loving, occupations and families, in the United States. And we need to examine the consequences of these patterns of work-family association for the lives of American men, women, and children.

(p. 89)

Commentary

This report comes from the 2001 competition for the Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research, given for the best research article published during a given year. A large panel of scientists did the “heavy lifting,” wading through more than 400 published articles to find the best of the best. This report is a “cribsheet” for practitioners – an hour’s worth of reading will tell you about an entire year’s worth of scientific research all over the world. In this commentary, I’ll do my best to explain what I see as the significance of the top 20 articles – the Kanter 20 -- for practitioners.

What Are the “Hot” Topics for Researchers?

Just as in popular culture, the attention of academic researchers gets grabbed by particular topics. The chart at the end of this section classifies the Kanter 20 by topic. Not surprisingly, the number #1 topic was mothers’ employment, the most popular work-family research topic for the past 50 years or more. Today, however, research questions are much more nuanced than in the past. Instead of simply asking, “Is mothers’ employment good or bad for children,” researchers are asking the much more complex question, “Under what conditions do particular characteristics of parents’ employment affect children in particular ways?” Researchers are studying the resilience of workers to conflict and burnout, the strategies workers use to navigate life successfully, and the specific ways that work and family life interact.

Instead of asking the overly-simplistic question, “Is mothers’ employment good or bad for children,” researchers today are asking the much more complex question, “Under what conditions do particular characteristics of parents’ employment affect children in particular ways?”

Work Hours and Schedules

Not surprisingly given recent discussions in popular culture, the #2 topic was the duration and timing of work. Here, the Kanter nominees focused on parents’ work involvement, changes at home when one partner retires, and the threats that shiftwork poses to marriage. Kanter co-winner Harriet **Presser**, for example, found that working evening or night shifts could multiply the likelihood of divorce by 3 to 6 times for parents, depending upon which parent worked shifts and how long they had been married. (For readers’ convenience, the commentary identifies Kanter Top 20 articles by using the last name of the first author, listed in bold and italics.)

Fathers

Fathers are another popular topic of research. Kanter co-winner Suzanne **Bianchi** reminds us that we have underestimated historical changes in fathers’ roles, which are always shifting (as are those of mothers). Although housework and child care are still highly gendered activities, we are now seeing measurable increases in fathers’ involvement with their children. **Moen** focuses on the *joint* strategies fathers and mothers use to achieve their life goals, showing us new visions of work and family involvement.

Division of Domestic Labor

Some feminists believe that tension between work and family life cannot be resolved so long as women are responsible for most of the unpaid work in families on top of a significant amount of paid work.

The debate about gender rages on in the academic literature. Women's roles have changed more than men's in recent decades, although men have made measurable shifts – particularly in the amounts of time they spend with their children. Some feminists believe that tension between work and family life cannot be resolved so long as women are responsible for most of the unpaid work in families, on top of a significant amount of paid work. Yet, in a number of studies women report feeling satisfied with what appear to be very inequitable divisions of labor. As a result, researchers have conducted many studies that try to explain why men and women divide household labor in the ways that they do, and how they feel about it. Why don't men do more? Why aren't women angry? How might equity be possible, and what good might it do?

Most studies, including several among the Kanter 20, now focus on three possible explanations for the ways that men and women divide domestic work: the “Time Availability” hypothesis, the “Relative Resources” hypothesis, and the “Gender Ideology” hypothesis. The “time availability” explanation proposes that men and women allocate household labor simply based on the time they have available when they are not working for pay or fulfilling other obligations. The “relative resources” explanation focuses on who controls family resources like money and goods, suggesting that partners with more power are able to influence the allocation of household labor in their favor. The “gender ideology” explanation proposes that the allocation of household labor is a symbolic enactment of gender relations, where marital partners are guided by their personal ideologies about what is appropriate behavior for husbands and wives. Finally, the “economic dependence” argument suggests that spouses who are more economically dependent on their partners will do more household work.

In their tests of these hypotheses, *Bianchi* found that men are spending more time with their children than they did 30 years ago, and that women are spending less time on housework. *Doucet* showed that community norms are still perceived as powerful influences causing discomfort for men and women trying to go a different way. *Greenstein* and *Szinovacz* revealed that some work-family processes differ for men and women, and that economic dependence may still be a major factor in the dynamics of marital relationships.

Overall, these studies suggest that the time availability hypothesis operates in only a limited way – that the allocation of household tasks is not a simple arithmetic exercise. Marital power, expressed through control of resources and economic dependence, is still a powerful force. Gender ideologies are also important, but this may be more true for men than women.

Gaps in Earnings

Another puzzle for researchers is the persistent wage gap between men and women, considered by several Kanter nominees. *Hinze* studied male and female physicians married to each other and found that work hours and earnings were linked more tightly for women than for men. There

appeared to be real earnings benefits for men when their wives worked less, but this did not work in reverse for women. One possible explanation is that married men, but not women, spend less time on household work and thus devote more time to paid work. *Hersch* investigated this possibility but found that married and single men spent equal time on housework. They speculated that employers might offer training or promotions selectively to married men, or that the stability induced by marriage helps men to advance in the work force.

Notable Features of this Year's Nominees

The nominees for the 2001 award displayed considerable diversity in research topics and methods. In-depth qualitative analyses were more prominent this year. Also striking this year was the important role played by the National Survey of Families and Households, used in the analyses for five of the papers (*Presser, Greenstein, Hersch, Kaufman, & Szinovacz*).

National and International

Several of the studies included in the Kanter 20 were international or multi-national, including research on East and West Germany, Canada, and Great Britain.

For example, *Trappe* creatively used historical data from East and West Germany to try to understand this pattern as a function of government policies. In the West, policies encouraged women not to combine simultaneous full-time work and childrearing, while in the east the opposite was true. Fathers earned more than mothers in both cultures, but the gap was larger in the west – a sort of “child bonus.” In contrast, women in the west paid a “child penalty.” In the east, neither the bonus nor the penalty was evident in a direct way. Indirectly, however, some women paid an earnings penalty because they took jobs below their qualifications. There also was no evidence that men in the east participated more in domestic work.

Several of the studies in the Kanter 20 were international or multi-national.

DiPrete used data from the U.S. and Germany to compare the impacts of divorce, marriage and unemployment on families' financial prospects as a function of government policies. Findings showed that men's financial prospects depended heavily on both loss of a marital partner and unemployment, but that loss of a marital partner was even more important for women's prospects. Perhaps not surprisingly, welfare policies were extremely important for the financial prospects of women.

A different type of data – historical documents and records – was used by *Zylan* to trace the chain of events through which day care policy in the U.S. became yoked to welfare policy.

Working Class Families

The vast majority of studies about families have focused on two-parent, white middle-class families. In recent years, researchers have begun to correct this oversight with thoughtful studies about diverse families. Three of the Kanter nominees focused specifically on issues especially likely to confront blue collar families. *Perry-Jenkins* selected a sample of workers who worked

in jobs with specific characteristics and families with particular structures. *McGraw* studied the families of fishermen who are away from home for weeks at a time. *Presser* focused on the price that shiftworkers pay in marital stability. These studies show us that workers at different levels of the organization come to their jobs with different goals and priorities. They also point out how powerless some workers feel to exert control over their work environments. Finally, they demonstrate how fundamental work-life issues are for many workers affecting the basic stability of marriage.

Organizational Issues

Although most of the Kanter 20 focused on individual workers and their families, a few nominees addressed the level of the work unit or the organization. *Bernas* considered supervisors in her examination of workers' resilience to stress. Unexpectedly, the findings showed that strong leader support was positively related to work-family conflict, perhaps because high-quality relationships with supervisors carry high expectations. *Perry-Smith* found clear connections between the availability of work-family benefits and the financial performance of organizations. *Lee* studied a large number of reduced-load work arrangements among managers and professionals to discover ways that organizations learn from creative experiments.

Hallmarks of Excellence

The basic criterion for selection of the Kanter nominees and winners is quality. For researchers, this means scientific rigor. What indicators of rigor do the nominated studies exemplify?

The data sources are diverse, from longitudinal data about government policies and individuals' time use, to in-depth interviews and public records of organizational performance.

- **Strong connections to theory.** By linking their ideas to theoretical schools of thought, the authors position their studies at the leading edge of existing knowledge. Their findings not only test their own hypotheses, but the propositions of entire theories. As the evidence for or against particular theories mounts, researchers can focus their energies on ideas with the greatest likelihood of being correct. A good example in this year's Kanter 20 is the dialogue among several of the studies about theories explaining the division of domestic work.
- **Large samples.** In addition to being large, many of the samples are randomly selected and/or nationally representative, such as in the studies by *Bianchi* and *DiPrete*. When not large, samples typically comprise hard-to-find or theoretically important groups. For example, *Hinze's* use of male and female physicians married to each other was not only creative but controlled several significant threats to the validity of the study.
- **Detailed data.** Many of the studies use longitudinal data, some over very long periods of time, such as the policy analysis by *Zylan* and the time-use studies used by *Bianchi*. The data sources are also diverse, from the ones just mentioned to in-depth interviews (*Doucet*) and public records of organizational performance (*Perry-Smith*).

- **Creativity.** Throughout these studies there are many examples of researchers developing creative solutions to research problems. *Secret*, for example, worked around the problem of trying to develop a representative sample with limited resources and a pool of volunteer respondents (who usually aren't representative). *Szinovacz* used the transition to retirement to reveal the dynamics of dividing household labor.

Research Challenges

Contrary to what one might expect, not all of the Kanter studies started out as successes. *McGraw* set out to conduct a study of fishing families and had the very disappointing experience of finding few who were willing to participate. But her team turned this “failure” into an important opportunity to re-learn that the needs and interests of research participants may differ from those of researchers and should be paramount.

Research on work-family issues and innovations is challenging. The traditional scientific tools for proving causation – control groups, random assignment, and data gathered over time – are often unavailable to those who study families and employers. As a result, we continue to struggle to isolate the precise effects of specific factors – a struggle salient to many of the Kanter 20.

Conclusion: Lessons for Work-Life Practitioners

This year's Kanter 20 adds to the evidence of a positive connection between family-friendliness and organizational performance. The most intriguing contribution here is by *Perry-Smith*, who showed that bundles of family-friendly benefits were positively related to organizational performance, even when measured objectively. The results also suggest that the return increases at an accelerating rate as the number of benefits increases – the performance of organizations who offered all four groups of benefits was three times that of organizations who offered only one group less.

Different workers want different things from their jobs. Although this may be one of those “well, duh!” observations, the truth is that some work-life programs and policies don't penetrate very deeply into the hierarchy of organizations. Just like the larger society, the workforce is stratified into layers of individuals with different interests and needs. Blue collar workers look to their jobs with different goals than white collar workers, as *Perry-Jenkins* found. Older fathers display family commitment differently than younger fathers, according to *Kaufman*.

It is possible that good supervisors are a mixed blessing.


Good supervisors might be a mixed blessing. Although supervisor supportiveness has clearly been shown to be helpful in many workers' eyes, the relationship may come with expectations and obligations that increase the conflict workers experience, according to *Bernas*.

Family-friendly policies and programs are predicated on the belief that family life interferes with work activity, but families themselves work hard to minimize these effects. As *Bianchi* reminds us, we tend to overestimate the effects of employment on parents' time with their children. *Erickson* found that the key may lie in employers' hands -- it is not family situations alone but their interactions with other factors such as job burnout that interfere with work

performance. Supporting this conclusion is *Secret's* finding that employer characteristics are more powerful predictors of benefit use than the characteristics of employees or families themselves.

Work-family conflict may increase for men. Evidence here from *Kaufman* and others suggests that younger men are especially likely to want to be actively involved with their children, and willing to spend less time at work to do it.

Disconnects between corporate leaders and front-line workers are likely to continue. Most corporate leaders are in the age cohorts studied by *Szinovacz*, where men's involvement in "women's work" was minimal except when men were retired and women were still employed. In contrast, many front-line workers are in the age groups studied by *Kaufman*, where many fathers want to be actively involved in family work.

In the remainder of this report, the symbol  indicates the likely relevance of a particular article for work-life practitioners.

Overview of Article topics

Name of First Author	Mothers' employment	Duration and timing of work	Fathers	Gender and earnings	Division of domestic work	International	Gender role attitudes	Parenthood	Marriage	Private work-family policies	Separation and divorce	Work-Family Conflict	Time with children	Organizational Performance	Alternative work arrangements	Working-class families	Public work-family policies	Family Stress	Job Stress	Emotional Support	Communities	Supervisors	Retirement
Winners																							
Bianchi	X		X			X							X										
Presser	X	X	X								X												
Finalists																							
Bianchi	X		X		X																		
Erickson...																							
Hinze		X		X																			
Perry-Smith...										X				X									
Top 20																							
Bernas...												X						X	X	X		X	
DiPrete...				X		X					X						X						
Doucet	X		X		X	X															X		
Greenstein				X	X		X		X														
Hersch...				X					X														
Kaufman...	X	X	X				X	X															
Lee...	X	X				X				X					X								
McGraw...	X	X					X	X		X		X	X	X									
Moen...	X	X	X		X				X	X		X								X			
Perry-Jenkins...	X							X	X		X					X			X				
Secret		X					X	X		X					X			X					
Szinovacz		X			X		X		X														X
Trappe...	X		X	X		X																	
Zylan	X			X				X								X	X						
COUNTS	11	8	7	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1

The Winning Articles

Summaries and Author Biographies

Author Biography

Suzanne M. Bianchi received her Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Michigan (1978) and is currently Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality, at the University of Maryland. She is also an Affiliate Faculty member of the Womens= Studies Department and the School of Public Affairs. Prior to her current position, she served as Assistant Chief for Social and Demographic Statistics in the Population Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Bianchi's research focuses on women's and children's economic well-being and changing patterns of work and family life. With John Robinson and Melissa Milkie, she is currently engaged in new time diary data collection on American families (funded by the Working Families Program of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation) and is co-authoring a book from this project, *Changing Rhythms of Work and Family Life*, that will appear as a volume in the Rose Monograph Series published by Russell Sage. She has just completed a project on demographic changes in the family, with Lynne Casper, and their book from the project, *Change and Continuity in the American Family*, will be published by Sage in January 2002). With funding from the Russell Sage Foundation, she is also researching whether growing income inequality in the U.S. has resulted in growing inequality in parental investments in children over time.

In addition to co-winning the 2001 Kanter award for the published version of her presidential address to the Population Association of America, Bianchi won the National Council on Family Relation's Rueben Hill Award for the best paper published on the family in 2000 (AWomen=s Economic Independence and the Probability of Divorce.@ Journal of Family Issues October 2000). In 1999, her paper with Philip Cohen on "Marriage, Children, and Women's Employment: What Do We Know?" won the Lawrence Klein Award for the best contribution to the *Monthly Labor Review* in that year.

In addition to being a Past President of the Population Association of America (PAA), she is also a member of the American Sociological Association (ASA) and the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR). She has chaired the ASA Family Section (1997-98) and the ASA Population Section (1993-94), served as guest editor for a special volume of *Demography* on AMen in Families," and is serving as a member of the Committee on Family Work Policies of the National Academy of Sciences.

Suzanne M. Bianchi
Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality
Department of Sociology, University of Maryland
College Park MD 20742
sbianchi@socy.umd.edu

**Maternal Employment and Time with Children:
Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?**

Suzanne M. Bianchi

Demography

Volume 37, 2000, pp. 401 – 414

Despite rapid increases in the proportion of mothers participating in the labor force, mothers spent an average of 5.5 hours per day with children in 1998, more than the 5.3 hours they spent in 1965. The goal of this paper was to explain why women's movement into the paid workforce has not been accompanied by a dramatic decrease in mothers' time with children. Analyses of national data suggested four reasons:

We have overestimated mothers' time with children in the past.

One problematic assumption has been that activities away from the job are compatible with child rearing but activities on the job are not. Research on developing countries has provided important opportunities to observe many challenges to this assumption. In reality, the effects of mothers' work time on involvement with children depend on educational and other opportunities available to children, the availability of older siblings or other relatives to provide child care and parents' comfort with them doing so, and parents' attitudes and values about appropriate time use for themselves and their children.

We have overestimated how long employment takes mothers away from their children. Employed mothers spend about 86% as much time as non-employed mothers with their children younger than 13. Each hour of employment between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. reduces time with children by about 22 minutes; each hour of employment between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. reduces time with children by about 42 minutes. Employed mothers spend less time in sleep, personal care, and leisure than non-employed mothers. Employed mothers also curtail their hours of work and change employers or jobs to accommodate childrearing responsibilities.

Childcare responsibilities are changing. Today, regardless of mothers' employment status, families spend fewer years on average providing large amounts of hands-on care to very young children, and more years providing less intense care to older children who are not yet launched. More preschool-age children spend time outside the home in school-like settings regardless of their mother's employment status. In 1967, less than 10% of all children aged 3 to 5 were in preprimary educational programs; by 1997, 44% of the children of nonemployed mothers and 51.7% of the children of employed mothers were in such programs.

We have underestimated changes in fathers' involvement with their children. Fathers are spending one hour more per day with children than they did in 1965. While fathers reported having children with them about half as often as did mothers when studied in 1965, fathers in 1998 reported being with children two-thirds as often as mothers, a finding corroborated by several studies around the world.

Because of our failure to measure adequately what women do with their time, we overestimate maternal investment in children when mothers are in the home and fail to understand how much mothers do to protect their time with children ... we also may be underestimating how much women's changed market roles are altering men's domestic roles...

(p. 403)

Author Biography

Harriet B. Presser (Ph.D. 1969, University of California, Berkeley) is Distinguished University Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Maryland. She was the founding director of the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality at Maryland from 1988-2001, having just stepped down. She is Past President of the Population Association of America (1989), and was named George Washington University's 1992 Distinguished Alumni Scholar, having received her B.A. from there in 1959. Prior to her Maryland appointment in 1976, she has held faculty positions at the University of Sussex (England) and Columbia University, and was also on the staff of the Population Council, the Institute of Life Insurance, and the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Professor Presser's research expertise is in the areas of social demography, focusing on the intersections of gender, work, and family. She also studies population and family policy issues from a national and international perspective. She teaches courses in both these areas, and currently serves on the National Academy of Science's Family Work Policy committee. She is currently writing a book, Toward a 24-Hour Economy: Nonstandard Work Schedules and America's New Families, to be published by the Russell Sage Foundation. She is also doing research funded by the National Science Foundation that explores, for the first time, the relationship between disability status and nonstandard hours of employment in the U.S.

Harriet Presser
Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality
Department of Sociology, University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
presser@socy.umd.edu

Nonstandard Work Schedules and Marital Instability

Harriet B. Presser

Journal of Marriage and Family

Volume 62, 2000, pp. 93-110

Employment during nonstandard hours and weekends is very common among married couples in the United States. This study examines the extent to which working evening, night, or rotating shifts and weekends affects the likelihood of marriages ending in separation or divorce.

Among 3,467 married couples in the National Survey of Families and Households, interviewed in 1987-88 and again in 1992-94, nonstandard work schedules were associated with greater marital instability. However, this relationship held only for couples with children and for those working night and rotating shifts.

In addition to which shifts were being worked, the effect of nonstandard schedules on marital stability also depended which spouse worked such schedules and the duration of the marriage: Fathers who worked fixed nights and were married less than 5 years at the first interview were 6 times more likely to be separated or divorced by the second interview than similar fathers who worked days.

For mothers married more than 5 years at the first interview, working fixed nights increased the odds of separation or divorce by almost 3 times, and may have an effect during the earlier years of marriage as well (although not statistically significant). Working rotating shifts doubled the odds of marital dissolution for mothers but not fathers, but only for mothers married more than 5 years.

These findings held after adjusting for differences in the number of hours worked, various demographic variables, the husband's and wife's gender ideologies, and the extent to which couples spent time alone together. The question of whether spouses in troubled marriages are more likely to move into night or rotating shifts was explored, but this did not seem to be the case. Important areas for future exploration include the psychological and physiological stress of working very late hours, and the potential disruption of family meals, socializing, and other activities as a function of shift schedules.

...very late hours of employment, most of them past midnight, seem to add special stress to the marriage, and only when there are children. This holds for both men's and women's night work, but it is only women's, not men's, shift rotation that is associated with marital dissolution.

(p. 108)

Summaries of Finalists

**Is Anyone Doing the Housework?
Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor.**

S. M. Bianchi, M. A. Milkie, L. C. Sayer, & J. P. Robinson

Social Forces

Volume 79, 2000, pp. 191-228

sbianchi@socy.umd.edu

The purpose of this article was to describe and explain changes in men's and women's involvement in housework and child care over the past 30 years. Three competing theoretical explanations were tested. The "time availability" explanation proposes that men and women allocate household labor based on the time they have available when they are not working for pay or fulfilling other obligations. The "relative resources" explanation focuses on who controls family resources like money and goods, suggesting that partners with more power are able to influence the allocation of household labor in their favor. The "gender ideology" explanation proposes that the allocation of household labor is a symbolic enactment of gender relations, where marital partners are guided by their personal ideologies about what is appropriate behavior for husbands and wives.

Two types of data were used for these analyses. Time diaries list all activities over a series of days, recorded by research participants as they occur. Diary data were gathered on four separate occasions between 1965 and 1995 from nationally representative U.S. samples totaling 6,740 adults. Additional data came from the 1992-94 survey of 4,107 couples in the National Survey of Families and Households.

Except for child care and shopping, the number of hours of domestic work or chores performed by family members has fallen steadily since 1965. Women have cut their housework time almost in half since the 1960's. About half of the 12 hour per week decline occurred because women are marrying later, having fewer children, and are more likely to participate in the labor force.

In contrast to women, men's housework time has almost doubled. By the 1990's men were responsible for about 1/3 of housework performed. Most of this was not due to factors such as labor force participation or the timing of marriage or parenthood, but rather appeared to be the result of increasing willingness to do this work. The rate of increase slowed during the 1990's, however.

Results of statistical regression analyses supported the time-availability and relative-resource models more strongly than the gender perspective – that is, husbands and wives tend to allocate household labor according to how much time they have and who controls resources in the family. Husbands' hours in unpaid labor are less responsive to time availability or relative resources than wives', however, supporting the gender perspective.

*...a woman in the 1990's
performs a bit more than
half the hours that a
woman in the 1960s did.*

*Gender segregation of
tasks continues, with wives
performing the "core,"
traditionally feminine
tasks to a large degree and
men concentrating their
household labor on other,
more episodic or
discretionary tasks.*

(pp. 218-219)

Family Influences on Absenteeism: Testing an Expanded Process Model

R. J. Erickson, L. Nichols, & C. Ritter

Journal of Vocational Behavior

Volume 57, 2000, pp. 246-272

rericks@uakron.edu

Unscheduled absences can cost firms with over 1000 employees more than \$1,000,000 per year. Despite evidence showing that family issues have become the most frequently cited reason for missing work, studies of absenteeism continue to focus on job-related conditions and attitudes as factors.

...experiencing a high level of burnout did not, on its own, necessarily lead to greater absenteeism. It was the combination of feeling burned out and having to raise and find child care for young children that led to increased work absence.

(p. 266)

Building on theoretical models showing that family structure affects employee attendance either directly or by interacting with other factors, this paper examines the relationship between family factors and workers' reports of absenteeism.

The family factors studied included number of children in the family, the presence of children younger than 6, hours spent in household tasks, and difficulty with child care arrangements. Family factors also included attitudes such as marital burnout, and perceptions of parental stress and parental rewards.

Participants in the study were 211 couples, randomly selected from a county in northeastern Ohio, in which both partners were employed full-time. Data were gathered in two waves about 6 months apart.

Findings showed that job and family factors were related to absenteeism more strongly in combination than separately.

Both men and women missed more work when they reported higher burnout AND children under the age of 6 or difficulties in arranging child care. In fact, difficulty arranging child care was more strongly related to rates of absenteeism than was the availability of flexible work arrangements.

The researchers conclude, "organizations that are able to reduce the burden of raising young children for their employees are likely to reap the benefits associated with reduced absenteeism – even among those who are experiencing job burnout" (p. 266).

Inside Medical Marriages: The Effect of Gender on Income

S. W. Hinze

Work and Occupations

Volume 27(4), 2000, pp. 464-499

sxh3@po.cwru.edu

Explaining differences in earnings between men and women remains a challenge for researchers. Among physicians, for example, women earned about 69% as much as men in 1995. Individual characteristics, such as education level, experience, and job performance are usually offered to explain income differentials. These factors do not fully explain gender differences, however, except among young physicians in practice less than 10 years.

Another possibility is that men and women are treated differently in the structure of the field of medicine. For example, differences in earnings may be a function of sex segregation, because women tend to be concentrated in lower status specialties such as pediatrics, and are more likely than men to be owners. Differences in earnings also could be a function of discrimination. A much more immediate explanation may be subjective variables such as perceived sacrifice. Finally, there may be intermediate explanations -- "meso level" influences such as the number of hours worked, family structure, and spousal work situations.

... the experiences of women and men in the same occupation married to spouses in the same occupation differ markedly. For women, sacrifice is better explained by family and work characteristics and plays an important role in predicting both work hours and income. For men, the most important predictor of income is years of experience.

(p. 488)

This study focused on 321 physicians married to physicians, a creative way to find men and women with very similar occupations and educational training. A survey was administered to 2,200 alumni of Case Western Reserve University or the University of Cincinnati who graduated between 1980 and 1990. The response rate was 57%. Members of the final sample came from 40 different states and 18 different specialties, and were similar to a national sample in age, race, and specialty.

Statistical analyses examined the relationship between work hours and income, controlling for years of training and practice, prestige of specialty, whether or not in private practice, spouses' income and hours worked, number of children, duration of career interruptions for child rearing, and the degree to which each physician felt they had sacrificed work for family.

Results showed that about 18% of the variation in earnings was explained by training, prestige, own and spouse's work hours, and perceptions of sacrifice. For example:

- Men, but not women whose spouses worked fewer hours earned more.
- Women's hours, but not men's, are closely linked to income.
- Women who perceive greater sacrifice work fewer hours.
- Men who perceive greater sacrifice miss conferences and informal time with colleagues.

This study offers important insights into the ways that gender interacts with other factors to produce unequal incomes for men and women.

Work-Family Human Resource Bundles and Perceived Organizational Performance

J. E. Perry-Smith & T. C. Blum
Academy of Management Journal
 Volume 43 (6), 2000, pp. 1107-1117
 terry.blum@mgt.gatech.edu

This study tested the proposition that work-family policies enhance organizational performance. The nationally representative U.S. sample consisted of 527 firms studied as part of the National Organizations Survey conducted in 1991.

...a relationship exists between work-family bundles and several dimensions of organizational performance. Perhaps an HR bundle that gives employees the flexibility, the information, the convenience, and the financial assistance to better manage their nonwork lives can be considered strategic and should be added to the list of the "best practices" of strategic human resource management.

(p. 1115)

The researchers expected that the relationships between work-family policies and performance would be stronger in larger firms, older firms, and firms with higher proportions of female employees. Analyses controlled for industry, whether or not firms were subsidiaries, levels of competitive or union pressure, the percent of employees who were managers, the progressiveness of HR policies, and the number of standard benefits offered, such as insurance for health, life, and disability, pensions, and sick leave.

Organizations were grouped into four categories, according to their levels of benefits:

1. Low on all work-family policies
2. Paid leave and traditional dependent care benefits
3. Paid leave and less traditional dependent care benefits (elder care, financial assistance)
4. High on all work-family policies (onsite child care, child care resource and referral, flexible scheduling)

Three measures of organizational performance were used.

Two came from employees' subjective reports: their perceptions of the performance of the organization itself and of the organization in the context of its industrial market. The third measure was objective: percent increase in sales and profits over the past 12 months (for-profit firms only), according to the U.S. Industrial Outlook and COMPUSTAT.

The four groups of organizations differed on each of the three indicators of performance. Findings were stronger for the objective than the subjective measures. As predicted, firms with more comprehensive "bundles" of policies performed better. For example, firms in group 4 had a performance index of 28, more than 3 times that of the nearest group.

Unexpectedly, the authors did not find that the relationships between work-family policies and firm performance were stronger in larger firms. They did find, however, that performance is more tightly connected to work-family policies in older firms and firms with higher proportions of women.

Summaries of the Remaining Articles in the Top 20:

The Kanter 20

**Contributors to Stress Resistance:
Testing a Model of Women's Work-Family Conflict**

K.H Bernas & D.A. Major
Psychology of Women Quarterly
Volume 24, 2000, pp. 170-178
dmajor@odu.edu

Based on the premise that stress is a major contributor to work-family conflict, this research examined resources likely to reduce the stress and work-family conflict women experience. Family stress and job stress have been identified as primary sources of work-family conflict.

This survey-based study explored the role of social resources and personality in reducing the stress of working women. The premise behind the research was that factors that reduce stress should also serve to indirectly reduce work-family conflict.

...although having a high-quality relationship with one's boss may help alleviate work interference with family by reducing experienced stress, the demands and expectations associated with such a relationship may also contribute to work interference with family. Thus, a good relationship with one's supervisor may represent a double-edged sword for working women.

(p. 175)

Participants were 206 women recruited in daycare centers, a business community, and a university setting.

The social resources examined include family emotional support and leader-member exchange (LMX). LMX is a positive give-and-take relationship with one's supervisor. "Hardiness" was the personality dimension studied. People who are hardy enjoy challenges and feel they have control over life events.

Findings showed that family emotional support, LMX, and hardiness were all associated with lower stress. Surprisingly, LMX was also linked to greater work-family conflict. The results suggest that while LMX may provide some relief from job stress, this valued relationship could also have detrimental effects on a woman's ability to balance work and family life.

**Family Change, Employment Transitions, and the Welfare State:
Household Income Dynamics in the United States and Germany**

T. A. DiPrete & P. A. McManus

American Sociological Review

Volume 65, 2000, pp 343-370

tdiprete@soc.duke.edu

The authors of this study aimed to understand the impact of household changes and government policy on the short- and long-term financial prospects of households by contrasting Germany and the U.S. These two western societies have had different approaches to income redistribution, and different patterns of labor force participation and divorce.

Data come from two longitudinal studies involving thousands of families: The U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics (1981-1993) and the German Socio-Economic Panel (1984-1996).

For each family, the occurrence of “trigger” events was coded -- events that put the family at financial risk, such as job loss or divorce. In addition, the researchers coded factors that might affect the power of trigger events, such as the frequency of such events, their financial impact, the government policies that could increase or decrease their impact, and subsequent events that could improve or worsen the original effect.

As predicted, Germans were relatively sheltered from the negative consequences of unemployment by German social welfare policies. In both the U.S. and Germany, social welfare policies provide limited short-term protection against the financial consequences of partner loss, but women clearly lose more than do men in the short-term (p. 365).

As predicted, Germans were relatively sheltered from the negative consequences of unemployment by German social welfare policies. In both the U.S. and Germany, social welfare policies provide limited short-term protection against the financial consequences of partner loss, but women clearly lose more than do men in the short-term.

(p. 365)

In the short term, men’s job loss or gain has the greatest impact on household income. However, because state policies do such an effective job of offsetting the negative consequences of employment transitions, gain or loss of a marital partner is the more consequential event when the basis for comparison is income AFTER government transfers. Longer term, both job changes and partner loss have long-term effects for men, with the effects of job change apparently stronger than the effects of partner loss. For women, union formation has the biggest short-term and long-term effect on income and living standards, but the effects of gaining and losing jobs are not trivial, especially in the United States. Finally, the effects of welfare policies are extremely important for women, particularly in minimizing the effects of job loss and divorce.

‘There’s a Huge Difference Between Me as a Male Carer and Women’: Gender, Domestic Responsibility, and the Community as an Institutional Arena

A. Doucet

Community, Work & Family

Volume 3(2), 2000, pp.163-184

Amdoucet@aol.com

In recent years, men have increased not only the time they devote to domestic labor but also the range of tasks they perform. There has been little change, however, in their *responsibility* for tasks. That is, while men *do* more, they do not take on an equal or comparable share of the worrying, strategizing, planning and juggling of the pressures and demands of young children’s lives -- this study explores why.

“domestic responsibility ... is located both within families/households as well as between families/households, between social institutions (work, families and the state) and within the community”

(p. 166)

While most prior explanations had focused on power differences between husbands and wives and their respective gender ideologies, this study also considered communities as places where informal rules and norms for mothers and fathers play out.

The research subjects were 23 British heterosexual couples who were committed to sharing equal responsibility for housework and care of their young children. Three interviews were conducted with each family between 1992 and 1994, one separately with each spouse and one joint interview.

The interviews revealed that despite their strong commitment to gender symmetry at home and at work, all 23 of the women and men unwittingly held on to the idea that outside the home – in the larger community environment -- women “should” be primary carers while men “should” be the family’s primary earners and workers. These shoulds were reinforced by neighbors, other parents, friends, family and kin, resulting in guilt feelings for “straying” among the research participants. The women in the study felt judged against other mothers; the men felt inspected by other men.

Although men appreciated the benefits of sharing the emotional responsibility for children, community-based responsibility continued to elude them. Research participants expressed interest in seeing changes in the links between social norms for masculinity, men’s friendships, and community responsibilities.

**Economic Dependence, Gender, and the Division of Labor in the Home:
A Replication and Extension**

T. N. Greenstein

Journal of Marriage and the Family

Volume 62, 2000, pp. 322-335

ted_greenstein@ncsu.edu

“Why, when women’s employment and earnings have changed so much, does housework remain primarily their responsibility?” is the question that motivated this study. Four possible explanations were tested: control over resources in the home, time availability, gender role attitudes, and the degree of economic dependence among spouses.

Analyses were based on 2,912 married couples where both partners were younger than 65. Data were gathered from each of these couples during wave 1 of the National Survey of Families and Households, and were weighted to ensure a nationally representative sample. Analyses controlled for region of residence, metropolitan areas, Hispanic background, and number of children.

Both the number of hours and the proportion of household work performed by each spouse were examined. Respondents also were asked about the traditionalism of their attitudes toward gender roles. Finally, economic dependence was measured as the difference between self and spouse income, divided by total household income, resulting in values ranging from -1 (completely dependent) to $+1$ (respondent completely supports spouse).

In terms of the hours spent on housework, different processes appeared to be operating for wives and husbands. For wives, there appeared to be a straightforward relationship between economic dependence and housework: wives who were the most economically dependent did the most housework. For husbands, the relationship was not quite so simple: husbands whose wives’ earnings were equal to their own devoted the most time to housework.

In terms of the proportion of housework performed, both wives and husbands who occupied nonnormative earner roles (that is, breadwinner wives and dependent husbands) seemed to exaggerate their reports of the amount of housework they did in the direction of appearing more consistent with the norm for their gender.

The couples that most closely approached an equal distribution of housework tended to be those couples in which the breadwinner role was shared, that is, those couples in which each spouse brought home about half of the family earnings. This finding held even when gender ideologies were taken into account. Thus, it may be that men’s adherence to traditional gender roles may be less about personal views regarding gender and more about individuals’ wishes to appear to conform to community norms. As marriages in this country continue the trend toward dual-earner couples with increasingly equal incomes, it would appear that a likely outcome would be a continuing trend toward equality in the household division of labor.

As marriages in this country continue the trend toward dual-earner couples with increasingly equal incomes, it would appear that a likely outcome would be a continuing trend toward equality in the household division of labor.

(p. 334)

Household Specialization and the Male Marriage Wage Premium

J. Hersch & L. S. Stratton

Industrial and Labor Relations Review

Volume 54 (1), 2000, pp. 78-94

jhersch@law.harvard.edu

Empirical research solidly establishes that married men earn 10 – 30% more than single men with similar characteristics. But we don't know why this marriage premium occurs. One possibility is that the premium exists even before marriage – that men who are more productive also are more likely to marry. Although an important factor, this explains less than half of the premium. Another possibility is that marriage allows men to “specialize” or focus on their work while women do the same in the home (even if also working outside the home for pay). Specialization allows men to develop skills and experience that enhance their productivity and ultimately their earnings.

In the sample we examine, marriage does seem to have made men more productive in the market. However, this enhanced productivity does not seem to have resulted from household specialization. There is little difference by marital status in the total amount of time men spent on home production, although there are differences in the type of home production activities.

To test this hypothesis, the authors used data from 1,373 employed white men interviewed in 1987-88 and 1992-94 as part of the National Survey of Families and Households.

The researchers found that married men spent virtually the same amount of time on household tasks as single men, although they tended to perform different tasks. Specifically, married men spent less time on tasks such as cooking and cleaning. The more time men spent on household tasks, the less they earned, regardless of their marital status. Although married men earned more than unmarried men, the explanation does not seem to lie in specialization in the performance of household tasks.

Explanations for future researchers to explore include the possibility of preferential treatment of married men by employers with regard to training or promotions, or increased productivity as a function of the stability induced by marriage.

(p. 93)

**The Influence of Parenthood on the Work Effort of
Married Men and Women**

G. Kaufman & P. Uhlenberg

Social Forces

Volume 78(3), 2000, pp. 931-949

gakaufman@davidson.edu

The question addressed by this study was, "How does having children affect the work activities of fathers?" There is reason to believe that the answer to this question may be changing because men's roles are changing. The percentage of men who report wanting to be actively involved with their children is rising.

Researchers tested two competing hypotheses. The "good-provider" hypothesis predicts that fathers will work more than men who don't have children, as a way of demonstrating their commitment to their families. The "involved father" hypothesis predicts that fathers will work less than other men, based on well-established patterns among mothers.

Like several of the other Kanter nominees, this study used data from the second (1992-93) wave of the National Survey of Families and Households. The sample included over 3500 married men and women younger than 50. Researchers examined the number of hours worked each week, the number and ages of children, and parents' attitudes about appropriate roles for mothers and fathers.

The results showed that women with children worked about 5 hours less per week than married women without children. In contrast, men with children worked an average of 1.8 hours more each week than men without children. Although having a working spouse was related to whether or not men and women were employed, spouse's work hours had a significant effect only on men: Men whose wives worked more tend to work more hours themselves.

In terms of gender role attitudes, women with less traditional attitudes worked significantly more hours than women with more traditional attitudes; the opposite was true for men, especially men younger than 35. Among 30-year-old, white, college-educated professional men, traditional fathers worked almost 11 hours more per week than comparable men without children, but egalitarian fathers worked about 9 hours less. Traditional fathers with children under six work an average of 48 hours per week, compared to 42.5 hours per week among similar fathers with more egalitarian attitudes.

At least for fathers in more recent birth cohorts, attitudes toward desirable child care arrangements have a striking effect on number of hours put into work. Among men who accept a more traditional view of parenting, fatherhood is associated with an increase of nearly 11 hours per week at work. In contrast, among those with a more egalitarian perspective, fatherhood is associated with a decrease of 9 hours per week at work.

(p. 944)

**Organizational Paradigms of Reduced-Load Work:
Accommodation, Elaboration, and Transformation**

M. D. Lee, S. M. MacDermid, & M. L. Buck

Academy of Management Journal

Volume 43(6), 2000, pp. 1211-1226

lee@management.mcgill.ca

One of the few Kanter nominees to focus on the organizational level, the purpose of this study was to examine employers' responses to reduced-load work arrangements. Since innovative work arrangements often begin as unofficial, grassroots experiments, they present organizations with opportunities to learn. Here, the researchers considered the perspectives of multiple stakeholders to develop a thorough understanding of organizational responses.

The continual fine-tuning of reduced-load arrangements observed in firms following [the transformation] paradigm is consistent with organizational learning characteristics of continuous updating and "intentional imbalance." Each experiment is a development toward possible new experiments which generates continual exploration for adaptive and innovative processes.

(p. 1223)

The main participants in the study were 82 managers and professionals who were working part-time for reduced compensation. In addition, each respondent's spouse, boss, a peer, and an HR representative were interviewed and managers' direct reports were surveyed. Over 375 interviews were conducted and 200 surveys were distributed in all.

The researchers found several key ways that the employers' responses differed, such as the degree to which bosses assumed some responsibility for the success of the arrangement, the way that negotiations for the arrangement took place, and the posture of the employer toward reduced-load work arrangements in general. Three employer "paradigms" emerged in the analyses.

"Accommodation" organizations focused mostly on individual situations, permitting isolated reduced-load arrangements but neither learning from them nor promoting their wider use.

"Elaboration" organizations tended to be sufficiently open to new ideas that they formally allowed alternative work arrangements, although sometimes the formalization limited future innovation.

Finally, "transformation" organizations tended to treat alternative work arrangements as experiments that offered new opportunities for learning. The researchers concluded that learning would be more likely to spread beyond isolated individual situations when: "(1) the negotiation of a reduced-load arrangement is guided by the needs of both an individual situation and an organization's culture; (2) the responsibility for making the arrangement effective is shared by a target individual and a senior manager, thus moving the organization beyond the individual level of learning; 3) the organization frames an individual work arrangement in light of long-term business needs such as adaptation to a changing workforce or recruitment and retention; and 4) the organization is open to reduced-load work as being consistent with a more general encouragement of learning and improvisation" (p. 1222).

**Studying Postmodern Families:
A Feminist Analysis of Ethical Tensions in Work and Family Research**

L. A. McGraw, A. M. Zvonkovic, & A. J. Walker

Journal of Marriage and the Family

Volume 62,2000, pp. 68-77

Lori.McGraw@orst.edu

Researchers often run into ethical dilemmas when studying work and family, particularly among low-wage or disadvantaged workers, because they feel a responsibility to try to intervene. Feminists argue that social justice should characterize the process of doing research.

This paper is based on a study of fishing wives, whose husbands were away 22 days per month and 9 months per year. These wives are deeply embedded in both a threatened industry and in family businesses. Despite careful planning, the researchers found themselves almost completely shut out when they approached wives about participation in the study.

The researchers used the small number of focus groups and interviews they were able to complete as opportunities to deepen their understanding of wives' refusals and acceptance of the invitation to join the study. They learned that respondents seriously doubted that participation could help to save their livelihoods.

Through the research process, participants increased their awareness of their own negative feelings and their feelings of solidarity with other fishing families. They began to feel more connected to the larger social and political environment.

The authors caution that "family researchers have an obligation to their colleagues to write the truth about our experiences and the tensions we encounter, in order to avoid misleading each other about how research actually proceeds. Family research is not a neutral process; it is inherently political in content and in method. In the interests of creating authentic science and serving families well, we should be clear about our own political and professional agendas, and we should acknowledge the social nature of research. Failure to do so imperils our connections with participants and our knowledge of families" (p. 76).

...researchers should attend to participants' frames of reference. Each of us, researcher and participant, is differentially positioned with reference to the world, and that difference has implications for the meaning of the research process. As researchers who navigate between very different social worlds, it is our responsibility to attend to this positionality, our own and that of our participants.

(p. 75)



**Effective Work/Life Strategies:
Working Couples, Work Conditions, Gender, and Life Quality**

P. Moen & Y. Yu

Social Problems

Volume 47(3), 2000, pp. 291-326

pem3@cornell.edu

This study draws on data from a national sample to assess the life quality of workers in dual-earner families facing the challenge of three jobs -- two at work and one at home -- in a world still operating on the obsolete breadwinner/homemaker template.

As members of the large baby boomer cohort and those following in their wake move through their work and family “careers,” they may well reshape the institutional landscape. Dual-earner couples are in the process of negotiating, not only among themselves, but (as employees, parents, and citizens) with employers, policy makers, schools, and child care providers, to reshape options. Studies are needed to explore systemic changes at work and in communities that might foster innovative strategies that do not simply reproduce existing gendered divisions.

(p. 316)

What workplace conditions and couple-level strategies are most related to various indicators of life quality for men and women in dual-earner households? The researchers find that most dual-earner couples follow “neotraditional” arrangements, where husbands work long hours and wives work fewer hours for pay. Women typically report more stress and overload, and less personal mastery than men. However, conditions at work are important for both men and women. Specifically, people with demanding and insecure jobs have lower life quality, while those with supportive supervisors report less conflict, stress, and overload.

Work hours and work-hour preferences matter as well. Men and women in couples where both spouses work regular (39-45) full-time hours seem to be most effective in managing the multiple dimensions of their lives.

**Parental Job Experiences and Children's Well-Being:
The Case of Two-Parent and Single-Mother Working-Class Families**

M. Perry-Jenkins & S. Gillman

Journal of Family and Economic Issues

Volume 21(2), 2000, pp. 123-147

mpj@psych.umass.edu

The vast majority of work-family research focuses on middle class families with two parents. This study focused on 52 working-class families headed by single mothers and 50 with two parents. The purpose was to explore the processes that link work, parents' actions, and children's well-being.

All of the parents in the study worked at least 35 hours per week in jobs where they performed routinized tasks, with little autonomy and under heavy supervision. All families had a child between 8 and 12 living in the home. Single moms had been separated or divorced for at least 2 years. Interviews were conducted at home with mothers, fathers, and the target child.

Children's reports of well-being were similar between single-mother and two-parent families. Fathers scored significantly higher on all psychological well-being than their wives and the single mothers. In dual-earner families, fathers' positive work experiences were related to daughters' positive evaluations of their psychological well-being. The

opposite pattern occurred for dual-earner mothers, however: more positive work environments were related to daughters' reports of lower well-being. Single mothers' more positive evaluations of their work environments were linked to sons' reports of greater restraint of aggressive tendencies. These findings did not appear to depend upon the well-being of the parent.

By restricting the study to examine only working-class families, it was shown that employment experiences hold far less significance for women's well-being than has been documented in the literature for middle-class women. Family context also matters in understanding work-family linkages. In two-parent families, fathers' employment was related to daughters' psychological well-being, while in single-parent families it was mothers' work that mattered for sons' aggressive behaviors.

(p. 144)

Identifying the Family, Job, and Workplace Characteristics of Employees Who Use Work-Family Benefits

M. Secret

Family Relations

Volume 49, 2000, pp. 217-225

mcsecr@pop.uky.edu

Although many employers offer work-family benefits, they are often used by only a minority of the employees who need them. Few studies have explored the characteristics of the employees who use work-family benefits – this study aimed to close that gap.

This study was conducted as part of a local initiative to increase family-responsive work policies. Out of 325 businesses associated with the initiative, 88 agreed to participate. About 1400 employees (out of several thousand) volunteered to be interviewed by phone; 527 employees from 83 businesses were ultimately interviewed. The sample was proportionate to the gender, dependent care responsibilities and size and sector of the employer organizations.

Parents of dependent children are no more likely than other employees to use benefits but particular family problems predict female employee use of paid leave and mental health benefits. Workplace size, sector, and culture are better predictors of employee use than are employee job characteristics.

(p. 217)

Each employee was assigned four scores to indicate their use of particular types of benefits: alternative work arrangements, paid leave, child care, and mental health benefits. Statistical analyses examined the factors that predicted employees' benefit use, including employee characteristics, family roles, job attributes, and workplace characteristics.

Taking into account whether or not employees had access to each particular type of benefit, the researcher found that paid leave benefits were more likely to be used by employees who worked in larger organizations, who reported more positive workplace cultures, or who worked in the nonprofit sector. Employees in both the non-profit and public sectors were more than twice as likely than those in the for-profit sector to take advantage of alternative work arrangements, but employees in the public sector were less likely to use mental health benefits.

Other results emphasized the importance of family characteristics in combination with other factors in predicting who will use work-family benefits. For example, women who reported family crises were 3.3 times more likely to use paid leave. Women with more child care problems were 2.3 times more likely to use mental health benefits.

Employees who reported less traditional gender role attitudes were less likely to use paid leave benefits. Although workers who earned more were in general only half as likely to use mental health benefits, workers who had higher-paying jobs and more child-care problems were 1.43 times more likely to take advantage of mental health benefits. Higher-paid workers also were more likely to use alternative work arrangements. Otherwise, salary and occupational status were not related to use of benefits. None of the job attributes indicating employer attachment were related to benefit use.

Changes in Housework after Retirement: A Panel Analysis

M. E. Szinovacz

Journal of Marriage and the Family

Volume 62, 2000, pp. 78-92

szinovme@evms.edu

In this study, the transition to retirement was studied as a way of revealing the relationship between paid and unpaid work. Most prior studies have been cross-sectional, making it difficult to tell which factors are causes and which are effects. Although several possible explanations have been proposed -- time availability, control over resources, and gender role attitudes -- there is no consensus among the evidence to date.

Data came from the first (1987-88) and second (1992-94) waves of the National Survey of Families and Households. The sample included 608 continuously married couples who responded to both waves, and in which at least one spouse was 50-70 years old and employed 10 hours or more per week at Time 1.

The researchers developed a list of household tasks, used statistical procedures to identify those typically performed by men and by women in the research sample, then calculated the number of hours each spouse spent performing male and female tasks. Other variables included changes in work hours and employment status, gender role attitudes, husbands' income relative to that of their wives, and spouses' perceptions of their partner's power (indexed by how badly they would fare if divorced). Analyses controlled for couple income, the number and presence of children, the length of the marriage, wives' work history, and the health of the spouses.

Results showed that spouses' retirement influenced not only their own but also their partner's household contributions to tasks in the "wife's domain." After their spouses retired, both husbands and wives devoted less time to "female chores." Retiring husbands whose wives continued to work outside the home took on more household responsibility until the wife retired, when she resumed charge of her domain. Adaptations of housework to wives' work hours seemed to depend on spouses' gender-role attitudes, whereas adjustments to husbands' work hours were more dependent on the marital power structure. In both cases, more egalitarian gender-role attitudes or higher dependence of the husband led to more flexibility in the allocation of housework. Apparently, gender-role ideology and power outweighed the effects of "efficiency" or time availability. Husbands' attitudes appeared to have more of an impact on the relationship between wives' paid labor and the allocation of both spouses' cross-sex tasks, whereas wives' attitudes moderated changes in wives' housework in their domain in response to their own employment. Thus, husbands' attitudes may set guidelines that influence whether "help" to the other partner is responsive to wives' paid work obligations.

...retiring husbands whose wives continue to work outside the home take on more household responsibility until the wife retires. Once she retires, the wife seems to again take charge of her domain.

(p. 89)

How Do Children Matter? A Comparison of Gender Earnings Inequality for Young Adults in the Former East Germany and the Former West Germany

H. Trappe & R. A. Rosenfeld

Journal of Marriage and the Family

Volume 62,2000, pp. 489-507

trappe@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

The old Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) and former East Germany (German Democratic Republic) presented a striking contrast in policies and regulations that attempted to help women balance employment and domestic work. Women in the West were encouraged to be full-time workers and mothers sequentially, women in the East to combine roles simultaneously.

...the way people combined family and paid work did differ between the two Germanies. In the West, there was a more traditional specialization in domestic versus paid work, with family and employment policies enabling and constraining many women to choose one or the other. For whatever reason, married fathers fared especially well in terms of earnings under this system. In the GDR, family and work policies helped women combine employment and childrearing, although this did not mean that men combined paid and domestic work.

(p. 504)

Using data for men and women born in the 1950s and early 1960s, these researchers examined the impact of having children on earnings in East and West Germany. In the West, fathers earned more than childless men while mothers earned less than other women. While marital status, credentials, current work position, and employment history failed to explain any variation in the effect of parenthood for men, for women being employed part-time explained such differences. Surprisingly, the extent of their previous employment did not.

In the East, too, there was an earnings gap between fathers and mothers, although much smaller than in the West. While there was a “child bonus” for men, there was no “child penalty” among East German women. Rather, children had an indirect effect: some women with children took jobs below their qualifications, and this reduced their earnings.

The authors concluded, “the way people combined family and paid work did differ between the two Germanies. In the West, there was a more traditional specialization in domestic versus paid work, with family and employment policies enabling and constraining many women to choose one or the other. For whatever reason, married fathers fared especially well in terms of earnings under this system. In the GDR, family and work policies helped women combine employment and childrearing, although this did not mean that men combined paid and domestic work” (p. 504).

Maternalism Redefined: Gender, the State, and the Politics of Day Care, 1945-1962

Y. Zylan

Gender & Society

Volume 14 (5), 2000, pp. 608-629

yzylan@yahoo.com

Almost alone among industrialized nations, the U.S. offers no universal paid maternity leave and very limited public support for child care. In 1962, funds for day care were formally codified in U.S. policy as part of public assistance, a decision that has had long-term consequences for public support of child care ever since. This study traces the events during the 17 years prior to 1962 that culminated in the fateful policy decision.

Preexisting government policies were one important factor. The Lanham Act of 1941 had (unintentionally) provided funds for the construction and operation of day care centers in war-impacted areas as part of policies that encouraged the employment of women. Once the war ended, disagreements about the effectiveness of the policy and whether it should continue, as well as low funding and tangled administrative structures made its continuation unlikely.

Aid to Dependent Children was another important policy. Passed as part of the social security act of 1935, but under attack in the 1940's and 1950's, ADC supported mothers staying home. In contrast, day care policy seemed to assume mothers should work. Children's advocates, however, turned to ADC as a possible source of funds for child care.

The philosophical tensions about whether or not women should be encouraged to be employed persisted in the relationship between the Children's Bureau – which saw day care as a welfare issue – and the Department of Education, which saw early childhood education as enrichment during important developmental periods and proceeded to create Head Start.

When a national effort to redesign welfare policy emerged, advocates saw an opportunity to secure new funds for day care, but proposals had to be couched within the welfare rubric. Ultimately, day care's association with welfare policy was also the source of its undoing. Once linked to welfare, it was then quickly subordinated to it. Funding requests made by the Children's Bureau were repeatedly cut, and by 1967, day care was programmatically aligned with Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

While child welfare advocates clearly hoped that the introduction of a day care provision would be just the first, small step in an expanding national commitment to the policy, their optimism was ultimately misplaced. What was a clever strategy to get day care on the national policy agenda – situating it within the Child Welfare Services and linking it to the effort to reform welfare policies for poor women – rapidly secured its marginalization.

(p. 625)

First-Round Nominees Citations and Contact Information

Angrist, J. D., & Johnson, J. H. (2000). Effects of work-related absences on families: Evidence from the Gulf War. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 54, 41-58. angrist@mit.edu

Arrighi, B. A., & Maume, D. J. (2000). Workplace subordination and men's avoidance of housework. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21(4), 464-487. arrighi@nku.edu

Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2000). Reduced-hours employment: The relationship between difficulty of trade-offs and quality of life. *Work and Occupations*, 27(2), 168-187. rozbarnett@mediaone.net

Brandon, P. D. (2000). Child care utilization among working mothers raising children with disabilities. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 21(4), 343-363. brandon@soc.umass.edu

Cappelli, P., Constantine, J., & Chadwick, C. (2000). It pays to value family: Work and family tradeoffs reconsidered. *Industrial Relations*, 39(2), 175-198. cappelli@Wharton.upenn.edu

Caputo, R. K. (2000). Race and marital history as correlates of women's access to family-friendly employee benefits. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 21(4), 365-385. caputo@ymail.yu.edu

Cooper, M. (2000). Being the "go-to-guy": Fatherhood, masculinity, and the organization of work in Silicon Valley. *Qualitative Sociology*, 23(4), 379-405. coops@Socrates.Berkeley.edu

Douthitt, R. A. (2000). "Time to do the chores?" Factoring home-production needs into measures of poverty. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 24(1), 7-22. douthitt@facstaff.wisc.edu

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178-199. edwardsj@bschool.unc.edu

Frone, M. R. (2000). Work-family conflict and employee psychiatric disorders: The National Comorbidity Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 888-895. frone@ria.buffalo.edu

Glass, J. (2000). Envisioning the integration of family and work: Toward a kinder, gentler workplace. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(1), 129-143. Jennifer-glass@uiowa.com

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 237-249. tim-judge@uiowa.edu

Lambert, S. J. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 801-815. slambert@midway.uchicago.edu

Mirchandani, K. (2000). "The best of both worlds" and "cutting my own throat": Contradictory images of home-based work. *Qualitative Sociology*, 23(2), 159-182. kiran@oise.utoronto.ca

Quilgars, D., & Abbott, D. (2000). Working in the risk society: Families perceptions of, and responses to, flexible labour markets and the restructuring of welfare. *Community, Work & Family*, 3(1), 15-36. kjq1@york.ac.uk

Sirianni, C., & Negrey, C. (2000). Working time as gendered time. *Feminist Economics*, 6(1), 59-76. sirianni@brandeis.edu

Smith, J. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Klebanov, P. K., & Lee, K. (2000). Welfare and work: Complementary strategies for low-income women? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 808-821. jsmith@fordham.edu

Trzcinski, E. (2000). Family policy in Germany: A feminist dilemma? *Feminist Economics*, 6(1), 21-44. e.trzcinski@wayne.edu

Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1), 113-123. niniyang@mail.clayton.edu

Award Procedures

Structure of the Review Committee

The committee is chaired by Shelley M. MacDermid, Professor and Director of the Center for Families at Purdue University, and Director of the Midwestern Work-Family Association. During 2001, 23 reviewers participated in selecting the Kanter winners. Reviewers are invited to serve by the committee chair, using a variety of criteria. For example, reviewers are selected to represent a variety of scientific fields and institutions. International representation is desirable. Each year, nominees and winners from the prior year are invited to serve on the committee. Volunteers are invited to apply to join the committee via work-family networks and listservs. Both junior and advanced scholars are invited to serve, but most members are senior scholars with long publication records. Membership on the committee rotates on a staggered cycle of approximately three years.

Journals Reviewed

Articles in 36 journals were reviewed for the 2001 Kanter competition. The selection of journals was guided using four sources: an empirical study by Bob Drago identifying where most of the work-family literature appears, the journals most frequently appearing in the citation database developed by the Sloan Work-Family Researchers' Network, and an informal survey of leading researchers about the journals they regularly read. Members of the review panel are also surveyed each year about journals they recommend adding to the list.

Qualifying Articles

The Kanter award is given to the authors of the best work-family research article published during a calendar year. No external nominations are accepted for the award. Instead, every article published in a large number of peer-reviewed scientific journals is scrutinized. The articles must be data-based and innovative (i.e., not summaries of existing research). Both qualitative and quantitative analyses are eligible.

Initial Pool of Nominees

Each reviewer was responsible for examining all articles published during the 2000 calendar year in 3-5 scientific journals. Each journal was examined by at least 2 reviewers, who nominated the articles they felt were deserving candidates for the Kanter award. Reviewers also were encouraged to nominate articles that they knew about through other sources.

Second Round

Each of the 39 nominated articles was sent to 3 or 4 reviewers, who scored it according to several standard criteria. The total scores were used to select the Kanter Top 20; the top 6 articles became finalists for the award.

Final Round

In the final round, all reviewers scored each of the 6 finalist articles. Two articles were declared co-winners. After the winners were chosen, reviewers were asked (as they are each year) to recommend revisions to the award process for the 2002 award.

Members of the Kanter Award Committee 2001

Committee Chair

Shelley M. MacDermid
Child Development and Family Studies
Purdue University

Rosalind Barnett	Brandeis University
Matthew Bumpus	California State University at Chico
Karen Crooker	University of Wisconsin—Parkside
Robert Drago	Pennsylvania State University
Linda Duxbury	Carleton University, Canada
Naomi Gerstel	University of Massachusetts
Leslie Hammer	Portland State University
Bridget Heidemann	Seattle University
E. Jeffery Hill	Brigham Young University
Erin Kelly	University of Minnesota
Susan Lambert	University of Chicago
Mary Dean Lee	McGill University, Canada
Suzan Lewis	Manchester Metropolitan University, UK
Ross Macmillan	University of Minnesota
Stephen Marks	University of Maine
David Maume	University of Cincinnati
Eliza Pavalko	Indiana University
Marcie Pitt-Catsoupes	Boston College
Teresa Rothausen	University of St. Thomas
Susan Roxburgh	Kent State University
Mary Secret	University of Kentucky
Patricia Voydanoff	University of Dayton
Mark Wardell	Pennsylvania State University

Journals Reviewed

Academy of Management Journal	Journal of Management
Academy of Management Review	Journal of Marriage and Family
Administrative Science Quarterly	Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology
American Journal of Sociology	Journal of Occupational Health Psychology
American Sociological Review	Journal of Organizational Behavior
Community, Work, and Family Demography	Journal of Vocational Behavior
Family Relations	Marriage and Family Review
Feminist Economics	Monthly Labor Review
Gender and Society	Personnel Psychology
Gender, Work and Organizations	Psychology of Women Quarterly
Human Relations	Qualitative Sociology
Human Resource Management	Sex Roles
Industrial and Labor Relations Review	Signs
Industrial Relations	Social Forces
Journal of Applied Psychology	Social Problems
Journal of Family and Economic Issues	Sociological Forum
Journal of Family Issues	Work and Occupations
Journal of Health and Social Behavior	

The Center for Families at Purdue University

The Center for Families works to strengthen the capacity of families to provide nurturing environments for their members. The center promotes decision-making that is both informed by rigorous research and responsive to families' needs, and works to make such research available, accessible, and understandable; develops innovative ways to enhance the quality of life of children and families; and creates and nurtures collaborations for change to improve the quality of life for families and children. Primary audiences for the center's work are educators, human service professionals, employers, and policy makers.

The Midwestern Work-Family Association is a membership organization of employers interested in family issues. MWFA offers employers of all sizes opportunities to address -- individually and collectively -- challenges confronting today's workplaces around issues of work and family. The association is committed to creating high quality work environments that are consistent with business objectives, and serves as a catalyst for change to make the midwest a more family-friendly place to work and live. Members of the association interact through leadership network meetings, conferences, training sessions, and electronic media.

The Initiative for Families in Business at Purdue University supports the long-term viability of families in business by advancing knowledge and understanding of the unique dynamics, challenges and rewards of combining the dynamics of family life with owning and running a business. The initiative brings together faculty members from many disciplines, including small business management, consumer sciences, marketing, marriage and family therapy, and family studies to collaborate with families who own and run businesses. Initiative activities include conducting research, developing educational opportunities, and strengthening connections between students and family businesses.

The Boston College Center for Work & Family

The Boston College Center for Work & Family is a research organization within the Carroll School of Management that promotes employer responsiveness to families. The Center's guiding vision is to serve as the bridge linking the academic research community to the workplace. To gain increased understanding of the challenges faced by both employees and employers in meeting the goals of the individual and the enterprise, the Center conducts basic and applied research studies and analyzes secondary information sources. The Center's initiatives fall into three broad categories: research, employer partnerships, and information services.

The Work & Family Roundtable, founded in 1990, is a business partnership providing leadership to shape corporate and public responses to the demands of work, home, and community in order to enhance employee effectiveness. Throughout its ten years, the Roundtable has focused on activities that enable members companies to think more strategically in the area of work/life and to strive for higher standards. Looking to the future, the center is committed to pursuing new opportunities that strengthen the Roundtable as a true learning alliance.

The New England Work & Family Association (NEWFA) was established in 1992 to help employers understand and address the complex work/life challenges facing today's workforce. NEWFA provides a forum and resource base for organizations in any phase of work/life planning and policy development. Through the offered publications, web site, and quarterly meetings, NEWFA members benefit from up-to-the-minute information and research on a wide range of work/life issues, including work force effectiveness, global strategies, and flexible work arrangements.

**Best of the Best:
The 2001 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award
for Excellence in Work-Family Research**

Order Form

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

E-mail: _____

Number of copies	Price	Total
___ @	\$25 Full report (Not for profit organizations)	\$_____
___ @	\$50 Full report (For-profit organizations)	\$_____
___ @	\$1 (List of citations only)	\$_____

<p>Enclosed is my check for \$_____ made payable to <i>Purdue University</i></p> <p>Charge my: <input type="checkbox"/> VISA <input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard <input type="checkbox"/> Discover Card #: _____</p> <p>Authorized Signature: _____ Expiration Date: ____ / ____</p> <p>Total charge: _____</p>

For more information contact:
Shelley MacDermid
Center for Families at Purdue University
shelley@purdue.edu

Please return order form to:
Center for Families
1269 Fowler Building, Room 238
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47909-1269
FAX: 765-496-1144

Purdue University is an equal access/equal opportunity institution.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY



CENTER FOR FAMILIES

School of Consumer and Family Sciences

Purdue University

1200 W. State St.

West Lafayette, IN 47907-2055

Phone: (765) 494-9878

Fax: (765) 494-0503

E-mail: cff@cfs.purdue.edu

Web site: www.cfs.purdue.edu/cff