The Next Generation of Work-Family Partners

by Kathleen Christensen, Ph.D.

When the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation established the Dual Career Working Family Program, we understood that sustainable change would require both a long-term vision and the involvement of diverse stakeholders. Consequently, we have encouraged our grantees to involve graduate students and post-doctoral researchers in funded studies and to engage in cross-disciplinary collaborations. Although these strategies have not always been easy, they have nurtured a multi-generational group of researchers who are becoming more comfortable speaking the languages of more than a single discipline.

Today, there is a new challenge confronting the academic community. As we begin to build stronger bridges between knowledge-building processes and change-oriented initiatives, we will need to find new ways to nurture the next generation of work-family partnerships. In the future, work-family collaborations will not only need to be multi-disciplinary, but they will also need to include representatives of workplaces, such as management and employee groups.

Some researchers have already ventured into this new arena. Several work-family leaders featured in this issue of the
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INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE

“Paying it Forward”* (see page 2)

Four years ago, Brad, Teri and I started to talk about our ideas for helping to support the loosely-coupled community of work-family researchers by offering resources on the web. At that time, there were lots of skeptics. Many people questioned whether the technology we needed was actually available. (Fortunately, they were not correct.) Others expressed doubt that academics would be
Research Newsletter have blazed paths into the researcher-practitioner frontier. For example, Shelley MacDermid has initiated a new project at Purdue — “A Labor-Management-Research Partnership: Expanding Options for the Time and Timing of Work in a Continuous-Operations Environment.” (See “Research Updates,” p.27). This study will identify opportunities for change in rigid work hours and work structures. The action research team will be working with employees to find out what they need, and will work closely with both labor and management to identify and implement solution-focused strategies. Forging these new types of partnerships will be critical to the next wave of work-family research.

As the work-family community moves forward on the partnership agenda, we will have to consider two important questions:

What incentive structures can be built into work-family projects to engage collaborators with different (sometimes conflicting) interests? Sometimes organizational pain, like recruitment and retention problems, will be enough to bring new partners to the table. In other situations, however, researchers may need to identify innovative incentives.

How can work-family projects be tailored so that they are relevant and responsive to different types of workplaces, ranging from manufacturing sites to university settings, and to the collaborators at these workplaces? The effective partnerships of the future will need to understand and respect the variations in occupational expectations and work demands within and between particular types of workplaces.

It is inevitable that these new collaborations will alter the direction of some research. It may be more difficult to predict the specifics of future research agenda. However, these partnerships will form the foundations of a new work-family legacy that we will leave to the next generation.

comfortable using web-base resources. (Such stereotypes!) Perhaps most significantly, there were many cynics who did not believe that researchers would be willing to help foster the development of a network. We are pleased to report that the predictions of these dis-believers did not come to fruition.

One of the unique characteristics of work-family research community is the willingness of so many people to contribute to the common good. There is a norm of “paying it forward” rather than waiting to “pay it back.” We have prepared this issue of the Research Newsletter as a tribute to the civic-mindedness of work-family researchers. The examples of generosity within this community abound. Several of the articles in this issue of the Research Newsletter reflect the dynamic sharing of ideas and collaborations that have developed within the work-family research community.

Our feature article reflects a conversation that Teri Ann Lilly had with Rhona Rapoport. Not surprisingly, Rhona was identified by many of the respondents to the 2001 Online Survey as one of the most influential leaders in the work-family area of study (To view timeline, please go to http://www.bc.edu/wfnet-work.) She is currently coordinating an interesting project that is gathering information of the roots of the work-family area of study and considering the implications for possible future work-family agendas. On behalf of the work-family research community, we wish to express our appreciation for the “idea gifts” that Rhona continues to give to us all.

We are also pleased to include articles that highlight recent conversations between pairs of work-family leaders. Joe Pleck and Jim Levine discussed masculinity and fatherhood. Perry Christensen talked with Fran Rodgers about women in corporate America. Ellen Galinsky and Shelley MacDermid reflected on the National Study of the Changing Workforce. Stu Friedman and Ellen Kossek explored the importance of bridging the worlds of research and practice. These dialogues were stimulating and insightful.

This issue of the Research Newsletter celebrates the community-builders. Marcie Pitt-Catsoughes

* “Paying it Forward” is a movie produced by Warner Home Video in 2000. The plot of the story is based on an idea developed by a school age child for passing good deeds “forward.”
Rhona Rapoport is director of the Institute of Family and Environmental Research, a nonprofit educational trust located in London. In 1994-95 she was a scholar in residence at the Ford Foundation, and in recent years she has been a Distinguished Fellow and adviser at the Center for Gender in Organizations at the Simmons Graduate School of Management in Boston. She received her doctorate in sociology at the London School of Economics and subsequently completed training as a psychoanalyst at the London Institute of Psychoanalysis. For twenty years, she has been a consultant to the Ford Foundation working on affirmative action programs in the United States and in developing countries and on work and family issues. She has collaborated with action research projects in the United States and England, as well as on the development of a training program on organizational change and work-family issues for advancing diverse groups in the new South Africa. She has written numerous publications, many with her late husband, Robert, including such pioneering work-family literature as “Work and family in contemporary society,” (1965, American Sociological Review, vol. 30) and Dual Career Families (1971, Penguin Books). In 2002, she published Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance (Jossey-Bass; co-authored with, L. Bailyn, J.K. Fletcher & B. Pruitt.)

Editor’s note: Rhona and Robert Rapoport created a rich body of work-family research that has influenced generations of researchers and others interested in work-family issues. Without question, the research the Rapoports were linking sociology and psychology of family and sociology of work, (cf. “Work and family in contemporary society” (1965, American Sociological Review, volume 30)) and Dual Career Families (1971, Penguin Books). In 2002, she published Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance (Jossey-Bass; co-authored with, L. Bailyn, J.K. Fletcher & B. Pruitt.)

In the 50s and early 60s, Rhona and Robert Rapoport began thinking and researching equity and work and family issues. A key turning point in the journey took place in Boston when the Rapoports (who were located at different universities) worked on separate research projects both related to critical life transitions with young adults. Robert was working on career transitions when leaving college and Rhona on transitions when getting engaged, married, having a child. Rhona observes, “It made sense to use the same sample and look at the critical transitions with the same people.”

“We found that work and family decisions affected one another and also were gender inequitable—surprise, surprise. This effect was at the personal and interpersonal level, a kinship-community level. The connections were unbelievable.”

In the 60s, the Rapoports published several papers that broke with traditional ways of linking men, women, work, family, equity. Their innovative research showed how decisions about marriage, family, and work were connected. The Rapoorts were linking sociology and psychology of family and sociology and psychology of work, (cf. “Work and family in contemporary society” (1965, American Sociological Review, volume 30)).

Despite the fact, that the Rapoorts were clearly pushing theoretical and discipline boundaries, this early research received little attention. According to Rhona, the articles did not generate much interest—“nothing happened.” Rhona notes that there was little reaction to the article that introduced the concept of the dual-career family, “The dual-career family: A variant pattern and social change” (1969, Human Relations, volume 22(1): 3-30).

In 1971, however, folks did react to the publication of the book, the Dual-Career Family (Pelican Books). The book developed the concept of dual-career couples that the Rapoorts introduced in the 1969 paper. Drawing on extensive interview data, the book focused on five families. Rhona observes, “In retrospect, I think people responded to human interest stories, even though the book was quite conceptual.”

To understand the work of Rhona Rapoport, one has to appreciate her impassioned commitment to equity. Raised in South Africa, Rhona early on embraced the values of basic human dignity. In the late 50s, Rhona studied families and working women in a rapidly industrializing town in Uganda. “It became clear that cultural factors and the traditional role relationships between men and women were making it very difficult for women to progress as they wanted.”

She envisions a “more equitable society along many dimensions: gender, age, race, class, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, and perhaps others not recognized yet.”

For Rhona, her research clarified the “need for role relationships in families to alter and to increase gender equity and to change the part work plays in people’s lives.” Rhona notes that all of her work “points to NOT viewing or conceptualizing work as oppositional to family and other areas of life.”

In that vein, she notes that it is important to include work as “in” life, not as “or” life as in work/life. Rhona comments, “I don’t like the notion of Work/Life issues. The issue is how to integrate work, family, community and leisure interests.”

*THE “MOVEMENT” ON WORK-PERSONAL LIFE INTEGRATION: LOOKING BACKWARDS TO GO FORWARD.*

FOR INFORMATION ABOUT THIS EXCITING RESEARCH PROJECT, GO TO HTTP://WWW.BC.EDU/WFNETWORK, CLICK ON RESEARCH PROFILES, CLICK ON RAPOPORT.
Not only are these issues important by themselves, but for gender equity (and other elements of diversity).

From the beginning, the Rapoorts said that equal opportunity for women was not enough, that you had to bring men into the picture for it to work. In the 60s this was an unpopular view and the Rapoorts received criticism in the press, from other scholars, and in particular from those in the women’s movement.

Rhona states the position that underpins her work, “It is necessary to change the opportunities that men and women have, to make the opportunities more equitable, AND to change the constraints on them. We have changed law and policy, but not the constraints on women, nor the constraints on men to participate in things outside work.”

Today, while contested by some, many agree with the way she frames the issue; indeed, it has become “conventional wisdom” – work and family issues can not be seen as women’s issues.

The Rapoorts’ work was ahead of its time and Rhona continues to be in the forefront. She strongly believes in change and linking scholarship to practice. She was part of the groundbreaking research project on work redesign with L. Bailyn, D. Kolb, J.K. Fletcher and others. (See Relinking Work and Family: A Catalyst for Organizational Change). Using an action research model, this study examined the work organization and culture in three corporations to find ineffective and inequitable work practices. The research team provided recommendations on how to redesign work practices to improve company performance and the lives of employees at work and home.

Rhona states, “For decades now, there has been an undervaluation of the ‘implementation gap.’ That is, there has been a focus on policy and legal changes without sufficient attention to how these can be made to work optimally in practice. The latter requires attention to individuals, relationships and systems in which they operate. This involves intensive work and is regarded as too time-consuming. I believe that in the medium-run, change occurs more rapidly when these issues are attended to”.

This collaborative partnership led to the recently published book, Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance, co-authored with L. Bailyn, J.K. Fletcher, and B.H. Pruitt. This book lays out the methodological action research approach that the team used in the work redesign studies.

Currently, Rhona is engaged in a research project with S. Lewis and B.H.Pruitt, The “Movement” on Work-Personal Life Integration: Looking Backwards to Go Forward, which is funded by the Ford Foundation. This study looks back at the “work-personal life” movement in a number of countries over the past three decades. The purpose is to capture the learning that has occurred in different countries about optimal ways of linking paid work with the rest of life and consider implications for the future – for individual men and women, for families and for communities.”

One goal of the proposed project is to gather the learning from these efforts and engage people familiar with and committed to the work in a process of reflecting on past experience and considering its implications for the future.

Once again, Rhona will be at the forefront of an innovative project designed to make a difference in people’s lives.
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The Sloan Newsletter is pleased to include articles that highlight recent conversations between pairs of work-family leaders: Joe Pleck and Jim Levine, Fran Rodgers and Perry Christensen, Ellen Galinsky and Shelley MacDermid, Stu Friedman and Ellen Kossek. We think these dialogues reflect the dynamic sharing of ideas and collaborations that have developed within the work-family research community.

**Masculinity and Fatherhood: A Dialogue about Pioneering Research with Joe Pleck and Jim Levine**

_A Conversation with Joe Pleck, Ph.D._

by Jim Levine, Ph.D.

Joseph H. Pleck is Professor of Human Development and Family Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He co-directed the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey for the U.S. Dept of Labor, which introduced the concept of work-family conflict and provided national data about its prevalence and correlates. He has presented Congressional testimony in support of the Family and Medical Leave Act, and has been an advisor to the National Research Council’s Panel on Employer Policies and Working Families and to Family and Work Institute’s the National Survey of the Changing Workforce.


Dr. James Levine, director of The Fatherhood Project at the Families and Work Institute in New York City, is the author of seven books, over 100 articles, and produced the PBS Documentary, Fatherhood USA. In 1995 he served as a consultant to Vice President Gore in drafting the new federal initiative on fatherhood. In 1997, Working Mother magazine named him as one of the top 25 men in America who make a difference in the lives of working mothers. In 1998, ABC’s 20/20 profiled his work. Jim’s most recent books are New Expectations: Community Strategies for Responsible Fatherhood and Working Fathers: New Strategies for Balancing Work and Family, which The Wall Street Journal selected in 1998 as one of the top ten work-life books of the year. He is the married father of two grown children, both of whom are teachers in NYC.

**Levine:** You are one of the pioneers in research on masculinity and fatherhood, as well as one of the founders of the work-family field as well. How did that happen?

**Pleck:** When I began studying masculinity and gender in the early 1970s, I quickly realized that 90% of what most people mean by “gender” or “gender roles,” at least for adults, concerns what people do in their paid work and in their families. So, it seemed clear to me that what men do in the family, and especially how they are as fathers, is central to understanding men’s lives. And, to understand men as fathers and family members, we have to understand how work and family are connected for men, and compare that to how work and family are connected for women.

**Levine:** How has the understanding of fatherhood changed over the generations of work and family research?

**Pleck:** In the late 1960s, sociology already had a research area called “work and family,” but what it focused on was the transmission of occupational status from fathers to sons, and how characteristics of fathers’ jobs might be reflected in whether mothers’ child rearing emphasized independence or conformity. So, the beginnings of work-family research actually focused on fatherhood.

In the early 1970s, women began complaining more vocally that men weren’t doing enough in the family. In the mid-1970s, several books appeared — including my own *Men and Masculinity* and your *Who Will Raise the Children?* — which argued that men would benefit if gender roles were less stereotyped. And by 1979, the data I collected in the U.S. National Quality of Employment survey showed that equal percentages of fathers and mothers reported that their work and family roles interfered with each other “a lot” or “somewhat.”

In the 1980s, research has substantially deepened and extended the arguments and findings made during the previous decade. The work you and I did with Michael Lamb tried to systematically develop a new concept of father involvement that had both theoretical and practical implications. Then, in the 1990s, John Snarey’s research demonstrated that father involvement seemed to promote men’s “psycho-social generativity” later in their lives. And my work on “informal” parental leave showed that men are more involved in early care than is publicly acknowledged: the majority of new fathers take days off from work when their child is born, but they don’t think of it as parental leave.

**Levine:** Have changes in the work-family field affected the understanding of fatherhood?

**Pleck:** Everyone has switched from naming the issue as “working mothers” to “work and family” (or “work-life”). But, a lot of people still implicitly think that work and family is just a polite euphemism for working mothers that avoids charges of gender discrimination. I’ve noticed that many managers get pretty uncomfortable with the proposition that work and family issues really affect men as well.

**Levine:** Are there new approaches to research on fatherhood that you think hold special promise for the work-family field?

**Pleck:** We’ve learned that managing work and family doesn’t have to do just with allocating time, but with [the “emotional transmission” from work –] how we feel [–] and how we communicate those feelings. For example, my colleague Reed Larson’s use of “beeper” methodology has shown that fathers’ mood is more positive at home than at work, but mothers’ mood is more negative. Further, father’s mood at the end of his workday seems to influence mother’s mood after he arrives
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The Road Ahead for Women in Corporate America
A Conversation with Fran Rodgers

by Perry Christensen, WFD Consulting

Fran Sussner Rodgers is the CEO of WFD, Inc. She founded WFD (formerly Work/Family Directions) in 1983 for the purpose of assisting corporations in igniting and sustaining employee commitment to business results. WFD was a pioneer in developing a new generation of employee benefits and services. Its LifeWorks Program which was available to over 3 million employees was sold to Ceridian Corporation in 1999. At the time of the sale, WFD was one of the largest female owned businesses in the country. WFD now advises dozens of Fortune 100 companies on talent strategies especially in the area of adjusting to demographic and generational changes and in managing the use of time.

Ms. Rodgers is a graduate of Barnard College of Columbia University, Tufts University and the MGH professional training program in Clinical Psychology. She is a member of the Board of Directors of Fleet Boston Financial, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, and is a Trustee of Barnard College. At Brigham and Women’s Hospital she is chair of the Strategic Plan for Women’s Health. She is also a Fellow of the of the National Academy of Human Resources and a Trustee of its Foundation.

Ms. Rodgers is widely recognized as a leader in addressing the simultaneous labor force and business changes. She presented to the President at the White House Conference On Corporate Citizenship in 1996. In 1994, she was a national winner of the Ernst and Young/Merrill Lynch Entrepreneur of the Year contest. In 1996, she was named one of the 25 most influential working mothers in the US by Working Mother Magazine. She has received many honors from organizations such as the YWCA, International Women’s Forum, the American Society on Aging and the New England Council. In 2000 she received the Columbus Award for Discovery from the Commonwealth of Ma. And Tufts University.

She is married to Charles S. Rodgers, is the mother of two daughters, ages 23 and 20.

Editor’s note: Fran Rodgers, founder and CEO of WFD Consulting, has been a thought leader in the field of women’s advancement and work-life strategy for more than 25 years. WFD Consulting has conducted extensive research in Fortune 500 companies around the globe and helped guide companies such as Deloitte & Touche, IBM, and Aetna toward a better understanding and utilization of female talent. Fran spoke with Perry Christensen, senior consultant at WFD Consulting, about the work corporations have ahead of them in attracting, retaining, and promoting women.

Christensen: You have been working on women’s issues in corporations for over 25 years. What’s changed and what hasn’t in that time?

Rodgers: The biggest change I’ve seen is that women no longer have to prove that they can be as good as men in business. Their skills as managers and contributors have been convincingly demonstrated, again and again. Some cultural attitudes still exist, but overall there has been enormous progress in eliminating outright bias and discrimination. Another change I’ve seen is the recognition that people’s personal lives are an issue in the workplace. Almost every large company has implemented policies and procedures to address employees’ personal lives at work – this never would have been seen as important to business results 25 years ago. Finally, community dependent care services are more widely available now – cost is still a major issue, but there is greater availability.

What still hasn’t changed? There are three things that have remained surprisingly constant over the past 25 years. The first is the ongoing struggle between individuals and employers over the possibility of being both good parents and good workers. For individuals this is a critical, jugular issue; for companies it is one that is addressed only at the margins. Businesses address this issue with programs and policies that give support for personal life, but don’t deal with the fact that contribution and commitment are still measured by willingness to work long hours, even though many of those hours are unproductive and could be eliminated.

The second constant is the demographic profile of successful men in companies. For the past 25 years, WFD’s corporate research has found that the percentage of exempt men with wives who work in the home full- or part-time has remained constant at 65 - 70%. Meanwhile there has been a small change in the number of working women with stay-at-home spouses; only about 10% of working women have a spouse who is the primary caretaker of the home. The fact remains today, as it was 25 years ago, that men in power have stay-at-home wives and women in power are part of dual-career couples.

The third constant is that women are still seen as a niche or diversity group despite the fact that women are usually the majority of consumers and often the majority of employees.

Christensen: Given the significant increase in corporate work-life programs, why haven’t we seen a commensurate increase of women in top leadership?

Rodgers: Many of these policies and programs are on the margins of the organization, rather than being part of a systemic change in the way business is done. So what these programs really have accomplished it to make it viable for women to stay in the workforce after they have children. They don’t necessarily help women rise within the organization, but they do keep them at work.
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Christensen: So what do companies need to understand in order to capitalize on women’s leadership potential?

Rodgers: I really look at the issues for women in corporate America in terms of life cycle — both of their careers and their lives. When women are young and rising in an organization before they start families they often do have a level playing field with men. Everyone is expected to work tremendous hours, but this has no differential impact on women before they have children. In the second phase of the career (usually 7 or more years in) women often become mothers and a disparity between men and women emerges. This is the phase where women with children either drop out of the organization or stagnate in the lower or middle levels because of the differential impact workload and demands on time have on them. If you want to move women into executive and leadership positions, it’s very important to mind the talent pipeline and make sure women aren’t dropping out or getting stuck in middle management. Finally, if women do manage to make it through this maternity phase (or decide not to have children at all) and rise high within the organization, a new issue arises. The higher a woman rises within an organization, the more likely it is that she perceives there is an ‘Old Boys Club’ really calling the shots and making the important decisions. In many of our interviews and research with senior women, they report that important decisions that affect them and their business responsibilities are frequently being made without their input. As a result, you would be surprised at the number of senior women who report that they don’t feel they are making a substantial impact on the business.

Christensen: You do work on women’s issues around the globe. Are the themes and issues you describe also true for women outside the U.S.?

Rodgers: In my work around the globe, I have come to believe that the desire to be successful at work and care for your family is universal among men and women. In other words, this is not just something that American women want. Even in cultures where women’s roles are very prescribed, if a woman does manage to break through that culture and secure a position in a company there are virtually no differences in what she needs and wants from what American women are striving for. I really believe that everything we’ve learned in the U.S. about women’s careers also applies to other countries.

Christensen: If an organization is really serious about improving the environment and opportunities for women, what is the most important thing to do?

Rodgers: The number one thing that companies need to do is respect people’s time. I don’t mean expect fewer results or effort from people, but to remove wasted time during the day so that when people are putting in the time it is on the important tasks that will ultimately drive the company forward. It should be the number one priority of managers to reduce wasted time at work. American business is based on the assumption that time spent is somehow related to the success of a venture. This has never been proven — it is a myth that is pervasive in the U.S. culture. Companies are sloppy about how they use employees’ time because they don’t have to pay for it — for exempt employees, anything over 40 hours is free to the company. If companies changed the way they squander employee’s time, they would powerfully impact the success of women in business.

Christensen: Let’s talk a little more about this ‘Old Boys Club’ issue — how can corporations change what they don’t even see?

Rodgers: This is a really difficult behavior to change. In my experience, women have done just about all they can here — the real change needs to come from the men in power. They need to get to the point where if a major decision is being made with only men in the room, they realize that they are not getting the input they need.

Christensen: Looking to the future, what kind of information will make a difference? What should researchers focus on?

Rodgers: Understanding time and how it relates to productivity. There is currently very little written about the relationship of time to results. Does putting more time into an activity really yield better results?

We are at the beginning of a new challenge in American business — the separation of time from success. Businesses have to learn what women have already learned out of sheer necessity — to focus on what is most important and only do those things that will make a difference. When businesses start to appreciate time as a finite and valuable resource not to be squandered, the last great barrier to women in the workforce will be broken down.
Masculinity and Fatherhood, continued

home – a kind of “emotional transmission “, but the reverse is not true. In effect, fathers get to use home as a refuge from work and mothers don’t. This is another dimension of what our colleague Arlie Hochschild has called “the second shift.”

Some of my recent work has focused on how a father constructs his identity. Whereas mothers seem to construct their maternal identity independent of their relationship with the child’s father, fathers’ construction of paternal identity is more grounded in – or mediated by – their relationship with the child’s mother. And, interestingly, the more fathers view themselves as co-parents, the more involved they are with their kids.

Levine: Post 9/11, has anything struck you as particularly significant regarding our understanding of fatherhood?

Pleck: When I read the brief biographies of the men lost on 9/11, I’m struck that their family lives define them as much or more as their work.

FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE WORK OF JOSEPH PLECk AND JAMES LEVINE, PLEASE GO TO:

HTTP://WWW.BC.EDU/WFNETWORK, CLICK ON LITERATURE DATABASE, ENTER PLECk OR LEVINE IN AUTHOR FIELD, CLICK ON SEARCH.
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“At Dare to Dream”: A Dialogue About the National Study of the Changing Workforce with Ellen Galinsky and Shelley MacDermid

Editor’s note: Ellen Galinsky is the President and co-founder of the Families and Work Institute in New York. In the late 1980s, she began to work on reviving the Quality of Employment Survey (QES), a nationally representative study of the US workforce that was conducted by the US Department of Labor (DOL) in the 1970s. In 1977—the last year the study was conducted by DOL, the QES added questions assessing employees' life off the job as well as on the job. When it became clear that the Department of Labor would not repeat this study, the Families and Work Institute reinvented it as the National Study of the Changing Workforce, building on many of the questions asked in the 1977 QES. The National Study was first conducted by the Families and Work Institute in 1992 and every five years thereafter.

The NSCW is unique in many ways. One of its defining characteristics is the participative and inclusive approach adopted by Galinsky, James T. (Terry) Bond, the study co-director, and other members of the Families and Work Institute’s research team. As a result of this collaborative approach to study design and data analysis, the NSCW initiative has engaged the interest of practitioners and academics, alike.

Enter Shelley MacDermid, a long-time work-family researcher. MacDermid, Director of the Center for Families at Purdue University and Co-Director of the Military Family Research Institute at Purdue, is a self-professed “nutt” about solid research designs that lay the foundations for continued knowledge-building. Upon reading the findings of the first NSCW, MacDermid became enthusiastic about the data, as well as the potential of the NSCW. After the release of findings from the 1997 NSCW, MacDermid entered into a partnership with Ellen Galinsky and Terry Bond to support and encourage researchers to use the dataset. In 2001, MacDermid, Galinsky, and Bond edited a special issue of the Journal of Family and Economic Issues, which included articles that presented findings from secondary analyses of the NSCW completed by researchers around the country.

The third NSCW is collecting data in 2002. What a gift to us all.
Based on information given to me by the principal researchers involved in the 1977 Quality of Employment Study, I knew that our study would be expensive. It is very resource-intensive to conduct the type of interviews and obtain the representative sample necessary for this type of investigation. At this point, we turned to a number of business leaders to help us think through the funding issues. Jack Carter of IBM was especially helpful. He suggested a model of business funding that was often used for benchmarking studies. Individual companies participated in and supported these projects so that they could compare their employee findings against comparable companies. Although we were not going to collect company-based data, the model had promise.

So, this is how the Quality of Employment Study was reinvented as the National Study of the Changing Workforce. Companies and foundations were approached to sponsor the study. In return, they could use the national data to benchmark issues from their own employee surveys. More important, they could suggest what I called “burning questions” that the study should address and answer.

The final thing I want to emphasize about the origins of the NSCW is that we were fortunate to have a number of people who made critical contributions and commitments to the project. We began to call companies to see if our idea for funding and design was sound. It was unbelievably gratifying that after some first and second calls, we started getting positive responses. The first “yes” was from Rennie Roberts (VP of HR at American Express) The second was from Ted Childs at IBM. IBM not only provided support but they gave us researchers on loan to work with us on the study design. It was incredible.

MacDermid: Well, I had just begun my first position as a faculty member when the Families and Work Institute embarked on the NSCW journey. Honestly, as an Assistant Professor here at Purdue, I was very wet behind the ears, very interested in work and family, and very interested in doing research inside organizations.

I had done a study while I was a master’s student, and in the fall of 1989 the Council on the Status of Women at Purdue invited me to participate in a panel. And, Arlene Johnson, who at the time was at the Families and Work Institute, was on that same panel. That was the first time I met Arlene, someone I continue to respect very much. I had heard of Ellen Galinsky’s work by that time, but I never imagined we would work together in the future.

As I became more familiar with the work of the (Families and Work) Institute, I developed an increasing admiration for Ellen and what the Institute did, in part because Ellen has does such a good job of establishing relationships and credibility with researchers and with the business community, alike. I think that’s a really difficult thing to do. And so I always paid attention to what they were doing.

I don’t recall when I heard first about the National Study of
Kossek: Stew, we have known each other for over a decade. What first made you interested in field of work and family?

Friedman: We all come at this topic for different reasons. For me, I was hit with a thunderbolt when I became a parent; it changed my career. It forced me to think in a new way about what I was going to do to make the world a better place for my children. There is a Hebrew phrase, tikkun olam, which means “to heal the world.” The idea is that the world is a broken place and our task is to heal it. I became aware of the importance of this idea as a vision towards which I might aspire in my work when I looked into the eyes of my first child the moment he was born. I was passionately committed; always an asset when trying to get something done! Prior to this epiphany, I had been reading and writing about work/family and adult socialization while getting my PhD at the University of Michigan. In particular, Dan Katz and Bob Kahn’s work on role theory and Joe Veroff’s course on socialization were major influences on my thinking. That’s my story, Ellen. How did you get into this field?

Kossek: I had a similar experience in that becoming a parent also made work and family issues more salient to my research and my life. I had my first child while a Ph.D. candidate at Yale. I was told that the university policies did not permit maternity leave for doctoral candidates, and if I wanted to take time off from my studies I would have to reapply for my fellowship without any guarantees. Though I was back at Yale three days after giving birth, this experience certainly made me very interested in studying work-family policy. What made you start the Wharton Work/Life Roundtable?

Friedman: When I was back in the classroom I began speaking to students about my role and theirs in helping to better shape work environments and careers to nurture the next generation; in other words, to enable working parents to do all the things they need to do for their careers and their families. Some students were very interested and receptive, and others thought this topic didn’t belong in the MBA curriculum. I began to experiment with how to bring work/life issues into the classroom, then found colleagues like you and convened them from business schools along with counterparts from leading companies to form a think tank on how we should be bringing this topic into business education. Jessica DeGroot, a Wharton MBA student at the time, was instrumental in shaping that agenda. We were fortunate to have the NY Times cover our first meeting, and the response was strong, in both positive and negative terms. We heard from many people, from Newt Gingrich to executives in Japan. Some thought it folly while others applauded, encouraging us to continue, which we did. Out of this grew the Wharton Resource Guide (Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer), a “Harvard Business Review” article, and a series of teaching cases (now posted on the Sloan Network Library of Papers, Presentations, Reports).

Kossek: What did you learn about work/life during your two years as a senior executive in a major corporation?

Friedman: One thing that became very clear is how change in the culture of work/life is more likely to occur when it is seen as serving directly the collective interests – both near- and long-term – of the firm, and not just the non-work interests of parents or any other single employee group. Successful strategies for creating more flexible and responsive work environments aren’t rooted in worker protection ideologies. Key stakeholders, and senior management in particular, have to believe that the work/life voice really is speaking for shareholders as well as for moms and dads who want more time with their kids. Perhaps this seems ironic, or paradoxical, given what I just told you about how I got into this field.

Kossek: What do you mean by paradoxical?

Friedman: The apparent paradox is that you will get greater worker protections and increased flexibility in work arrangements, the more work/life change initiatives are framed first and foremost as enhancing business results, such as increased quality, reduced cost, higher productivity, and faster innovation. We showed this to be the case at Ford Motor. Total leadership...
Changing Workforce, but when I did I was very excited. Obviously, the data from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey were really too old to be used much longer. I felt the emerging work-family field was really struggling to produce definitive findings because we were always had problematic samples. So much of the corporate work focused on only one company at a time and small percentages of the workers of those companies. Consequently, I felt that we weren’t really gaining any very definitive insights. Yet it can be very difficult for academics to get to gather information across companies.

I started to realize that the impact of the National Study of the Changing Workforce was going to be phenomenal once it became clear that the study was going to be repeated every five years. I knew in advance about the publication schedule of the 1997 study, so I started bugging Terry Bond about developing some processes so that lots of researchers could have access to the dataset. I just felt that the data set was such a incredible resource; I was really excited about the idea - not only using it myself - but also giving other researchers and students access to it. I was also committed to finding ways to encourage corporate folks to use the data set. I felt that a national representative sample could be such a good benchmark for individual companies.

**Galinsky:** It is instructive to look back and realize how far we have come. We did the first study in the field of work-family life when I was Bank Street in late ‘70s/early ‘80s, and we were studying experiences at Merck. The field was so new that we didn’t even know what variables should be in the study! We considered work variables drawn from industrial psychology, and we looked at family variables from psychological and family sociological research. We tried to make the best decisions about what were the important constructs to examine, what aspects of people’s lives that made a difference in the outcomes. This was not easy, since we were looking work and family life as both predictors and an outcomes. Deciding which variables could best capture the work-family transaction was really difficult.

We developed an open-ended question for our first study at Merck, one that I have used in research every since. The question was, “If you could make one change that would maintain or improve your productivity and would also improve your personal and family life, what would that change be?” The answers people gave us to that question led us to a study of the relationships that employees have with their supervisors. In the Merck study, employees reported that supervisors didn’t “get” the dual nature of the changes that were affecting them; it was their answers that encouraged us to think about models that describe family and work.

At the Families and Work Institute, we always felt that National Study of the Changing Workforce could help the field to focus on two things:

1) Identifying and measuring the important variables: For example, we wanted to help focus on variables that could help to describe and define things like, “What is supervisor support?” “What is a family-friendly culture?” “What are the constituent elements of job demands?” “How important is time?” “What does schedule flexibility really mean?”

2) Proposing and refining conceptual models: We realized that the field needed conceptual models to fit the variables together in a way that explained people’s experiences.

We felt we could be better able to meet these objectives if we could benefit from the advice of different experts. So, we assembled an advisory group. We tried to pick academics who were in different fields than we were, so that we could examine the issues from different perspectives. In one way, we wanted the content and structure of the National Study to “walk between” the paths used in anthropology, industrial psychology, organizational psychology, sociology and economics, for instance. Our idea was to bring in a group of academics with different perspectives to advise us and then to see how all their ideas could move us toward an overarching conceptual model.

In return for their advice, we offered them a nationally representative data set for analysis. Since they contributed to the study design, they could also ask some of the questions important to them.

As you might imagine, the National Study is a huge undertaking—speaking of having a demanding job! Terry (Bond) and I have had our noses to the grindstone. Both the ‘92 and ‘97 studies were under funded. As soon as we released general findings, the funding ended but the real work began—of continuing to mine the data, of responding to researchers’ and reporters’ queries. It was a tremendous drain on the Institute’s resources, but we believed in this study so much. We were committed to making this work because we wanted the data set to become a central resource for the field.

Then, we met Shelley. She was such a champion for this work. She has become, and will be an important leader for the study. I can’t tell you how thrilling this was for Terry and me to have an academic like Shelley advocate for increased involvement of researchers in the use of the data set.

**MacDermid:** Well, it just seemed to me that there were lots of ways for researchers to use this great dataset. As you know, we invited scholars to submit manuscripts about analyses they conducting using the NSCW data for a special issue of the Journal of Family and Economic Issues. That issue was published in Summer, 2001. The articles in this first special issue focused quite a bit on family conflict as a key variable, although some looked at work and organizational characteristics.

I am really happy to announce that we are going to do another special issue, this time for the Journal of Family Issues. Readers can contact us for the call for papers. We will feature analyses of one or both of the NSCW studies. It will be interesting to see if some people do comparative work with the datasets.

There are a number of reasons why we want to continue to edit special journal issues focused on the National Study of the Changing Workforce. In the first place, these special issues increase interest and visibility of the data set. We had a good number of submissions for the issue that was published in 2001. Secondly,
puts the “work” in “work/life” front and center. Flexibility increases business results. Leadership, performance and the firm’s collective purpose; these become the driving issues, not how to give parents more time off to take care of their children. I could be wrong, but in my view, most of the work/life field has the reverse priority, and, I believe, that’s why it is currently a relatively low-level HR issue in most companies, and not a strategic business concern, despite whatever rhetoric we hear to the contrary.

Kossek: I agree with you on the argument that it needs to be framed as a strategic issue more than time off for parents, but I think some work/life professionals will not like what you are saying.

Friedman: The point is that “work/life” is read as entitlement and zero-sum by most business leaders. This is the wrong language for affecting real change from within the corporate system. Total leadership casts the dual interests of increased business results and enriched lives as mutually reinforcing, with an emphasis on the skills that leaders at all levels require. I have found in my adventures as head of global leadership develop-

ment for a large company that there’s much greater receptivity when you start the dialogue with increased business results and enriched lives as the goals. This approach is intended to break us out of the typical “work/family balance” mindset, in which “balance” is the operative term, reinforcing the traditional zero-sum view.

Kossek: Yes, “balance” is a funny word. Roles may never be truly in balance. Sometimes one gives more to the family, and sometimes more to work. One needs balance over a life cycle.

Friedman: I believe the normative pressures implied by “balance” are inhibiting, even crippling. We don’t want people to think that they have to be role models for what is typically seen as balance – in the sense of equal engagement in both work and personal life – do we? I believe the work/life movement stands for choice, which is why I prefer “alignment” (of actions and values, no matter what they are) and “integration” as the means for achieving it.

Kossek: What did you learn about universities compared to business corporations? What would you like to communicate to
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common phenomenon. Because we conducted indepth analyses of how being a primary earner affected women, their marriages, and their husbands or partners, our findings were very relevant and in the news.

It’s important for us to transition the National Study into a program, in part, so that we can address these on-going calls for data and for analyses. We were not funded to do the special issue of the *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. Unlike some academics, we don’t have funded time for pursuing these interests. You are either working on a funded project, or doing extra work. Thus, we have redesigned the National Study of the Changing Workforce as sequential five-year efforts. Funders can be either contributors or sponsors. In addition to funding the overall study, sponsors are also supporting a special report. Under this new scheme, we will produce one overall report and six topical reports between now and 2006.

I must also comment on the significance of the financial support we have received from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. After the ’97 Study, the Sloan Foundation provided us with funds to create and disseminate public-use files for both the 1992 and 1997 surveys. As we prepared for the ’02 study, the Sloan Foundation granted resources to cover the considerable costs of data collection. That kind of support makes it possible for us to “dare to dream.” I think of these Sloan grants as miracles. In so many ways, the National Study has been blessed.

**MacDermid:** I’m very interested to hear that there will be regular reports coming out of the National Study. I think these also can offer some really interesting possibilities for collaboration with the academic community.

Ellen has an ability to develop collaborations that work both for academics and business people. She always makes it look so easy, and she is able to comfortably engage people in conversations. She’s always got all these facts from the NSCW at her fingertips, and makes the information accessible. She often looks like she does it as easily as breathing.

I think people should know that Ellen really works at this. Once, Ellen was presenting some of the preliminary findings from her book, *Ask the Children*, at a meeting of the Work & Family Roundtable. She explained that the book was literally hot off the press and that she was still in the process of developing her presentation. Consequently, she needed to consult the book at several points during the meeting when she wanted to make specific points. It was a real revelation for me to see how hard Ellen has to work to make it sound so easy. It was a good lesson, because I realized that it takes a special kind of person or character to work both with academics and practitioners AND it takes hard work. Even Ellen has to work really hard to build this relationships and communicate with these different groups.

It often seems like there is a really big divide between academics and business people. One of the great things about the National Study is that it helps to encourage a dialogue about:

- What’s quality research?
- What’s relevant research?
- What’s rigorous research?
- What are the appropriate benchmarks?
- What kinds of thing we should be measuring?

I think that the business and academic interest in the National Study is really positive because I think that it can bridge the gap.

**Galinsky:** The mission of the Families and Work Institute is to provide data to inform decision-making. So, it’s not only important for us to figure out how to do the study, but we always work really hard to communicate the meaning of the findings. I think a lot about how to say what we are saying, because it might not be heard if you don’t say it the right way.

Obviously, we want our work to be very rigorous, and you keep the communications consistent with the findings, but you have to say it in a way that can be heard, particularly if your data challenge the way people think about specific issues. I do try out what I’m going to say lots of different ways before I actually go public with it, to see if I can talk about the findings with language and with stories and with facts in a way that the findings can be heard. With research, you have questions that you care about, and you don’t know what you are going to find. Then you get all of these numbers back and, WOW, you start to see the story inside the numbers. And, you have to figure out how to tell people what the story is in new and compelling ways. I do think that you have to be bi-lingual, tri-lingual, quadra-lingual to walk in the different worlds of business, academia, government, and the media.

The National Study has been designed to be a true collaboration. The sponsors and advisors bring their issues forward as part of the study design, so it’s a partnership from the beginning. It’s a respectful partnership. A good project respects and responds to everybody’s interests in ways that are honest.

---
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universities, now that you’re back in one?

Friedman: Unlike private sector organizations, universities don’t seem to have the same capacity to switch rapidly back and forth between part-time and full-time workers, nor do they have the same degree of flexibility in general. Universities are more rigid than businesses because they are buffered from market pressures to a greater degree, and so the more traditional labor market models seem to hold on longer in academia.

Kossek: Don’t you think tenure adds to the rigidity of the labor market?

Friedman: Tenure is another factor that seems to slow down universities’ responsiveness to change in labor market dynamics. Universities don’t feel compelled to respond to the war for talent in the same way companies do. Yet more and more people who would have traditionally been academics are creating different kinds of careers for themselves, more than a few forming hybrid careers that cross academia and business. These new career models are likely to drive universities to become more flexible and responsive to market pressures.

Kossek: I agree with this larger framing, not only for practice but also for research. The work/life field needs to rethink the language and the research questions asked. The research needs to be broader and more interdisciplinary. We need to ask different questions. We need to publish in more management journals, more mainstream HR and OB journals. It is still viewed as a fringe issue by many mainstream researchers. This summer, I will talk to new Ph.D.s for the Academy’s HR Division on how to manage work and family issues. While this is a good step, it would also have been good to have a research focus as well for these students, to attract them to the topics of our field.

Friedman: I agree, Ellen. I’d encourage you to consider stretching the boundaries of your talk a bit, and make this point when you’re talking to the next generation of people coming into academia. Help them to see that, as the growing body of evidence shows, work/life is not only a social movement intended to benefit the next generation of children in our society, it’s a field with powerful ideas for cultural transformation that compel businesses to make more intelligent and humane use of people and technology.
The 2001 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award
Excellence in Work–Family Research

Harriet B. Presser and Suzanne Bianchi were presented the 2001 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award at the annual work-family conference, “Persons, Processes, and Places: Research on Families, Workplaces and Communities.”

The award-winning papers were selected by a panel of scholars from different disciplines. The panel was chaired by Shelley MacDermid, Purdue University.

In 1999, Shelley MacDermid, Director, Center for Families at Purdue University, developed the idea for an award and approached the Boston College Center for Work & Family about collaboration. The award is named in recognition of Rosabeth Moss Kanter, author of the 1977 monograph, “Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy.” MacDermid states: “Her work demonstrates sensitivity to the needs of both families and organizations. This dual perspective is something we need to promote.” {For more details about the award, the process for selecting the winners, and the 2000 recipients, please read the Sloan Newsletter, Autumn 2000 2(3).}

2001 Kanter Award Winning Papers

Our sincere congratulations to Presser and Bianchi.

“Nonstandard Work Schedules and Marital Instability” A Conversation with Kanter Award Co-Recipient Harriet Presser

by Cheryl Caron

Harriet Presser is the 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 and she is the past President of the Population Association of America (1989). Prior to her appointment at the University of Maryland, she 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. Her 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.

Editor’s Note: Harriet Presser is the co-winner of this year’s Kanter award for an outstanding article entitled, “Nonstandard work schedules and marital instability.”

Presser has created an impressive body of work around an important issue not previously studied—the widespread prevalence of employment at nonstandard hours—that is, evenings, nights, or rotating shifts. Her innovative research has shed light on the determinants and effects of nonstandard work arrangements and, specifically, on how families develop strategies to care for children.

Presser’s research was ahead of its time and many of her ideas are just taking root. Recent scholarly and popular publications have focused on nonstandard hours and “split-shift” or “tag-team parenting.” Additionally, a number of researchers, union leaders, and policy makers have called for more research on nonstandard hours.

Presser is currently conducting research regarding the relationship between disability status and nonstandard hours of employment, funded by the National Science Foundation. We look forward to reading more of Presser’s work and thank her for her substantial contribution to the work-family area of study.

How did you select this particular focus of study — nonstandard work hours.
Presser: As a demographer and sociologist, I became interested in the effect of women’s employment on fertility expectations. With the growth of maternal employment in the 1970s, I was particularly interested in how child care problems—related to the first child—affected the timing of the second child and the total number of children women wanted. Care child questions had not been asked in fertility surveys, and I played a role in getting the Census Bureau to add such questions to the June 1977 Current Population Survey.

In analyzing these data, I found that one-fifth of all preschool-aged children were cared for by fathers when mothers were employed. Since almost all of these fathers were also employed, this finding intrigued me and I wondered if there was substantial “split-shift” parenting among dual earner couples—that is, one spouse working mostly in the evening and night and the other mostly in the day. I found data on work schedules from the May 1980 Current Population Survey, and discovered (with my co-author Virginia Cain) that one-third of all two-earner couples with preschool-aged children were split-shift couples. This study, published in *Science*, was the start of a long-term investigation of the movement toward a 24-hour economy and its consequences for families. I am currently writing a book on this topic.
Previous research reports the increase of women in the workforce and the “absence effect” — when women spend less time in the home. Can you tell us about these changes and how this phenomenon is having an impact on the American family?

Presser: The growing prevalence of split-shift parenting means that the home-time structure of family life is changing. With sequential parenting, two-parent families look like one-parent families in many ways from a child’s perspective. Among single mothers, there is considerable split-shift parenting between mothers and grandmothers. These grandmothers are often otherwise employed. Moreover, when parents work late or rotating hours, the number of child care arrangements that are needed is often greater than when they work days. Overall, child care becomes an especially complex issue when parents work nonstandard work schedules. Also, when parents work evenings, they are often not having dinner with their children, which I regard as the most significant daily ritual of family life. There is a wide range of issues that need to be addressed concerning the impact that working nonstandard hours has on parent-child interaction and child development. Unfortunately, the available data are very limited in this regard.

In this article, you specifically report on nonstandard work hours and marital instability. Can you discuss what led you to consider this aspect of family life?

Presser: I am interested in the consequences of nonstandard work hours, in general, and a key secondary data source to study this is the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Since the NSFH is a longitudinal survey, I was able to examine whether married couples nonstandard work schedules at the first wave of the survey were associated with marital instability by the second wave of the survey, about five years later.

You report that both married men and women with children who work late night hours (after midnight) have the highest rate of marital instability during this period. Tell us about the added stress on marriages in these situations.

Presser: It is interesting that it is only among couples with children that there is a significant relationship between late hours of employment and marital instability. I think sleep deprivation combined with the added stress of rearing children has its toll. Also, if you look at the types of night jobs that are often held, they can be very demanding. For example, many women night workers are nurses, waitresses, or cashiers. All of these occupations are service positions that require continuous diligence. Many mothers then come home to care for their young children. This is true of fathers, also, who may be employed as policemen or work in other stressful occupations at night, and then come home to their young children in the morning, as their wives go off to work.

What recommendations can you give to other researchers who are interested in accessing data about work and family issues?

Presser: It is important to study not only how many hours people work, but which hours they work—and what the consequences are for family life. In particular, we need studies of the consequences of parental employment at late and rotating hours for children. Large data sets are needed, so the number of cases for rigorous analysis by type of work schedule and age of child will be sufficient. Since doing special surveys on this topic can be very expensive, an alternative is to “piggy-back” work schedule questions to on-going surveys—an approach I have used in the past. It would be good to do this for on-going studies on child development—again, if they have large sample sizes. There is also a need for intensive qualitative studies, preferably longitudinal, on the effect of nonstandard work hours on parent-child interaction and child development.

In conclusion, what do you think is important about this topic of research?

Presser: We are moving toward a 24-hour economy, in which various factors external to the family are affecting the temporal nature of employment and, consequently, the temporal nature of family life. One-fifth of all employed Americans work mostly in the evenings, nights, or on rotating schedules. One-third of all two-earner couples with children are split-shift couples. As my study shows, nonstandard work schedules can affect the stability of marriages. It may affect families in other profound ways. We need to know more, so that we have a more realistic view of family life today and better anticipate changes in the future. Such knowledge would also enable us to develop more informed family policies that take into account the temporal complexities of family functioning and child care needs.

Related Publications by Harriet B. Presser


Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?” Interview with Kanter Award Co-Recipient Suzanne Bianchi

by Cheryl Caron

Suzanne M. Bianchi is 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 Women’s 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. 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 “Men in Families,” and is serving as a member of the Committee on Family Work Policies of the National Academy of Sciences.

Bianchi’s research focuses on women’s and children’s economic well-being and changing patterns of work and family life. Her research on the relationship between women’s increased economic independence and marital disruption (with Liana Sayer) won the National Council on Family Relation’s Rueben Hill Award for the best paper published on the family in 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. Bianchi, with Lynn Casper, recently published Change and Continuity in the American Family (2002, Sage Publications). She has published in major journals and is co-authoring two forthcoming books (see list of publications at end of article).

Suzanne Bianchi has a penchant for writing award-winning papers. Her most recent award is the Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research. The award-winning paper – “Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?” – is the published version of her March 2000 Presidential Address to the Population Association of America.

Bianchi’s skill is evident in this paper. It is a solid academic paper, grounded in data, and written with an engaging style. She begins the analysis by posing a provocative question:

“The puzzling thing about the reallocation of mothers’ time to market work outside the home is that is appears to have been accomplished with little effect on children’s well-being.”

Bianchi unravels the puzzle by looking at the issue from a somewhat different angle than other researchers. We encourage you to read this award-winning article as well as her other work (see publication list). She kindly spoke with us about her work.

Your research focuses on women’s and children’s economic well-being and changing patterns of work and family life. How did you choose this particular focus of study?

Bianchi: I am a demographer and sociologist. Therefore I am interested in change across cohorts. Personally, I have enjoyed the opportunity to observe behavior across generations – in my family and as a teacher working with students. I have a strong interest in studying how different generations balance work and family. Through my observations and research, I look for periods of change – when does dramatic or rapid change occur? It appears that, in the U.S., the 70’s was a period of rapid and dramatic change. Baby Boom women came of age, birth control was readily available, more young women were pursuing higher education, women began to delay having children, more women were entering the workforce. This intrigued me.

What do you think has been the most significant issue, over time, in studying working mothers and the impact of their work on the family?

It seemed to me that there was, and continues to be, a great deal of concern that the rapid movement of women into the workplace may cause children to suffer as a result of their mothers’ reallocation of time from parenting to work responsibilities. Additionally, there was concern that the larger community would suffer from a lack of investment in schools and community – civil society responsibilities that women traditionally spent their time doing.

There were fairly large estimates of how much the investment in children might be changing. Anecdotally, it seemed to me, mothers were certainly reallocating their time but it didn’t seem that they were reallocating it away from their children so much as reallocating it to preserve time with their children. Obviously, something had to give. To investigate this, I embarked on a new type of data collection, the time diary data collection tool. This would allow me to get a handle on what people reported they were actually doing with their non-work hours. If we don’t analyze this correctly, we might be overly dramatic in our estimates of how much the increase in women’s labor force participation is perhaps curtailing time invested in children.

We have to think carefully when change occurs and not assume, right away, that we know how that change is playing out. People adjust and they consider what is important to them and then they make decisions about how to allocate their time - within constraints, naturally. They try to maintain what is important to them.

In the Kanter award-winning article, your analysis includes a section on mothers’ work in developing countries. How does this relate to our experiences here in the United States?

Bianchi: As a demographer, I am fortunate to have colleagues who study demography in other countries. There is a rich literature available regarding who does take care of children, in developing countries, when mothers’ time is allocated to activities other than child rearing. That perspective allowed me to think about, historically, in the U.S, how caregiving was, perhaps, put together by multiple people. Just because mothers are in the home, we can’t assume that what they have to do in the home is automatically compatible with spending time with their children. The developing country literature makes that clear because there are often tasks that women have to do that interfere with child minding. When one goes back and looks at the historical literature in the U.S., when households were larger, child minding wasn’t always carried out by the mother. Frequently other family members and older siblings provided care. The historical record in the U.S. isn’t exactly comparable.
with developing countries but thinking about the contrast in different times and places helps me to get a better handle on what is going on today. Too often, we forget that comparative analysis.

You also report that, as more women entered the workforce, some child activities were shifted to fathers. Do you think this has been a positive or negative shift?

Bianchi: I’m not sure I can comment on whether this is positive or negative. I think it is different. We are on a road to more gender similarity in what men and women do. I do have an interest in how fathers interact with their children and what activities they are participating in. Children are being raised differently. I am interested in finding out who orchestrates or manages the activities of the family and who provides the real care of the children, as opposed to, providing fun activities.

In the paper, you suggest that we may have overestimated the time non-working mothers spent with their children and have we underestimated the time working mothers spend with their children. Can you elaborate on this?

Bianchi: It was assumed that mothers in the 60s spent so much time with their children but there were other competing activities in the home. The question is – how much time was actually spent in one-on-one quality interaction? There has been a big change in our standard of living and there have been advances in technology that assists us with those other activities in the home. For example, we now have microwaves for cooking which decreases the amount of time mothers spend on that activity. Today, we are seeing a decrease in the time mothers spend on housework and a decrease in volunteerism. Spending time with children is the last thing working mothers give up. Also, parenthood is a more voluntary thing. When people can opt out of parenting altogether or delay child bearing until they are ready, we may be seeing a changing “selectivity” in who becomes a parent.

What recommendations do you have for further research in this area of study?

Bianchi: I think we need a better sense of how technology alters how we care for our children. For example, the cell phone is sometimes being used to monitor children. Is this increasing communication? Is the cell phone communication a work interruption? E-mail is another new technology that increases communication. Parents are using e-mail to communicate with children who are away at college. Is e-mail at work being used to communicate about family issues?

We also don’t have a handle on the interactions of non-resident fathers with their children. Are expectations for non-resident fathers changing in regard to care of the children? No one study is the “be all, end all” but a compilation of research on a number of topics and subgroups of mothers and fathers and children is needed.

Tell us about your current/future research projects.

Bianchi: I just completed a project on demographic changes in the family, with Lynne Casper. Our book, Change and Continuity in the American Family, was published in January 2002.

Currently, I’m working with John Robinson and Melissa Milkie on a Sloan-funded project involving new time diary data collection on American families. We are co-authoring a book from the project—Changing Rhythms of Work and Family Life. I also have funding from the Russell Sage Foundation to research whether growing income inequality in the U.S. has resulted in growing inequality in parental investments in children over time.

I am also very interested in what family spillover there is at the workplace; interruptions in work to handle family issues. Keeping work and family issues completely separate is an illusion.

Related Publications by Suzanne Bianchi


“The Child Care Problem: An Economic Analysis” A conversation with Author David Blau

by Teri Ann Lilly

David Blau is Professor of Economics and Fellow of the Carolina Population center at UNC - Chapel Hill. He is a labor and population economist with research interests in two main areas: the economics of aging, and the economics of child care. Blau published his first paper on child care in 1988 and has published a total of ten papers on child care in refereed journals. He also organized a conference and edited the resulting conference volume on The Economics of Child Care (1991), co-edited a special issue of the Journal of Human Resources (Winter 1992) on child care, and authored a paper on child care subsidies forthcoming in a National Bureau of Economic Research volume on means-tested transfers in the U.S. His new book, The Child Care Problem: An Economic Analysis, was published in October 2001 by The Russell Sage Foundation. He has presented papers at numerous conferences, forums, and government meetings on child care, and attended the White House conference on child care in 1997. He has been awarded three grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) to study child care issues, and two from the Russell Sage Foundation, including a one year visiting scholar appointment at Russell Sage.

Editor’s note: Blau has been researching child care issues for about fifteen years. In this book, Blau draws upon that knowledge base to analyze child care issues in US. He synthesizes and critiques research investigations from various disciplines, discusses conceptual issues, and presents a model for reform. The book is broad in scope and rich with data and empirical results—a treasure for researchers and policy makers. Blau presents his economic analysis in a nontechnical fashion to encourage all readers to think about the “problem” and solutions.

David Blau is a researcher who steps outside of discipline boundaries to inform his analysis. Consequently, his recent book, The Child Care problem, presents a fresh, distinct, scholarly approach to the issues.

This unique approach evolved over a 15-year span of researching child care issues. Trained as a labor economist, Blau initially asked basic economic questions: “What factors influence people’s decision to work or not, specifically women with young children?” “How does the cost of child care influence the labor supply behavior of mothers of young children?”

Over time, Blau began reading articles outside of economics from the large body of literature on child care. Much of this research was by sociologists and psychologists and focused on child care quality. Blau became intrigued with the issue of quality, an issue that “economists don’t have much to say about.”

Blau reflects, “It seemed to me, quality was as important an issue as cost, because of the fundamental fact that quality of child care affects child development. I began thinking about approaches that would allow me to draw on the insights from the child development literature and use them in an economic framework.”

The book is the product of this innovative approach. Blau’s analysis identifies the main problem in the child care market—Low Quality.

“When you read popular literature by advocates of child care you get the sense that there are big problems in the market. Economists have very well defined tools to identify whether markets work or not. I systematically tried to identify the kind of market failures that many people were asserting...I found that most of the problems identified as failure were localized, transitory, or were misunderstandings of how markets function. The real problem that I identified is that high-quality child care is expensive, and for whatever reason most people are not willing to spend as much money as it takes to purchase high-quality care. The consequence is that children may be harmed by sub-optimal care.”

“Society should care about the quality of child care,” argues Blau. “What strikes me about childcare policy is that you can use childcare for two purposes: (1) encourage employment of families with young children to participate in labor market and (2) enhance the quality of childcare to improve child development.”

The tension between these two policy perspectives is a recurring theme throughout the book. Most child care policies encourage employment. Blau explains his perspective: “Why do we want to encourage or subsidize the labor force participation of mothers of young children as opposed to subsidizing the general cost of bearing and raising young children — whether the mother is in the labor force or not.”

It is from this perspective that Blau proposes a market-oriented model for child care that addresses the problem of low quality care. “My proposal is a radical departure; it would make child care subsidies contingent on the quality of care—the family would get a higher subsidy if they use a higher quality of care.” Under Blau’s model, a mother who wants to provide developmental benefits for her children by placing them in a high quality preschool or childcare arrangement would be able to subsidize the care – whether or not she worked.

continued p20
Blau notes that some parents have more difficulty finding child care, such as those who work nonstandard hours, have low income, and have children with disabilities. Although his proposal does not specifically address special populations, Blau feels that the proposed subsidy is generous enough to relieve some of the problems, for example, the mother who needs to work nights, the higher cost of finding childcare should be to a large extent covered. He cautions that the subsidy would not cover the needs of every family. For instance, if a child is severely disabled, a more targeted program would be needed to supplement the subsidy.

Blau summarizes, “I think the proposal fits pretty well with a lot of developmental psychologists’ perspective of the child care market. It doesn’t fit well with the perspective of many economists, who tend to be more employment oriented, encouraging employment for low-income mothers to be economically self-sufficient.”

“I have been pleased by the generally favorable reaction to the book from readers who have contacted me. Ironically, the readers who have been most interested in following up on the reform ideas have been from other countries—England, Holland, and Japan. Policy makers in the U.S. may not be ready for the kind of change in direction I propose.”


FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE WORK OF DAVID BLAU, PLEASE GO TO:

HTTP://WWW.BC.EDU/WFNETWORK, CLICK ON LITERATURE DATABASE, ENTER BLAU IN AUTHOR FIELD, CLICK ON SEARCH.

“Careers In and Out of Organizations” Author Tim Hall Revisits the Study of Careers

by Teri Ann Lilly

Biographical sketch: Douglas T. (Tim) Hall is Professor of Organizational Behavior and Director of the Executive Development Roundtable in the School of Management at Boston University. His research and consulting activities have dealt with career development, the new employee-employer contract, executive succession, management of diversity, and work/life issues. He is a fellow of the Academy of Management and the American Psychological Association and is currently serving on the board of governors of the Center for Creative Leadership, and as a visiting scholar at the Boston College Center for Work & Family. He is the recipient of the American Psychological Association’s James McKeen Catell Award (now called the Ghiselli Award). In 2001, Hall received the Everett Hughes Award from the Academy of Management for his research on careers. Hall holds an Erskine Visiting Fellowship at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand.

Editor’s Note: To illustrate what we meant by the theme of this Newsletter—“Generations of Thought in Work-Family Research”—we suggest you read Tim Hall’s recent book, Careers In and Out of Organizations (2002, Sage). This volume traces the evolution of key concepts and ideas introduced in his 1976 book, Careers In Organizations, and places them within the context of contemporary work communities. We had the pleasure of speaking with Hall about the changing context and nature of careers.

“Looking Back”

In 1976, Hall published Careers In Organizations, which was one of the first publications to link two areas of study, careers and organizational behavior. Hall observes, “At that point in time, career literature could be found in different departments, vocational psychology, sociology, and education. The literature was fragmented, not highly differentiated. There were no courses on careers in schools of management and business, and certainly no Careers Division in the Academy of Management.”

In the context of the early 70s, career boundaries were firm, bounded within the organization. “Simpler definitions of career prevailed; they were rooted in professional interpretations of advancement and success. In the behavioral sciences, scholars did view careers as a process and from a less value-laden perspective. Everett Hughes was writing about objective careers (a lifelong sequence of jobs) and subjective careers (the particular experiences in those jobs.)”

The protean career

In the final chapter of his 1976 book, Hall identified an emerging form of career. “It was speculation, based on anecdotal evidence. Although a reasonable one, given the social and economic turbulence following the Vietnam war years.”

Hall referred to this emergent form as the protean career—a term taken from the Greek sea god Proteus, who could change shape at will. Hall conceptualized the protean career as a career driven by the needs of the individual rather than the organization and characterized by frequent change, autonomy, and self-direction.

Work/Life issues

Hall recalls, “Work/life issues were absent from the 1976 book
and to my knowledge, they were not a part of the research or practice area. The increasing number of women entering the workforce stimulated an interest in women’s issues (not even gender issues!). At the time, most of the career related research considered women who were employed (full-time or part-time) and women who were full-time homemakers. And researchers were just beginning to study the work and family domains.”

Hall credits Rhona and Robert Rapoport with establishing work-family as an area of study. “The Rapoorts created an analytic framework for studying the issues by separating out the component parts—her career, his career, her family, his family.”


Although Hall does not mention his own contribution, he, too, conducted pioneering research that examined roles and dual-career couples and conflict (Hall 1972; 1973), Hall & Gordon (1973), and Hall & Hall (1979; 1980).

Revisioning the book—The 21st century
When Hall began thinking about his recent book, he thought he would revise the 1976 volume. “But the book took on a life of its own, and it became in part a revision and in part a completely new book.”

Work/life issues
Hall observes, “The starkest difference between the 1976 volume and the current one is probably the area of work/life. In the current book, I note that work-life issues are a clear part of the career landscape, both in research and in practice.”

In this book, Hall devotes a chapter to work/life issues. He reviews and analyzes related work/life research and discusses organizational and career implications. Following the chapter, Hall includes a section with suggestions for research—something he does throughout the book.

Protean career
Another remarkable change is the nature of the career. “The protean career is no longer emergent, it has emerged full-blown,” Hall declares.

Careers have become more of a subjective and internal matter. As the protean changes occurred, boundaries became more permeable. Hall, however, argues that today’s careers are not totally boundaryless as some have argued.

The role of the organizations
Within the current context, organizations face many forms of transformation, for example, merging, acquiring, redefining mission, downsizing, etc. Acknowledging the changing boundaries precipitated by transformations, including large numbers of self-employed and temporary (contingent) workers, Hall added the “and out of” to the title of the new book—Careers In and Out of Organizations.

In the recent book, Hall does include a chapter about organizational process on career development. He admits to some hesitancy about the chapter, because “career development can no longer be found as an specific, managed activity in many organizations.”

For Hall, the protean changes in career do not remove responsi-

bility from organizations to offer support. He does not suffer lightly organizational claims that we are now in an era where it is up to the individual—“rationalizations!”

However, tight resources are a reality and Hall advocates the creative use of natural resources. Hall underscores the importance of making links between career development and corporate success. In his book, Hall proposes strategies that “use the everyday work of the business as the engine for career development.”

Hall writes:

“The main difference in where we are now early in the 21st century and where we were in 1976 when Careers In Organizations was published, is that we have a solid understanding of organizational intervention points of factors that enhance career development. We know that people grow as a result of challenging job assignments and from supportive and challenging relationships, serious self-reflection, professional assessment of talent, with appropriate feedback and developmental planning” (Careers In and Out of Organizations, p. 311).

“Looking Ahead”
Just as Hall introduced the protean career as an emerging form, in this book, Hall introduces an emerging view of career as a calling. The notion of calling taps into our need to find meaning in our work.

Hall explains, “The notion of calling brings with it a sense of community within which we do our work, and that our work should contribute to others.”

We thank Hall for his contribution to the community and encourage you to read Hall’s recent book and the impressive body of work that he has produced.

References

Generations of thought: the study of careers
Related publications by Douglas T. Hall
Go to http://www.bc.edu/wfnetwork, click on literature database, enter hall douglas into “author” field, click “search”.

Rights Information
“What’s Happening to Home? Balancing Work, Life, and Refuge in the Information Age”: A conversation with Maggie Jackson

by Teri Ann Lilly

Maggie Jackson currently a freelance writer, specializing in workplace and work-life issues, and writing mainly for The New York Times and The Boston Globe. She was the national workplace columnist for The Associated Press from 1995 until 2001. Jackson received a B.A. in English from Yale University in 1982 and a degree in International Politics from the London School of Economics in 1990. She served as a foreign desk editor and business desk editor at The Associated Press. In 2001, Jackson received the 3rd Annual Conference Board/Families and Work Institute Award for Outstanding Work-Life Journalism. She is the recipient of an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation research and travel grant to visit the Sloan Centers on Working Families.

The complexities of modern life have prompted us to change the meaning of home, often “unconsciously” argues Maggie Jackson, workplace columnist. In her recently published book, Jackson explores basic questions about what “home” is as we move from the industrial age to the computer age. In today’s technologically wired world with increasing work demands, Jackson suggests that the boundaries between home and work blur and the lines between private and public fade.

Mirroring these challenges, the book juxtaposes each chapter with excerpts from the diary that Jackson kept while writing the book. The entries document Jackson’s home as a “work-in-progress” while illustrating the idea of home as personal and subjective. “Just as the larger questions of life, work, identity, and love get played out on the smallest of scales, so these diaries capture the seeming trivialities that represent core ideas of home (p 162).”

Jackson’s approach to the topic of work and family boundaries is fresh and original, emanating from her background as a journalist. She began her career working abroad reporting on general topics in different countries. When she returned to the States, Jackson looked at U.S. culture and social trends with an outsider’s perspective. In the mid-90s, her work became more focused on workplace and work-family issues. At about the same time, Jackson was juggling work, caring for her two small children, and caring for her elderly parents.

In 1997, Jackson began to think about the far-reaching role of the company in the U.S. Employees were increasingly turning to corporations for solutions for work-family balance, such as caring for their children, providing health clubs, setting up grocery services, and more. Jackson notes, “I became intrigued about the controversial status of employee, neighborhood, community. The company becomes the surrogate home, raising issues of power and freedom.” Jackson makes this point in an article, that resonated with many; the article was published in over 165 Newspapers (“Is Your Company Your New Hometown?” September 1998).

On the cusp of the millennium, Jackson was asked to write an article about work and family balance from an historical perspective. The article was published in July 1999 and is entitled “100 Years of Home and Work.” The assignment gave Jackson the opportunity to build a strong knowledge base of work and family issues. As she explored the issues from different angles, Jackson noticed that the intrusion of work on home or the relevance of home was a key issue for many of the folks she interviewed. She began to think about the implications of being technologically connected, including the loss of privacy.

The knowledge gleaned from writing these key articles, coupled with her personal experiences, inspired Jackson to consider “home as the starting point for any discussion of work-family balance, not an afterthought.” To answer her questions, she read extensively, looked at social trends, called and called experts, and began interviewing. She conducted interviews with 225 people by both telephone and in person from all walks of life across the country. Jackson’s search for answers also led her to Sweden, a country that is noted for its interest in work-family balance issues and as a “hot place for technology.”

With the tenacity of a journalist and researcher, Jackson pursued an answer to her question: “What is home?” Jackson’s goal, however, is not to provide a definitive answer in the book, rather to shatter assumptions, to challenge the reader to revision home. A devoted urbanite and committed to her work, Jackson does not want to recreate the homes of the past. Indeed, one senses that Jackson sees home in this technologically wired world as a frontier. “We are all pioneers in this recreating of home.”

About her own experiences, Jackson writes, “While writing this book, I learned the importance of keeping boundaries between home and work, public and private, here and there. But I learned how to make and remake those boundaries, cross and recross those boundaries without turning my life into a jumble (p. 162).”

Jackson continues to push the boundaries of her career. Recently, she was awarded an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Grant to report on work and family research produced at the Sloan Centers for Working Families. Of course, Jackson promises to keep thinking about home, creating home, and recreating home as she continues her work.

Where Should We Go From Here?

By Marcie Pitt-Catsouphes, Ph.D., Boston College

In November 2001, the Sloan Work and Family Network invited Network affiliates and other academics who presented at the February 6-7 work-family conference “Persons, Processes, and Places” to respond to an electronic survey. This survey asked people to reflect on the past, present, and future of the work-family area of study.

We were pleased that 66 people took the time to respond to our survey. Indeed, many prepared very detailed and elaborate responses. We thank all of you who contributed.

The responses to some of the questions were included in the 2002 Work and Family Timeline, posted on the website of the Sloan Work and Family Network. We would like to encourage all of you to look at this timeline, and contact us with your suggestions for additions and corrections.

One of the questions included in the survey asked respondents to identify work-family topics and issues that have not yet been sufficiently studied and/or adequately addressed. The top three issue areas needed further research attention identified by the respondents were: contexts & culture (16 respondents), social justice (11 respondents), and workplace response (10 respondents). It will be interesting to see how these topics are addressed over the next 5 – 10 years.

The following summarizes the responses. For more information about the Online Survey, please go to the Sloan Research Network Library of Papers, Presentations, and Reports, and go to Sloan Network Products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Perceptions of Work-Family Topics Not Yet Sufficiently Studied (n = 66 *)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please note: The total does not equal 66 because some respondents left this answer blank, whereas others provided more than a single response.

A Preview

In the next issue of the Research Newsletter, we will include an article about Chandra Mason, a Ph.D. candidate at CUNY. She has prepared a paper discussing the methodology and analysis of those 100 work-family research articles cited most often in the social science literature. The results of her work were incorporated into the 2002 Work-Family Timeline.

Chandra’s paper will be posted on the Sloan Full-Text Library. Please see her list of the 100 Most Cited Articles. PDF
The MIT Workplace Center: Redesigning Work, Family, Community Connections
An Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Center

Established in July 2001, the MIT Workplace Center’s stated aim is “to build — in theory and in practice — a mutually supportive relationship between the performance of firms and the well being of employees, their families, and communities.” The Center will combine research on work and family with experimental models for change in selected workplaces. The Goal is to draw on that experience to “create multiple templates for work practices that promote work-family integration. Currently, research is being conducted in the Boston area health care industry.

The Center’s prestigious staff include: Lotte Bailyn, Ph.D., Co-Director, Tom Kochan, Ph.D, Co-Director; Ann Bookman, Ph.D., Executive Director and Mona Harrington, Ph.D., Program Director.

The MIT Center has charted an impressive agenda, which is underpinned by four key strategies: research, stakeholder dialogues, workplace experiments, and public education.

Research strategies
—analyze the structure of the greater Boston regional economy and its labor force and gather data on trends in key industries. These data form an empirical base for possible interventions.
—collect information on the firm level about work processes, technological and work performance innovations, and work-family policies.
—document the gap between work structures and policies and the realities of family life and map appropriate responses (this is done in particular workplaces).
—assess workplace-based experiments; record process of designing and implementing systemic workplace change and evaluate the outcomes.

Stakeholder dialogues
—engage all stakeholders in the examination of work-family problem and design of solutions
—organize dialogues with stakeholder groups with the aim of reaching broadened mutual understanding.

Workplace experiments
—collaborate with those who work inside a firm and others who are affected by work practices.
—redesign of work systems and employee practices.

Public education
—develop and pilot educational programs regionally and nationally
—communicate with popular press and academic press

For more information about this exciting new Workplace Center, please visit http://web.mit.edu/workplacecenter/
Contact: (Phone) 617.452.2199.

New Research Center to Focus on “Designing Work Wisely”

Thanks to Kimetha Firpo for telling us about this new Center! The Center for Designing Work Wisely (CDWW) is a new, non-profit, research organization that works to enhance the performance of organizations and outcomes for employees through improvements in organizational design and work processes and increased flexibility in the location and scheduling of work.

To advance the effort to help companies and employees develop a 21st Century workplace, CDWW will focus on three areas of work:

Core Research—which focuses on a broad range of organizational practices to strengthen and guide the development of superior ways to design and practically manage effective workplaces;

Applied Research—a collaboration of for-profit organizations who want to pioneer applied research that benefits organizations and employees; and

Advocacy Campaigns— a new, focused set of sustained initiatives geared to change fundamental thinking and habitual practices that block the innovation that could grant us entry into the 21st Century workplace.

CDWW will be jointly led by Dr. Eileen Appelbaum, labor economist and leading researcher in the field of management and organization practices, and Kimetha W. Firpo, a former work-life management consultant to Fortune 500 companies.

Dr. Appelbaum is co-President of CDWW. She also serves as Director of the Center for the Study of Women and Work at Rutgers University. Previously, Dr. Appelbaum was Director of Research at Economic Policy Institute in Washington, D.C.

Ms. Firpo is also co-President of CDWW. She managed the U.S. client services function of WFD/Ceridian. Ms. Firpo also served as vice president of Harris Bank, where she came to appreciate the power of workplace practices in building business strength—while designing, developing and managing the bank’s work/life programs in concert with her other responsibilities.

CDWW board members include Paul Rupert, President of Rupert & Company (Chairman), Gil Gordon, President of Gil Gordon Associates (Vice Chairman), and Linda Marks, Principal, Rupert & Company.
We look forward to learning more about this innovative Center. Contact: (Phone) 202-331-5513. Visit CDWW at http://www.cdww.org/

MARIAL CENTER AT EMMORY UNIVERSITY LAUNCHES NEW PUBLICATION

Elizabeth Kurylo of the MARIAL Center reports the following information regarding their program.

This semester, the MARIAL Center will publish its first newsletter, called “Families That Work: Newsletter of the Emory Center for Ritual and Myth in American Life.” Articles in it will describe MARIAL research projects, programs and guest speakers.

Emory University’s MARIAL (Myth and Ritual in American Life) Center was founded in the fall of 2000 through a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The Center focuses its research on the functions and significance of ritual and myth in dual wage-earner, middle-class families in the American South, with the aim of understanding how family cultures are produced and reproduced under conditions of modern working life. The Center is directed by Dr. Bradd Shore, a cultural anthropologist.

The MARIAL Center has four basic purposes: to promote scholarly studies of myth and ritual among working families in the Southeastern United States; to train the next generation of scholars to focus attention on American middle-class families; to publicize findings through scholarly channels and more broadly through the media; and to find ways to use the insights gained from research to encourage and foster positive social change. MARIAL research is done by an interdisciplinary team of faculty, students and postdoctoral fellows involved in a collection of distinct but related projects. Current research projects focus on story-telling and the transmission of family histories; rituals of adolescents and teenagers; family scheduling, ritualization and stress; public policy implications of contemporary myths of motherhood and their class associations; and the influence of Baptist family-life centers.

For more information, please go to MARIAL: The Emory Center for Myth and Ritual in American Life. www.emory.edu/-College/Marial/about/index.html

TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE NEWSLETTER:

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE NEWSLETTER, PLEASE CONTACT THE MARIAL CENTER AT: MARIAL CENTER, EMMORY UNIVERSITY, EMMORY WEST SUITE 413E, 1256 BRIARCLIFF ROAD, ATLANTA GA 30306—PHONE: (404) 727-3440, EMAIL: MARIAL@LEARNLINK.EMORY.EDU, FAX: (404) 712-9520.

Aspen Institute’s Initiative for Social Innovation through Business

by Nancy McGaw

The mission of the Aspen Institute’s Initiative for Social Innovation through Business (Aspen ISIB) is to increase the supply of business leaders who understand – and seek to balance – the relationship between business success and social and environmental progress.

Toward that end, we focus on the education of current and future business leaders. Signature programs include:

CasePlace.Org – Aspen ISIB has recently gone live with a new resource for business school faculty – www.CasePlace.org. This is an online searchable database of business case studies and supplementary teaching materials that enable business school faculty to integrate discussion of pressing social and environmental issues into the MBA curriculum.

It is searchable by thematic keywords and features links to case sources and background materials to enrich the cases. This free site is designed for business school faculty, students and many others with an interest in incorporating Social Impact Management into the core curriculum. New cases and other materials are added weekly. Many faculty have been contributing ideas and materials to the site.

The site includes a special section on current events which suggests ways to bring current events into the classroom to stimulate students to connect what they are learning to today’s news and to anticipate some of the timely questions (e.g. Enron).

Business Leaders Dialogue – an annual invitation-only meeting held in Aspen, Colorado that provides an opportunity for leaders to reflect and engage in frank discussions about the changing role and shifting public expectations of corporations.

Developing Balanced Leaders – a learning network of experts in executive education who share experiences and build knowledge about cutting-edge executive education programs that train balanced business leaders – those who can effectively steer corporations within the complex social and environmental dynamics of a global marketplace.

Beyond Grey Pinstripes – a biennial survey of business schools,
conducted in partnership with the World Resources Institute, to assess what their MBA programs are doing to prepare graduates for social and environmental stewardship.


Research Studies

The Most Frequently Cited Work-Family Articles and Levels of Explanation: A New Approach to Theoretical Integration

by Chandra Mason

Chandra Mason is an advanced doctoral student in the Social-Personality Psychology doctoral program at The Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York. She earned a B.A. with a major in Psychology from the University of Virginia and a M.A. in Psychology from James Madison University. She demonstrated an interest in work and family issues early in her career with her Master’s thesis in which she compared two models of work-family behavior that implied different “solutions” (i.e., equal division of household labor versus work-family program participation) to work-family conflict. The research project described below was conducted as a partial requirement for the doctoral degree.

Editors note: Chandra Mason’s project created a buzz at the February Conference, “Places, Processes: Work, Families and Community.” Mason has been collecting and analyzing data on work-family articles that are most frequently cited in the Social Sciences Citation Index. Mason has kindly written a couple of summary paragraphs about the project.

As noted by Rosalind Barnett (1997), shared paradigms and dialogues are rare in the field of work and family. Specifically, Barnett criticized the field as “hampered by the lack of an inclusive model” and “ atheoretical” (p. 126). In response to this criticism, she proposed an extensive model of work-family behavior that integrated work and family research.

In my training as a social psychologist, I encountered a conceptualization of social psychological research that also promises to lend an organizational structure: levels of explanation. First proposed by Willem Doise (e.g., 1980), this approach rests on the premise that a thorough appreciation of a given social psychological phenomenon requires 4 levels of explanation: intrapersonal processes, inter-personal processes, power and status relationships among social groups, and socially shared beliefs, norms, expectations and representations. While Doise’s central goal was to detect the conceptualization and operationalization of a given research endeavor on multiple levels of explanation (i.e., articulation), this approach also serves as a way to organize a body of research to reveal complementary aspects of seemingly disparate research questions and findings within it. Doise’s system may be more appropriate for the tasks of organizing and describing research activity than all-inclusive theories of work-family behavior that are difficult to test. The levels of explanation approach carries the additional benefit of being relevant to any field of research.

Therefore, I explored the viability of Doise’s conceptualization as an organizing structure for a sample of articles from the literature on work and family. Following Doise’s (1980) example, I applied the levels of explanation lens to a sample of the most frequently cited published articles that I generated using the Social Sciences Citation Index. Based on this systematic analysis, I concluded that work-family articles in the sample generally were articulated; every article combined at least 2 levels of explanation. The analyses also revealed that all levels of explanation were represented in the sample; however, there appears to be a preoccupation with theorizing the effects of level 4 constructs (e.g., the effects of gender ideology), rather than the level 4 constructs themselves. Perhaps most importantly, reviewing research in terms of levels of explanation proved to be a useful organizational tool for a sample of publications from this rapidly growing, diverse body of research. Likewise, this review suggested that the practice of engaging the levels of explanation framework in all stages of research may help researchers to streamline logic, reveal gaps in theory, and underscore poor operationalization. Through this systematic approach to research, we can evaluate our own and other researchers’ progress towards theoretical development in the field of work and family research. PDF

<CMASON@gc.cuny.edu> Copyright C. Mason


View Mason’s List of “100 Most Frequently Cited Articles in Social Sciences Citation Index.” Go to Sloan Network Library of Papers, Presentations, and Reports.

Forthcoming: Mason has kindly agreed to post her complete paper in the Sloan full-text Library.

Forthcoming: The Sloan Newsletter, summer issue, will include a complete article about her project, including her methodological approach.
The Consequences of Work, Community, and Parenting Resources and Demands for Family Well-being

by Patricia Voydanoff

Using a resources and demands approach, I am examining the extent to which work, community, and parenting resources and demands influence three aspects of family well-being (marital quality, family integration, and adolescent adjustment). The study is based on data from 578 married two-earner couples with a child aged 10-17 interviewed for the 1992-1994 National Survey of Families and Households.

Parents’ time in paid work and community activities has curvilinear effects on family well-being. Fathers who work short hours and spend low amounts of time in community and professional organizations report higher levels of family well-being than those who spend a moderate or high amount of time. However, mothers who work a moderate or high number of hours tend to report higher family well-being than those who work short hours. In addition, fathers and mothers who spend moderate and high amounts of time in organized youth activities and informal helping report higher family well-being than those spending a low amount of time. The same is true for adolescents’ time in organized youth activities. These findings reveal the effects of tradeoffs between the social and psychological resources accompanying participation in work and community activities and the time demands associated with moderate and high levels of participation.

Work and community demands are stronger predictors of family well-being than work and community resources are. Resources such as parents’ job satisfaction, community satisfaction, and satisfaction with friends are positively, but not strongly, associated with family well-being. However, the demands, negative work spillover and economic strain, have relatively strong negative effects on family well-being. Adolescents’ peer-based school problems also are negatively related to adolescent adjustment. In addition, harsh parenting behaviors are positively related to adolescent problems and grades, whereas nurturing behaviors are positively related to grades but unrelated to adolescent problems. The findings support the resources and demands approach to varying degrees for the resources and demands included in the study. Few gender differences are found. The study is a relatively comprehensive examination of the combined effects of work, community, and parenting resources and demands on family well-being.

Contact: Pat Voydanof, voydanof@flyernet.udayton.edu. For more information and a biographical sketch of Voydanoff, view the Sloan Research Profile.


by Shelley MacDermid

This project brings researchers, labor leaders, and corporate managers together to collaborate in a change effort to develop and implement a new plan for the time (i.e., duration) and timing (e.g., schedules) of work. The research team was invited to the project by an international labor union that has represented workers at the site for 40 years. The setting for this project is a plant in southern Indiana that is part of a global manufacturer of flexible packaging and pressure-sensitive material. The work schedules at the plant were designed about 20 years ago with a younger workforce that may have been more attracted to economic incentives and less encumbered with family responsibilities outside of the workplace such as childcare or eldercare. The plan also was designed when fewer employees were women with children and members of racial and ethnic minority groups.

The research team will examine the views of management and diverse groups of workers and family members regarding the existing procedures for devising and assigning work schedules. We also will assess the relationships between existing work schedules and productivity, absenteeism, and the quality of work life and family life. Second, we will design and implement a cooperative labor-management-researcher change effort to develop a new work schedules plan. We will incorporate the views of both workers and family members about work schedules into discussions of new arrangements. We will also attempt to assess the effects of this enhanced participation on work and family outcomes. Our research will address the following questions:

What are management’s and workers’ expectations and experiences of the rewards and costs of shiftwork?

How do workers experience working nonstandard schedules as compared to regular daytime schedules? What are the implications for marital quality, family relationships, and interactions with children?

How do gender, family structure, and life cycle interact with reactions to shiftwork? How do the presence and ages of children influence families’ experiences with shiftwork?

How does worker and family participation in shaping alternative work arrangements affect their subsequent response to the time demands of work?

Contact: shelley@purdue.edu
The Effects of Parental Shiftwork on Children’s Socioemotional Well-Being

by Roz Barnett

We received a new 3-year grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The grant is entitled, “The Effects of Parental Work Schedules on Children’s Socioemotional Well-being: A Study of Dual-earner Families with Shift-working Mothers.” The purpose of the study is to better understand the consequences of day-shift and evening-shift work schedules for RNs and for their families.

The project team includes, R. Barnett, Principal Investigator, K. Gareis, Project Director, and D. Ellis, Project Administrator.

The sample will be married female RNs in dual-earner couples who work day or evening shifts and have at least one child 8-13 years of age. The grant focuses on (a) the reasons why dual-earner couples with school-aged children opt for nonstandard shift work; (b) the rewards and concerns they associate with their shifts; (c) their concerns about their children’s well-being; and (d) the workplace, school, and community policies that hinder or facilitate their ability to manage their work and family demands. To our knowledge this is the first systematic study to address these issues. The study will proceed in two stages. First, we will conduct a series of focus groups to be followed by in-depth quantitative survey interviews with 60 families—30 in which the mother is a day shift worker and 30 in which the mother is an evening shift worker. In each family, we will interview the mother, father, and all children 8-13 years of age.

Contact: Roz Barnett, rbarnett@brandeis.edu. For more information and a biographical sketch of Barnett, view the Sloan Research Profile.

Academic Motherhood: Managing Complex Roles

by Kelly Ward & Lisa Wolf-Wendel

Academic Motherhood: Managing Complex Roles is a four phase study of women faculty managing work and family while on the tenure track. Phase One of the study is complete and involved interviews with 30 women from research universities throughout the country. These women represent a cross-section of disciplines and varying levels of institutional prestige. What we found from these interviews is that these women have a lot of individual wherewithal and manage their work and family lives without a lot of institutional support. Analysis of the transcripts reveals five themes that cut across all participants, regardless of the institutions and fields in which these women work. The themes that emerged from the data that are the focal point for this project thus far: (1) The joy of professional and personal roles, (2) Perspective making, (3) Academic life, (4) Role models and others, and (5) Institutional contexts. A summary of these themes follows.

Perspective making. One of the most common sentiments expressed by study respondents was that having a child makes one set priorities and for many of the women in the study, children were number one priority.

Academic life. The structure of academic life, especially for those in their pre-tenure years at research universities, has many characteristics that both encourage and inhibit women with small children. Among the most encouraging factors, for example, are the flexibility and autonomy afforded to faculty. Indeed, while touting the flexibility of academic life and its helpfulness in raising a family, respondents also noted the significant price one has to pay.

Role models and others. A major finding of this study is the role that other people play in brokering one’s ability to smoothly combine work and family. The function role models and others play manifest in many forms and serve, in particular, as shapers of perception and direct sources of support and challenge.

Phase Two includes interviews with women from masters/comprehensive universities, Phase Three women from liberal arts colleges, and Phase Four women from community colleges. Data collection will be completed in Spring 2002. We are hopeful of making a rather definitive statement about life on the “mommy track” for junior women faculty as the result of this research. Past research in this area has been very limited and has also failed to look at women from all institutional types.

Contact: Kelly Ward kaward@okstate.edu. For more information and a biographical sketch of Ward and Wolf-Wendel, view the Sloan Research Profile.
Joint Work/Family and Work/Life Conferences

February 2002
San Francisco, CA

For the first time, three key work/life conferences were held contiguously: The American Work Life Professionals (AWLP) Conference, College and Universities Faculty Association (CUWFA) Conference, and the The Business and Professional Women’s Foundation (BPW)/ Alfred P. Sloan Foundation academic work-family conference.

Attendees of the conferences shared a joint networking reception where many attendees enjoyed renewing, or forging new acquaintances. The following morning, demographer Harold Hodgkinson gave a dynamic presentation at a joint plenary. Hodgkinson is Director of Center for Demographic Policy at the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, DC.

According to feedback, one of the most interesting statistics for researchers and corporate folks alike concerned retirement: Of the 70 million folks aged 46-64, 80% plan to work during retirement; 1/3 will work for interest and enjoyment; 1/4 for income; 1/5 plan to start a new business or career.

Many remarked that it was an important step forward to include some joint sessions. However, some attendees commented that the joint meetings accentuated the different perspectives brought to work and family issues. One well-known researcher noted that the three groups were “talking in completely different languages!” She emphatically stated, “We need to bridge the perspectives of academics, researchers, policy makers, business leaders, and other.”

Persons, Processes, Places: Research on Families, Workplaces and Communities

San Francisco, CA
February 7-9, 2002

Throughout the conference, attendees voiced their astonishment at the number and breadth of the sessions.

The success of the conference may be attributed to the guiding hand of organizer Shelley MacDermid, The Center for Families at Purdue University, the inexhaustible and welcoming staff from the Business and Professional Women’s Foundation and the generous support of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

A Few Snapshots

Animated discussions spilled over into the hallway following the first research plenary. How do we approach our research? How important is context? What are our underlying assumptions? How do we reframe the work-family relationship? Is it a means-end relationship? The debates stimulated by the following presentations continued throughout the conference.

The First Research Plenary

“Process, Process, Process”
by Rosalind Barnett

“It Could be Otherwise”: Institutions and Inequality in Work-Family Research”
by Erin Kelly

“Where is the Work in Work-Family Research?”
by Kathleen Christensen

Attendees lavished praise on the session topics, which, among others, included the following.

- Work of Sloan Centers on Working Families
- Work and family needs among union-represented workers
- Identity at work
- Fathers at work and at home
- Corporate America and women of color
- The underside of “family friendliness”
- Low-income fathers
- Measurement and theory
- Experiences of workers who travel
- Gender at work
- How do settings matter?
- Culture at its roots
- Adult development and paid employment
- Low-wage workers

Which session to attend? This was the dilemma the attendees faced because of the multiple choices. Perhaps that is why some sessions had few in attendance, such as the session devoted to “Corporate America and Women of Color.” Presenter Jennifer Tucker noted the sparse audience and expressed the wish that more had attended.

This informative session included the following presentations.

- “Work and Family Concerns of Latina Mothers: The Aspiration-Attainment Disparities” by C.M Villanueva, M.M. Schlehofer-Sutton & B.L. Guzman

For information about these papers, please contact wfnetwork@bc.edu

Some of the sessions stood out as “boundary-pushers.” For example, the session entitled, The Work-Family Interface: Frontiers in Theory and measurement, included the following innovative papers.

- “The Interactive Effects of Work Life and Home Life” by Friedlander, F. & Delbecq, A.
- “Toward a Theory of Work-Family Facilitation” by Gryzwacs, J. To view.
- “Developing a Model of Successful Work-Family Fit” by Rothausen, T.
A Few Impressions

The number and diversity of the conference sessions mark the breadth of the burgeoning work-family area of study.

Taken together, the conference session topics (and presentations) illustrate the growing sophistication of the work-family research.

The large number of graduate students, attending and presenting, indicates both the growth and appeal of the area of study.

The number of professional disciplines represented underscores the cross-discipline nature of the research and the importance of a conference that bring us together.

Taken together, the animated discussions, the differences of opinion, the questioning of methods and frames point to a successful and productive conference!

Expanding Synergies
American Work Life Professionals (AWLP)
Conference
February 6-8, 2002

Conference raises provocative issues
by Susan Seitel, President, Work & Family Connection

In the midst of the recession, AWLP’s February conference had its own economic reality, with 300 fewer attendees than attended last year, and some former corporate work-life managers showing up as new consultants, looking for clients or another job, whichever came first. But as always, it was an exciting, stimulating place to listen and learn from each other about our field.

Here are just a few of the things we learned:

A session called “The Latest in the Debate on Child Care Policies” made it painfully clear that there is no real public debate on this policy and never has been. It left us wanting to organize parents everywhere to raise money (a dollar a year would do it) and pay lobbyists to convince policymakers of the importance of the first five years of a child’s life. We overheard hallway talk about the idea of merging employee assistance and resource and referral services. (“Submerge is more likely,” said one worried small R&R provider, already suffering from the loss of subcontracts). The hope expressed by many is that when big EAPs tack R&R services on to their offerings as a value-added, they’ll give them the investment and marketing they need to succeed.

We learned about the wonderful, comprehensive new plans for the AWLP/Boston College credentialing program (read the list of core competencies at <www.awlp.org/certification>). We heard more exciting news about work-redesign – both process and results. It was enough to want to learn more, including why it isn’t on every company’s agenda.

And in an edge-of-your-seat final session about the future of the field, we heard presenter Stew Friedman suggest that “work-life” is actually the wrong name for what we do. Top management, he said, sees it as a zero-sum game, as entitlement. “But say it’s about driving performance,” he said, “and you can get anyone’s attention.”

This year’s AWLP conference was a little unsettling, always provocative, and sometimes inspirational. And it left us exactly the way a good conference should – with some unresolved questions, and a great desire to pursue the answers.

Copyright Sue Seitel

CUWFA
“The Heart of the Matter: Valuing Diversity in Work/Life”
The College and University Work/Family Association (CUWFA)
February, 6, 2002
San Francisco, CA
CUWFA Conference Day

College and University Work/Family Association (CUWFA) held the 7th annual conference in conjunction with the AWLP conference. “CUWFA is an organization dedicated to providing leadership in facilitating the integration of work and study with family and personal life in institutions of higher education. CUWFA offers services to support the diverse group of professionals contributing to the development of work/family programs and policies on campus: human resources administrators, student services administrators, work/family managers, child care and elder care program directors, senior administrators, faculty, and others...” for more information (summary is forthcoming), please go to http://www.cuwfa.org

The keynote speaker was LaDoris Cordell, Vice Vice Provost on Campus Relations and Special Counselor to the President, Stanford University. She discussed strategies for change for work/life programs within Universities.

Implementation of flexible working schedules within universities was the focus of the Plenary, given by David H. Rodbourne, Vice President, Center for Ethical Business Cultures.

Sheila B. Kamerman, Ph.D. Receives Lifetime Achievement Award

February, 2002

We thank John McNutt, Ph.D., Boston College Graduate School of Social Work, for sending us this notice. McNutt is National Chair of Social Welfare Policy and Practice Group.

The Social Welfare Policy and Practice Group presented the Lifetime Achievement Award to Dr. Sheila B. Kamerman, Ph.D.,
Interim Dean and Compton Foundation Centennial Professor of Social Work, Columbia University. Dr. Kamerman is clearly one of the most prolific scholars in our field and has contributed greatly to our understanding of the role of social policy in society. The selection committee, consisting of George Haskett (Chair), Kathleen Sisko and Richard Hoefer, considered a large number of excellent nominations. Dr. Kamerman joins Dr. Alfred Kahn (a former teacher and frequent co-author) and Dr. Bruce Jansson who received the award in previous years. She has written numerous books and articles on work-family issues, including child care policy, family leave policy, and workplace responsiveness.

The Social Welfare Policy and Practice Group was created to encourage the study and teaching of social welfare policy and policy practice within social work education. The group is further concerned about the creation of optimal social policy and social welfare policy.

Catalyst Gives Award for “Redefining Diversity in 21st Century Workplace”
New York, NY
April 11, 2002
The annual Catalyst Award Dinner and awards ceremony was held April 11, 2002. Avon Chairman and CEO, Andrea Jung, presided over the awards ceremony.

Catalyst reports: Each award is given to proven initiatives that establish innovative programs to attract, advance, and retain the best and the brightest talent while monitoring the representation of women from entry level to the senior executive.

The 2002 Catalyst Award was given to Bayer Corporation, Fannie Mae, and Marriott International.

—Bayer Corporation’s initiative focuses on developing women and people of color over time and providing them with the tools to rise up the multi-divisional global Bayer Ladder.

—Fannie Mae’s initiative reaches inside and outside Fannie Mae to educate both employees and customers about the benefits of a diverse workforce and a diverse society.

—Marriott creates a three-pronged approach where women construct a personal development plan that identifies goals and allows them the ability to move throughout the different businesses of the 24-hour a day hospitality company.

Each company presented an in-depth analysis of the award-winning initiative at the full-day Catalyst Award Conference.

For more information, visit <http://www.catalystwomen.org>.

PAPERS/PRESENTATIONS/CASE STUDIES
AVAILABLE ON THE SLOAN NETWORK
The Sloan Network is piloting a full-text “Library of Papers, Reports, and Presentations.” For more information, go directly to full-text library http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/wfnetwork/library/index.html

We thank our initial contributors and encourage others to send us their papers!

Recent Publications

REPORTS FROM RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS


To download, please go to: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=266687

Books


Asian Consumer and Family Economics Association (ACFEA) Conference
Deadline for submission of papers is November 1, 2002.
The Fifth Biennial Conference of Asian Consumer And Family Economics Association (ACFEA) will be held at College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan, on July 2-4, 2003.
All papers are to be written in the English language. Only completed papers will be accepted for review.
In addition, authors of papers that are outstanding in quality and content will be invited to submit their work to a special issue of the Journal of Family and Economic Issues. Papers published in this special issue will be selected on the basis of a blind peer review that is separate and apart from the review process for the conference.
For more information, go to http://www.socialsciences.nccu.edu.tw/ACFEA/2003_call.htm

Special Issue of the Journal of Family Issues
Contributions from the national Studies of the Changing Workforce
Submissions are due by December 1, 2002
The Center for Families at Purdue University and the Families and Work Institute are collaborating to edit a special issue of the Journal of Family Issues. Shelley M. MacDermid, Ellen Galinsky, and James T. Bond are guest editors.
The 1992 and the 1997 National Studies of the Changing Workforce are the first detailed examinations of work and family issues with nationally representative samples in almost two decades. These data sets now are available to researchers for analysis. The submitted manuscripts must include analyses of one or both of the data sets.
For more information, see announcements on the main page of the Sloan Research Network http://www.bc.edu/wfnetwork or contact shelley@purdue.edu.

“Innovative Research in Management”
The IInd European Academy of Management Conference
May 9 - 11, 2002
Stockholm, Sweden
The EURAM conference is organized by the Stockholm School of Entrepreneurship in collaboration with Scandinavian Academy of Management
The European Academy of Management (EURAM) is an open, international and multicultural European Forum for networking and research in management. EURAM emphasizes multidisciplinary theoretical perspectives and methodological pluralism as well as critical examinations of the historical and philosophical roots of management theory and praxis.
Special track on Work-Family Issues is organized by Stephen Poelmans <poelmansteven@iese.edu> and Sue Lewis <s.lewis@mmu.ac.uk>.
Scholars from all fields of management are invited to jointly participate in the exciting exploration of innovative and creative ways of theorizing, conceptualizing and studying management and business.
Complete information is available at http://www.sses.com/public/events/euram/

“Building Effective Networks”
Academy of Management
August 8-14, 2002
Denver, Colorado
The theme: Examining and understanding the what, why and how of building effective networks. For more information, visit http://www.aom.pace.edu/

“Allocation Processes and Ascription”
American Sociological Association
August 16-20
Chicago, Illinois
The 2002 Annual Meeting will focus on the allocation processes that generate or contain ascription-based inequality.
For more information, go to http://www.asanet.org/convention/homepage.html

Fifth international meeting on “Work, Stress and Health”
March 19-22, 2003
The fifth international meeting on “Work, Stress and Health” will be held in Toronto, Canada.
As in past years, the meeting will be sponsored by the American Psychological Association and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in the United States. They will be joined this year by a third hosting organization, the School of Business at Queen’s University.
Work-family issues were a very prominent part of the four prior conferences, and will no doubt again be a major focus at the next meeting.
If you have any questions or suggestions, please feel free to contact Julian Barling (jbarling@business.queensu.ca).

Asian Consumer and Family Economics Association (ACFEA) Conference
July 2-4, 2003
Taipei, Taiwan
The Fifth Biennial Conference of Asian Consumer And Family Economics Association (ACFEA) will be held at College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan, on July 2-4, 2003. The deadline for paper submission is November 1, 2002. The deadline for poster and panel proposal submission is January 20, 2003.
The central topic of the conference is to improve the well being of consumers and families. Professionals in economics, consumer economics, family economics, agricultural economics, marketing, management, political science, education, psychology, sociology, social work, and other related fields are welcome to submit papers, poster proposals, and panel proposals addressing theoretical, empirical, methodological, pedagogical, and policy issues as they apply in an Asian context.
For more information, please go to http://www.socialsciences.nccu.edu.tw/ACFEA/2003_call.htm