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Introduction

Welcome to the 2003 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 2002 and nominated for the 2003 Kanter award. These articles were selected after reviewing more than 2000 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)
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 unsubtle, 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 2003 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 close to 1000 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 different topics from year to year. The chart at the end of this section classifies the Kanter top 20 by topic. Multiple roles, gender and earnings, mothers’ employment and careers were the topics covered by the most studies; key themes of interest to work/life professionals are organizational culture, work-family conflict and coping, employment decision-making, gender and compensation, and domestic violence.

Organizational Culture

This year, Kanter nominees tested some of the ‘conventional wisdom’ of work/life. For example, a common belief is that formal work/life programs and policies won’t thrive when informal practices or the organizational culture are unsupportive. Finalist Anderson* put this belief to the test by conducting a side-by-side comparison of formal and informal work/life supports. Using a large nationally representative sample, they found that both formal policies and informal practices mattered, but that workers’ conflicts between work and family and their attitudes about their jobs were more strongly related to informal practices such as managerial support than to formal policies. One formal policy -- schedule flexibility -- was related to lower levels of work-to-family conflict.

Behson tested this conventional wisdom in a different way, asking whether organizational cultures that are specifically supportive of work-family issues are meaningfully different from cultures that are generally supportive, such as those emphasizing trust and fairness. He found that work-family supportiveness did not differ from general supportiveness in explaining job satisfaction and commitment, but it did explain work-family outcomes such as work-family conflict.

Another common belief is that the success of customized work arrangements depends upon special characteristics of individual workers, such as great communication skills, rather than factors outside of the individual. Lee put this belief to the test in a study of over 80 reduced-load work arrangements among managers and high-level professionals in the U.S. and Canada.
Results showed that workers, their bosses and coworkers attributed success equally to individual factors and contextual factors such as a supportive boss.

Supervisors are a key element in workers’ experiences, and conventional wisdom suggests that workers will receive more support from supervisors and coworkers who themselves face work-family challenges. Blair-Loy examined the characteristics of workgroups (e.g., mix of men and women), workers (e.g., family needs), and coworkers and supervisors in relation to workers’ use of leaves and flexible work arrangements. Workers’ use of leaves was related mostly to family needs, while their use of flexibility was shaped mostly by work group characteristics. Unexpectedly, having coworkers or supervisors with family responsibilities reduced workers’ use of work-family policies. Workers with male, unmarried supervisors were more likely than workers with female married supervisors to use flexibility policies, leading the researchers to speculate that workers are more able to use flexibility policies when their supervisors have more power.

Taking culture to a whole new level are a group of Kanter studies focusing on entire societies. Scandinavian countries are well-known for their explicit commitments to encouraging men and women to share the responsibilities of parenthood and paid work. Both Norway and Sweden have recently implemented “poppa month” or “daddy days,” periods of paid parental leave available only to fathers following the birth of a child. In addition, fathers have access to considerable amounts of unpaid leave. Brandth focused on fathers’ use of different types and amounts of leave in Norway. Fathers were less likely to use leave, particularly unpaid leave, when they were less educated, in lower-level jobs and when their employers had higher expectations for overtime work. Finalist Haas focused on Sweden, looking at variations across companies in fathers’ behavior, finding that characteristics of individuals, families, and organizations all were relevant. For example, personal beliefs in shared parenting and partners’ willingness to share leave were significant predictors of fathers’ use of leave, as were supportive organizational cultures, reward structures, and work/life philosophies.

Work-Family Conflict and Coping

The entire work/life industry is focused on the goal of reducing work-family conflict, and yet there is much we don’t yet know about why conflict occurs and for whom. Grzywacz used nationally representative samples of middle-aged and older workers to study patterns of conflict, finding that conflict was more likely to occur among workers who were younger, female, single, parents, more well-educated, and higher-level. Major focused specifically on work hours, predicting that high demands at work and at home increase work hours, which in turn increase interference of work with family. Indeed, work hours were generally higher when the job was more important, when workers felt overloaded, and when they thought employers expected longer hours. Work hours were modestly related to work interference with family, which was strongly related to psychological distress. As expected, workers put in longer hours when they perceived their jobs as more important, received more rewards for long hours, and who had more responsibilities off the job. Unexpectedly, work overload and organizational expectations for long hours were directly related to perceptions of higher work-family interference.

What about how workers cope with conflict between work and home responsibilities? Finalist Mennino studied men and women making tradeoffs at work and at home. Unexpectedly, they found that men and women were equally likely to make tradeoffs, and that with only one
exception, gender attitudes were not related to tradeoffs by men or women -- men and women facing similar demands made similar tradeoffs. Occupation did matter, however. Workers made more tradeoffs at home (e.g., missing family occasions) and fewer at work (e.g., refusing additional hours) when they worked in demanding or male-typed jobs. Workers made more tradeoffs at work when they had more demands at home. Workers with more human capital, such as more education, were more likely to make tradeoffs at work. Behson studied workers’ efforts to make informal accommodations at work to family needs, finding that workers with more schedule control were able to reduce stress by informally modifying their work patterns – at very low cost to employers.

**Decisions about Entering and Leaving the Workforce**

The labor force participation of women is a perennially popular topic for researchers, employers, and governments. Many countries around the world now rely on women as a major component of their workforces, making it very important to understand the factors that attract, repel and retain women workers. Several Kanter nominees addressed this goal.

A topic that has come up in previous Kanter competitions is the effect of wives’ employment on divorce. There is a concern that marriages with two earners are less likely to last than more traditional one-earner arrangements. Answering this question requires longitudinal data so that it is possible to test long-term outcomes. Schoen analyzed such data to find that wives’ employment status matters only when one or both marital partners is already dissatisfied, in which case it increases the risk of divorce.

Cohabitation is another popular topic, particularly with regard to how it compares to marriage. For younger women, cohabitation appears to bring fewer resources than marriage. Abroms examined the work hours of women living with a spouse, a cohabiting partner, or a relative. Married mothers worked the fewest hours, even when controlling for number of children, leading the researcher to speculate that they had access to more financial resources and help than mothers who lived with a relative or a cohabiting partner. Later in life, Pienta found that cohabitation did not appear to matter for retirement expectations, which did not differ for cohabiting and married individuals. Husbands but not wives said they would retire earlier if they had more wealth and later if they lacked health insurance.

Responsibilities for dependents can play a major role in women’s decisions about employment. Hakim compared the decisions of women who were more work-centered vs. more family-centered, finding that child care responsibilities had little or no impact on the employment of work-centered women. Wharton compared employees in three countries who worked for the same company in terms of their interest in working part-time. Workers in the U.S. were much less interested than those in England and Hong Kong; workers with children were more interested than those without children. Married mothers of young children were the most interested and men without children were the least interested. A perennial preoccupation is with the effects of mothers’ employment on children, particularly during the first year of life. Waldfogel examined data from several hundred white, black, and Hispanic children from birth to age 8. For white children, mothers’ employment during first year was associated with 2-3 point deficits on tests of vocabulary, math and reading, although this was offset by benefits of employment later. There were no such effects for black or Hispanic children. Negative effects for first year employment were strongest for families with the lowest income. Dentinger focused on the other end of the lifespan, examining women who had caregiving responsibilities for their husbands. Women providing care to their husbands were five times more likely to retire than women who were not, and this was especially...
true when caregiving responsibilities became more intense. These patterns were not observed among men.

**Gender and Compensation**

Researchers have long tried to account for persistent differences in the compensation men and women receive. Many studies have shown that factors like education and experience account for some of the discrepancy. Researchers have been unable to identify the factors that account for the rest of the discrepancy and many conclude that discrimination against women has not been eliminated as a possible explanation.

This year’s **winner** focuses on the size of men’s wage advantage as a function of the gender composition of their workplaces. Budig compared the wages of men and women in workforces that contained very few men (i.e., where men were ‘tokens’), workforces where there was a balance of men and women, and workforces composed mostly of men. Findings showed that men earned about 11% more than women and were more likely than women to be promoted, regardless of workforce composition, but that overall wages were lower when there were more women in the workforce. Men’s wage advantage increased over the course of the study (1982-1993).

Another well-established compensation bias is that married men tend to earn more than unmarried men. Not clear, however, why this bias exists. One possibility is that the factors leading to productivity and to marriage are similar – that more productive men are more likely to marry. But our understanding is clouded because cohabiters do not get treated consistently. Cohen found that the marriage premium has been declining slightly over time, and also that productive men are more likely to marry. Cohabiters are like married in terms of compensation and the marriage premium.

Of course, compensation is determined by characteristics of the job, not just the worker. Using the same 1982-1993 data as Budig, **finalist** England studied the compensation men and women received in jobs that involved ‘care work,’ or face-to-face work assisting the growth and development of others. She found that the wage penalty for care work is about the same size as the wage benefit of education, and that women paid greater penalties for care work than men. The biggest wage penalties were for women professors and child care workers – 26% and 41% respectively. The best chances for offsetting the wage penalties of carework were through education and union membership.

**Work and Domestic Violence**

Many work/life professionals are concerned about domestic violence, especially when it intrudes into the workplace, but results from one Kanter study suggest that there should be just as much concern about violence going home from work. **Finalist** Melzer examined how different jobs were related to violence at home, asking whether men working in certain kinds of jobs were more violent towards their wives. He focused on men working in violent jobs, such as police officers; dangerous jobs, such as firefighters; and jobs where men were minorities, such as clerical jobs. “Violence” was defined as a report by oneself or one’s spouse of the husband hitting, shoving, or throwing things at the wife. Men working in all three types of jobs tended to be more violent than a low-violence comparison group; of the three, dangerous jobs were associated with the least violence at home, followed by violent jobs. The men who were most violent at home were the men who worked in clerical jobs. This raises important questions not
only about how workers get matched with jobs, but also how the characteristics of particular kinds of jobs might produce chronic stress.

**Hallmarks of Excellence**

As in the past, research studies nominated for the Kanter award share several methodological strengths. Corporate practitioners who wish to conduct or use research to assess the performance of existing programs or the need for new ones can apply these strengths in their own work.

Many of the questions work/life professionals want answered are questions about cause and effect. What difference does a particular program make? How big a problem are family issues for work performance? Does being supportive hurt a manager’s career? Such questions can be answered only with longitudinal data, because such data reveal the sequence of events. Kanter nominees this year used longitudinal data very effectively to sort out, for example, the causal relationships between wives’ employment and marital quality, and the consequences of mothers’ jobs for children. Sometimes it is possible to use existing data to answer important questions, such as the role of gender or workforce composition in the evolution of wages over time.

Another important lesson from the Kanter nominees is that the quality of the research sample is very important. As was true in past competitions, many of the nominees used large nationally representative samples – often government data sets that are publicly available on the internet. Such data sets can be useful benchmarking tools for corporate professionals. Government data sets used by this year’s Kanter nominees include the:

- Census (used by *Abroms*),
- National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY for short; used by *Budig, England, and Waldfogel*),
- Current Population Survey (CPS; used by *Cohen*), and the
- National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH for short; used by *Melzer and Schoen*).

Of particular interest this year were data sets focusing on middle and later life. These included the:

- National Survey of Midlife Development (MIDUS; used by *Grzywacz*);
- National Study of Daily Experience (NDSE; used by *Grzywacz*); and
- Health and Retirement Study (HRS; used by *Pienta*).

The National Study of the Changing Workforce, used by *Anderson*, is an example of an important national data set gathered not by the government but by the Families and Work Institute, in an effort to ensure that workers’ experiences are well-documented.

When research samples are not large, they are usually unique or cutting-edge in some way. Often, they represent a phenomenon that is not yet common or well-understood. For example, the reduced-load professionals and managers studied by *Lee* and colleagues are rare cases. The care workers and workers in dangerous or violent jobs studied by *England* and *Melzer* respectively represented workers in special situations that tell us something important about the labor force as a whole. In a way, they are “canaries in the mine” of work/life issues.
Readers will note that many of the studies conducted by Kanter nominees used data sets in which response rates were quite high, something that is very important but difficult to achieve. Good response rates come with careful marketing of the study to prospective respondents, attractive but reasonable incentives, and rigorous protection of respondents’ confidentiality.

Many of the Kanter studies emphasize high-quality measurement instruments, meaning measures that have a proven track record, an accumulation of evidence that they measure what is intended, and validation against external standards. Especially useful are measures that have well-established ‘norms,’ or benchmarks for knowing how a particular response compares to what would be observed in the population as a whole. Such measures are particularly useful when measuring phenomena that have the potential to generate costs for the employer, such as physical or psychological ailments.

Finally, readers will note that many of the Kanter articles make careful predictions about what they expect to find, often using previous research and theory for guidance. They offer reasons why a particular factor should matter and then test their prediction. For example, without theory or prior research, how would Melzer have known to study men in clerical occupations? Kanter nominees typically conduct rigorous analyses, with regular use of statistical controls to remove factors that might confound the results. For example, since retirement decisions are often made on the basis of one’s own health, it is important to control for this factor when studying the impact of caregiving. Kanter nominees also typically work hard to eliminate or compare alternative explanations. Several articles this year, for example, worked to sort out the relative contributions of individual, family, and workplace factors in workers’ experiences of work-family conflict.

Conclusions: Lessons for Practitioners

What are the lessons of the 2003 Kanter competition? Of course readers are the ultimate authorities on the lessons to take away, but here are some possibilities.

- Both formal policies and informal practices matter, but informal practices may matter more for work-family conflict.

- Work-family supportiveness is more important than general supportiveness for work-family conflict, but not for job satisfaction or commitment.

- Success in reduced-load work arrangements appears to be due to factors both inside and outside individual workers.

- Powerful supervisors may be especially important for workers’ use of supportive policies and programs.

- Workers with high job demands or low human capital appear especially likely to experience work-family conflict.

- With adequate schedule control, workers reduce their own stress by making informal accommodations. Men and women appear to respond similarly to similar work demands, but
women continue to face challenges that are unique, particularly in the area of wage
disadvantage.

- Marriage appears to be better for women’s resources than cohabitation. Employment doesn’t
  hurt strong marriages, but early employment may have small negative consequences for white
  children. Heavy caregiving responsibilities curtail women’s employment.

- Men’s wage advantage is intact regardless of the gender composition of the workplace. Both
  men and women, but especially women, pay heavy wage penalties for doing care work.

- Job characteristics are associated with domestic violence in unexpected ways.

As is true every year, this year’s Kanter 20 repeatedly remind us that workers are members of
family systems containing spouses, children, parents, or other family members. Workers’
abilities to respond to work demands, to find a sense of balance in their lives, to take advantage of
career opportunities, and to be effective at home and at work depend not only on what happens at
work but what happens at home.

* For readers’ convenience, only the name of the first author is used to refer to each nominated
  study.

Note from Shelley MacDermid: As chair of the Kanter award committee, it is ethically
uncomfortable to include my own work among the top 20. I do not wish to disqualify my co-
authors from consideration, however, so the policy I follow is to withdraw articles on which I am
an author from the competition after the second round. Members of the committee are also often
authors of nominated articles; no reviewer is ever sent their own article for review.

In the remainder of this report, the symbol 4 indicates the
likely relevance of a particular article for work-life practitioners.
## Overview of Article Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of First Author</th>
<th>Multiple roles</th>
<th>Mothers' employment</th>
<th>Career consequences</th>
<th>Gender, employment and earnings</th>
<th>Organizational culture</th>
<th>Corporate work-family policies</th>
<th>Work-family conflict, balance</th>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Government policies</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Working-class families</th>
<th>Children's well-being</th>
<th>Marriage and divorce</th>
<th>Family structure</th>
<th>Alternative work arrangements</th>
<th>Duration and timing of work</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Coping</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Eldercare</th>
<th>Job stress</th>
<th>Gender role attitudes</th>
<th>Retirement</th>
<th>Coworkers</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budig</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson…</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England…</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennino…</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Michelle J. Budig, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts. Her research interests include gender, labor markets, work and family conflict, and social inequality. Her recent publications investigate the wage penalty for motherhood, earnings and promotions disparities for male and female occupational tokens, the earnings penalty associated with caring labor, the relationship between women’s employment and fertility histories, and feminist theory on the family. Her current research examines gender differences in self-employment participation and earnings, motherhood wage penalties in a comparative perspective, and racial/ethnic discrepancies in the effects of human capital on wages.
Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Elevator
M. J. Budig
Social Problems
Volume 49, 2002, pp. 258-277
budig@soc.umass.edu

Though men’s advantages in wages and promotions have been studied for many years, few studies have considered the effect of the gender composition of workplaces on this advantage. In other words, does the size of the gender gap in wages depend on whether workers are mostly men or by women?

Using 1982-1993 data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY), Budig analyzed changes in men’s and women’s wages and promotions in predominantly male and female workplaces. After controlling for skill, level of authority, education, and job demands, she was able to parcel out the effect of gender composition on men’s financial advantage.

Men were paid more than women regardless of gender composition, education, and other job characteristics. The gender gap in wages did not depend on whether the workplace was occupied mostly by men or by women.

Budig concluded that women remain at a disadvantage due to greater responsibilities for children and housework. In addition, the findings of this study make clear that employers cannot rely on the composition of worker populations to equalize wages – the gender gap exists regardless of the relative representations of men and women.

Until we also challenge the structure of work that currently rewards stereotypical masculine attributes, as well as the traditional gender division of labor in the home, gender inequalities in earnings will persist.

(p. 275)
Summaries of Finalists
Much of the research on work-family conflict in the last decade has focused on formal policies and organizational initiatives. These authors build on this previous research by studying both informal workplace practices and formal policies as they relate to work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, and how these in turn are related to employee outcomes.

The researchers used data from the Families and Work Institute’s 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce to study a large nationally-representative sample of employed men and women. Measures of formal organizational initiatives focused on schedule flexibility and dependent care benefits; measures of informal workplace practices included managerial support and career consequences. Other variables considered were family structure, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict, job satisfaction, turnover intent, stress, and absenteeism.

The authors used a statistical technique called structural equation modeling that allowed them to simultaneously test for relationships among all of the variables of interest, instead of just a few at a time.

Results showed that informal workplace practices were more strongly associated than formal policies with work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, and were directly related to employee outcomes. Managerial support (an informal workplace practice) was found to have the strongest relationship with overall employee outcomes, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict. On the other hand, having a flexible schedule (a formal organizational initiative) was found to lower employees’ likelihood of experiencing work-to-family conflict. The findings were equally applicable to men and women in the sample. The authors called for greater attention to informal workplace practices that might influence an employee’s ability to balance work and family life.
Occupations in which individuals prepare children for their future roles, care for the sick, elderly, and disabled, and provide support for individuals confronting personal crises and mental health issues are among the most important for the well-being of our society. Yet, these positions are not highly esteemed. This study examined the relative pay of jobs classified as “care work” (i.e., counseling, child care, teaching, and health care), predicting that care work carries a wage penalty.

The same person earns less when in an occupation coded as care work than when working in other occupations.

(p. 468)

Data came from the 1982-1993 waves of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY). The sample was limited to participants who were employed part-time or full-time for at least two years during the time of the survey, resulting in large representative samples of men and women nearly equal in size.

Results indicated that there was a wage penalty of about 5% for individuals in care work jobs, even after education, employment experience, industry characteristics, and unmeasured differences were controlled.

A comparison of “care work” and “interactive service work” (i.e., sales, receptionists, waiters/waitresses) revealed that both job types carried a wage penalty. However, there was greater similarity in the size of the penalty among men than among women. Among women, the wage penalty for service work was about 3%.

Subgroups of care work jobs (e.g., childcare workers, primary school teachers, secondary school teachers) were created to examine possible penalties in more detail. The occupation carrying the largest penalty was childcare. While both men and women paid a large wage penalty in childcare jobs, this was especially true for women, for whom the penalty was 41%.

Overall, there appears to be strong evidence that there is a wage penalty for individuals performing care work. Women tend to be more affected by this penalty than men since they are most likely to hold positions in areas such as teaching, childcare, counseling, and nursing.
Sweden is a society that actively promotes men’s sharing of childcare duties, such as through guaranteed paid parental leaves, parts of which are reserved only for fathers’ use. The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of organizational culture on Swedish men’s use of parental leave.

Surveys were mailed to 317 fathers in six randomly selected companies in Sweden. Based on personnel directors’ responses, three companies were categorized as “passively oppositional” and three as “conditionally supportive” in their approach to fathers taking parental leave.

Although fathers’ sense of responsibility for caregiving did not vary by employer, fathers in ‘conditionally supportive’ organizations were significantly more likely to take leave than fathers in ‘passively oppositional’ organizations. Men were more likely to take parental leave when they perceived their organizations as basing policies and programs more on caring than profits, more father-friendly, and more supportive of equal employment opportunities for women. In addition, men used more parental leave when their work group rewarded task performance rather than face-time.

More than organizational culture, however, individual- and family-level attributes predicted men’s use of parental leave. For example, men’s advocacy of shared parenting and partners’ willingness to share leave were significant predictors of their use of leave.

These results suggest that caring rather than masculine values of organizations may work in favor of fathers taking more parental leave. This study also suggests that fathers can effectively make change in their work environments.
Gender, Work, and Intimate Violence:  
Men’s Occupational Violence Spillover and Compensatory Violence.  
S. A. Melzer  
Journal of Marriage and Family  
Volume 64, 2002, pp. 820-832  
samelzer@citrus.ucr.edu

Work-family relationships and intimate violence have both been studied many times, but are seldom brought together in research. To better understand the relationships between jobs and levels of intimate violence, Melzer focused on violence perpetrated by men working in eleven occupational classifications. He hypothesized that men in violent or dangerous occupations might be more likely to use violence at home. He also considered whether the workers in each occupation were predominately male or female.

For men in female-dominated occupations, unwillingly unemployed men, and men earning a disproportionately small percentage of the couple’s income, compensatory violence may be used to protect men’s gendered identities.

Using data from the 1988 National Study of Families and Households, the author studied wives’ reports of violence as a function of the occupations of 5,208 men. Well-validated scales measured the influence on spousal abuse of unemployment, age, men’s education, proportion of household income, substance abuse, children in the home, and occupations.

Results were surprising. Men in clerical jobs performed mostly by women were the most likely to use violence, followed by men in professional specialty occupations (e.g., doctors, engineers, architects, etc.). Less likely to use violence were men who worked in physically violent (e.g., police, military, corrections workers, etc.) or dangerous jobs (e.g., firefighters, miners, etc.).

These findings contradict popular assumptions that laborers, operators, and assemblers—occupations normally associated with blue-collar work—have the highest levels of intimate violence. Instead, spousal abuse was more common among men who worked in female-dominated occupations, were unwillingly out of work, who had less than a high school education, or who earned less or were younger than their wives.
Increasing time constraints and greater demand for two incomes have increased the pressure for trade-offs between work and family. Using data from the 1996 General Social Survey, the authors studied a large number of employed men and women in terms of their job demands, their gender ideologies (i.e., their views of appropriate behavior for men and women), the gender composition of their occupations, and the accommodations they made.

Examples of tradeoffs at home include missing family occasions, inability to do regular chores, or inability to care for a sick child. Tradeoffs at work include cutting back on work or refusing a promotion or additional hours of work.

With two exceptions, men and women were equally likely to make tradeoffs at home or at work. Men were more likely than women to take on extra paid work, and women were more likely than men to be unable to nurse a sick child or relative.

Findings showed that women with more traditional attitudes about gender were more likely than other women to refuse promotions, but otherwise gender attitudes were not related to the tradeoffs made by men or women.

Men and women who faced similar employment demands responded in similar ways. Women and men with children and/or multiple adults in their homes, were more likely to refuse a promotion than individuals who lived alone or without children. Single-parent fathers were more likely to refuse promotions than single mothers, perhaps because they could more easily afford to do so.

Men and women in predominantly male occupations were more likely than those in predominantly female occupations to miss a family gathering. Men in predominantly male occupations were also more likely to take on extra work and less likely to refuse a promotion than men in other jobs.
Summaries of the Remaining Articles in the Top 20:

The Kanter 20
Previous research focusing on women’s work and family tradeoffs has failed to reflect the diversity of family structures in today’s society. This study investigated factors affecting the number of hours worked by mothers of young children when a spouse, cohabiting partner, or relative was present in the household. The researchers were especially interested in the conditions under which mothers would choose to work more hours.

Data for this study came from the Public Use Micro Sample of the 1990 US Census. Women selected for study were 18 to 50 years old and married, cohabiting with a partner, or living with a relative and had at least one child younger than age six living in the same household.

The analysis revealed that when an additional adult was present in the household, the number of hours worked by mothers was strongly influenced by the type of relationship with that adult. This suggests that mothers receive different types and levels of support from relatives, unmarried partners, and spouses.

The income of the other adult was related to mothers’ work hours only when mothers were married. Married women worked fewer hours than those who were cohabiting or living with a relative. The reverse was true when women lived with a partner: Cohabiting mothers were more likely to work additional hours than women in the other groups. Mothers who lived with a relative worked more hours than married women, but fewer hours than women living with a partner.

The total number of children in the household also was related to mothers’ hours. Mothers who had more than one child worked fewer hours than those with only one child. Women with more education worked more hours per week, especially if they lived with a relative or unmarried partner.

Overall, the number of hours worked by mothers of young children were affected by the presence of another adult in the household. These effects varied by relationship type, and were influenced by mothers’ financial need, childcare need, and human capital.
Coping with Family-to-Work Conflict:  
The Role of Informal Work Accommodations to Family  
S. J. Behson  
Journal of Occupational Health Psychology  
Volume 7, 2002, pp. 324-341  
behson@fdu.edu  

Research on conflict between work and family has focused primarily on the flexibility of employers and the willingness of employees to request alternative work arrangements. Little attention has been devoted to the informal behaviors employees use to meet their work and family obligations, specifically temporary modifications of usual work patterns in order to balance work and family needs.

The researcher developed a scale to measure specific coping behaviors for reducing family-to-work conflict, such as arranging to switch duties with coworkers, using work time or break time to attend to family matters, or bringing children to work. Two studies were conducted, the first with 141 workers at ten branches of a telecommunications company and the second with 128 MBA students at three universities. From a measurement perspective, the new scale appeared to perform well in both studies.

The researcher correctly predicted that workers would use “informal accommodations” when they experienced more family-to-work conflict and when they had more control over their schedules. He also correctly predicted that informal accommodations would reduce the likelihood that family-to-work conflict would increase stress and that stress would predict lower job satisfaction and less commitment to the organization. Data did not, however, support predictions that family financial responsibility and supportive organizational cultures would increase use of informal accommodations.

A second study examined the overall coping strategies of workers who made informal accommodations at work. Workers who used informal work accommodations also tended to seek social support, indicating that they used a wide range of coping behaviors.
Many work-family practitioners believe that organizational cultures are a key element in supporting workers’ abilities to be successful at home and at work. It is not clear, however, whether an organizational culture specifically supportive of family issues is more or less effective than a generally supportive culture in predicting work-family conflict, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The sample included 147 employed graduate students, 46% of whom were women, 58% of whom were married and 46% who had at least one child living with them. Well-validated scales were used to measure perceptions of work-family supportiveness and organizational support, including fairness of interpersonal treatment and trust in management. Analyses took into account responsibilities to dependents as well as demographic information.

Results of the study indicated that work-family specific constructs failed to explain employee attitudes such as job satisfaction and commitment when studied together with perceptions of organizational support, fairness of interpersonal treatment and trust of management. Results did support the proposition that perceptions of family support are better at explaining outcomes more specifically related to work and family such as work-family conflict.

…although work family context may be associated with more positive general employee affect, … affect is more adequately explained by general organization context.

(p. 70)
Previous research on work-family policies has focused on how and why employers decide to provide work-family benefits to their employees. Little is known about how the social context within organizations shapes use, which is the focus of this study.

The sample was obtained from a large financial company with work-family policies in place. The sample contained 459 professionals and managers from 76 work groups across the 3 divisions. Workers’ use of policies was classified into two groups: family-care policies (resource and referral, sick time and/or leave to care for dependents), and flexibility policies (flextime, flexplace, compressed work weeks).

The researchers used an innovative multilevel approach which allowed them to consider not only individual-level factors in workers’ use of policies, but also factors related to the perspectives and experiences of the other members of their work group. The goal of the analyses was to identify the factors that best predicted which workers would use which types of policies. The analyses controlled for income, job autonomy, and number of weekly work hours.

Over half the workers studied wished they could “cut down on the hours at work,” and half were concerned about the impact of work on their family and personal lives. However, almost two-thirds felt that taking parental leave or setting limits on hours worked would hurt their career advancement. One-fourth believed that consistently spending long hours at work would enhance their career progress.

Use of family-care policies appeared to be shaped primarily by family need, while use of flexibility policies was shaped primarily by work group characteristics. Men and women in mostly female work groups were less than half as likely to use family-care policies as workers in mostly male work groups. Men and women with male supervisors were more likely to use both family-care and flexibility policies. Workers with male, unmarried supervisors were 50% more likely than workers with female married supervisors to use flexibility policies. Coworkers or supervisors with family responsibilities reduced, not increased, the likelihood that workers would use work-family policies. The researchers concluded that workers are more likely to use work-family policies when they are protected by powerful supervisors and coworkers.
Corporate work-family managers often are concerned about the low use of their programs and policies by fathers. In Norway, parental leave has been a major public policy focus since the 1990s. The purpose of this study was to explore how Norwegian fathers make decisions about using the parental leave rights guaranteed to them by law.

Questionnaires about fathers’ working conditions and their impact on fathers’ decisions to use leave were mailed to all men who recently became fathers in two municipalities in central Norway. From the same sample, 30 couples who used parental leave rights in various ways participated in open-ended interviews.

Since the inauguration of legally-protected paid parental leave for fathers, the percent of fathers who take at least some leave has risen from less than 1 percent to 80 percent. Most fathers take at least some of the paid leave that is reserved for fathers, but relatively few fathers take unpaid leave. Analyses of the survey data revealed that fathers were less likely to use leave, particularly unpaid leave, when they were less educated and when their employers had higher expectations for overtime work. Moreover, fathers in higher-level jobs and in non-management positions reported higher use of leave rights.

Data from the interviews allowed the researchers to identify four kinds of practices fathers applied to leave decisions. Fathers in the “Limit-setting” group were strongly motivated to stay at home and spend as much time as possible with the child, and they adjusted their work accordingly whenever possible. For fathers in the “Unrestrained” category, work came first and use of leave was adapted around it. Fathers in the “Right-using” category used only the father’s quota according to the state allowance, and would not have done so had the government policy not been in place. Lastly, “Traditional-bond” fathers placed little priority on leave.

This study revealed great variation in fathers’ use of leave. Individual adaptation was more important in explaining fathers’ practices than the specifics of state policy, but policy was important in making leave possible.

The main underpinning of this strategy is the intention to encourage the fathers’ contact with and care for their children by labeling working men as fathers. Another objective is to share the benefits and burdens of working life and family life between men and women. (p. 186)
The marriage premium is the earnings advantage of married over unmarried men. By most estimates, married men earn 10% to 40% more than their unmarried counterparts. This study generates a new estimate of the marriage premium that takes into account the recent growth in cohabitation. It tests three proposed explanations of the marriage premium: that marriage has a positive effect on the productivity of men, that productive men are more likely to be married, or that employers discriminate in favor of married men.

The author examined data from the Current Population Survey from 1976 to 1999. The sample for the Current Population Survey is large and nationally representative, as well as diverse in race, age, and income.

The size of the marriage premium varied considerably during the 25-year study period, although the general trend was a very slight decline for both white and black men. The analyses of this study revealed, however, that the rate of decline is overstated when cohabiting men are grouped in with never-married men. The marriage premium is somewhat smaller for black than for white men.

Only one of the three proposed explanations was supported. The idea that marriage promotes men's productivity because husbands and wives specialize in different areas was not supported. Men's work hours increased by only 8% while their wives' work hours increased by 39%, indicating that specialization has declined much more steeply over time than the marriage premium.

The explanation that employers discriminate in favor of married men was also not supported. As alternative family forms are increasingly accepted the marriage premium was expected to decline sharply if it was caused by such discrimination, but only a slight decline was found.

The explanation that productive men are more likely to marry is the only explanation that was supported in this study, because it was the only explanation that did not predict a strong decline in the marriage premium.
Informal caregiving, which is usually unpaid and voluntary, has become a common experience for both men and women in late midlife. For example, one quarter of all wage and salaried workers in 1996 provided informal care to elders. Over three quarters of care to elderly and disabled Americans continues to be performed through informal, unpaid care by families. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of caregiving responsibilities on the timing of retirement, and differences between men and women in these influences. Two dimensions of caregiving were considered: the intensity of care responsibilities and whether or not the care recipient was a spouse. The sample for this study included 763 pension-eligible men and women in the 1995-1995 Cornell Retirement and Well-Being Study.

Findings showed that most men and women had been informal caregivers at some time since the age of 30. The effects of caregiving on retirement depended on both the relationship between the caregiver and the recipient and the caregiver’s gender. Women were substantially more likely than men to retire when caregiving responsibilities became more intense. Women who cared for more than one person were 50% more likely to retire than those who did not provide care to anyone. Men’s caregiving responsibilities, however, were not related to the timing of their retirement.

In terms of the relationship between caregivers and care recipients, women who were providing care to their husbands were five times more likely to retire than women who were not providing care to their husbands. However, men who were providing care to a spouse were less than half as likely to retire as men not providing care to their spouse.

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers suggested that caregiving responsibilities may contribute to more strongly sex-segregated gender roles during the retirement years, where women devote more time to caregiving and men devote more time to paid employment.
Previous research on work-family spillover has focused primarily on employees in the professional sector of the economy. With the labor force expected to age and become more racially and educationally diverse, and with job growth projected in the service sector, it is important to know more about work-family experiences in different subsets of the working population. This study examined work- and family-related stresses among employees of different ages and background characteristics.

A large representative sample of employed workers was obtained by merging data from the National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States and the National Study of Daily Experiences, a study that gathered daily diary data. Background characteristics such as age, gender, race, marital status, parental status, educational attainment, and occupation were used to predict both positive and negative spillover from work to family and from family to work, as well as daily stresses at work and at home.

Results revealed that older workers experienced higher levels of positive and lower levels of negative spillover from work to family than young and middle-aged workers. Women experienced more spillover from work to family, both positive and negative, than men. Black workers experienced lower levels of negative spillover, and higher levels of positive spillover from family to work than other ethnic groups. Less educated employees experienced less negative spillover between work and family than highly educated employees. Parents reported higher levels of negative spillover from family to work than individuals without children. Married individuals reported higher levels of positive spillover from family to work than individuals who were separated, divorced, widowed, or never married. Finally, managers and professionals experienced more negative spillover from work to family than individuals with service jobs.

Stated another way, negative spillover was higher among workers who were female, younger, white or Hispanic, more educated, parents, or managers and professionals. Positive spillover was higher among workers who were female, older, black or married.
Lifestyle Preferences as Determinants of Women’s Differentiated Labor Market Careers
C. Hakim

Work and Occupations
Volume 29, 2002, pp. 428-459
c.hakim@lse.ac.uk

National longitudinal studies have revealed much about the attitudes, life goals, and aspirations of women regarding labor market behavior, but these discoveries have had little impact on sociological theory. The purpose of this article was to develop a new perspective called preference theory, and to assess the utility of the theory in predicting women’s employment patterns, occupational choice, and fertility.

Preference theory assumes that for the first time in history, women have real choices about work and family because of social and economic developments including the availability of contraception and equal employment opportunities.

When women have real choices, they typically choose one of three different lifestyles: (1) home-centered, (2) work-centered, or (3) adaptive. Home-centered and work-centered lifestyles have been less preferred by women than the adaptive lifestyle. Adaptive women seek to find a genuine balance between work and family.

Using data from the 1999 British survey, the researcher accurately predicted that the ability of women to choose their lifestyle regarding work and family would affect their decision-making in three areas: (1) fertility and family size; (2) employment patterns across the lifecycle; and (3) responsiveness to public and employer policies and social and economic circumstances. For example, work centrality and family role preferences both had substantial impacts on work rates, doubling them among women.

Wives who work only if their child care responsibilities allow them to do so are in effect fulfilling a prior choice of emphasis on homemaking as life’s central activity. Child care responsibilities have little or no impact on the employment of work-centered women.

(p. 430)
Contextual Factors in the Success of Reduced-Load Work Arrangements among Managers and Professionals
M. D. Lee, S. M. MacDermid, M. L. Williams, M. L. Buck, & S. Leiba-O’Sullivan
Human Resource Management
Volume 41, 2002, pp. 209-223
lee@management.mcgill.ca

Employers are working hard to sustain worker loyalty with family friendly policies such as flextime and part-time. However, high-level managers and professionals have often denied access to such policies because their work is thought to require a full-time presence. This study focused on voluntary part-time employment among high-level professionals and managers to examine levels of success and the factors facilitating or hindering success.

Data were gathered from face-to-face interviews with 82 professionals and managers from 42 organizations. The participants had been part-time for an average of 4.2 years; most were women who were married with young children. Interviews also were conducted with the respondent’s spouse/partner, senior manager, peer coworker, and a human resource representative. In addition, the persons who reported to each manager were asked their perception of the manager’s overall effectiveness and their views about the effects of reduced-load work arrangements.

Managers and professionals reported that the work arrangements were quite successful and many reported improvements in personal well-being. Senior managers also gave positive evaluations of reduced-load work arrangements, stating that work performance was maintained or enhanced. Over half of the senior managers, however, reported logistical problems due mainly to difficulties scheduling meetings or worries that other employees would want to work a reduced load. With regard to coworkers, over half expressed strong support for the work arrangement and reported no negative impact on the work unit. Some coworkers did report feeling frustrated when they had to cover for reduced-load workers, or when they had to work extra hours during peak periods even though the reduced-load workers could limit their availability.

The 15 top factors that facilitated the success of reduced-load work arrangements were evenly split between individual and contextual factors, with a supportive senior manager being mentioned the most often. With regard to human resource policies, respondents identified policies that addressed financial and logistical problems as the most helpful.
The purpose of this study was to explore the effects of work hours on work-family conflict. The authors studied three characteristics of work (importance of the job to the worker, overload at work, and perceived rewards for long hours) and three family characteristics (parental demands, financial need, and nonjob responsibilities). The 513 participants of the study were randomly selected from a Fortune 500 company; none were unionized and none were on international assignments.

The authors hypothesized that work and family characteristics would increase work time, which in turn would increase work interference with family.

The findings partially supported the hypothesis. All the work and family variables except parental demands were significantly related to work time. Workers’ hours were longer when the job was more important to them, when they felt overloaded at work, when they perceived expectations for long work hours, and when they had greater financial need. They worked fewer hours when they had fewer non-job responsibilities and – unexpectedly – when they perceived more organizational rewards for long hours. In turn, work hours were positively, although modestly, related to work interference with family, which in turn was strongly related to psychological distress.

Contrary to predictions, two work and family characteristics (work overload and organizational expectations for long hours) predicted work interference with family directly. Thus, four work and family characteristics (importance of the job, rewards for long hours, non-job responsibilities, and perceived financial need) were related to work interference with family through their relationship with work hours. Long hours at work were significantly related to work interference with family, which in turn was related to psychological distress.

The results of this study suggest that concerns over expanding work week are well founded, and provide further impetus for employers to find ways to adopt more efficient work practices that maintain or enhance productivity while reducing unnecessary work hours.

Both in academic research and in the popular media, the problem of work-family conflict is commonly assumed to rest fundamentally on the predicament of too much to do in too little time. Yet researchers still know relatively little about how people choose to invest their time and how these choices may ultimately affect individual, family, and organizational outcomes.

(p. 434)
Who Expects to Continue Working After Age 62?
The Retirement Plans of Couples
A. M. Pienta & M. D. Hayward
Journal of Gerontology
Volume 57b, 2002, S199-S208
pienta@ufl.edu

The issue of retirement is likely to become the subject of increased public debate and policy. The impending retirements of Baby Boomers threaten the Social Security system. The age for social security eligibility will shift to age 67 by the year 2007. The authors examined retirement expectations to see if retirement decisions are made on a couple or individual level. They also looked at how these expectations are shaped by gender and other household characteristics.

To answer these questions the authors used the 1992 Health and Retirement Survey, selecting for study people aged 51-61 who were married or cohabiting in couples where both partners were working. Both partners were asked to assess the likelihood that they would continue work after age 62, in addition to answering questions about job characteristics, family characteristics, and personal health.

The authors found that retirement expectations did not differ between married and cohabiting couples. Neither husbands nor wives reported a strong likelihood of working after age 62. Although husbands were more likely than wives to predict working full-time after age 62, wives were also less likely to work full-time at the time of the survey. Both husbands and wives were more likely to expect to continue working if they had jobs that were cognitively demanding or when they were self-employed. Both husbands and wives also were more likely to expect to continue working if they were older.

Husbands’ and wives’ expectations about the timing of retirement were related, suggesting that decisions about retirement are made at the couple level. The greater their combined pension wealth, the less likely couples were to expect to continue working after age 62. Husbands, but not wives, predicted that they would retire later if they lacked health insurance.
Women’s Employment, Marital Happiness, and Divorce
R. Schoen, N. M. Astone, K. Rothert, N. J. Standish, & Y. J. Kim

Social Forces
Volume 81, 2002, pp. 643-662
schoen@pop.psu.edu

The possible relationship between women’s employment and divorce is very controversial. One perspective argues that the most stable marriages are those in which each partner specializes in a role, such as domestic responsibilities for wives and economic activity for husbands. According to this view, marital stability is threatened by wives’ employment because the exchange relationships with their husbands are disrupted. The opposing perspective argues that dissatisfaction with marriage leads both to employment and to instability. Women’s employment simply provides a means in which women can leave unsatisfactory marriages.

The researchers tested these perspectives with data from the 1987-88 and 1992-94 waves of the National Survey of Families and Households. The large representative sample contained individuals who were married, under the age of 50, and were non-Hispanic white or African American. The outcome variables were marital quality, whether or not the wife was employed full-time (35 hours or more), and a large number of control variables that had been found in earlier research to predict marital stability such as age at marriage, duration of marriage, race, and number of children.

Without taking marital happiness into account, couples, couples in which the wife is employed full-time were 24% more likely to have a marital disruption than couples in which the wife is not employed. When marital happiness was taken into account, however, wives’ employment status had no effect on marital disruption when both partners were happy. If either partner was dissatisfied with the marriage, the wife’s employment did significantly increase the risk of marital disruption. Thus, women’s employment was a factor in divorce only when one or both members of a couple were dissatisfied with the marriage.

In terms of other risks of divorce, couples with one child or no children were more likely to divorce than couples with more than one child. Second marriages were also at higher risk for divorce than first marriages. Lastly, cohabiting prior to marriage did not increase the risk of marital dissolution.
The Effects of Early Maternal Employment on Child Cognitive Development
J. Waldfogel, W. Han, & J. Brooks-Gunn

Demography
Volume 39, Number 2, 2002, pp. 369-392
jw205@columbia.edu

Today, it is common for women to work outside the home as opposed to playing the role of full-time homemaker, regardless of whether or not they have children. It is a recent trend, however, for mothers of very young children to participate in the labor force. This study investigated the effects of early maternal employment on children’s cognitive development.

Data came from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY), a regularly-conducted government survey. Children with complete data from birth through eight years of age were selected. The final sample was made up of a large number of children born between 1982 and 1989, among them children of European, African, and Latin descent.

Analyses revealed some persistent negative effects of maternal employment during the first year of life on cognitive outcomes among white children. This was not true for African American or Hispanic children, even when various individual and family characteristics affecting child development – such as the home environment, breast feeding, and type of child care – were controlled.

Amount of time spent working by mothers also negatively affected the cognitive outcomes of white children. For example, negative effects persisted as long as seven or eight years when mothers worked more than 20 hours a week during the child’s first year of life; girls were more negatively affected than boys.

Family income contributed to the effects of maternal employment on white children’s cognitive outcomes. Children from low-income families were more affected by early maternal employment than children from families with more income.

While white children seemed to be affected by employment of mothers during their first year of life, employment after the child’s first year did not appear to have adverse affects. In fact, mothers’ employment during children’s second or third years of life had positive effects on children’s cognitive development.
Interest in part-time work was studied across three different cultures: the United States, England, and Hong Kong. The authors examined the role of national context and other factors such as marriage, parenthood, and gender as it related to interest in part-time work. The authors also checked for differences between the three countries in marriage, parenthood, and gender.

The authors worked with one large international company. The study focused on 260 finance professionals in the United States, England, and Hong Kong. All of the studied employees held similar positions at the company.

The authors examined two main hypotheses: 1) that women, married persons, and parents, in addition to those without a homemaker spouse would be more interested in part-time work across all countries and 2) that interest in part-time work would vary across nations.

The authors found that 43% of all employees had some level of interest in part-time work. Married women with young children were most interested in part-time work, while men without children had the least interest in part-time work. In general women were more interested than men in part-time work. Those that were married tended to be more interested in part-time work than those who were not married. Employees with children were more interested in part-time work than employees without children.

Interest in part-time work differed by country. Employees in Hong Kong were more interested in part-time work than were their counterparts in the United States or England. Single men in Hong Kong were more likely to express interest than were single women and married men in the United States and England. Americans were the least likely to express interest in part-time work. However employed women were more likely than men to work part-time in the United States and England. This did not hold true for employees in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong employed women were just as likely as men to work part-time.

One starkly evident finding is that American finance professionals are less likely to express interest working part-time than their counterparts in England and Hong Kong.

(p. 56)
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2003 KANTER AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN WORK-FAMILY RESEARCH


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 2003, 30 reviewers from 3 countries 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 52 journals were reviewed. 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 2002 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 40 nominated articles was sent to 2 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 finalist articles to determine the winner. After the winners were chosen, reviewers were asked (as they are each year) to recommend revisions to the award process for the 2004 award.
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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 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.
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