Beyond Work-Life "Integration"

Joan C. Williams,[1] Jennifer L. Berdahl,[2]
and Joseph A. Vandello[3]

[1]Center for WorkLife Law, University of California, Hastings College of the Law,
San Francisco, California 94102; email: williams@uchastings.edu

[2]Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
British Columbia V6T 1Z2

[3]Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620

Keywords

Abstract

Research on the work-family interface began in the 1960s and has grown
exponentially ever since. This vast amount of research, however, has had
relatively little impact on workplace practice, and work-family conflict is at
an all-time high. We review the work-family research to date and propose
that a shift of attention is required, away from the individual experience of
work and family and toward understanding how identity and status are de-
fined at work. Several factors enshrine cherished identities around current
workplace norms. The work devotion schema demands that those who are
truly committed to their work will make it the central or sole focus of their
lives, without family demands to distract them. Importantly, the work devo-
tion schema underwrites valued class and gender identities: Work devotion
is a key way of enacting elite class status and functions as the measure of a
man—the longer the work hours and higher the demand for his attention, the
better. Advocating change in the way work is done and life is lived meets re-
sistance because it places these cherished identities at risk. Resistance to these
identity threats keeps current workplace norms in place. This is why even
the business case—which shows that current practices are not economically
efficient—fails to persuade organizations to enact change. What is needed
now is sustained attention to the implicit psychological infrastructure that
cements the mismatch between today's workplace and today's workforce.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

The study of the work-family interface can be traced back to at least the 1960s (e.g., Goode 1960, Kahn et al. 1964), but research on the topic has seen explosive growth since the 1980s. Demographers have documented several trends that frame the field. First is the shift away from the breadwinner-homemaker family: In roughly 70% of American families with children, all adults are in the labor force (Williams & Boushey 2010). The second demographic shift is the sharp rise in men's participation in family work: Men's household contributions doubled between 1965 and 2000, mostly due to increases in men's time spent providing child care (Bianchi et al. 2000). Both trends pull in the direction of greater gender equality.

The workplace has not kept up with these trends. Although families have shifted toward equal parenting, the workplace pulls them in the opposite direction. For professionals, the rise in over-work leads to neo-traditional families, in which the father typically has the "big job" while the mother's workforce participation is curtailed to support his. Less privileged workers often face just-in-time schedules that change daily and weekly, often with little notice (Lambert et al. 2014),

requiring low-wage workers to make brutal trade-offs between supporting their families and caring for them.

The classic tool for persuading businesses to adopt new practices is to demonstrate their bottom-line economic benefits, also known as "the business case." After 25 years of demonstrating the business case for family-friendly work practices, however, businesses have not been persuaded to adopt them. A key—but little examined—question is why. The answer requires attention to questions that have rarely been posed in the psychological literature on the work-family interface: how fundamental social identities and statuses are forged on the job. Sociologists have chiefly explored this psychological issue. The vast majority of studies in the psychology literature on work and family have focused on the individual experience (Casper et al. 2007), sometimes on what organizations can do to help individuals, but not on organizational and social contexts that define their experiences. We believe this is why, to quote Ellen Kossek and colleagues, "Work-family researchers have not made a significant impact in improving the lives of employees relative to the amount of research that has been conducted" (Kossek et al. 2011a, p. 353). Our hypothesis is that identities constructed around the ideal worker norm (Williams 2000) and the work devotion schema (Blair-Loy 2003), combined with gendered identities regarding masculinity and motherhood, have made the business case impossible to hear and time and career norms extraordinarily resistant to change. What's needed now is sustained attention to the hidden psychological infrastructure that cements the mismatch between today's workplace and today's workers.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SIX MAJOR STRAINS OF WORK-FAMILY RESEARCH

Industrial-Organizational Psychology

The bulk of research on the work-family interface has been in industrial-organizational (I/O) psychology. The primary focus of this research has been on the individual experience of work-family conflict, its correlates, and refining tools of measurement (e.g., Masuda et al. 2012). A notable and important exception is the growing literature on informal organizational support and workplace cultures (e.g., Hammer et al. 2011, Swanberg et al. 2011). Measures of work-family culture and perceptions of informal managerial support can be more important than formal policies on employee affective and behavioral outcomes (Behson 2005). Hammer and colleagues (2011), for instance, designed a supervisor-training program intended to increase family-friendly culture. The training program was effective (increasing job satisfaction, reducing turnover intentions) for employees high in work-family conflict but actually counterproductive for employees with low work-family conflict, which may explain why movements toward family-friendly work cultures are hard to sustain.

Social Psychology

Until recently, experimental social psychologists have been little engaged in the work-family field: a 2007 review found that only 2% of work-family studies used experimental designs (Casper et al. 2007). Most salient are the studies on the maternal wall and the flexibility stigma in the *Journal of Social Issues* and on redesigning and redefining work in *Work and Occupations* (all coedited by Joan C. Williams). These studies demonstrated the nature and extent of discrimination against working mothers, the flexibility stigma to caregiving fathers, and how work norms and structures are hostile to or supportive of balancing work and family. Like I/O psychology, the focus of this research has been at the individual level of analysis, but social identities and cultural norms inform its theorizing.

Survey Research

A third important arena of work-family scholarship consists of survey-based studies documenting the rise of workplace flexibility policies. A crucial resource for both scholars and advocates is the Study of the Changing Workforce database of the Families and Work Institute (Aumann et al. 2011, Bond et al. 2002). This work documents the rise in organizations' adoption of a canonical array of flexibility policies that include telecommuting, flextime (the ability to change starting and stopping times), compressed workweeks (working full time hours in less than five days a week), and reduced hours arrangements. The steady rise in the adoption of such policies ended with the Great Recession of 2008. As of 2010, many organizations were reducing or eliminating flexibility policies, with the largest drops in flextime (SHRM 2010). Post-recession, no increase occurred except in ad hoc telecommuting (Kossek et al. 2014).

The Business Case

A fourth key area of research documents the business case for workplace flexibility. For a good recent summary, see the pamphlet that prominent work-life scholars wrote for the Society for Human Resource Management (Kossek et al. 2014). Work-family conflict costs employers in decreased job satisfaction and commitment from their employees (Kossek & Ozeki 1998), more frequent absenteeism and intentions to quit, greater attrition, and lower job performance and career success (Anderson et al. 2002). Effective flexibility policies enable employers to attract and retain from a much broader talent pool than do time norms that artificially privilege breadwinners married to homemakers (e.g., Kelly et al. 2008, Kossek & Michel 2010). Longitudinal studies document that work-family conflict predicts physical and mental health deterioration over time (e.g., Goodman & Crouter 2009, Van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009), further costing employers in absenteeism, productivity, and health insurance. Many studies report business benefits of restructured work, including improved recruiting and productivity and decreased turnover intentions and absenteeism (Kelly et al. 2008, Kossek et al. 2006, Moen et al. 2011).

Action Research

A fifth strain of work-family research was founded in the 1990s by Lotte Bailyn's *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate World* (1993). Bailyn's "action research" involves working with companies to design, study, and document a workplace intervention. Bailyn's collaborative interactive action research (CIAR) model reflected a dual agenda combining the goals of increasing the retention and advancement of women with improved business performance. The CIAR model involved intensive interventions designed to question the gendered assumptions that shape organizational time norms and uncover ways in which overwork leads to poor planning, decreased productivity, and other organizational detriments. Bailyn's 2002 coauthored book describes a number of interventions, some of which proved sustainable and some of which did not (Bailyn et al. 2002). More recent action research projects bump up the level of rigor, relying on randomized control experimental designs (Kelly et al. 2014), discussed below.

Cultural Comparisons

A final growing area of scholarship examines public policy in cross-cultural context, documenting that the United States has the fewest work-family reconciliation policies of any developed country and the longest work hours (OECD 2014). Jody Heymann's (2013) path-breaking work

documented that the United States stands alone among developed nations for its lack of paid maternity leave. Janet Gornick and Marcia Meyers' (2003) work highlights how many fewer family supports exist in the United States than in Europe, where families benefit from such policies as paid parental leaves as long as six months (US paid parental leave: 0 weeks), a minimum of four weeks paid vacation (US minimum paid vacation: 0 weeks), shorter average workweeks (down to 35 hours/week in France), the right to have one parent work part time until the youngest child is age 12, part-time equity (proportional pay for part-time work), high-quality subsidized child care, the right to request a flexible schedule, and limits on mandatory overtime. American parents "are squeezed for time and pay a comparatively higher penalty for working reduced hours" than parents in most other developed countries (Gornick & Meyers 2003, p. 58).

THE INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE OF WORK AND FAMILY

With that brief overview, we now turn to a closer examination of work-family research in psychology. The field has grown exponentially since the 1960s. A PsycINFO search on the topic reveals a handful of publications in the 1960s leading up to almost 2,000 in the first decade of the twenty-first century. This literature has benefited from many review essays and meta-analyses (e.g., Allen et al. 2012, Amstad et al. 2011, Bianchi & Milkie 2010, Butts et al. 2013, Byron 2005, Eby et al. 2005, Ford et al. 2007, Kossek & Ozeki 1998, Maertz & Boyar 2011, McNall et al. 2010, Michel et al. 2011). By far the most common approach to the study of work and family has been to view them as conflicting domains, referred to as work-family conflict or work-family interference. As we will see, that is only one of the theoretical takes on the work-family interface. This review makes no attempt to summarize every study, or even every theme explored in various studies, but instead sketches a basic background to provide a springboard to defining a way forward for work-family research.

Work-Family Conflict

The theoretical foundations for the conflict perspective on work and family can be traced to the scarcity hypothesis (Goode 1960), which proposes that time and energy are limited, finite resources, and to Robert Merton's role conflict hypothesis, which proposes that people sometimes face conflict among their multiple social roles (Merton 1949). These models were applied to work-family studies in the 1970s, in important early work (Kanter 1977, Pleck 1977, Rapoport & Rapoport 1971) acknowledging the existence of dual-career families and the overlap and conflict between work and family roles. Overall, early research on work and family presented a bleak picture. For instance, conflict theory (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985) proposed that work and family were incompatible domains due to their competing responsibilities. Early research on work and family almost exclusively examined negative outcomes of attempts to combine them, particularly for women and their families. Perspectives that allowed for the possibility of role enhancement would come later.

The framing of work and family as oppositional forces highlighted the need to consider the direction of conflict, from work to family and from family to work. From a scarcity perspective, work-family conflict might be expected to have different directions for women and men due to traditional gender roles. Traditional caregiving roles expect women to devote relatively more attention to family (Eagly 1987), suggesting work should be a greater source of conflict for women than men. Conversely, because of traditional breadwinner roles (Zuo 2004), men's conflicts might be expected to have their source in the home (see Gutek et al. 1991). Indeed, though the earliest studies usually failed to consider the direction or flow of conflict, by 1984 researchers began

to explore family-to-work spillover (Crouter 1984) or family interference with work (FIW, as opposed to work interference with family, WIF). Empirical work has shown that FIW and WIF have distinct antecedents and outcomes (e.g., Frone et al. 1992, Kossek & Ozeki 1998), that rates of self-reported WIF are substantially higher than rates of FIW (Bellavia & Frone 2005), and that sex is only weakly correlated with FIW and WIF (Byron 2005).

By the early 2000s a wide range of studies and several meta-analyses had documented high levels of individual work-family conflict, with negative consequences at work and at home. After 2000 a new perspective became influential: that work and family can enrich, as well as deplete, one another.

Work-Family Enrichment

In 2001, Rosalind Chait Barnett and Janet Shibley Hyde posited an "expansionist" theory: that multiple roles can be beneficial (Barnett & Hyde 2001). This perspective was consistent with earlier work by Catherine Kirchmeyer (1993), designed to reassure employers that women's (and men's) nonwork commitments did not make them less desirable workers, a finding that was duplicated in a more recent study (Allis & O'Driscoll 2007). Another early study documented the benefits of multiple roles for managerial women: This early literature clearly was intended to counter the common contention that working mothers hurt children, families, and themselves (Ruderman et al. 2002). Meanwhile, Joe Grzywacz, Leslie Hammer, and their coauthors explored the theme of positive spillover (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks 2000, Hammer et al. 2005). Other authors explored work-family enhancement (Ruderman et al. 2002), work-family facilitation (Hill et al. 2007, Tompson & Werner 1997, Wayne et al. 2004), and work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell 2006). All of these constructs, the distinctions among which "are not always clear," articulate the mutual benefit of integrating work and family and "the perspective that combining multiple roles can result in beneficial outcomes for the individual" (Allen 2012, p. 1170).

As with work-family conflict research, enrichment studies have examined the direction of the flow of benefit, from work to family and vice versa. The past decade has seen many attempts to review and assess the state of research on work-to-family and family-to-work enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell 2006, Grzywacz et al. 2007, McNall et al. 2010). As early as 2001, scholars recognized that work-family spillover could simultaneously be enriching and depleting (Rothbard 2001). A review by Greenhaus & Powell (2006) found that the 15 studies measuring both work-family conflict and work-family enrichment reported low correlations between them. Heavy investment in work or family roles has a surprisingly small effect on the experience of conflict (Byron 2005); work-family conflict and enrichment are not simple opposites (Allen 2012). For example, in their study of legal secretaries, Weer and colleagues (2010) found that work interference with family diminished employees' work capacity while family-to-work enrichment did not compensate for the diminished capacity. In other words, one's participation in family produces positive spillover to the workplace, but this positive spillover does not compensate for the conflict the workplace introduces for the family, resulting in lower overall job performance.

LIMITATIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL FOCUS

Absence of Context

In the flurry of definition, direction, and measurement of constructs, something was gained, but something was lost: the focus on work-family conflict as a structural problem. Some recent studies do not focus on workplace interventions at all. A notable example advocates making families

happier by urging employees to talk more with their partners about the good things that happened to them at work. The same study proposes that employers should produce more positive affect at work that will spill over at home (Culbertson et al. 2012), which seems too vague a prescription for employers to implement. Indeed, many of the interventions proposed in the work-family literature propose organizational interventions that would leave the workplace-workforce mismatch intact. Examples include proposals to enhance work-family enrichment by creating opportunities for professional development (Molino et al. 2013).

An encouraging recent trend is research that aims to measure organizational culture (Allen 2001, Behson 2005). Much of this work considers the specific aspects of culture, such as work-family climate (Paustian-Underdahl & Halbesleben 2014), work-family culture (Thompson et al. 1999), and supervisor support (Hammer et al. 2011). These studies take a crucially important step in the direction of looking at how workplace ideals are constructed on the job, abandoning the tight focus on individuals' experience of the work-family interface.

Yet much of the research on work-family enrichment is headed in an ever-more-individualistic direction, as evidenced by the recent fascination with the dispositional factors that correlate with work-family conflict (e.g., Wayne et al. 2004). To quote the ever-insightful Joseph Grzywacz and Dawn Carlson, "[v]iewing work-family balance as an individual-level problem borders on victim blaming" for a "challenge [that] itself is the consequence of demographic transitions in the workforce and the American family, and transitions in how work is performed" (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007, p. 458). Although it is no doubt interesting that work-family conflict correlates with neuroticism, negative affect, low self-efficacy (Allen et al. 2012), a preoccupied attachment style (Sumer & Knight 2001), and the Big Five (Michel et al. 2011), and it is mitigated by positive thinking (Rotundo & Kincaid 2008), surely the takeaway is not that employers should address the sky-high levels of work-family conflict among US workers by hiring only the well-adjusted and cheery or that society can rest assured that people end up where they deserve. Plugged into current work structures, the well adjusted and cheery are likely to become neurotic, negatively affective, low in self-efficacy, and subject to negative thinking.

Erasing Gender

In addition, some studies often ignore gender in ways that end up mixing apples and oranges. Although Barnett's expansionist theory focused on countering the "separate spheres" assumption that working women hurt both themselves and their families, family-to-work enrichment studies have not distinguished between a dual-career husband's support for his working wife and a homemaker's kudos to her breadwinning husband; rather, both are captured in a single measure of partner support (Ferguson et al. 2012, Greenhaus & Powell 2006, Grzywacz & Marks 2000). This erasure of gender is troubling given findings that spousal support is particularly important for working wives, even more important than supervisor support (Lee et al. 2014, Wayne et al. 2006), and that wives provide more emotional support for husbands than vice versa (Greenberger & O'Neil 1993). By neglecting gender, family-to-work enrichment measures inadvertently embrace, as uncontroversial and untroubling, some key aspects of male privilege within families.

An excellent critique—tellingly written by Canadians, not Americans—advocates integrating gender more thoroughly, and in a more sophisticated way, into work-family research (Korabik et al. 2008). It pinpoints some of the ways that gender effects are overlooked when researchers use highly gendered categories without acknowledging the key role played by gender: studies of part- versus full-time work and of job categories that are heavily male or female, samples that are heavily skewed toward men or women, or analyses of the impact of egalitarian attitudes on the work-family interface without differentiating between men and women. A meta-analysis of 61 studies found

no overall gender differences in either work interference with family or family interference with work (Byron 2005), yet one wonders what is getting bleached out in the wash. For example, one study found that men with egalitarian attitudes experience more family interference with work than women with egalitarian attitudes and than men with traditional ones (Korabik et al. 2008).

Ignoring Class

Similarly, inattention to class sometimes shapes the field in disturbing ways. The clearest example is that some researchers' insistence on shifting from the term "work-life balance" to "work-life integration" inadvertently embeds a series of class-based assumptions. Studies of nonelite Americans report that they emphatically do not want a work life that pervades their home life. Jessi Streib's study of cross-class marriages found that although spouses who grew up in white-collar households typically exhibit work devotion and prefer work deeply integrated into their lives, spouses from blue-collar childhoods distance their identity from work and create clearer boundaries between their work and home lives; these findings echo prior studies (Streib 2015). Blue-collar men's identities are intertwined with being a good provider, and often they see their jobs as a means to an end—to support their families—rather than a totalizing identity (Williams 2010). Thus, one study found that although physicians worked all of the time, emergency medical technicians took pride in putting limits on their overtime shifts for the good of their families (Shows & Gerstel 2009). Shifting to the terminology of "work-family integration" implicitly takes sides in this debate and embeds the expectation that work will be ever present in the life of every responsible worker. That is why we do not use the term.

A subtler example concerns findings about whether limiting work hours correlates with work-family conflict (Wayne et al. 2004). The important work of Jerry Jacobs and Kathleen Gerson (Jacobs & Gerson 2004) documenting the time divide—that in the United States, high-income workers work too many hours while low-income workers have trouble getting enough hours of work to pay the bills—shows that a measure seeking a simple correlation between work hours and work-family conflict or enrichment is doomed to fail. At a deeper level, the failure to connect work-family facilitation/enrichment/spillover findings with the extensive literature on class would be a loss for both fields, because the work-to-family enrichment measure offers a profound message: It holds the potential to show, with all the precision of measurement I/O psychology offers, precisely how a lack of class and gender privilege makes people unhappy.

BEYOND THE INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE OF WORK AND FAMILY

Prior authors have called for changes in work-family scholarship, and the response has been mixed. We echo one persistent critique, first articulated as early as 1990 (Zedeck & Mosier 1990), and encourage work-family scholars to move beyond their focus on the individual experience of work-family conflict and enrichment toward an analysis of social context (e.g., Eby et al. 2005, Zedeck 1992). In 2007, Casper and colleagues noted that work-family research should make "greater use of longitudinal and experimental research designs, gather more multisource data, and move beyond the individual level of analysis," as well as adopt "more diverse conceptions of family" and study workers in occupations other than nonmanagerial or professional positions (p. 28).

New Methods

Some researchers have answered the call for new methodologies, notably Gerstel & Clawson's (2001) elegant multisource study, which combined in-depth interviews, survey data, and an analysis

of union contracts. Less effective have been calls to shift from cross-sectional to longitudinal studies in order to gain a better understanding of causation (Allen 2012) and calls for less reliance on single-report, self-report survey data (Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999, Zedeck 1992). As of 2007, most studies were still cross-sectional (89%) and correlational (89%), and 77% of studies used only one data collection method (Casper et al. 2007). With some notable exceptions, that remains the case today; however, longitudinal studies have begun to emerge (e.g., Goodman & Crouter 2009, Hall et al. 2010, Hammer et al. 2005, Nohe et al. 2015, Radcliffe & Cassell 2014, Van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009). Given that one-shot survey studies are so much easier and cheaper than longitudinal or multisource studies, their persistence will remain a fact of life in the context of ever-increasing research funding shortages and intense pressures to publish more and faster; longitudinal studies take time and can be expensive. If the field begins to place high value on longitudinal multisource studies, higher-quality research allowing for more in-depth and causal temporal analysis may become more common.

Diversified Samples

On the other hand, work-family researchers have responded admirably to the call to diversify their samples. Although 95% of work-family research has been based on US or British samples (Kossek et al. 2011b), recent studies have explored work-family enrichment in China (Kwan et al. 2010, Siu et al. 2010) and India (Bhargava & Baral 2009), positive spillover in Australia (Haar & Bardoel 2008), the relationship of spillover and sleep quality in Canada (Williams et al. 2006), stress reduction in Germany (Hartung & Hahlweg 2011), work-home conflict and facilitation in Norway (Innstrand et al. 2010), negative effects of work on home life and positive effects of home life on work in South Africa (Rost & Mostert 2007), and work-family facilitation in Albania (Karatepe & Bekteshi 2008), to name a few. Ollier-Malaterre and colleagues (2013, p. 433) point out the various ways in which such studies "conceptualize national context as dynamic rather than static and as heterogeneous rather than homogeneous."

Some fascinating findings are emerging from these studies. One example: Koreans who feel close to their families feel they need to work more to reward their family members for their emotional support (Lee et al. 2011). Another example: Indians report the same level of work-family enrichment regardless of their marital or parental status, presumably because mothers are not assumed to be sole suppliers of children's needs but rather have extended family networks (Bhargava & Baral 2009). An important finding from a recent cross-cultural study of national paid-leave policies and work-family conflict was that paid-leave policies had only modest effects on work-family conflict (Allen et al. 2014), which is troubling, given the nigh-exclusive focus on paid leave among advocates of work-family policy in the United States. An interesting transnational research question is whether less workaholic countries show more work interference with family than family interference with work, as US samples do (Allen 2012).

One review focused on studies in sociology and demography noted that, whereas research before 2000 focused almost exclusively on whites, research on low-income families and families of color increased after 2000 (Bianchi & Milkie 2010). In I/O psychology, startlingly few studies include American nonwhites—a significant oversight because the few studies that exist suggest substantial racial differences. One found a larger gender difference in both family-to-work and work-to-family spillover among Latinos than among whites or blacks (Roehling et al. 2005). Another found that white mothers experience more negative spillover from family to work than black mothers do (Dilworth 2004, p. 256).

Equally exciting are the new studies that address calls by several scholars to examine working-class jobs (Casper et al. 2007, Heymann et al. 2002), such as studies of hourly workers as opposed to

professionals, including studies of legal secretaries (Weer et al. 2010), blue-collar workers (Berdahl & Moon 2013, Rost & Mostert 2007), nurses in Italy (Russo & Buonocore 2012), and hotel workers in Albania (Karatepe & Bekteshi 2008). Other studies explore the impact of unions on the work-life interface of unionized workers (e.g., Berg et al. 2014). No doubt the most influential studies of hourly workers are those examining just-in-time scheduling by Susan Lambert (e.g., Lambert 2008) and Julia Henly (e.g., Henly et al. 2006). Their studies document the harsh impact on workers of just-in-time schedules that change from day to day and week to week, often with as little as three days' notice. Such schedules impose costs on employers that are typically overlooked, notably turnover that reaches as high as 500% a year (Lambert 2008).

Organizational Intervention Studies

"To assume that individual-level work-family relationships translate into system-level change is thus far unsubstantiated" (Grzywacz et al. 2007, p. 560) and is probably unwarranted. Studies are needed that "design organization-wide interventions to avoid or mitigate [work-family conflict]" (Maertz & Boyar 2011, p. 87). Though relatively few and far between, some excellent studies of organization-wide interventions have shed light on how policies can be designed and implemented to help employees balance their work and home lives (Kelly & Moen 2007; Kelly et al. 2011, 2014; Perlow 2012). These organizational intervention studies involve top-down initiatives that enable employees to flexibly manage their work schedules. Studies to document the business case for flexibility have debunked concerns about its cost and disruption to business. We review these studies as examples of what research could look like moving forward to effect real understanding and change, and then we consider social norms that stand in the way of changing how work gets measured and done.

As noted, Lotte Bailyn started doing intervention studies in the 1990s. More recent is Leslie Perlow's study of consultants at the Boston Consulting Group (BCG) (Perlow 2012). Perlow identified that the reason BCG consultants were experiencing such high work-family conflict and burnout was not so much their long hours and travel, but rather the unpredictability of their schedules: People could not make personal plans. Working with a single BCG team, Perlow gave them a collective goal of scheduling predictable time off (PTO). Each team member got one night "off" starting at 6:00 PM for a defined and predictable unit of time each week. "Off" meant no work, no phone, no email, etc. The team would need to have a weekly meeting (with mandatory attendance) for 30 minutes to talk about the calendar for whose night off would take place when and to review whether people took their night off, and if not, what to do differently next time so they did. The intervention was so successful that BCG has rolled out PTO to more than 2,000 teams in 32 offices with 30 facilitators in 14 countries.

Additional intervention studies reflect the work of Erin Kelly, Phyllis Moen, and their coauthors documenting the benefits of a results-only work environment (ROWE) model of scheduling and accomplishing work (Bloom & Roberts 2015, Hammer et al. 2011, Kelly et al. 2011, Moen et al. 2011). ROWE was developed and implemented at the corporate headquarters for Best Buy. Unlike most flexible work arrangements targeted at individual workers, ROWE attempted to change the corporate culture by making flexibility the norm. The culture change was intended to destigmatize the choice to work remotely or in nontraditional hours. Studies of the ROWE model showed that it decreased work-family conflict, negative spillover (Kelly et al. 2011), and turnover (Moen et al. 2011).

The gold standard for this kind of research are the intervention studies by led by Erin Kelly, Phyllis Moen, Ellen Kossek, and Leslie Hammer, financed by the Work, Family, and Health Network funded by the National Institutes of Health. These studies rely on randomized control

trials (Kelly et al. 2014). One such study, performed in the informational technology department of a Fortune 500 company, combined supervisor-support training (Kossek et al. 2011a) with increased worker schedule control. The intervention showed significant, although modest, improvements in work-family conflict and family time adequacy, and larger shifts in schedule control and perceived supervisor support for work-life balance (Kelly et al. 2014).

These studies reinforce earlier findings that demonstrate how organizational culture, practices, and policies can affect work-family conflict. McNall and colleagues (2011) showed that high perceived organizational support is associated with high levels of work-family enrichment regardless of low core self-evaluations (Greenhaus & Powell 2006), indicating the importance of organizational support and the conceptual limits of focusing on dispositional characteristics of the individual worker. A perception of supervisor and coworker support is particularly beneficial in reducing work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Marks 2000, Kossek et al. 2011a), as are family-supportive mentoring programs (de Janasz et al. 2013). Combining supervisor support with schedule control and family-friendly work policies is especially effective (Kelly et al. 2011). And consistent with Leslie Perlow's study of a major consulting firm, team aspects of organizational culture have been shown to be associated with work-family enrichment insofar as team resources can be deployed in the interest of allowing individuals increased flexibility (Hunter et al. 2010).

Value incongruence between individuals and organizations is also associated with greater work interference with family (Perrewe & Hochwarter 2001). To the extent that employees perceive organizations as family supportive, they increase affective commitment. Understanding the impact of informal organizational resources on employee perceptions allows for deeper understanding of the reciprocal relationship between work-to-family enhancement and employee affective commitment to the organization (Wayne et al. 2013).

The Flexibility Stigma and the Business Case

Simple surveys documenting the availability of flexible work options gloss over the important issue of whether organizations stigmatize those who use them. Studies find mixed evidence on the effect of common work-life policies on workers' perceived schedule control (Kelly et al. 2008, Kossek & Michel 2010). Both qualitative and quantitative studies have consistently reported that professionals with flexible work arrangements are viewed as time deviants who are marginalized (e.g., Epstein et al. 1999, Glass 2004, Leslie et al. 2012). Christened the usability problem by Susan Eaton (Eaton 2003), this flexibility stigma deeply flaws many, or most, existing flexibility programs (Williams et al. 2013). Quantitative studies confirm workers' fears. Those who take leaves or use flexible work practices experience slowed wage growth (Coltrane et al. 2013, Glass 2004), earn fewer promotions, have lower performance reviews (Judiesch & Lyness 1999), and are perceived as less motivated and dedicated to work (Rogier & Padgett 2004) than those who conform to the ideal-worker template.

The flexibility stigma literature from experimental social psychology needs to be integrated with studies from I/O psychology on family-supportive workplace cultures to assess which flexibility policies are window dressing and stigmatized and which are embraced and usable. Also important are studies of what Ellen Kossek and colleagues have called the implementation gap (Kossek et al. 2011a). The question is whether the flexibility stigma represents a policy implementation gap or whether it also (or instead) represents resistance within the organization to changing the time norms that frame the identities of powerful actors whose personal and professional identities were forged on the anvil of work devotion.

What matters is whether time norms are changed. Leslie Perlow and Erin Kelly differentiate between accommodation policies that plunk down flexible work arrangements in an environment

where the norm of work devotion remains unchanged and the work redesign model, in which workplace norms are changed for everyone without linking the change specifically to work-family issues—arguing instead that the new model responds to business needs (Perlow & Kelly 2014). Examples of work redesign are the interventions of Kelly and her colleagues and of Bailyn and Perlow's PTO.

In addition, new organizations are emerging that make work-life balance integral to their business models. A 2015 study identifies over 40 organizations with new business models for practicing law in ways that offer better work-life balance for lawyers—many of them men who want to work a flexible 50-hour week rather than being "always on" (Williams et al. 2015b). Other "new models" have been identified elsewhere (Schulte 2014). It would be fascinating to have studies comparing family supportiveness of the workplace cultures of these new models with the cultures of more traditional organizations.

The fact that these new models have acted on the business case for workplace flexibility makes it all the more striking that more traditional organizations remain unimpressed. This highlights an important issue: Why has extensive documentation of the business case failed to persuade most organizations to initiate meaningful change? A related question is why even successful interventions, with thoroughly documented business benefits, remain fragile flowers: Bailyn and her team mention several successful interventions that were nonetheless abandoned (Bailyn et al. 2002). More dramatic is that Best Buy eliminated ROWE when a new CEO decided he needed all hands on deck, despite rigorous academic research documenting its business benefits (Kelly et al. 2011, Moen et al. 2011, Ressler & Thompson 2008).

Perhaps what is needed is a more rigorous business case (Correll et al. 2012). But businesses typically do not require regression analysis before making decisions. We propose that what is needed is not simply more evidence or more rigor but a different conversation—one that explores the psychological investments in cherished identities.

THE WAY FORWARD

We need to direct our attention to the social norms and workplace structures that have proved remarkably resilient in the face of widespread demands for change. We propose that what is required is a merging of the individual and contextual lenses of analysis to understand how social norms and identities incentivize individual behavior. Social norms are the "soft tissue" of organizational life, enacted through micro social processes that can eclipse concerns about the organizational bottom line. Social identity concerns deflect attention away from rational metrics of production—and indeed may cloud people's ability to differentiate between identity performance and a rational assessment of the effectiveness of existing work practices. The way forward in work-family research requires a sustained focus on identity. Sociologists look at social structures, psychologists look at individual behavior; identity connects the two.

This discussion begins with an assessment of which identities people perform at work: the good worker, the good man, the good woman, and the good person. Our chief focus is on professionals, as the norms of work devotion (Blair-Loy 2003) that fuel extreme work hours and the exponential pay that comes with them (Cha & Weeden 2014) are most intense in this demographic. Professionals are also most influential in shaping workplace policies and norms.

The way forward for work-family research suggests five new kinds of studies: (*a*) studies that explore the intertwining of work devotion with workers' sense of themselves as moral people; (*b*) studies that explore work as a masculinity contest in which hours worked become the measure of a man; (*c*) studies that explore the tug-of-war among women, as ideal-worker mothers judge mothers who take leave and use workplace flexibility as bad workers—and those mothers judge

ideal-worker mothers as bad mothers; (*d*) studies that explore how work devotion is a way of enacting professional-managerial class status; and (*e*) studies that explore a new business case for redefining the ideal worker, focused not on the costs of failing to retain women, but instead on the inefficiencies and costs that ensue when work becomes a masculinity contest.

The Good Worker: Work as a Moral Act

People whose identities have developed around the norm of work devotion have deep investments in proving—to others, but perhaps more importantly, to themselves—that redefining the ideal worker norm is infeasible. Identity threat research documents how vigorously people resist threats to the identities around which they have forged their lives (Branscombe et al. 1999). The ideal worker norm is just such an identity. Identities framed around work devotion may well exercise an additional hold because people who live up to them have to make painful sacrifices in order to do so (Blair-Loy 2003). Those who make themselves always available for work do so at the cost of "missing their children's childhoods," to quote the cliché, among other things. If work could be organized differently, does that mean their sacrifice was unnecessary? Women face unsettling considerations. A mother who devotes herself first and foremost to work may be an ideal worker— but is she a bad mother? A psychologically healthy woman in this situation will have a lot invested in convincing both herself and others that she had no alternative. Both the personal sacrifices demanded by the work devotion schema, and the conflict between the ideal worker and the ideal mother, make the identity threat posed by demands to change the organization of work too threatening to countenance. Thus the ideal worker norm may well be even stickier than are other fundamental social norms.

Assessing the extent to which the work devotion schema defines a given workplace will be an important direction for future research on the success and failure of organizational policies and social practices around work and family. Some important recent research has begun to examine the centrality of work and family to people's identities (Greenhaus et al. 2012, Ng & Feldman 2008); also useful in this context is work on the life roles salience scale (e.g., Cinamon & Rich 2002). Although this recognition of identity in shaping work hours and the work-life interface is a welcome sign, these studies treat work centrality as an individual difference variable rather than a gendered cultural norm. When cultural expectations to work are strong (as they are for men), relationships between individual difference variables (in attitudes, values, and personality) and work behaviors might be expected to be attenuated. This may help explain why work and family centrality predict women's work hours but not men's (Greenhaus et al. 2012). Similarly, Ng & Feldman (2008) unexpectedly found that career satisfaction and educational level were more strongly related to work hours for women than for men. In essence, the male norm of work devotion may trump individual attitudes about the centrality of work.

The Good Man: Work as a Masculinity Contest

Mary Blair-Loy observes that elite men's jobs revolve around the work devotion schema, which communicates that high-level professionals should "demonstrate commitment by making work the central focus of their lives" and "manifest singular 'devotion to work,' unencumbered with family responsibilities" (Blair-Loy & Wharton 2004, pp. 151, 153). Extreme schedules, inflexible schedules, and chaotic last-minute schedules that require constant adaptation and availability to work are a way of enacting masculinity (Ely & Meyerson 2000).

Cynthia Fuchs Epstein and her coauthors found that, among corporate lawyers, overwork was seen as a heroic activity—a way of measuring masculinity without a ruler (1999). The next year,

Marianne Cooper's study of Silicon Valley engineers closely observed how working long hours turns computer keyboarding into a manly test of physical endurance (Cooper 2000). "There's a kind of machismo culture among the young male engineers where you just don't sleep," one father confided. "He's a real man; he works 90-hour weeks. He's a slacker; he works 50 hours a week" (p. 382), another engineer explained. Said yet another, "I really feel like it is kind of a machismo thing; I'm tough. I can do this. Yeah, I'm tired, but I'm on top of it.... The people who conspicuously overwork are guys, and I think it's usually for the benefit of other guys" (p. 384). Seven years after that, Pamela Stone quoted a woman saying that her department was "really dominated by these young guys who wanted to be hotshot litigators," noting that part-time employment and job sharing "just wasn't in their realm of reality" (Stone 2007, p. 86).

An insightful study is Katherine Kellogg's investigation of a mandated reduction in work hours among surgical residents in Boston; it demonstrated how masculine work culture resists even mandated changes. Kellogg documented the tremendous resistance to the new rule, which provided that surgical residents could work no more than 80 hours a week, a sharp decrease from their traditional 120-hour workweeks. Virtually all of the "attendings" (senior doctors) opposed the new rule, she found—despite the fact that it offered them concrete advantages in terms of work-life balance. She also documents why: Older surgeons had built their identities around an "iron man" model of the surgeon as the top-of-the-macho-hospital heap, lording it over not only nondoctors but also over nonsurgeon doctors by enacting the role of "action-oriented male heroes who singlehandedly perform death-defying feats, courageously acting with certainty in all situations" (Kellogg 2011, p. 51). These iron men viewed the need for sleep as a weakness, and valued "living at the hospital" as a manly badge of honor. They derided reformers who sought to comply with the new rules as "weak," "softies," "part-timers," "wusses," "pantywaists," and "girls" (p. 135).

If long hours, and the exponential income benefits that follow them, are the measure of a man, men will find themselves under strong pressure to intensely devote themselves to work. Indeed, existing studies suggest that men face a stark choice. If they conform to the breadwinner role, having children helps them at work—after all, they have a family to support (Cuddy et al. 2004, Fuegan et al. 2004). But men who do not make themselves always available to work often face harsh interpersonal penalties. Studies on the flexibility stigma found that men who took family leave, requested a flexible schedule, or even just made their caregiving responsibilities salient on the job encountered a serious stigma because they were seen as too feminine or not man enough (Berdahl & Moon 2013, Rudman & Mescher 2013, Vandello et al. 2013). This flexibility stigma for men is a penalty for gender deviance; serious organizational penalties follow (Butler & Skattebo 2004). If work is a masculinity contest in which outing oneself as not 100% devoted to work can cause a severe loss of status, no wonder most men keep quiet and conform. A recent study found that men experience work-family conflict to the same extent as women but tend to cope in ways that permit them to "pass" as ideal workers, even as they take more time off work than work devotion suggests they should (Reid 2015).

The identity threat perspective also offers insight into the sharp increase in the wage premium for overwork (Cha & Weeden 2014), which is largest in professional-managerial jobs. Before women entered elite jobs in large numbers, no wage premium existed for working 50+ hours/ week (overwork). In recent decades, such a premium has arisen—and all but offsets the convergence in the educational levels of men and women. The overvaluation of work hours in excess of 50 hours/week is not justified economically, but it is part and parcel of the work-as-a-masculinity-contest dynamics in which hours have become the measure of a (elite) man.

Viewing work as a masculinity contest can also help explain why work-life initiatives often are supported at the top but are undermined by middle management (Hochschild 1997). Although

masculinity is precarious for most men (Vandello et al. 2008), men in the middle tend to hold on tightest to traditions of manliness (Berdahl 2007, Munsch 2015). Men on the top can afford to take on feminine traits without losing face (think of Brad Pitt, with babies hanging from every limb). So can low-status men, who are out of the "game." But middle-status men tend to hold on for dear life—they are so close, after all, to the measure of a man. This may explain the persistent pattern of middle-level managers' resistance to work-life initiatives. More research could help unpack this dynamic and how to interrupt it.

Another promising avenue for study is the shift in ideals of fatherhood, away from "set-piece fatherhood"—the good dad as someone who shows up to the school play and other special events (Hochschild 1989)—to the involved father as someone who participates in his children's daily care (Aumann et al. 2011). This is commonly understood to be a generational shift; it would be nice to know whether it is true. A recent study interviewed baby boomer men who left traditional law firms to found their own new models of legal practice that allow them more participation in family life (Williams et al. 2015b); this study suggests that new ideals of fatherhood are not limited to millennial men. Studies on the "new" dad would be welcome (e.g., Humberd et al. 2015).

A final promising avenue of research for which psychologists are well suited concerns how one goes about changing time norms when work is a masculinity contest. Kellogg's (2011) study of surgeons highlights two important ingredients. The first is a way that men with alternate visions of what it means to be a "real man" can begin to align with women to gel resistance to the dominant narrative. The second is that reformers articulate their alternate vision as an alternate vision of manliness. Kellogg's reformers countered the traditional narrative of the surgeons as "working machines" who "don't eat and don't sleep" with a new narrative of surgeons who were "well-organized" and "efficient" workers who "know how to prioritize tasks" in order to hand off patient care efficiently to the "night floats" who take over and allow the surgical residents to go home (Kellogg 2011, p. 161). Reformers, like those who opposed them, used masculine metaphors: They spoke of chief residents as coaches rather than commanders, of interns as rookies rather than beasts of burden. Too often, work-life reformers have used the language of femininity, for example by linking the work-life reform with the need to revalue traditionally devalued "invisible work" (of relationship building, team building, etc.) (Bailyn et al. 2002). Doing so dooms reform efforts. The key is to make explicit that this is a contest between two different visions of what it means to be a man.

The Good Woman: Work as a Moral Hazard

All women face a clash of social ideals: The ideal worker is always available to the employer, and the ideal woman is always available to her family (Kobrynowicz & Biernat 1997). This is a situation fraught with potential for identity threat. Field studies have shown that working women who forego having children experience the highest levels of mistreatment from their coworkers (Berdahl & Moon 2013), consistent with experimental research documenting that women who do not become mothers are seen as competent but cold (Cuddy et al. 2004).

Experimentalists have also documented the negative judgments made about the competencies of working women who have children: Women appear to be damned if they do and damned if they don't. A vignette study of normative discrimination against mothers presented mothers who were indisputably competent and committed to their work and found that women—not men—tended to dislike those mothers and held them to higher performance standards (Benard & Correll 2010). The authors suggest that identity threat explains the female subjects' hostility to the working mother: "People perceive similar, highly successful others as threatening to one's self-concept when that person's success seems unattainable" (Benard & Correll 2010, p. 623). This

is an example of what has been called the tug-of-war among women, when gender bias against women fuels conflicts among women (Williams & Dempsey 2014).

This tug-of-war helps explain the persistent reports of older women judging younger women for having kids, or advising them not to avail themselves of flexible schedules or other family-friendly options such as stop-the-tenure-clock policies. One study found that single women work the highest levels of unpaid overtime of any group (Trades Union Congr. 2008). This helps explain the backlash against family-friendly policies by single women, who protest that they get left holding the bag when mothers (and, increasingly, fathers) leave for child-care reasons. "I worked full time my whole career" is a common refrain among older women with and without children. The message: I performed as an ideal worker, which is why I succeeded professionally.

This identity is often sharply contested by younger women with statements such as, "I don't want someone else to raise my children"—direct statements about who's a good mother and who isn't. In this context, older women's insistence that "I just did what this job requires" is another instance in which any challenge to work devotion is interpreted by ideal workers as a personal attack. Interestingly, a parallel tug-of-war is emerging among men. Younger men's insistence that a good father is involved in the daily care of his children articulates an attack on the older, absent breadwinners as "bad fathers" (e.g., Humberd et al. 2015). In this highly fraught atmosphere, reimaging workplace ideals becomes too personally threatening.

The Good Person: Work Devotion as a "Class Act"

"The work devotion schema articulates a moral imperative," notes Mary Blair-Loy (2003, p. 22). Michèle Lamont's study confirms that ambition and a strong work ethic are "doubly sacred" for professional-managerial men "as signals of both moral and socioeconomic purity" (Lamont 2012, p. 85). Hard work and competence were seen by the elite American men (but not the French ones) Lamont interviewed as a central component of moral character: "A strong work ethic continues to be read as a guarantee of moral purity. Hard work and competence are equated with moral superiority, especially if they result in professional success" (Lamont 2012, p. 40). Ambition, too, is seen as a sign of character by professional-managerial American men, but not by blue-collar men, who tend to see it as a form of narcissism (Williams 2010).

Work devotion intertwines moral purity with elite status. It's a class act; a way of signaling and enacting privileged status (Williams 2010). Fifty years ago, Americans signaled class by displaying their leisure (think bankers' hours, 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM). At present, elites display their extreme schedules to establish how important they are—and how virtuous, given how very, very hard they work. Thus, Kellogg's surgeons scornfully decried new work rules limiting the hours of surgical residents to 80 a week, with explicit statements that work should be the central focus of one's life ("Surgery shouldn't be part of what you do. It should be all of what you do"; Kellogg 2011, p. 68) and that reformers who wished to follow the new rules were degrading surgery into a blue-collar job ("Residents would develop a shift-worker mentality rather than an ethic of commitment to the patient"; p. 4).

Blair-Loy (2003) draws parallels between the words bankers use to describe their work— "complete euphoria" or "being totally consumed"—and Emile Durkheim's classic account of a religious ceremony among Australian natives. Work devotion, like many forms of religion, provides moral credentialing through a totalizing experience. "Holidays are a nuisance because you have to stop working," one banker told Blair-Loy. "I remember being really annoyed when it was Thanksgiving. Damn, why did I have to stop working to go eat a turkey? I missed my favorite uncle's funeral, because I had a deposition scheduled that was too important" (Blair-Loy 2003, p. 34). Identity threat, again: Once someone has missed a favorite uncle's funeral, that individual

has a substantial investment in the belief that this is the only way to be a true professional—and not (just) because work devotion is the measure of a man, but because it is a method of moral credentialing. (That speaker, in fact, was a woman.) The assumption that the work role is the key axis of identity is epitomized by the classic cocktail party question, "What do you do?" Asked this question at a reunion, one blue-collar guy leaned his head aggressively toward the questioner and stated, "I sell *toilets*" (Williams 2010, p. 185).

The convergence of so many powerful social forces—gender, class, and morality—fuels a "devotion to work that borders on addiction," notes Marianne Cooper (2000, p. 395) in her study of Silicon Valley workers. She quotes one engineer who admitted, "I was just anxious as hell unless I was working." Ultimately, it took him "years and 12-step programs" to cure his addiction (p. 389). These and other emotional dimensions of work have been oddly understudied by work-family researchers.

Why the Business Case Fails to Persuade

The business case for workplace flexibility has been documented over and over again for decades. Some have argued that the problem is the lack of causal studies rigorously linking workplace flexibility with enhanced recruitment, productivity, and worker engagement, and decreased turnover, absenteeism, and health insurance costs (Correll et al. 2014). Yet the need for rigorous double-blind studies, itself, is telling. Businesses typically do not insist on double-blind levels of rigor before making a business decision. The fact that the most rarefied academic-level data would be required to convince businesses highlights the profound resistance with which workplace flexibility proposals are met—resistance fueled by identity threat.

The way forward points to quite different sorts of studies. A new business case would shift attention away from the costs imposed on organizations by their failure to attract and retain women and would focus instead on the costs imposed by treating work as a forum for moral, gender, and class identity contests. Cooper's study points the way: "Remarkably, poor planning is reinterpreted as a test of will, a test of manhood for a team of engineers" (2000, p. 389), she notes, commenting that failure to delegate was tolerated or even admired. "They have no idea how to delegate," one engineer told her, because the need to work long hours made delegation counterproductive to ledger masculinity (Cooper 2000, p. 388). Working oneself so hard as to undermine productivity also was an accepted practice: "The managers have no idea what an altered state they are in all the time while they are managing these guys," noted another engineer (p. 389). Similarly, Kellogg (2011) found that the iron man mentality made surgeons who live for the OR (operating room) scornful of follow-ups with patients (or indeed scornful of talking with patients at all), apt to wear surgical scrubs outside the hospital (which signals work devotion but compromises sterility), and, of course, utterly exhausted (which leads to medical mistakes and malpractice lawsuits).

Other promising lines of inquiry would examine resistance to the business case. One coauthor has spent a lot of time trying to persuade businesses of its validity, only to be met (not invariably, but persistently) with a sentiment that "my business is different"—unique in some way. Again, the insistence on totally precise and rigorous real-time information of a type not typically demanded in other business contexts signals a deep level of resistance. It would be helpful to better understand this dynamic. Another avenue might be to abandon the business case for the moral imperative of equal opportunity and making life manageable and fulfilling for workers and their families. Just as we do not argue against child labor or slavery with a business case, but consider these practices to violate incontrovertible human values, perhaps we should also not rely on a business case to argue against inhumane and discriminatory work norms that hurt employees and their families. The recent sharp shift in business ethics concerning highly unstable just-in-time schedules

for hourly workers offers hope. Once *The New York Times* got interested in covering the havoc wreaked on workers' lives by unstable hours, businesses abruptly began to treat scheduling as a corporate responsibility, such that first Starbucks and then Walmart announced a shift to more stable schedules (Kantor 2014, Lobosco 2015). Of course, it has always been easier to change workplace norms that do not threaten the identities of the (mostly) men at the top of organizations (Ely & Meyerson 2000), as evidenced by Robin Ely and Debra Meyerson's influential study of an organizational change initiative that reformed workplace norms for blue-collar offshore oil platform workers (Ely & Meyerson 2010).

CONCLUSION

Today's workplace remains a relic of the past. This review attempts to detail psychological processes that have made this workplace remarkably resistant to adaptation to the modern workforce. All too often, the ideal worker is still defined as someone always available for work, despite the fact that today only 20% of American families are breadwinner-homemaker families (Cohn et al. 2014). At various points in their lives, most workers have responsibility to care for children, elders, and/or ill or disabled partners or other family members.

We propose that organizational change to reshape workplace time norms for professionals has been stalled by two psychological processes. The first is that critical social identities are forged on the job: core identities of what it means to be a good worker, a good man or woman, and a good person. The second, resulting from the first, is that any proposal to redefine work is profoundly threatening to people whose identities have been forged around the old way of doing it. These psychological processes need to be studied by psychologists. Until they are, the work-family field will have far less impact than it should in helping to update the twenty-first century workplace to the twenty-first century workforce.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LITERATURE CITED

Allen TD. 2001. Family supportive work environments: the role of organizational perceptions. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 58:414–35

Allen TD. 2012. The work and family interface. In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology*, ed. SWJ Kozlowski, pp. 1163–98. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Allen TD, Johnson RC, Saboe KN, Cho E, Dumani S, Evans S. 2012. Dispositional variables and work-family conflict: a meta-analysis. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 80:17–26

Allen TD, Lapierre LM, Spector PE, Poelmans SAY, O'Driscoll M, et al. 2014. The link between national paid leave policy and work-family conflict among married working parents. *Appl. Psychol.* 63:5–28

Allis P, O'Driscoll M. 2007. Positive effects of nonwork-to-work facilitation on well-being in work, family and personal domains. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 23:273–91

Amstad FT, Meier LL, Fasel U, Elfering A, Semmer NK. 2011. A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching domain relations. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 16:151–69

Anderson SE, Coffey BS, Byerly RT. 2002. Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *J. Manag.* 28:787–810

Aumann K, Galinsky E, Matos K. 2011. *The New Male Mystique*. New York: Fam. Work Inst.

Bailyn L. 1993. *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate World*. New York: Free Press

Bailyn L, Rapoport R, Fletcher JK, Pruitt BH. 2002. *Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Barnett RC, Hyde JS. 2001. Women, men, work and family. *Am. Psychol.* 56:781–96

Behson SJ. 2005. The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work-family support. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 66:487–500

Bellavia GM, Frone MR. 2005. Work-family conflict. In *Handbook of Work Stress*, ed. J Barling, EK Kolloway, MR Frone, pp. 113–48. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Benard S, Correll SJ. 2010. Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender Soc.* 24:616–46

Berdahl JL. 2007. Harassment based on sex: protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 32:641–58

Berdahl JL, Moon SH. 2013. Workplace mistreatment of middle class workers based on sex, parenthood, and caregiving. *J. Soc. Issues* 69:341–66

Berg P, Kossek EE, Misra K, Belman D. 2014. Work-life flexibility policies: Do unions affect employee access and use? *Ind. Labor Relat. Rev.* 67:111–37

Bhargava S, Baral R. 2009. Antecedents and consequences of work-family enrichment among Indian managers. *Psychol. Stud.* 54:213–25

Bianchi SM, Milkie MA. 2010. Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *J. Marriage Fam.* 72:705–25

Bianchi SM, Milkie MA, Sayer LC, Robinson JP. 2000. Is anyone doing the housework? U.S. trends and gender differentials in domestic labor. *Soc. Forces* 79:191–228

Blair-Loy M. 2003. *Competing Devotions: Career and Family Among Women Executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Blair-Loy M, Wharton AS. 2004. Mothers in finance: surviving and thriving. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 596:151–71

Bloom N, Roberts J. 2015. A working from home experiment shows high performers like it better. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, Jan. 23

Bond T, Thompson C, Galinsky E, Prottas D. 2002. *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Fam. Work Inst.

Branscombe NR, Ellemers N, Spears R, Doosje B. 1999. The context and content of social identity threat. In *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content*, ed. N Ellemers, R Spears, B Doosje, pp. 35–58. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Sci.

Butler AB, Skattebo A. 2004. What is acceptable for women may not be for men: the effect of family conflicts with work on job-performance ratings. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 77:553–64

Butts MM, Casper WJ, Yang TS. 2013. How important are work-family support policies? A meta-analytic investigation of their effects on employee outcomes. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 98:1–25

Byron K. 2005. A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 67:169–98

Casper WJ, Eby LT, Bordeaux C, Lockwood A, Lambert D. 2007. A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 92:28–43

Cha Y, Weeden KA. 2014. Overwork and the slow convergence in the gender gap in wages. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 79:457–84

Cinamon RG, Rich Y. 2002. Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for the work-family conflict. *J. Couns. Psychol.* 49:212–20

Cohn D, Livingston G, Wang W. 2014, April 8. After decades of decline, a rise in stay-at-home mothers. Washington, DC: Pew Res. Cent. **http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/04/08/after-decades-of-decline-a-rise-in-stay-at-home-mothers/**

Coltrane S, Miller EC, DeHaan T, Stewart L. 2013. Fathers and the flexibility stigma. *J. Soc. Issues* 69:279–302

Cooper M. 2000. Being the "go-to guy": fatherhood, masculinity, and the organization of work in Silicon Valley. *Qual. Sociol.* 23:379–405

Correll S, Kelly E, O'Connor LT, Williams JC. 2014. Redesigning, redefining work. *Work Occup.* 41:3–17

Crouter AC. 1984. Spillover from family to work: the neglected side of the work-family interface. *Hum. Relat.* 37:425–42

Cuddy AJC, Fiske ST, Glick P. 2004. When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *J. Soc. Issues* 60:701–18

Culbertson SS, Mills MJ, Fullagar CJ. 2012. Work engagement and work-family facilitation: making homes happier through positive affective spillover. *Hum. Relat.* 65:1155–77

de Janasz S, Behson SJ, Jonsen K, Lankau MJ. 2013. Dual sources of support for dual roles: how mentoring and work-family culture influence work-family conflict and job attitudes. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 24:1435–53

Dilworth JL. 2004. Predictors of negative spillover from family to work. *J. Fam. Issues* 25:241–61

Eagly AH. 1987. *Sex Differences in Social behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Eaton SC. 2003. If you can use them: flexibility policies, organizational commitment and perceived performance. *Ind. Relat.* 42:145–67

Eby LT, Casper WJ, Lockwood A, Bordeaux C, Brinley A. 2005. Work and family research in IO/OB: content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *J. Vocat. Behav.* 66(1):124–97

Ely RJ, Meyerson DE. 2000. Theories of gender in organizations: a new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 22:103–51

Ely RJ, Meyerson DE. 2010. An organizational approach to undoing gender: the unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 30:3–34

Epstein CF, Seron C, Oglensky B, Saute R. 1999. *The Part-Time Paradox: Time Norms, Professional Life, Family and Gender*. London: Routledge

Ferguson M, Carlson D, Zivnuska S, Whitten D. 2012. Support at work and home: the path to satisfaction through balance. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 80:299–307

Ford MT, Heinen BA, Langkamer KL. 2007. Work and family satisfaction and conflict: a meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 92(1):57–80

Frone MR, Russell M, Cooper ML. 1992. Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 77:65–78

Fuegan K, Biernat M, Haines E, Deaux K. 2004. Mothers and fathers in the workplace: how gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *J. Soc. Issues* 60:737–54

Gerstel N, Clawson D. 2001. Unions' responses to family concerns. *Soc. Probl.* 48:277–98

Glass JL. 2004. Blessing or curse? Work-family policies and mother's wage growth over time. *Work Occup.* 31:367–94

Goode WJ. 1960. A theory of role strain. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 25:483–96

Goodman WB, Crouter AC. 2009. Longitudinal associations between maternal work stress, negative work-family spillover, and depressive symptoms. *Fam. Relat.* 58:245–58

Gornick JC, Meyers MK. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Greenberger E, O'Neil R. 1993. Spouse, parent, worker: role commitments and role-related experiences in the construction of adults' well-being. *Dev. Psychol.* 29:181–97

Greenhaus JH, Beutell NJ. 1985. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 10:76–88

Greenhaus JH, Parasuraman S. 1999. Research on work, family, and gender: current status and future directions. In *Handbook of Gender and Work*, ed. GN Powell, pp. 391–412. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Greenhaus JH, Peng AC, Allen TD. 2012. Relations of work identity, family identity, situational demands, and sex with employee work hours. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 80:27–37

Greenhaus JH, Powell GN. 2006. When work and family are allies: a theory of work-family enrichment. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 31:72–92

Grzywacz JG, Carlson DS. 2007. Conceptualizing work-family balance: implications for practice and research. *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.* 9:455–71

Grzywacz JG, Carlson DS, Kacmar KM, Wayne JH. 2007. A multi-level perspective on the synergies between work and family. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 80:559–74

Grzywacz JG, Marks NF. 2000. Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: an ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 5:111–26

Gutek BA, Searle S, Klepa L. 1991. Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76:560–68

Haar JM, Bardoel EA. 2008. Positive spillover from the work-family interface: a study of Australian employees. *Asia Pac. J. Hum. Resour.* 46:275–87

Hall GB, Dollard MF, Tuckey MR, Winefield AH, Thompson BM. 2010. Job demands, work-family conflict, and emotional exhaustion in police officers: a longitudinal test of competing theories. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 83:237–50

Hammer LB, Cullen JC, Neal MB, Sinclair RR, Shafiro MV. 2005. The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 10:138–54

Hammer LB, Kossek EE, Bodner T, Anger K, Zimmerman K. 2011. Clarifying work-family intervention processes: the roles of work-family conflict and family supportive supervisor behaviors. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 96:134–50

Hartung D, Hahlweg K. 2011. Stress reduction at the work-family interface: Positive parenting and self-efficacy as mechanisms of change in Workplace Triple P. *Behav. Modif.* 35:54–77

Henly JR, Shaefer HL, Waxman E. 2006. Nonstandard work schedules: employer- and employee-driven flexibility in retail jobs. *Soc. Serv. Rev.* 80:609–34

Heymann J. 2013. *Children's Chances: How Countries Can Move from Surviving to Thriving*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Heymann J, Boynton-Jarrett R, Carter P, Bond JT, Galinsky E. 2002. *Work-Family Issues and Low-Income Families*. New York: Ford Found.

Hill EJ, Allen S, Jacob J, Bair AF, Bikhazi SL, et al. 2007. Work-family facilitation: expanding theoretical understanding through qualitative exploration. *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.* 9:507–26

Hochschild A. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Penguin

Hochschild A. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan/Holt

Humberd B, Ladge JJ, Harrington B. 2015. The "new" dad: navigating fathering identity within organizations. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 30:249–66

Hunter EM, Perry SJ, Carlson DS, Smith SA. 2010. Linking team resources to work-family enrichment and satisfaction. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 77:304–12

Innstrand ST, Langballe EM, Espnes GA, Aasland OG, Falkum E. 2010. Work-home conflict and facilitation across four different family structures in Norway. *Community Work Fam.* 13:231–49

Jacobs JA, Gerson K. 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Judiesch MK, Lyness KS. 1999. Left behind? The impact of leaves of absence on managers' career success. *Acad. Manag. J.* 42:641–51

Kahn RL, Wolfe DM, Quinn R, Snoek JD, Rosenthal RA. 1964. *Organizational Stress*. New York: Wiley

Kanter RM. 1977. *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Kantor J. 2014. Working anything but 9 to 5. *New York Times*, Aug. 13. **http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/08/13/us/starbucks-workers-scheduling-hours.html**

Karatepe OS, Bekteshi L. 2008. Antecedents and outcomes of work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation among frontline hotel employees. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 27(4):517–28

Kellogg KC. 2011. *Challenging Operations: Medical Reform and Resistance in Surgery*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Kelly EL, Kossek EE, Hammer LB, Durham M, Bray J, et al. 2008. Getting there from here: research on the effects of work-family initiatives on work-family conflict and business outcomes. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* 2:305–49

Kelly EL, Moen P. 2007. Rethinking the clockwork of work: why schedule control may pay off at work and at home. *Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour.* 9:487–506

Kelly EL, Moen P, Oakes JM, Fan W, Okechukwu C, et al. 2014. Changing work and work-family conflict: evidence from the work, family, and health network. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 79:485–516

Kelly EL, Moen P, Tranby E. 2011. Changing workplaces to reduce work-family conflict: schedule control in a white-collar organization. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 76:265–90

Kirchmeyer C. 1993. Nonwork-to-work spillover: a more balanced view of the experiences and coping of professional women and men. *Sex Roles* 28:531–52

Kobrynowicz D, Biernat M. 1997. Decoding subjective evaluations: how stereotypes provide shifting standards. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 33:579–601

Korabik K, McElwain A, Chappell DB. 2008. Integrating gender-related issues into research on work and family. In *Handbook of Work-Family Integration: Research, Theory, and Best Practices*, ed. K Korabik, DS Lero, DL Whitehead, pp. 215–32. Amsterdam: Academic

Kossek EE, Baltes BB, Matthews RA. 2011a. How work-family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Ind. Organ. Psychol.: Perspect. Sci. Pract.* 4:352–69

Kossek EE, Baltes BB, Matthews RA. 2011b. Innovative ideas on how work-family research can have more impact. *Ind. Organ. Psychol.: Perspect. Sci. Pract.* 4:426–32

Kossek EE, Hammer LB, Thompson RJ, Burke LB. 2014. *Leveraging Workplace Flexibility for Engagement and Productivity*. SHRM Found. Eff. Pract. Guidel. Ser. Alexandria, VA: SHRM Found.

Kossek EE, Lautsch BA, Eaton SC. 2006. Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 68:347–67

Kossek EE, Michel JS. 2010. Flexible work schedules. In *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 1, ed. S Zedeck, pp. 535–72. Washington, DC: Am. Psychol. Assoc.

Kossek EE, Ozeki C. 1998. Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: a review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 83:139–49

Kwan HK, Mao Y, Zhang H. 2010. The impact of role-modeling on protégés' personal learning and work-family enrichment. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 77(2):313–22

Lambert SJ. 2008. Passing the buck: labor flexibility practices that transfer risk onto hourly workers. *Hum. Relat.* 61:1203–27

Lambert SJ, Fugiel PJ, Henly JR. 2014. *Precarious Working Schedules Among Early-Career Employees in the US: A National Snapshot*. Chicago: EINet, School Soc. Serv. Admin., Univ. Chicago

Lamont M. 2012. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Lee E-S, Chang JY, Kim H. 2011. The work-family interface in Korea: Can family life enrich work life? *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 22:2032–53

Lee NY, Zvonkovic AM, Crawford DW. 2014. The impact of work-family conflict and facilitation on women's perceptions of role balance. *J. Fam. Issues* 35:1252–74

Leslie LM, Manchester CF, Park T, Mehng SA. 2012. Flexible work practices: a source of career premiums or penalties? *Acad. Manag. J.* 55:1407–28

Lobosco K. 2015. Walmart's other promise to workers: better schedules. *CNN Money*, Feb. 19. **http://money.cnn.com/2015/02/19/news/companies/walmart-wages-schedules/**

Maertz CP, Boyar SL. 2011. Work-family conflict, enrichment, and balance under "levels" and "episodes" approaches. *J. Manag.* 37:68–98

Masuda AD, McNall LA, Allen TD, Nicklin JM. 2012. Examining the constructs of work-to-family enrichment and positive spillover. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 80:197–210

McNall LA, Masuda AD, Shanock LR, Nicklin JM. 2011. Interaction of core self-evaluations and perceived organizational support on work-to-family enrichment. *J. Psychol.* 145(2):133–49

McNall LA, Nicklin JM, Masuda AD. 2010. A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 25:381–96

Merton RK. 1949. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press

Michel JS, Clark MA, Jaramillo D. 2011. The role of the Five Factor Model of personality in the perceptions of negative and positive forms of work-nonwork spillover: a meta-analytic review. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 79:191–203

Moen P, Kelly E, Hill R. 2011. Does enhancing work-time control and flexibility reduce turnover? A naturally occurring experiment. *Soc. Probl.* 58:69–98

Molino M, Ghislieri C, Cortese CG. 2013. When work enriches family life: the meditational role of professional development opportunities. *J. Workplace Learn.* 25:98–113

Munsch CL. 2015. *Transformations in masculinity and homophobia*. Presented at Intl. Conf. on Masculinities: Engaging Men and Boys for Gender Equity, March 5–8, New York, NY

Ng TWH, Feldman DC. 2008. Long work hours: a social identity perspective on meta-analysis data. *J. Organ. Behav.* 29:853–80

Nohe C, Meier LL, Sonntag K, Michel A. 2015. The chicken or the egg? A meta-analysis of panel studies of the relationship between work-family conflict and strain. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 100:522–36

OECD (Organ. Econ. Coop. Dev.). 2014. Average annual hours actually worked per worker [data set]. Paris: OECD. **http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx?DataSetCode=ANHRS**

Ollier-Malaterre A, Valcour M, den Dulk L, Kossek EE. 2013. Theorizing national context to develop comparative work-life research: a review and research agenda. *Eur. Manag. J.* 31:433–47

Paustian-Underdahl SC, Halbesleben JRB. 2014. Examining the influence of climate, supervisor guidance, and behavioral integrity on work-family conflict: a demands and resources approach. *J. Organ. Behav.* 35:447–63

Perlow LA. 2012. *Sleeping with Your Smart Phone: How to Break the 24/7 Habit and Change the Way You Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Bus. Rev. Press

Perlow LA, Kelly EL. 2014. Toward a model of work redesign for better work and better life. *Work Occup.* 41:111–34

Perrewe PL, Hochwarter WA. 2001. Can we really have it all? The attainment of work and family values. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 10:29–33

Pleck JH. 1977. The work-family role system. *Soc. Probl.* 24:417–27

Radcliffe LS, Cassell C. 2014. Resolving couples' work-family conflicts: the complexity of decision making and the introduction of a new framework. *Hum. Relat.* 67:793–819

Rapoport R, Rapoport R. 1971. *Dual-Career Families*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books

Reid E. 2015. Embracing, passing, revealing and the ideal worker image: how people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organ. Sci.* **http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0975**

Ressler C, Thompson J. 2008. *Why Work Sucks and How to Fix It*. New York: Penguin

Roehling PV, Jarvis LH, Swope HE. 2005. Variations in negative work-family spillover among white, black, and Hispanic American men and women. *J. Fam. Issues* 26:840–65

Rogier SA, Padgett MY. 2004. The impact of utilizing a flexible work schedule on the perceived career advancement potential of women. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* 15:89–106

Rost I, Mostert K. 2007. The interaction between work and home of employees in the earthmoving equipment industry: measurement and prevalence. *SA J. Ind. Psychol.* 33:54–61

Rothbard NP. 2001. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 46:655–84

Rotundo DM, Kincaid JF. 2008. Conflict, facilitation, and individual coping styles across the work and family domains. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 23:484–506

Ruderman MN, Ohlott PJ, Panzer K, King SN. 2002. Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Acad. Manag. J.* 45:369–86

Rudman LA, Mescher K. 2013. Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *J. Soc. Issues* 69:322–40

Russo M, Buonocore F. 2012. The relationship between work-family enrichment and nurse turnover. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 27:216–36

Schulte B. 2014. *Overwhelmed: Work, Love, and Play When No One Has the Time*. New York: Sarah Crichton Books

Shows C, Gerstel N. 2009. Fathering, class, and gender: a comparison of physicians and emergency medical technicians. *Gender Soc.* 23:161–87

SHRM (Soc. Hum. Resour. Manag.). 2010. 2010 employee benefits: examining employee benefits in the midst of a recovering economy. **http://www.shrm.org/research/surveyfindings/articles/documents/10-0280%20employee%20benefits%20survey%20report-fnl.pdf**

Siu O, Lu J, Brough P, Lu C, Bakker A, et al. 2010. Role resources and work-family enrichment: the role of work engagement. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 77:470–80

Stone P. 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Streib J. 2015. *The Power of the Past: Understanding Cross-Class Marriages*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Sumer HC, Knight PA. 2001. How do people with different attachment styles balance work and family? A personality perspective on work-family linkage. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 86:653–63

Swanberg JE, McKechnie SP, Ojha MU, James JB. 2011. Schedule control, supervisor support and work engagement: a winning combination for workers in hourly jobs? *J. Vocat. Behav.* 79:613–24

Thompson CS, Beauvais LL, Lyness KS. 1999. When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 54:392–415

Tompson HB, Werner JM. 1997. The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: testing a mediated model. *J. Manag.* 23:583–601

Trades Union Congr. 2008. Single women in their thirties do more unpaid overtime than anyone else. London: TUC. **http://www.tuc.org.uk/equality-issues/childcare/equal-pay/single-women-their-30s-do-more-unpaid-overtime-anyone-else**

Vandello JA, Bosson JK, Cohen D, Burnaford RM, Weaver JR. 2008. Precarious manhood. *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* 95:1325–39

Vandello JA, Hettinger VE, Bosson JK, Siddiqi J. 2013. When equal isn't really equal: the masculine dilemma of seeking work flexibility. *J. Soc. Issues* 69:303–21

Van Steenbergen EF, Ellemers N. 2009. Is managing the work-family interface worthwhile? Benefits for employee health and performance. *J. Organ. Behav.* 30:616–42

Wayne JH, Casper WJ, Matthews RA, Allen TD. 2013. Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: the mediating role of work-family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 98(4):606–22

Wayne JH, Musisca N, Fleeson W. 2004. Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: relationships of the Big Five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 64:108–30

Wayne JH, Randel AE, Stevens J. 2006. The role of identity and work-family support in work-family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 69:445–61

Weer CH, Greenhaus JH, Linnehan F. 2010. Commitment to nonwork roles and job performance: enrichment and conflict perspectives. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 76:306–16

Williams A, Franche R-L, Ibrahim S, Mustard C, Layton FR. 2006. Examining the relationship between work-family spillover and sleep quality. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 11:27–37

Williams JC. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What To Do About It*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Williams JC. 2010. *Reshaping the Work-Family Debate: Why Men and Class Matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Williams JC, Blair-Loy M, Berdahl JL. 2013. Cultural schemas, social class, and the flexibility stigma. *J. Soc. Issues* 69:209–34

Williams JC, Boushey H. 2010. Three faces of work-family conflict: the poor, the professionals, and the missing middle. San Francisco: Univ. Calif. Hastings Coll. Law, Cent. WorkLife Law. **http://www.worklifelaw.org/pubs/ThreeFacesofWork-FamilyConflict.pdf**

Williams JC, Dempsey R. 2014. *What Works for Women at Work: Four Patterns Working Women Need to Know*. New York: NYU Press

Williams JC, Phillips K, Hall ER. 2015a. Double jeopardy: gender bias against women in STEM. San Francisco: Univ. Calif. Hastings Coll. Law, Cent. WorkLife Law. **http://www.toolsforchangeinstem.org/tools/double-jeopardy-report**

Williams JC, Platt A, Lee J. 2015b. Disruptive innovation: new models of legal practice. San Francisco: Univ. Calif. Hastings Coll. Law, Cent. WorkLife Law. **http://worklifelaw.org/new-models-report/**

Zedeck S, ed. 1992. *Work, Families, and Organizations: Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Zedeck S, Mosier KL. 1990. Work in the family and employing organization. *Am. Psychol.* 45:240–51

Zuo J. 2004. Shifting the breadwinning boundary: the role of men's breadwinner status and their gender ideologies. *J. Fam. Issues* 25:811–32