

1

“Work-Family Scholarship”: Voice and Context

Ellen Ernst Kossek
Michigan State University

Susan J. Lambert
The University of Chicago

Integration of work and nonwork demands is one of the most critical challenges organizations, families, and individuals face today. Research on the integration of work and family—and work and personal life more generally—is burgeoning and crossing many disciplines. The extant psychological and management literatures, however, largely adopt an individual, psychological perspective that emanates out of role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978), focusing particularly on perceived conflicts between work and family roles. While perspectives on role conflict are valuable and some of the contributors to this volume draw on that rich tradition, we developed this book to address a number of persistent gaps in the work-family field, with its voice focused on work and organizations.

Researchers have tended to favor the life or family side of “work-life” issues. This can be partly attributed to scholars’ efforts to provide empirical evidence of what Rosabeth Moss Kanter termed the “myth of separate worlds” in her classic treatise on the relationship between work and family (Kanter, 1977). As Kanter pointed out almost 30 years ago, traditional employing organizations were designed as if typical workers did not have family or personal demands that competed for their primary identity and attention during working time. Ideal workers historically have been those who are rarely absent from or late to work and who do not let family responsibilities encumber their hours on and com-

mitment to the job (Williams, 1999). Of course, it is now generally accepted that growing numbers of employees have family and other life demands that influence their ability to join and contribute fully to the workplace. A critical societal problem is the structural mismatch between employers' job demands and employees' needs and responsibilities.

OBJECTIVES FOR THIS VOLUME

To Enrich Conceptualization of the Work Side of Work-Life Issues. We designed this volume with the primary objective of bringing work back into the center of the theoretical, research, and practical discussions on the interplay between employment and personal life, thus attending to the structural mismatch between job demands and worker responsibilities. Many employers have continued to treat work and personal life as separate worlds and have been slow to adapt job and career structures fully to changes in the workforce. Researchers have been slow also in reshifting their focus back to workplace influences and organizational barriers to change. As the chapters in this book demonstrate, the design of jobs and employment structures and the transmission of professional and organizational social cultures create stresses and parameters that shape the ways in which individuals are able to synthesize work and nonwork demands.

Organizational and job conditions, as well as cultural contexts, determine the extent to which employment experiences enhance economic, psychological, and physical well-being by providing an opportunity to realize the positive aspects of working and the benefits of multiple-role accumulation (cf. Barnett & Hyde, 2001). The current work-family literature has underemphasized the importance of job and organizational design in helping explain the work family nexus. Job quality; the ability to control when, where, and how one works; performing tasks that enhance skills and careers; work and societal cultures that value personal life; and opportunity structures that facilitate job security, mobility, and access to work-family supports all seem critical to workers' efforts to combine work and personal life effectively. These features of organizations and cultures are the subject of analysis in this book.

To Consider How Work-Life Issues Vary by Job, Organizational, and Cultural Factors. A significant cluster of the existing scholarly and practitioner literature on employer support for work and family has tended to take an advocacy position, suggesting that all organizations should promote the integration of work and family roles. We do not advocate a one-size model that is unlikely to fit all cultures, individuals, or organizations. Instead, we suggest that research is needed that generates understanding of the conditions under which greater employer and societal responsiveness is both

warranted and possible. This volume will speak to these issues. A primary goal of this book, then, is to examine work-life integration from not only individual psychological perspectives but also from organizational, cultural, and social perspectives, using them as a critical eye to examine how employment relationships, and ultimately work-life integration, may vary between cultures and within social contexts.

To Bring an Organizational Perspective to Work-Life Integration. Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999, p. 407) define work-life integration as occurring "when attitudes in one role positively spill over into another role, or when experiences in one role serve as resources that enrich another role in one's life." This definition is essentially grounded in a spillover perspective that views relationships between work and personal life in terms of attitudes that individuals carry from one sphere to another. Building on this good work, we argue that the study of work-life integration should also keep attuned to the conditions under which roles can be combined in ways that create psychological distress, regardless of who is in the role or whether spillover ensues. Additionally, there may be times when segmentation between work and personal life is a conscious strategy actively pursued by workers. Thus, we suggest that the study of work-life integration should measure not only integration but also the processes and strategies used to combine specific roles in specific organizational contexts.

To Build on Established Theories of Organizations. Another goal of this book is to broaden the work-life field by offering perspectives developed by writers whose focus is work and employing organizations. Many of these contributors do not define themselves primarily as work-family scholars; rather, they are organizational scholars with both strong theoretical underpinnings and knowledge of how to improve actual work practices. Although they may be new to the work-life field, they are a distinguished group at the peak of their careers in their respective disciplines.

To Integrate Organizational, Individual, and Cultural Perspectives. The book is organized around specific theoretical lenses and levels of analysis. The themes emerging from these sections are considered in a summary section that traces implications for both theory and practice. The ordering of chapters reflects an additional objective, which is to integrate multiple, sometimes disconnected, research perspectives on work and family. Organizational and social structures construct individuals' perceptions of what is possible in terms of work-life integration. Yet, individual differences beyond commonly employed measures of gender and parental status matter in explaining how workers integrate work and personal life. Moreover, the roles of the work group, and workplace social dynamics, are often ignored even though research shows us that work is defined and experienced very differently across societies and cul-

tures. Rarely are all of these lenses brought to bear on work and family issues, as is done in this volume.

CONTEXTUAL ORIGINS: WHY THIS BOOK WAS DEVELOPED

In 1992, Sheldon Zedeck edited a seminal book in the Industrial Organizational Psychology Frontiers Series. *Work, Families, and Organizations* examined diverse perspectives on the work-family relationship. The book was published at a time when many corporations were just beginning to respond to the changing gender and family demographics of the workforce and awakening to the need for greater understanding of work-family issues. Included in Zedeck's volume, which examined both individual and organizational perspectives on the links between the workplace and the family, were contributions by a wide range of experts, from industrial-organizational (I-O) psychologists to medical experts, family therapists to organizational behaviorists, policy specialists to investment counselors, and sociologists. Zedeck called on I-O psychologists to devote greater attention to the work-family interface, which, at the time, had been largely understudied by mainstream researchers. I-O researchers were encouraged to acknowledge the influence of family and other environments on the worker and to expand their variables to recognize more explicitly that work has meaning to families and vice versa (Brief & Nord, 1990).

It has been over a decade since Zedeck's volume was published, and many important societal changes have occurred. First, research agendas have broadened from "family-friendly" to "people-friendly" issues and from "work-family initiatives" to "work-life initiatives" (cf. Kirchmeyer, 2000). The broadening of the field to encompass the work-life domain reflects the view that just because employees do not have family-care responsibilities does not necessarily insulate them from life stresses and pressures to integrate work and nonwork roles. Currently, far more research has been done on integration of parenting with work than on other life roles related to community, eldercare, personal values, leisure, and aging. We designed this volume to reflect the broadening of the field toward study of work-life integration for all employees. Our book can be distinguished by its incorporation of individual, organizational, and cultural/social perspectives focused on links to work identity and the workplace. Our book thus extends the work Zedeck began by attending to changes in society and in organizations that have occurred since that writing and by broadening the scope to include some important and sometimes critical organization and management perspectives.

A second change that has occurred is that, regardless of the motivation, many employers have begun to experiment with flextime, telecommuting, and voluntary reduced-load work arrangements to give employees more discretion and personal flexibility in how they integrate work demands with other life roles

such as family, community, and leisure (Lee, MacDermid, & Buck, 2000; Scandura & Lankau, 1997). This increase in flexible work arrangements has further blurred the boundaries between work and home for many employees. Effectively switching and managing multiple work and nonwork roles has never been more complex. Findings from individual, family, and organizational perspectives are mixed in terms of the success and social acceptance of alternative work arrangements (Epstein, Seron, Oglensky, & Saute, 1998; Lee, MacDermid, & Buck, 2000). A recent review of the literature suggests that there remains much to be learned about how to make these arrangements work well (Avery & Zabel, 2001). Growing evidence shows that professionals, especially men, are often reluctant to experiment with these alternative work arrangements (Fried, 1998) and that sometimes fear keeps workers from using existing supports (chap. 18, this volume). More research is needed to examine the implications of these blurred boundaries and the ensuing social issues they raise (see chaps. 3, 4, 12, this volume). A critical eye is needed to examine the inherent conflicts that arise in employment relations by questioning organizations' motivations for providing flexible work arrangements—whether for benevolent or economic reasons (chapter 8, this volume).

Third, increasing numbers of employees now live and work in a global economy. The increases in globalization and the speed of communication have led to heightened demands to work. It also enables individuals to receive work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Research by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.org, 2003) indicates that 40% of male managers and almost 20% of female managers are working 49 or more hours each week, and the number of managers working these hours is growing. The problem of "work overload" may be even more serious for wage earners in low-income families who often need to work two or three jobs to make ends meet. Research is needed on the long-term effects of working long hours on psychological and physical health and on family relations. Research also needs to address the reasons managers are working excessively long hours and whether corporations benefit when they do (Brett & Stroh, 2003; Perlow, 1998). For example, Hochschild (1997) suggests that some people choose not to take advantage of employer policies that allow more time at home because today's workplace is easier and less emotionally challenging than today's home, given increasing divorce rates, eldercare demands, troubled children, and fewer stay-at-home spouses. People escape to work in order to exchange the messy entanglements of the modern family for the less intense and less complicated workplace (Hochschild, 1997). A critical assessment of the organization's role in encouraging or discouraging overwork and the costs and benefits of this is needed (chaps. 14, 15, this volume).

Fourth, as the workforce becomes increasingly multicultural, differences in values regarding the primacy of the work role to the family and to other life roles takes on growing importance. The U.S. model of segmenting work and family roles and expecting employees to work long hours (U.S. employees now

work the longest hours of workers in any Western country) is not the model followed in other parts of the world (Brett & Stroh, 2003). In Europe, for example, limits are being placed on the maximum hours employees may work per week, and rest periods and holidays are being mandated. The Working Time Directive, passed by the Social Affairs Council of the European Union (EU) in 2002, restricts employees from working more than 48 hours per week. Employees may work more hours only if they voluntarily agree to do so, and employers are not allowed to retaliate if an employee refuses to work overtime (Adnett & Handy, 2001).

Countries and cultures differ in beliefs and values about whether balancing work and family is a collective or an individual responsibility (Lewis, 1999), and whether societal, government, and employer involvement enriches a common good. The government and the community play a much less powerful role in the management of the work-life and work-family relationships in the United States, which is where the majority of I-O and management scholars work. For example, in 1998, the International Labor Organization announced that more than 120 nations provide paid maternity leave. Three prominent exceptions were Australia, New Zealand, and the United States (Wisensale, 2001). Within the United States, family is viewed as an individual responsibility with minimal intervention from the state (Lewis, 1999). Thus, employees who work for large organizations, live in wealthier communities, or have higher paying jobs are more likely to have higher quality child care and more disposable income to allocate to care. Mirroring the U.S. values of underemphasizing communal and societal responsibility for family, these issues have been understudied by I-O and management scholars, despite recent calls by researchers for the community domain to be incorporated in work-family research (Voydanoff, 2001). We included some chapters that address cross-cultural perspectives on managing work-life integration to fill this gap (chaps. 16, 17, this volume).

Fifth, more research is needed on individual differences that are linked to the organizational context (part III, this volume). For example, very little is known about how men are managing work-family responsibilities, because traditional work-family theories have relied heavily on theories of gender differences to explain work-family conflict. Recent research suggests that men who are involved in caregiving and domestic roles experience stresses similar to those experienced by women and perhaps even more severely (Schneer & Reitman, 1995; Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, 1996).

Sixth, work-family research in the organizational behavior and I-O psychology domains has largely developed separately from the human resource policy domains, fostering a gap between the application of work-family conflict theory to organizational and national policy and practice (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Further, the study of the climate and cultures, informal contexts, and communities in which these policies are embedded has been integrated only minimally with the study of policy (Kossek, Noe, & Colquitt, 2001). More research is needed,

as well as more theory developed, measuring the informal effectiveness of organizational work-life integration policies and supervisor support (chaps. 18, 20, this volume). Most policy research has been conducted in large organizations, which are more likely than small companies to be progressive in the adoption and cultural support of work-family policies (Pitt-Catsouphes, Swanberg, Bond, & Galinsky, 2004). In short, as with much academic research, the transfer of academic models to the workplace has been met with limited success (chaps. 22, 23, this volume).

OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

We asked each author to frame his or her chapter from a particular theoretical perspective, outlining its conceptual origins, defining its key concepts, and providing an overview of how it has been and currently is used. We encouraged the authors to use examples from their own as well as others' research to illustrate how the theoretical perspective can be used in empirical investigations of issues relevant to work-life integration. We also invited authors to consider: barriers to the implementation of the practical issues they raise, suggestions for improving the usefulness of organizational theory in furthering knowledge of work-life integration, and suggestions for methodologies and research designs that would support study of the key issues raised in their chapters. In this way issues would be touched on in multiple ways but not in all chapters to avoid repetition yet the chapters would still address common gaps in the literature.

Chapter 2 by Shelley M. MacDermid (Purdue University) follows this introduction and addresses how to build and broaden theory on work-family conflict. Based on more than 20 years of study from sociological and psychological perspectives, she takes stock of the work-family conflict construct. She identifies what researchers know and what they still need to know, and how best to learn in the future. She concentrates on measurement issues, including construct validity, content validity, and construct utility.

The second part of this volume takes an *organizational perspective*. Its content ranges from time compression, technology, organizational resilience, stratification and internal labor markets, formal work-life policies to work redesign. Organizational structures are powerful because they structure how individuals experience organizations and what individuals perceive as possible for managing work-life integration. Organizational and technological design factors create demand situations that individuals need to respond to regardless of who they are.

In chapter 3 Frances J. Milliken and Linda M. Dunn-Jensen (New York University) focus on the changing time demands of managerial and professional work. They discuss how the changing nature and expectations of this work, especially in the United States are affecting people's experiences of work-life dilemmas as we enter the twenty-first century. They develop the notion of time

compression and examine how the longer hours, the increased complexity of managerial and professional jobs, and the pressure to produce faster are altering the context within which individuals are making choices about how to define the boundary between the work and nonwork domains of their lives.

P. Monique Valcour (Boston College) and Larry W. Hunter (University of Wisconsin) consider in chapter 4 the relationship between technology and work-life integration. They note that new technologies—especially advances in telecommunication and information technology—enable individuals to relocate work across time and space to unprecedented degrees. But such technologies do not in themselves solve the problems of integrating work with other life interests. By considering technological advances jointly with the organizational contexts within which they are implemented, the authors describe a range of effects that technology can have on work-life integration. This ranges from the sorts of tasks to which technology is applied (routine to nonroutine activities) to how technology is associated with organizational buffers, such as whether it enables tighter as well as looser coupling of organizational activities. They conclude with four ways in which managerial choices further shape implementation, as well as how workers—users of technology—also shape the relationship between technology and work-life integration.

The issues of organizational resilience and security took on new meaning after September 11, 2001. While the attack on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon directed our attention to the need to increase organizational and individual security, it followed a large number of organizational events that piqued interest in smaller ways. The processes and oversights that contribute to catastrophic organizational events are increasingly documented in the organizational literature. One such process requests the segmentation of work and personal spheres, so that workers focus exclusively on work demands and do not allow interpersonal conflicts or nonwork obligations to break their concentration during their shifts. In chapter 5 Karlene H. Roberts, Vinit M. Desai, and Peter Madsen (University of California, Berkeley) examine what employees in “high reliability organizations” say about the normative lack of integration of work and the rest of their lives. They also explore how employees’ life experiences nonetheless find ways to inform their work.

The theories and methods of stratification have long been used to develop knowledge on how organizations structure traditional employment opportunities, such as opportunities for promotion, skill development, and wage growth. Susan J. Lambert and Elaine Waxman (University of Chicago) extend this framework on the stratification of firm-level labor markets to include a broader set of opportunities essential to balancing work and personal life. They discuss in chapter 6 the ways in which organizations distribute opportunities for balancing work and personal life at lower organizational levels.

Organizational structures and restructurings are commonly neglected in the analysis of work-life balance opportunities. These factors, often in the back-

ground, interact with the more typically identified factors such as attributes of individual workers and the work-life policies and strategies adopted by a firm and its managers. Philip Moss, Hal Salzman, and Chris Tilly (University of Massachusetts—Lowell) in chapter 7 discuss research that examines the interrelationship between structural changes in industries and firms, managerial strategy, and the structure of jobs. They focus on internal labor markets and implications for the quality of jobs, particularly changes in lower-skill, lower-wage jobs in terms of opportunity or mobility and for work-life integration.

In chapter 8 Kyra L. Sutton and Raymond A. Noe (The Ohio State University) argue that employer-offered family-friendly programs may be more myth than magic. They discuss the role of the human resources (HR) department in relationship to family-friendly programs and consider three theoretical perspectives that are related to the use and consequence of family-friendly programs. These perspectives include institutional theory, boundary theory, and the degree to which the firm adopts a control or commitment perspective of HR systems. They conclude that empirical evidence supports the notion that family-friendly programs are not always effective in reducing conflict for employees.

Joyce K. Fletcher (Simmons) and Lotte Bailyn (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) argue in chapter 9 that there is an equity imperative for redesigning work for work-family integration. They believe it is critical for organizations to consider how work-family issues are linked to work design. They identify the difference between an individual-level approach to the issue of work-family integration and a systemic approach. They also highlight the barriers to this systemic, more holistic approach and suggest ways to overcome them.

In the past decade, there has been considerable research on the conflict that individuals face managing their work and family lives. It has generally focused on the negative effects of these multiple roles, lacked a strong theoretical perspective, and not considered individual differences in personality, nonwork lifestyles, and relevant outcomes. The third part of this volume examines *individual perspectives* that are lacking in the more traditional research stream. An individual perspective helps us understand that not all individuals are alike. For example, not all women or all men are alike, although sometimes the popular press makes generalizations that prompt us to forget the role of individual differences in explaining how people experience work-life integration. Some of the chapters in this part note differences in how individuals experience their environments; person-environment interactions suggest that workers experience the contexts in which they are embedded differently. Others examine dispositional factors, the evolution of individuals over their career life cycle, varying motivations for work-life decision making, the issue of redefining how individual performance and success are measured, and how individuals make decisions about managing work-life boundaries and employing flexibility.

Research on engagement in work and family roles often focuses on environmental influences (e.g., supervisor, organizational climate, social policy) on in-

dividuals' emotions, cognitions, and behaviors. Researchers have suggested that personality be given greater consideration in understanding how an individual views and experiences multiple life roles. In chapter 10 Alyssa Friede and Ann Marie Ryan (Michigan State University) discuss the ways in which personality and self-evaluations may influence how individuals feel about and react to the interface between their work and family lives. The authors' model is applicable to how disposition influences engagement in multiple life roles.

Jeffrey R. Edwards (University of North Carolina) and Nancy P. Rothbard (University of Pennsylvania) present in chapter 11 a theoretical model that applies person-environment fit theory to stress and well-being associated with work and family. They describe how "fit" can be conceptualized in parallel terms for work and family and how person and environment constructs are linked across work and family. By extending existing applications of stress theories to work-family research, they clarify how the person and environment combine to produce stress, the role of cognitive appraisal in this process, and the effects of coping and defense on stress and well-being.

In chapter 12 Ellen Ernst Kossek (Michigan State University), Brenda A. Lautsch (Simon Fraser University), and Susan C. Eaton (Harvard University) contend that the nature of flexibility and how the individual psychologically experiences flexibility matter for work and family well-being. They develop the concept of *flexibility enactment*, which is the type of use and the way flexibility is experienced psychologically, and they investigate links to key work-family outcomes such as well-being. They discuss the conditions under which the availability and use of flexibility lead to reductions in work-family conflict or increased personal effectiveness at work and home and when using work-family policies such as teleworking or flextime. The authors conclude that different people will experience varied outcomes of flexibility, even after taking into account the constraints of their families and jobs.

Steven A. Y. Poelmans (University of Navarra, Spain) argues in chapter 13 that the decision process and conservation of resources theories of work and life are useful to theorists as they shift attention away from the consequences of work-family conflict for well-being to the actions that proceed and follow a work-family dilemma. He conceptualizes work-family conflict as an ongoing decision-making process based on three different levels of motivation (extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic) as drivers of action—relevant decision-making processes that proceed and follow interaction, based on different types of interaction (economic, social, altruistic) among multiple actors. Within this framework, work-family conflict is not treated as an external or internal stressor or a cause, as is the case in role theory, spillover theory, and self-discrepancy theory; rather it is an intermediate state.

In chapter 14 Mary Dean Lee (McGill University), Shelley M. MacDermid (Purdue University), Pamela Lirio Dohring (McGill University), and Ellen Ernst Kossek (Michigan State University) explore how the process of new identity

construction and socialization into parenthood is linked to professionals' requests for reduced-load work. They suggest that professionals have different orientations or self-conceptions prior to parenthood ranging from a career defined to a career orchestrated around family. Professionals go through a process of socialization and adaptation driven by their emotional responses to their changing social situations and eventually they negotiate new identities by interlinking professional and parent roles and depending upon organizational constraints.

Adopting a well-needed critical perspective, Jeanette N. Cleveland (Pennsylvania State University) argues in chapter 15 that there has been a single stakeholder bias associated with "the criterion problem," that is, definitions of performance and success. She holds that (a) success is a much broader and encompassing construct than simply upward mobility and spills over from work to nonwork domains; (b) whoever defines success may receive undue advantage in his or her work and nonwork lives as compared to those who have little or no voice in how success is defined; and (c) the criterion problem is one avenue of diversity research that may increase our understanding and handling of workplace discrimination and work-family interfaces. Cleveland makes the case that current workplace measures of success have largely reflected the will or the judgment of a given stakeholder, when in fact there are multiple stakeholders. Drawing from the sociological literature, a discussion of pluralism, acculturation, and individual and institutional discrimination is presented to make the case for a multiple-stakeholder perspective in developing measures to assess workplace performance and also in defining the boundaries of the construct "success" itself.

The fourth part of this book examines *cultural and social perspectives* on work-life integration. Basic nature, cultural assumptions, and social values may shape how individuals manage and view work-life integration. In this part, issues addressed include variation in gender equity and work-family social policy across nations, how global corporations manage local national workforces, the importance of supervisors and workplace climate in addressing work-life issues, the development of psychosocial capital in firms, and prevailing societal views on the value of work and life in terms of the corporate bottomline.

In chapter 16 Suzan Lewis (Manchester Metropolitan University) and Linda Haas (Indiana University) propose that a greater understanding of the impact of government policy on corporate work-life practices and cultures can be achieved by applying social justice theory. They suggest ways in which social justice theory can be useful in understanding work-life integration at the family, workplace, societal, and international levels. Lewis and Haas focus particularly on how government policies can affect individuals' sense of entitlement to support for integrating work and family and hence increase institutional pressures on employers to act in ways that are perceived as just. They emphasize the socially constructed nature of justice perceptions and that ideas of what is fair and taken for granted as just in one context may be contested in another.

Winifred R. Poster (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign) examines in chapter 17 how a global corporation constructs diversity in its struggles with race, class, and gender issues related to employment and work-family policy. As corporate agendas have changed from family-friendly to people-friendly, the conceptions and strategies for addressing race and gender are under debate and change. She draws on case studies of a U.S. high-tech multinational corporation and its subsidiary in India. She starts by analyzing the corporation's workforce diversity policy within its work-life program at its Silicon Valley head office and then examines how this program is transferred to the Indian subsidiary. She questions why two firms that have strong diversity policies and that are owned by the same umbrella parent organization—and that are moreover situated in two countries with a strong state rhetoric of equality—articulate their discourses of diversity and work-family in very narrow and opposing ways. For a U.S. high-tech firm, gender is the lens of diversity policy (even though race is a more overt tension among employees), whereas in a similar Indian high-tech firm, race/ethnicity is the primary lens for diversity policy (even though gender is a more overt tension). The answer lies in the process of discourse formation and the role of managers and institutional contexts in shaping it.

In chapter 18, on the role of speaking up about work-life issues, Amy C. Edmondson (Harvard University) and James R. Detert (Pennsylvania State University) offer a refreshing and innovative view. Summarizing their research on speaking up in organizations ranging from huge corporations to small community hospitals, they discuss the particular challenges of speaking up about life commitments at work. Understanding how people perceive the informal, interpersonal, and cultural environment in which they work presents a critical underpinning for understanding work-life imbalances and for helping individuals and organizations create a healthy balancing process. They theorize the role of speaking up in this balancing process, with attention to three levels of analysis—organizational, group, and individual. They are especially attuned to how informal rather than formal control mechanisms affect work-life balancing and to the effects of leadership chains—a concept that captures the interplay of multiple layers of management above most employees.

Sabir I. Giga (University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, United Kingdom) and Cary L. Cooper (Lancaster University, United Kingdom) discuss in chapter 19 the theory behind psychological contracts and the changing nature of the implied employment relationship. They discuss the potential benefits of social capital, both at a societal level and within organizations, and they develop a framework within which organizations can create “psychosocial capital” as a long-term prerequisite of the conventional corporate aims of economic and human capital. As psychological contracts are normally interpreted in terms of individual expectations, such as for working specific hours of the day, problems can arise when firms try to encourage a cohesive or teamwork-based en-

vironment without changing the psychological contracts they have established with workers.

Adding meat to the notion of supervisor support for work-family integration, Karen Hopkins (University of Maryland) in chapter 20 discusses the key gatekeeping role that supervisors play in workers' knowledge and use of organizational benefits, resources, and programs that can facilitate workers' management of work and life responsibilities. She reviews several social-psychological theoretical perspectives for understanding supervisor support and work-life balance/integration, including bystander-equity theory, leader-member exchange theory, and social identity theory. She argues that social identity theory in particular provides a promising context for examining supportive supervisory attitudes and behaviors. She also identifies the personal and organizational factors that contribute to supervisors' supporting and helping workers with work-life integration and explores how gender and race shape workers' perceptions of supervisor support.

In chapter 21 Marcie Pitt-Catsouphes and Bradley Googins (Boston University) recast the work-family agenda as a corporate social responsibility. They suggest that work-family issues be seen not only as a HR imperative but also as a set of social issues that are relevant to sustainable business success. Once the quality of life of working families is recognized as a social issue that has strategic importance to businesses, it then becomes possible for business leaders to address these concerns from the perspective of corporate social responsibility. The authors discuss the advantages of pursuing the “corporate social responsibility argument” for business commitment to work-family. Pitt-Catsouphes and Googins also suggest that business leaders become more accountable for the progress of their work-family agendas by openly discussing these issues in social reports, which are documents prepared for businesses' stakeholder groups.

Our final section, part V, includes two chapters summarizing crosscutting themes, divergence, and future directions. In contrast to the earlier chapters in this volume, which focus on content, Marian N. Ruderman (Center for Creative Leadership) in chapter 22 looks at an issue of process—how do theories of work-life relationships connect to (or disconnect from) the real world of organizational practice? Despite the contribution of theory to building our knowledge base in a structured way, there is a disconnect between the academic world and the world of practice. This chapter examines gaps between theory and practice, suggesting ways of bridging the two.

In the final chapter to this volume, chapter 23, the editors note established assumptions and enduring challenges in the work-life field. The goal of this concluding chapter is to summarize the implications of the volume for future research frontiers. We examine where authors agree and disagree, what is unique and similar in their approaches, and how their perspectives can advance theory and practice.

The audiences for this volume include the wide range of academics who are investigating relationships between work and personal life and professionals who help workers cope with the stresses of combining work with personal responsibilities, such as psychologists and HR personnel. Managers, union leaders, and others concerned about making the workplace more "employee-friendly" may also benefit from this book. The contributors to this volume have furnished a new wealth of knowledge to the field. We hope it will inspire others to attend more fully to the nuanced relationships between conditions at work and the realities of personal life. We thank the authors for their thoughtfulness.

REFERENCES

- Adnett, N., & Handy, S. (2001). Reviewing the working time directive: Rationale, implementation and case law. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 32(2), 114–125.
- Avery C., & Zabel, D. (2001). *The flexible workplace: A sourcebook of information and research*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56, 781–796.
- Brett, J. M., & Stroh, L. K. (2003). Working 61-plus hours a week: Why do managers do it? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 67–78.
- Brief, A., & Nord, W. (1990). Work and the family. In A. Brief & W. Nord (Eds.), *Meanings of occupational work* (pp. 203–232). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2000). Retrieved October 15, 2003, from www.bls.org
- Burkett, E. (2000). *The baby boon: How family-friendly America cheats the childless*. New York: Free Press.
- Epstein, C. F., Seron, C., Oglensky, B., & Saute, R. (1998). *The part-time paradox: Time norms, professional life, family, and gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Fried, M. (1998). *Taking time: Parental leave policy and corporate culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender & work*. (pp. 391–412). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1997) *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (2000). Work-life initiatives: Greed or benevolence regarding worker's time. In C. L. Cooper & D. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 79–94). New York: Wiley.
- Kossek, E. E., Noe, R. A., & Colquitt, J. (2001). Caregiving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 29–44.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior/human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139–149.

- Lee, M. D., MacDermid, S. M., & Buck, M. L. (2000) Organizational paradigms of reduced-load work: Accommodation, elaboration, and transformation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1211–1226.
- Lewis, S. (1999). An international perspective on work-family issues. In S. Parasuraman & J. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges for a changing world* (pp. 91–103). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Swanberg, M., Bond, J., & Galinsky, E. (2004). Work-life policies: Comparing the responsiveness of nonprofit and for profit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 14(13), 291–312.
- Perlow, L. A. (1997). *Finding time: How corporations, individuals, and families can benefit from new work practices*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Scandura, T., & Lankau, M. (1997). Relationships of gender family responsibility and flexible work hours to organization commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 377–391.
- Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. (1995). The impact of gender as managerial careers unfold. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 290–315.
- Stroh, L. K., Brett, J. M., & Reilly, A. H. (1996). Family structure, glass ceiling, and traditional explanations for the differential rate of turnover of female and male managers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 49, 99–118.
- Voydanoff, P. (2001). Conceptualizing community in the context of work and family. *Community, Work and Family*, 4, 133–156.
- Williams, J. (1999). *Unbending gender: Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wisensale, S. K. (2001). *Family leave policy: The political economy of work and family in America*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Zedeck, S. (Ed.) (1992). *Work, families, and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.