SUZANNE M. BIANCHI   *University of California, Los Angeles*

MELISSA A. MILKIE   *University of Maryland**

Work and Family Research in the First Decade
of the 21st Century

Scholarship on work and family topics expanded in scope and coverage during the 2000 – 2010 decade, spurred by an increased diversity of workplaces and of families, by methodological innovations, and by the growth of communities of scholars focused on the work-family nexus. We discuss these developments as the backdrop for emergent work-family research on six central topics: (a) gender, time, and the division of labor in the home; (b) paid work: too much or too little; (c) maternal employment and child outcomes; (d) work-family conflict; (e) work, family, stress, and health; and (f) work-family policy. We conclude with a discussion of trends important for research and suggestions about future directions in the work-family arena.

The intersection of family care and paid work was the subject of innovative research during the first decade of the 21st century and also continued to be a hot public policy issue. Consider the U.S. presidential campaign of 2008, which brought to the fore sensitive cultural issues about gender, parenting, marriage,

and work across the life course. The Republican vice presidential candidate, Sarah Palin, had a pregnant teenager and a special needs infant among her five children at the same time as she held a highly demanding job as governor of the state of Alaska. Michelle Obama, a lawyer and mother of two young daughters, left her high-powered career to campaign for her husband. Hillary Clinton, a U.S. senator and also a wife and mother, sought the presidency and assumed the visible position of secretary of state. Men's lives, too, evoked work and family intersection issues: Vice President Joseph Biden became a single parent of young sons when he first embarked on his Senate career because of a tragic car accident that killed his wife. He commuted daily by train between Washington and his home in Delaware so that he could return each night to his children. President Barack Obama, raised first by his single mother, then also a stepfather, and later by his grandparents, had a background that made clear that work and family challenges extended to all types of families, not just two-parent, dual-earner families.

Scholarship on work and family topics, initially narrowly focused on ''working mothers'' (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000), expanded in scope and coverage during the 2000 – 2010 decade. Three developments were important: demographic trends such as the increasing diversity of families and workplaces and the stagnation of mothers' labor force participation, methodological innovations such as better measurement of time allocation and

Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, Box 951551, 264 Haines Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551 (bianchi@soc.ucla.edu).

*Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, 2112 Art-Sociology Bldg., College Park, MD 20742 (mmilkie@socy.umd.edu).

more sophisticated analyses of work and family linkages using panel data, and the growth of scholarly networks such as those surrounding the Kanter Award and the Sloan research network that increased accessibility and attention to work and family scholarship.

Our challenge in assembling this review was to capture and summarize the breadth of new research findings while highlighting the most innovative research. First, we reviewed each issue of *Journal of Marriage and Family* from 1999 to mid-2009 for studies on topics related to the intersection between work and family. Second, we reviewed articles that won or were among the top 20 finalists for the Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research from 2001 through 2008. Third, we selected 15 additional journals to review. These included the *American Journal of Sociology*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Child Development*, *Demography*, *Developmental Psychology*, *Family Relations, Gender & Society*, *Journal of Family Issues*, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Social Forces*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, and *Work and Occupations* (see Drago & Kashian, 2003, for an assessment identifying core work-family journals). Each issue of these journals from 1999 to mid-2009 was reviewed for articles pertaining to work-family research. A resulting pool of over 800 articles was organized topically and reviewed for inclusion in this article. We also scanned book reviews for seminal works published during the decade, although we concentrated on journal publications.

The review is organized as follows: We first describe three important developments that shaped the field during the past decade. We then discuss the best research on six topics central to the work and family literature. These topics include (a) gender, time, and the division of labor in the home; (b) paid work: too much or too little? (c) maternal employment and child outcomes; (d) work-family conflict; (e) work, family, stress, and health; and (f) work-family policy. Finally, in the conclusion we summarize key findings and argue that future research in the field will be shaped by structural and demographic changes, such as the aging of the workforce, increased diversity of families and workplaces, the current economic crisis, and continued economic inequalities. Other

articles in this issue, particularly the articles on international family research (Cooke & Baxter, 2010), gender (Ferree, 2010), and families and health (Carr & Springer, 2010), complement our review of the work and family literature.

DEVELOPMENTS SHAPING THE WORK-FAMILY FIELD

Work and family issues that receive the greatest research attention reflect, in part, the economic and policy context of any given historical period. In 2009, as we completed this review, the United States was in a major recession, with an economic crisis that had stretched to global proportions, increasing unemployment, job insecurity, and economic hardship, major stressors to individuals' work and family lives. Income inequality remained an important feature of the economic context, and technological change continued to affect both family life and workplaces. Two demographic factors, the greater diversity of families and workplaces and the stagnation of married women's and mothers' employment rates, were especially important in creating a backdrop for research conducted in the decade.

A defining trend of the 2000 – 2010 decade was the increased diversity of families and workplaces. Families increasingly diverged from the two-parent, two-child family with a male breadwinner and female homemaker, as other types of families (e.g., gay and lesbian families, divorced parents with joint custody) increased. Single-parent families and stepfamilies remained a large share of households with children in this decade, and many scholars examined their work-life conditions and consequences. Workplaces also became more diverse, with growth in the 24/7 economy (Presser, 2003) and the increased flexibility of where and when work occurred, which influenced workers' home lives and the balance between spheres (Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009).

Increased immigration from Asia and Latin America expanded the racial and ethnic diversity of families and workplaces. Immigrant workers filled both low- and high-skilled jobs, pointing to the need to examine work and family issues across the economic spectrum. In the 2000 decade review article on work and family, Perry-Jenkins et al. (2000) noted that the literature focused almost exclusively on White

(European American) families, usually middle-class couples in professional occupations. This was less true of the 2000 – 2010 research on work and family, with expansion of research on low-income families and families of color (Chase-Lansdale et al., 2003; Gennetian, Duncan, et al., 2004).

Another important demographic trend shaping studies during the decade was that, after decades of dramatic rise, women's employment peaked in 1999 (at 60%) and then declined slightly in the first half of the 2000 – 2010 decade (Juhn & Potter, 2006). During the late 1990s, the labor force rates of single and married mothers diverged, with rates rising for single mothers but declining for married mothers with preschoolers (Hoffman, 2009). This drop in married mothers' employment raised questions about whether women were increasingly ''opting out'' of paid work in favor of spending more time with family. A controversial *New York Times Magazine* article in 2003 claimed that many well-educated, highly skilled women were eschewing demanding careers in favor of childrearing (Belkin, 2003), although the media coverage of the trend diverged from reality (Kuperberg & Stone, 2008). Nonetheless, with uncertainty about labor force trajectories of future cohorts of women, the ''opt out'' debate focused attention on a central research question in the work-family field: What keeps men's and women's allocation of time to paid and unpaid work dissimilar, even after decades of expanded opportunities in the workplace for women and minorities?

In addition to demographic changes that required expanded population coverage of work-family research, a second development important to the field was advances in data collection, measurement, and methodologies. For example, new measurement of time allotments and experiences in work and family realms enriched our ability to understand the central bind for adults, that of the 24-hour, 7-day week (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006; Schneider, 2006). The decade saw a growing body of research using time diary data collection methods to assess the gender division of paid and unpaid work and the use of the experience sampling method (ESM) to understand people's subjective experiences of time in family and work realms (Schneider).

During the decade, it became easier to adopt a life course perspective on work-family issues because of methodological advances and increased availability of panel data with which to study work and family issues. Sweet and Moen (2006, p. 205) argued that by examining people as they age, assessing the conjoint influence of family members, and paying careful attention to historical and cultural context, work-family research could ''promote understanding of the choices, constraints, strategies, and stresses of working individuals and families as they play out at different ages, careers stages and family stages.'' Some of the best research during the 2000 – 2010 decade used multiple data points and multiple methods to assess changes over time in work-family linkages.

A final important development over the decade was the creation and growth of communities of scholars focused on the work-family nexus. The Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research, established by Shelley MacDermid, who authored an annual ''Best of the Best'' report summarizing the findings of the top 20 articles published on work and family each year, brought together scholars to evaluate this work and attend conferences. The growth of innovative work was also supported by the Sloan Work-Family network, which funded research, conferences, and a commissioned handbook on work and family (Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek, & Sweet, 2006) and created an online network that expanded the visibility of research on work and family issues (Christensen, 2006).

GENDER, TIME, AND THE DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE HOME

Demographic trends, methodological innovations, and work-family networks of scholars focused attention on the key topic of gender, time, and the division of labor. During the 2000 – 2010 decade, a number of studies showed that men's and women's allocation of time to paid and unpaid work had become more similar, with the gender gap in the unpaid work of cooking, cleaning, and child care narrowing substantially (Sayer, 2005). The smaller gender gap in housework was a result of an increase in men's time but also a large decline in women's time in these activities (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Bianchi et al., 2006). With respect to child care, all the narrowing was because of an increase in men's time with their children: Beginning in the mid-1980s, married fathers' time with their children began to increase (Bianchi et al., 2006; Sandberg &

Hofferth, 2001, 2005). Mothers' average time in child care remained high and indeed was as high in the first decade of the 21st century as it had ever been (Bianchi, 2000; Bianchi et al., 2006; Sandberg & Hofferth, 2001, 2005; Sayer, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004). International data indicated that the increase in men's participation in the unpaid work of the home was not isolated to the United States but was occurring in Europe, Canada, and Australia as well (Bianchi et al., 2006; Bittman, 2000; Gauthier, Smeeding, & Furstenberg, 2004; Gershuny, 2000). Hook (2006), analyzing time use data across 20 countries and covering the 1965–2003 period, found an increase of an average of 6 hour per week in employed, married men's time in the home (housework and child care combined).

Despite the increase in fathers' involvement in the home, child care remained much more the purview of mothers than fathers, just as paid work hours remained longer for fathers than mothers. Craig (2006), using Australian time use data, showed that mothers compared to fathers spent more overall time with children, engaged in more multitasking, operated with a more rigid timetable, spent more time alone with children, and had more overall responsibility for managing the care of their children.

One unanswered question about paid work, housework, and child care remained central: Why were men's and women's time allocation to the home—though more similar now than in the past—still so dissimilar, especially in families with children? The answer to this question was viewed as key to understanding gender inequality in paid work outcomes, where women, particularly mothers, continued to suffer a ''wage penalty'' or blocked mobility in the labor market (Budig & England, 2001; Correll, Benard, & Paik, 2007).

Almost all studies of housework provided evidence on a limited number of causal explanations for men's relatively low contribution—the time availability explanation, the relative resources account, or some variant of the gender perspective that emphasized either the role of gender ideology or the idea of housework as ''doing gender.'' Despite the large number of studies, there emerged no dominant consensus on the most persuasive explanation for the persistence of the gender division of labor in the home. Those claiming that men's and women's paid and unpaid work was converging emphasized rational decision making and time availability as

the key explanation (Sayer, 2005). The gender perspective was increasingly invoked by those who viewed men's changes in the home as small, especially in comparison with women's changes in the market place. The ''doing gender'' variant of this perspective argued that definitions of masculinity were wrapped up in the economic provider role: Men resisted doing tasks defined as feminine, especially when their own performance as a provider was compromised (Bittman, England, Sayer, Folbre, & Matheson, 2003). Some researchers also pointed to women's reluctance to give up control, or ''maternal gatekeeping'' (S. M. Allen & Hawkins, 1999; Gaunt, 2008; also see Gupta, 2007, for a critique of the gender perspective in the housework literature).

Over the decade, a gender ''leisure gap'' opened, favoring men, where there was none in the past (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003; Mattingly & Sayer, 2006; Sayer, 2005). Mothers' leisure was found to be of lower quality than fathers' leisure experience as indexed by its ''contamination'' with other tasks, including child care (Bittman & Wacjman, 2000; Mattingly & Bianchi). On the other hand, although there was a second shift for employed mothers, it was not nearly as large as that claimed by earlier qualitative research, and the leisure gap between mothers employed full time and homemakers was larger than the gender gap between fathers and mothers employed full time (Milkie, Raley, & Bianchi, 2009; Sayer, England, Bittman, & Bianchi, 2009). In some family types, most notably those that remained male sole breadwinner, men worked longer total work hours (paid plus unpaid) than women.

PAID WORK: TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE?

Too Much Work

The increased diversity of workplaces and families and the attention to time use increased awareness of the problem of too many work hours or inflexibility in work hours as a major problem for families, leaving insufficient time and energy for family life (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004). With more single-parent households and many more dual-earner families, a much higher proportion of 21st century households than in the past had all adults employed and, thus, had limited flexibility in meeting demands at home such as the care of sick children (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001).

Parental feelings of not spending enough time with children were widespread and higher for fathers who spent more hours away from home in the paid workforce than mothers (Milkie, Mattingly, Nomaguchi, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004). Feelings of time deficits with children were more negatively correlated with measures of well-being among mothers than fathers (Nomaguchi, Milkie, & Bianchi, 2005). Families yearned for high-quality ''family time'' that was difficult to achieve in practice (Daly, 2001), though the emotions of family life tapped in real time through ESM methods varied considerably from this ideal (Schneider, 2006). Some research suggested that the lack of time for shared family activities had consequences for children, with more risky behaviors for adolescents in families with fewer shared activities (Crouter, Head, McHale, & Tucker, 2004).

Many occupations, especially those in the most well-remunerated workplaces, required total absorption in the job, which was problematic for workers who wanted to spend time with children and other family members (Blair-Loy, 2003). Not only were work demands increasing for highly educated workers, expectations of involved parenting were also increasing, especially among highly educated parents (Lareau, 2003; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004). A father's long work hours were negatively associated with the breadth of activities he did with his children (Bulanda, 2004; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001), less time with a spouse, lower marital quality when he felt high role overload, and less positive involvement with adolescent children (Crouter, Bumpus, Head, & McHale, 2001). Mothers (but not fathers) curtailed employment in the face of overwhelming demands from work and family, and this ensured continued gender inequality in both spheres of home and market (Bianchi & Raley, 2005; Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000).

Too Little Work and Men's Family Involvement

Although the work and family field was dominated by the assumption that ''too much'' work was the major problem in balancing the demands of family life, there was increased attention to the fact that ''too little'' work was also a major work-family issue (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004). In particular, employment difficulties and low earnings disconnected men from family life. Marriages were much less likely to form when men had poor economic prospects, and earnings potential was especially important for marriage among low-income men and minorities (Ahituv & Lerman, 2007).

Not only marriage but also parenting were tied to work for men. The provider role remained important for men (S. L. Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001; Townsend, 2002), with fathers often losing contact with their children when they could no longer provide for them. Fathers with higher earnings more often resided with their children throughout childhood compared to fathers with lower earnings, increasing inequality in children's life chances (Gupta, Smock, & Manning, 2004). Particularly in low-income families where couples were often not married at the time a child was born and fathers might never coreside with their children, a father's financial contribution was essential to his active parenting (e.g., visiting children and caring for and taking responsibility for them; Coley & Morris, 2002; Landale & Oropesa, 2001).

Family involvement and commitment to children also strengthened men's ties to the workforce, particularly for low-income fathers. Married men worked more hours with a feedback effect of increasing future earnings (Ahituv & Lerman, 2007). Fathers had stronger labor force attachment (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001; Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000) and earned more than childless men (Lundberg & Rose, 2000). This ''fatherhood wage premium'' was smaller for African American than White and Latino men, perhaps because married—but not unmarried—-fathers experienced this premium, and African American men were more often unmarried when they become fathers (Glauber, 2008).

Panel data allowed researchers to explore the causal mechanisms that might link work and family for men. It was hypothesized that becoming a parent induced men to reorient their priorities and commitments and strengthened their attachment to extended kin and to paid work. Parents, coworkers, and (prospective) spouses expected more maturity from a man who married and became a father. These expectations were internalized by men but also sanctioned and supported by extended kin and society at large. Finally, selection also played a role: More mature men more often became fathers, or filled the father role, than less mature men. Research suggested some support for each of these mechanisms (Kaufman & Uhlenberg,

2000; Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006; Knoester, Petts, & Eggebeen, 2007).

The increased number of studies of (low-income) men's involvement in families during the 2000 – 2010 decade—and the findings of the continued importance of financial provision for their involvement—added balance to the work and family literature. Work overload was not the only ''work-family'' problem that deserved attention. Too little paid work eroded family connections, particularly for men, by negatively affecting their motivation and ability to remain connected to partners, children, extended kin, and the community.

MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT AND CHILD OUTCOMES

Maternal Employment and Young Children

One of the largest topics in the work-family literature continued to be the relationship between parental employment, most often maternal employment, and child well-being. The vast majority of studies of maternal employment showed either no or small effects on child outcomes. One area where positive effects were increasingly reported was for young children in low-income families. Evidence mounted from random assignment, experimental research with welfare-eligible families that young children benefited from programs that increased a mother's stable employment or income (Morris, Huston, Duncan, Crosby, & Bos, 2001). Maternal employment improved the home environment (Gennetian, Crosby, Huston, & Lowe, 2004) and encouraged stable routines that benefited young children (Chase-Landsdale et al., 2003). Context was important, with the maternal employment-child outcome relationship conditioned by factors such as the level of social support a mother had and her own psychological health (Ciabattari, 2007; Raver, 2003).

During the decade, there were also a number of methodologically sophisticated studies, based on panel data, that found negative effects of early and extensive maternal employment but usually only in more affluent families (Ruhm, 2009). More behavior problems or lower cognitive outcomes were reported most often for boys, children from middle-class families, children with married parents, and White but not Hispanic or African American children (Brooks-Gunn, Han, & Waldfogel, 2002; Waldfogel,

Han, & Brooks-Gunn, 2002). Gordon, Kaestner, and Korenman (2007) reported that children who spent more time in child care had increased respiratory problems and high rates of ear infections. Nomaguchi (2006) found offsetting negative and positive effects of maternal employment on preschoolers: Children of employed mothers were better adjusted (e.g., lower hyperactivity scores, more prosocial behavior, less anxiety) but also had fewer positive mother-child interactions, read less frequently with a parent, and spent long hours in nonparental care.

Child Care

A review of work-family research cannot ignore child care as a topic—in part because it forms the nucleus of what much ''work-family'' conflict is about—how to care for children adequately when parents need or want to work outside the home. Studies from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Early Child Care Research Network, published throughout the decade, provided the bulk of new information on child care and child outcomes. One of the main findings from this network was the much larger importance of parenting practices than child-care experience for children's development (Belsky et al., 2007).

Child-care costs remained a barrier to employment and often resulted in curtailed work hours, particularly for low-income mothers (Baum, 2002; Meyers, Heintze, & Wolf, 2002). Types of available child care varied by location: Parents in metropolitan areas and higher income communities had greater access to center-based care than parents in other communities (Gordon & Chase-Lansdale, 2001). Finding high-quality child care was most difficult for working-poor and working-class families, where income was too high to qualify for government subsidized programs (e.g., Head Start) but too low to purchase high-quality care in the private market (Howes et al., 1995).

Parents varied in what they sought in child care, but, net of costs, warmth and educational level of caregivers and the type of curriculum a program offered were important considerations (Rose & Elicker, 2008). African American and Mexican American employed mothers more often used care by relatives than European American mothers (Uttal, 1999). When pregnant mothers were asked about the child-care arrangements they would like for their infants,

about twice as many (one half) preferred father care as actually achieved this goal after the birth of the child (Riley & Glass, 2002).

Finding stable child-care arrangements remained difficult for U.S. working parents, particularly for low-income, single mothers, those working variable shifts, and those who put together a patchwork of arrangements (Heymann, 2000). Having multiple child-care arrangements was more common among single mothers, mothers who worked less than full time, those with older preschool age children rather than younger infants and toddlers, and those who used informal arrangements (Morrissey, 2008). Mothers who managed to arrange their preferred type of care early in the child's life were less likely to switch caregivers and had more stability of care (Gordon & Hognas, 2006). Mothers had more work absences because of sick children when they used centers and large family day-care settings than when they used small, home-based caregivers, but they were less likely to quit their jobs when they used the former than the latter type of care (Gordon, Kaestner, & Korenman, 2008). Low-income mothers who used small, home-based nonrelative care were especially likely to exit employment. Patchwork child-care arrangements were particularly prevalent among low-income mothers trying to move from welfare to work (Scott, London, & Hurst, 2005).

Studies of older children focused on the child's self-care and suggested that parents chose self-care over supervised care when they lived in safer, suburban neighborhoods rather than urban neighborhoods and for children whom parents deemed responsible and mature enough to handle self-care. Self-care was less common among minority and low-income children than among White, higher income children, and children began small amounts of self-care at relatively early ages, between ages 8 and 10 according to Casper and Smith (2002). Parents' options for organized care that children wanted to attend diminished greatly as children aged, particularly at the transition from elementary to middle school (Polatnick, 2002).

Maternal Employment and Adolescent Outcomes

As the same time that studies showed positive effects of maternal employment on low-income preschoolers, evidence accumulated that maternal employment might be negative for adolescents in low-income populations where mothers were transitioning from welfare to work. In a meta-analysis of eight random assignment studies, Gennetian, Duncan, et al. (2004) reported small but negative effects on adolescents' school performance, likelihood of performing in the top half of the class, and an increased likelihood of grade repetition. Their evidence suggested that increased responsibility for younger siblings translated into lowered school performance of these adolescents. If correct, the group of children who were hurt by the increased work requirements under welfare reform was not young children, as originally feared, but older children.

Nonstandard Work Schedules and Family Outcomes

A number of studies focused on work schedules, family life, and child outcomes, with the overriding concern that some work schedules—or inflexibility in work schedules—might have deleterious consequences for child well-being and family life more generally. On the positive side, Barnett and Gareis (2007) found that when mothers worked evenings rather than daytime hours, fathers were more involved in child care, spent more time with children, and were generally more knowledgeable about their children's lives and activities. Wight, Raley, and Bianchi (2008) reported that evening work interfered with parental activities with children such as helping with homework and having dinner with the family, but parents who worked at nonstandard times spent more overall time with children and had more time alone with children than parents who worked standard daytime hours.

Han (2005) found that young children whose mothers worked nonstandard schedules, particularly in the first year of life, had lower cognitive development and used less expressive language than children of mothers who worked standard schedules. These negative effects perhaps reflected the lower quality of child care used by mothers in jobs with nonstandard hours. Increased maternal stress among low-income mothers with nonstandard work hours was another hypothesized pathway by which work schedules negatively influenced the behavior of preschoolers (Joshi & Bogen, 2007). Strazdins, Clements, Korda, Broom, and D'Souza (2006) reported less effective parenting and more behavioral problems for children

in families where parents worked nonstandard schedules. Presser (2000) also suggested that marital disruption increased when either the husband or the wife worked a night shift.

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

Attention to workplaces and work schedules fed naturally into a burgeoning body of research on work-family conflict across many different disciplines, including psychology, sociology, family studies, and business fields (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinkley, 2005). The best studies of work-family conflict acknowledged the diversity of workplaces and families, used longitudinal data, or used a life course approach to advance knowledge about trade-offs across partners in their work-family configurations. Studies of work-family facilitation, in which the conditions of one sphere enhanced the other sphere, remained a much smaller part of the literature. In this section, we discuss theoretical refinements and the linkages of social statuses, antecedents, and cultural context to work-family conflict.

Trends in and Theoretical Perspectives on Work-Family Conflict

Work-family conflict remained relatively common, and its level increased in recent years (Duxbury & Higgins, 2001) perhaps because of demographic and other changes. Work-family balance became a more salient issue in the culture as well (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Although a majority of married employed people felt at least somewhat successful in balancing the two central roles of work and family (Milkie & Peltola, 1999), a sizable group of parents—roughly half—experienced work-family conflict (Bellavia & Frone). Nomaguchi's (2009) decomposition analysis with two national surveys showed that work-family conflict increased among employed parents in the period from 1977 to 1997. Although some trends (more time spent with children in the latter era, more egalitarian gender attitudes, and increased job rewards) were linked with lower conflict, the countervailing trends linked to higher levels of work-family conflict (increased labor force participation and education levels for mothers and more time pressure on the job over this period) were more pronounced. For those experiencing difficulties of

work interfering with family, the conflicts were intense (Blair-Loy, 2003) and the structures of work and family hard to alter, particularly for single parents or lower income couples.

Theoretical diversity marked the study of work-family conflict, but little research explicitly tested differences among theories. Much of the field of work-family conflict implicitly took a role conflict orientation. Linked to role theory, the job demand-resources perspective was used to shed light on the specific occupational conditions that either contributed to difficulties (i.e., job demands that conflicted with family life) or to solving problems (i.e., resources that aided work-family balance). Border and boundary theories discussed the flexibility and permeability between the two spheres, and the gender perspective attempted to assess the meanings men and women attached to work and family life and how their ideologies contributed to levels and types of conflict. Two broader approaches that were often combined with other theoretical orientations included ecological theory (e.g., Voydanoff, 2005) and a life course perspective (e.g., Becker & Moen, 1999), each recognizing the complexities of the intersection of family and work across individuals' and families' life courses (see Bellavia & Frone, 2005, for a review).

The vast majority of the literature specified the direction of influence in assessing work-family conflict, for example, examining work-to-family (WTF) conflict or, less often, family-to-work (FTW) conflict (Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Byron, 2005). Most often, work-family conflict was viewed as arising from occupational conditions and assessed as a dependent variable, with researchers attempting to refine knowledge about its antecedents. Family to work conflict typically arose from the circumstances of home life, but Byron showed in her meta-analysis of conflict antecedents that some work and family factors have ''simultaneously disruptive effects'' within both spheres (p. 190). Work-family conflict was also increasingly used as a moderator or mediator variable in studies of the complex relationships among work conditions, family experiences, and well-being.

Social Statuses and Work-Family Conflict

A key demographic characteristic related to higher levels of work-family conflict was having young children or more children in the

home (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Other status differences in levels or types of conflict, such as by social class or gender, were more complex. Scholars studied particular occupations such as nurses or executives (Barnett, Gareis, & Brennan, 2008; Blair-Loy, 2001), but few studies compared occupations or explicitly assessed social class theoretically or empirically in relation to work-family conflict. Research indicated that women experienced more FTW conflict than men, but assessing gender differences in WTF conflict was complicated. Many studies indicated that women and men felt equal levels of work-family conflict, with major national surveys showing the same percentages of employed men and women experiencing work-family conflict (Bellavia & Frone; Milkie & Peltola, 1999; Schieman et al., 2009). Gender differences, however, were more often found when examining men and women who occupied similar job and family statuses (O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2005; Wharton & Blair-Loy, 2006). Meta-analyses indicated gender differences were more evident among parents than the general population, with mothers more conflicted than fathers (Byron, 2005). Finally, the consequences of work-family conflict were more tightly linked to well-being for mothers (Nomaguchi et al., 2005), given their ultimate responsibility for creating and sustaining a satisfactory and successful family life.

Selection effects are important to consider when assessing gender and work-family conflict (Schieman et al., 2009). Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Collins (2001) used a sample of married or partnered certified public accountants (CPAs) below the level of partner with at least one child. They showed that WTF conflict was related to withdrawal intentions, especially for those with lower career involvement, and for this less work-invested group, WTF conflict influenced actual withdrawal over the subsequent 2-year period. Surprisingly, the authors did not examine gender differences, although it is likely that those with lower career involvement were mothers. Moreover, the fact that there were more than twice as many married fathers than mothers in their CPA sample suggested that many mothers had already withdrawn prior to the initiation of the study, perhaps to reduce conflict. Thus, mothers who were most conflicted may have decided to never become certified or to exit the labor force when it was possible, each of which would prevent them from being part of the original sample of full-time employees included

in this study. Mothers who ''solved'' their psychological work-family conflicts by reducing work hours or leaving the labor force probably increased the likelihood that they would experience problems in reentering the labor force or obtaining decent wages in the future (Budig & England, 2001; Correll et al., 2007).

Antecedents of Work-Family Conflict

Jobs have both demands that might be associated with more conflict, particularly when decision-making control is low (Karasek, 1979), and resources such as flexibility that might be associated with solutions to work spillover into family life. Bakker and Geurts (2004) argued that job demands were linked to exhaustion and work-home interference, and job resources were linked with ''flow,'' which reduced work-family interference. Specific work antecedents that were linked to higher conflict included job stress (particularly overload), high job involvement, and more work hours. Having a supportive supervisor or coworkers or more flexibility was associated with lower WTF conflict (Byron, 2005), and informal work support was more important for lower WTF conflict than formal supports such as leave policies (Behson, 2005). T. D., Shockley, and Poteat (2008) found that having supervisors who were supportive of family was associated with less work-family conflict and more frequent family dinners; moreover, workplace policies such as allowing telecommuting were important for family and child well-being. The greater availability of telecommuting was linked to less fast food for children.

Some aspects of work that are considered resources, such as flexibility or job authority, did not always reduce WTF conflict. Schieman and colleagues posited the ''stress of higher status'' argument. For example, Schieman, Whitestone, and Van Gundy (2006) found that specific job conditions such as being self-employed and having more job authority created more, not less, work-home conflict. Schieman and Reid (2009) explicated the paradoxical null association between job authority and health by showing that, although those with job authority had greater earnings and more nonroutine work, both positively related to health, this was offset by greater WTF conflict and workplace conflict that eroded well-being. Similarly, Schieman et al. (2009) showed that flexibility, considered

a desirable resource, was actually linked to higher work-life interference when employees worked long hours. In all, assumptions about the benefits of job ''resources'' are in question, given that these resources may allow job demands to reach further into the home domain, particularly through technological change that allows much professional work to be conducted almost anywhere. Some argue, too, that available resources such as flexibility may not even be used. Kossek, Lautsch, and Eaton (2006) argued that researchers should not only assess whether formal policies like telecommuting or flextime were available for employees but also whether they were used and whether workers viewed their jobs as having flexibility.

Although family events or strains were hypothesized to be more tightly linked to FTW conflict than WTF conflict, Byron's (2005) meta-analysis showed that unexpected family events created both types of conflict. Perhaps snow days or sick children could create complicated feelings of conflict across a parent's roles, for example, parental guilt for farming out the care of a sick child to others and simultaneously frustration that the unanticipated event cut into work time and routines, thus exacerbating work stress. Thompson and Bunderson (2001) argued for examining identities because identity-discrepant time use created greater imbalance than certain objective conditions.

Work-Family Conflict: Cultural Considerations

Although work-family conflict research was conducted in many different countries over the decade—Bellavia and Frone (2005) counted 37 countries on all six inhabited continents—there was little that explicitly compared different cultures. One exception was Wharton and Blair-Loy's (2002, 2006) study of long work hours among professionals working for the same company in Hong Kong, the United States, and London. They found that workers in Hong Kong, with many obligations to extended family and kin, experienced greater work-home interference and expressed stronger desires for reduced hours compared with Western workers.

The relationship between gender and work-family conflict varied across different countries. Using a representative sample of Australian workers, Reynolds and Aletraris (2007) found that WTF conflict was associated with a desire for women, but not men, to reduce their work

hours when they had preschoolers but that FTW interferences were linked with women wanting to increase their work hours, perhaps an indication of an underlying strong identity commitment to work that made aspects of family life feel confining. With U.S. data, however, Reynolds (2005) found that work-life conflict made women want to decrease work hours regardless of whether the conflict originated at work or home. For men, this was true when conflict originated at work only. Reynolds also found that higher income workers were more likely to want to reduce hours, underscoring potential class advantages in the freedom to balance time obligations.

Studies examining ethnic differences expanded knowledge about how culture and ideology influence people's experiences of work-family conflict. For example, Roehling, Jarvis, and Swope (2005) found a larger gender difference in family-to-work and work-to-family spillover among Hispanics than among Whites or Blacks. They attribute this to Hispanics' stronger traditional gender ideology, less gender egalitarian work and family roles, and Hispanics' recent entry into the U.S. labor market. Hispanic women, especially mothers, had the highest levels of negative work-to-family and family-to-work spillover. Clark (2002) found that Nez Perce Indians had marginally less WTF conflict when they had more of a sense of community at work, linked to the number of coworkers in their ethnic group, underscoring the multidimensional ways to assess cultural meanings and fit. These studies highlighted the need to study how work and family processes varied across different cultural contexts.

Family-to-Work Conflict and Facilitation

A smaller literature linked family factors to work conflicts. Having young or disabled children was clearly associated with family-to-work conflict (Lewis, Kagan, & Heaton, 2000; Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon, & Kiger, 2007), and FTW conflict affected job performance (Witt & Carlson, 2006), though it depended on feelings of burnout (Erickson, Nichols, & Ritter, 2000) and gender, with women's more than men's performance affected by family to work spillover (Keene & Reynolds, 2005). Hyde, Else-Quest, Goldsmith, and Biesanz (2004) showed that having a preschooler with a difficult temperament was associated with more parental difficulties at

work and fewer felt rewards in combining work and family. Wallace and Young (2008), with a sample of Canadian lawyers, found that fathers benefited from family resources and family-friendly benefits, but mothers did not. Moreover, mothers of school-aged children were less productive than nonmothers, whereas fathers of preschoolers were more productive than nonfathers. Kirchmeyer (2006) found that among doctoral students, family structures influenced women more so than men. For women, having a young child and an employed partner was associated with favoring work-family balance, which in turn predicted geographic restrictions on work, whereas these factors did not influence job preferences of men. Moreover, having a nonemployed spouse only helped men's careers.

Work-Family Conflict Research Using a Life Course Perspective

The work-family conflict literature could be strengthened if it more often took an explicit life course perspective. This perspective increased recognition that there are periods in life when more work-family conflict should be expected, such as when there are young children in the home and all available adults are in the workforce, whether this is a single mother living alone or a dual-earner couple or some other arrangement (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001). For families with older children, the incompatibility of work schedules and school schedules (e.g., shorter days and summer vacations) made arranging coverage quite labor intensive and emotionally difficult (Barnett & Gareis, 2006). At later stages of the life course, caregiving for a disabled spouse or parent hastened labor force exit and compromised long-term financial security for women (Pavalko & Artis, 1997) and delayed retirement and lowered job satisfaction for men whose jobs often provided needed earnings and health care coverage (Dentinger & Clarkberg, 2002).

Several studies highlighted the importance of historical and cultural context and change. Technological advances permitted people to engage in work activities across different locations. Hill, Ferris, and Martinson's (2003) study of IBM workers showed that the virtual office (working with tools wherever it makes sense to do it) was positive for work success but negative for work-family balance and the home office (telecommuting from home) was positive for work-life balance. In addition to technological changes, there may be cohort changes in ideals about work-family intersections. Blair-Loy (2001) showed cultural shifts over time, with younger cohorts of women finance executives feeling less work and family conflict than older cohorts did, in part because they subcontracted out some domestic responsibilities.

Some work-family conflict research recognized the important component of "linked lives" in life course research, for example, the influence of a partner's conflict on one's own sense of balance and well-being. Fagan and Press (2008) found that when fathers experienced stressors at work, this crossed over to mothers feeling less successful in balancing work and family. Moreover, partners provided specific supports to each other that alleviated work-family conflict (van Daalen, Willemsen, & Sanders, 2006)—including practical supports like investing in child care and housework and emotional sustenance like support for career moves, interest in the partners' work, and so on (Becker & Moen, 1999; Thorstad, Anderson, Hall, Willingham, & Carruthers, 2006).

The literature also has not sufficiently recognized individual agency—how workers actively strategize to maximize work-family balance. Some important exceptions include Becker and Moen (1999), who detailed how dual-earner couples scaled back work to accommodate family life, including placing limits on work hours, favoring one spouse's career over another, and trading off periods when one partner had a "job" and the other focused on career. Several respondents in this qualitative study mentioned that they moved to a more rural area from a more frenetic urban area in order to experience better work-life balance. Berke (2003) interviewed 20 Mary Kay cosmetics consultants about their home-based self-employment and showed how they actively used many different behavioral, psychological, and spatial strategies to manage boundaries between their home and work lives. A necessary advance for the work-family conflict literature, even for research explicitly employing a life course perspective, is to use prospective designs to assess what people do in the months after experiencing conflict, not only what they say they want to do. These prospective studies also should focus attention on the process of how people make work-family choices within structural constraints, including choosing particular careers or jobs for their perceived fit with

family life, and what choices or changes in strategy actually succeed in subsequently reducing conflict.

WORK, FAMILY, STRESS, AND HEALTH

One key work-family research question was how paid work and its intersection with family life imprints deeply into the health and well-being of individuals. Work-family experiences shape mental and physical health as well as the self-concept largely through three avenues: the structure of work, conflicts between work and family, and not enough work. Assessing the causal links across work and family domains and health and well-being of individuals is complex and can be improved both with panel data and with a life course perspective.

Work-Family Stressors and Mental Health

The structuring of work is important for the mental health of family members. Work hours per se did not seem to have a strong link to mental health (Barnett et al., 2008; Gareis & Barnett, 2002), but the time of day and week that people worked mattered for work-family spillover (Davis, Goodman, Pirretti, & Almeida 2008) and health. In a study of nurses in dual-earner families, wives who worked evening shifts had more conflict and more distress than those who worked day shifts, and a wife's work shift also influenced her husband's sense of conflict (Barnett et al., 2008). Shift work among working-class, dual-earner new parents was linked to higher depression levels, and working a rotating shift was associated with lowered marital relationship quality among mothers (Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg, Pierce, & Sayer, 2007). Mismatches between children's school schedules and parents' work schedules were stressful, particularly for parents of girls (Barnett & Gareis, 2006). Finally, whether mothers worked part time or full time was important for how parenting strains affected depression: Parenting strains were more equal for mothers and fathers when both worked full time, more linked to depression for mothers than fathers when the wife worked part time (Roxburgh, 2005).

Research continued to show the deleterious effects of WTF conflict on health. Indeed, a meta-analysis of 67 articles focused on the consequences of WTF conflict demonstrated the strong link to strain, depression, somatic symptoms, and burnout (T. D. Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). Research on how work-family configurations contribute to individuals' well-being indicated the importance of workers' interpretations of their conditions. Barnett and Gareis (2000) showed that the perceived difficulty of trade-offs was a more important factor than the number of work hours for the mental health of physicians who worked reduced hours. Gareis and Barnett (2002), using a sample of 98 female doctors working either full time or reduced hours, showed that schedule fit was an important predictor of distress, not work hours or perceived job demands.

Work and family obligations exact huge allotments of time from people, and the time pressure people feel is a particularly important type of conflict that links to family members' well-being. Roxburgh (2004) showed that time pressure was associated with depression and that it explained the higher depression of employed women compared with men. Income moderated the influence of time pressure on depression, highlighting the importance of higher social statuses in alleviating this stressor. Nomaguchi et al. (2005) found that among dual-earner parents, fathers reported more time deficits with spouses and children than mothers did because of their longer work hours, but these feelings of pressure were related to lower well-being only for mothers. Among those who expressed a time shortage for themselves, fathers' well-being was more affected than mothers', underscoring the cultural and gendered nature of how feelings translate to well-being. Spending ''too little'' time with one's children may matter more for mothers' mental health than fathers' because mothers are supposed to be more devoted to family (Blair-Loy, 2003).

As noted above, work overload was not the only work-family problem that deserved attention; too little paid work or too poorly renumerated work created economic hardships and financial insecurity that deeply affected health as well as family relationships (Probst, 2005). Probst argued that objective stressors such as unemployment, downward mobility and forced early retirement, along with the economic deprivation associated with decreased income, was linked to the subjective strains of job security and adequacy. These negatively affected worker's health and their marital relationships and parenting quality. Research within the family stress and life course models by Conger, Elder, and

colleagues (Conger et al., 2002; Conger & Elder, 1994) indicated the clear pathways from economic problems to stressors within relationships and negative outcomes across family members, including adolescents and young children.

Causal relationships among job conditions, family experiences, work-family conflict, and well-being are critical but difficult to assess (Demerouti, Bakker, & Bulters, 2004; Mac-Dermid & Harvey, 2006). Although the link between work-family conflict and lowered well-being is ''unequivocal'' (Mullen, Kelley, & Kelloway, 2008, p. 198), much research is cross-sectional. Rantanen, Kinnunen, Feldt, and Pulkkinen (2008), using structural equation modeling (SEM) with two longitudinal data sets, showed that job exhaustion preceded psychological distress but distress also influenced work conditions. Steinmetz, Frese, and Schmidt (2008) revealed a cyclical model, using SEM with data from two panels of German workers, in which a pathway was specified from job stressors to depression to work-home interference to job stressors. Using a quite different, intensive interview approach to understanding causality, Blair-Loy (2003) in *Competing Devotions* showed that distress could influence decisions about work among executive women. Multiple negative family or work events created feelings of being overwhelmed that affected future work trajectories. Women ''chose'' to opt out of their jobs for less demanding, part-time work, even when they were devoted to their careers. This choice was structured by beliefs about what were ''proper'' work-family configurations for women.

Work, Family and the Self-Concept

Mastery or the sense of control that people feel over the important things in their life is tightly linked to mental health (Pearlin, 1999). Cassidy and Davies (2003), using a community sample of Canadians, found that the association between more work-family conflict and lower mastery was stronger for mothers than for fathers, as was the association between doing less than one's share of chores and lower mastery. Mastery was also important for achieving career goals but was contingent on structural constraints from family life. Reynolds, Burge, Robbins, Boyd, and Harris (2007) found that marriage increased the effect of mastery on the odds of achieving career goals, whereas children decreased mastery's effect. A history of uninterrupted work over the life course

was linked with higher mastery, and this in part explained how older women, who were much more likely to have had interrupted labor force participation because of family obligations, had a lower sense of control than older men (Ross & Mirowsky, 2002).

Carr (2002) also found cohort effects to be important in how work-family life linked to self-concept. She showed that Baby Bust women (born 1960–1970) and Baby Boom women (born 1944–1959), along with pre–World War II cohort men (born 1931–1943), had lower self-esteem if they cut back on paid employment compared to their peers who worked continuously, whereas older women and Baby Bust men who altered their work schedules had higher self-esteem than their peers. Carr argued that fitting in with the dominant work-family ideology of the era was important for a positive sense of self.

WORK-FAMILY POLICY

Any review of work-family research would be incomplete without some attention to research on policies and the policy context that remains so important to the work-family arena. Work-family policies received increased attention in the 2000–2010 decade, with research taking a decidedly more nuanced approach to the empirical investigation of policy contexts. Almost all research noted that the United States lagged behind other countries in the enactment of ''family-friendly'' work-life policies (Gornick & Meyers, 2003), but there was greater awareness of the tension between some family-friendly policies and gender equality in the workplace. Greater attention was given to distinguishing policies that encouraged labor force participation of parents (provision of child care) from policies that reduced market work (extended parental leaves) of new parents, especially mothers.

Observational studies pooled data across countries with differing policy contexts and showed that countries with a large public sector of female-typed jobs facilitated women's part-time employment but also tended to increase gender occupational segregation (Mandel & Semyonov, 2006). The provision of long parental leaves for childbirth discouraged female labor force participation and tended to ghettoize mothers when they were employed (Gangl & Ziefle, 2009). These ''mother-friendly'' policies were correlated with smaller gender wage gaps, but Mandel and Semyonov (2005) suggested

that this ''wage effect'' resulted from greater state control in the setting of wages in countries with more generous work-family policies. When the egalitarianism of the country's wage setting mechanisms was controlled, work-family policies such as extended leaves were associated with larger gender wage gaps.

Whether work-family policies are viewed as effective depends on the desired outcome, with labor market outcomes only part of the nexus. More time with one's own children may increase family well-being even though it erodes labor market outcomes of the individual parent. For example, a program in Norway that paid parents to care for their own young children increased parental time with children and was correlated with increased marital stability of the couple (Hardoy & Schone, 2008). Government provision of child care increased the pace at which women became first time mothers (Rindfuss, Guilkey, Morgan, Kravdal, & Guzzo, 2007), at the same time as it increased maternal employment (Misra, Moller, & Budig, 2007) and made it easier for low-wage mothers to meet employers' expectations for additional work hours (Press, Fagan, & Laughlin, 2006).

In the United States, research is underway using experiments in organizational settings aimed at reducing work-family stress by easing the requirements to work long hours. Moen, Kelly, and Chermack (2009) studied work groups in a large U.S. firm, Best Buy, as they changed from a focus on how many hours people spent on the job to what was accomplished on the job. Although this study was not a randomized trial, it afforded researchers the ability to compare groups undergoing a change that gave workers more control over their work schedules with groups that were not undergoing this change. Preliminary findings suggested positive effects: lower commuting times, more schedule control, more and higher quality sleep, more energy, and lowered work-family conflict in the groups undergoing change than in the control groups. The Best Buy intervention was focused on salaried workers: Lambert (2009) suggested far greater difficulty and more limited ability to change conditions of work when the target of an intervention was hourly workers.

CONCLUSION

Scholarship on the intersection of paid work with family life flourished during the 2000 – 2010 decade. In this review, we have highlighted key areas of work-family research of the past decade. There was an expansion of the field to consider the work-family issues of low-income populations, not just middle-class, European American families. There was a greater focus on men and fathers in the work and family research of the 2000 – 2010 decade than previously.

Research on the gender division of labor in the home documented that fathers were doing more in the home, overall workloads of mothers and fathers were relatively equal but remained gender specialized, with women doing more in the home and men doing more in the marketplace. Little progress was made on adjudicating among the hypothesized causes of this specialization (time availability, relative power, or gender display), but there seemed new urgency in studying the causes as growth in married women's labor force participation stalled and evidence mounted of a ''motherhood wage penalty.''

Increased research attention to the problem of too little work counterbalanced the more prominent attention to work overload and work-family conflict among professional workers. Too little work was most often a problem for low-income workers and eroded men's connections to families. Research on maternal employment among low-income populations yielded some surprising new findings. Contrary to concerns about the negative impact of forcing welfare mothers to work, greater maternal employment was usually found to be beneficial for young children in low-income families, but new concerns arose about possible negative effects on adolescents.

Research on subjective dimensions of work and family conflict used better methods and more often employed a life course perspective to assess causal directions between work-to-family interference and vice versa. There was increased use of panel data, sophisticated modeling (SEM in the social psychological literature, fixed effects in the social demographic literature) aimed at assessing temporal ordering of events and building the evidentiary base for causal claims and for understanding the mechanisms by which work affected family and family affected work. There was also a growing use of randomized experiments and quasi-experimental approaches to studying work and family issues. At the same time, a number of high-quality, ethnographic and qualitative

studies (e.g., Blair-Loy, 2003; Townsend, 2002) enhanced understanding of work and family linkages. In part, because of the Sloan work-family network and the Kanter Award, work-family scholarship appeared in the journals of an expanded number of fields, and scholars become more aware of the multidisciplinary research in the work and family area. Research on policy highlighted both negative and positive effects of ''family-friendly'' policies in non-U.S. contexts, and policy-relevant work-family research in the United States took on more methodological sophistication.

As we look to the future, just as the demographic context of the past decade—the growing diversity of families and workplaces and concern about the stagnation in maternal employment—influenced research topics, work-family research in the next decade will need to expand to consider work-family issues later in life. The aging of the Baby Boom generation, now poised to retire in the next decade, suggests the need for increased attention to issues that surround family caregiving across households (to frail parents and adult children and grandchildren) and the intersection of this type of caregiving with changing work statuses (e.g., retirement or reduced labor force participation, a spouse's retirement). Given the aging of the workforce, research needs to expand to include the effects of poor health or health shocks on work-family mismatch and stress throughout the life course, especially at older ages.

The study of family caregiving early in adult life, primarily focused on maternal employment and child developmental outcomes, must be better connected to caregiving later in life when the work issues concern retirement and old age income security. Do those who curtail employment to rear children end up being the family member who also provides care to aging parents later in life, leading to a life-long pattern of weak attachment to market work? Do men whose early labor force difficulties disconnect them from their children earlier in life end up without caregiving support in old age? How do differences in labor force attachment and family size and composition among siblings affect which child cares for a frail elderly parent or which adult children (and grandchildren) receive help from parents with child care and other needs? Answering these types of questions about life course trajectories and linked lives of

(extended) family members will almost certainly require new and innovative data collection designed to connect early life experiences with later life outcomes and designed to capture connections among related family member who do not coreside and who may be geographically distant when a caregiving need arises.

Also, the 2000–2010 attention to the problem of too few work hours among low-income populations sets the stage more generally for greater attention in the work-family literature to how families function during bad economic times and how unemployment and poor economic circumstances erode work-family balance. Taking a life course perspective, many families are experiencing job loss, eroded pension wealth, housing foreclosure, and affordability issues that may have long-term implications. All of these economic factors affect family processes and intergenerational family support systems. The work-family research of the next decade can build on advances in the 2000–2010 decade by more fully investigating both the objective economic conditions that affect gender and generational exchanges of help and support and also subjective pressures of work and family conflict that emerge in periods of economic uncertainty and have implications for health.

The coming decade also promises to be an interesting time to study work-family policy, as the U.S. federal government has become heavily involved in managing the economic recession and in reforming health care policy. It seems likely that the public sector will become a more active partner in ensuring health care coverage in the coming decade, as the United States begins to experience the crisis of long-term care needs of an aging population. The intersection of paid work, family caregiving, and public policy support of workers and their dependent family members, both young and old, requires increased attention to health issues in the coming decade. The connection between health care coverage for workers and their dependents is usually not considered in the discussion of work and family policies, and yet health care coverage may be key to understanding who remains employed in the face of overwhelming caregiving demands and who has the flexibility to reduce hours or leave employment to meet family members' need for care. In general, the work-family policy literature must expand its focus to a broader array of public policies and contexts that affect

the balance workers can achieve in meeting the needs of family members.

In conclusion, this review of the work-family literature demonstrates the great vitality and diversity of scholarship in the field. Because of the vast array of articles on work and family topics, this review was necessarily selective, and some topics have, no doubt, been given short shrift. Nonetheless, it is hoped that this review increases recognition of the multifaceted topics of inquiry in the work and family field, provides knowledge critical to scholars, policymakers, and other professionals who counsel families and design workplace programs to assist workers with integrating work and family life, and also suggests important directions for research in the coming decade.

REFERENCES

Ahituv, A., & Lerman, R. I. (2007). How do marital status, work effort, and wage rates interact? *Demography*, *44*, 623 – 647.

Allen, S. M., & Hawkins, A. J. (1999). Maternal gatekeeping: Mothers' beliefs and behaviors that inhibit greater father involvement in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 199 – 212.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 278 – 308.

Allen, T. D., Shockley, K. M., & Poteat, L. F. (2008). Workplace factors associated with family dinner behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*, 336 – 342.

Bakker, A. B., & Geurts, S. A. E. (2004). Toward a dual-process model of work-home interference. *Work and Occupations*, *31*, 345 – 366.

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

Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2006). Parental after-school stress and psychological well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 101 – 108.

Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2007). Shift work, parenting behaviors, and children's socioemotional well-being: A within-family study. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*, 727 – 748.

Barnett, R. C., Gareis, K. C., & Brennan, R. T. (2008). Wives' shift work schedules and husbands' and wives' well-being in dual-earner couples with children: A within-couple analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 396 – 422.

Baum, C. L. (2002). A dynamic analysis of the effect of child care costs on the work decisions of low-income mothers with infants. *Demography*, *39*, 139 – 164.

Becker, P. E., & Moen, P. (1999). Scaling back: Dual-earner couples' work-family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 995 – 1007.

Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work-family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 487 – 500.

Belkin, L. (2003). The opt-out revolution. *New York Times Magazine*, *26*, 42 – 86.

Bellavia, G. M., & Frone, M. R. (2005). Work-family conflict. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 113 – 148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Belsky, J., Burchinal, M., McCartney, K., Vandell, D. L., Clarke-Stewart, K. A., & Owen, M. T. (2007). Are there long-term effects of early child care? *Child Development*, *78*, 681 – 701.

Berke, D. L. (2003). Coming home again: The challenges and rewards of home-based self-employment. *Journal of Family Issues*, *24*, 513 – 546.

Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Maternal employment and time with children: Dramatic change or surprising continuity? *Demography*, *37*, 401 – 414.

Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? U.S. trends and gender differentials in domestic labor. *Social Forces*, *79*, 191 – 228.

Bianchi, S. M., & Raley, S. B. (2005). Time allocation in families. In S. M. Bianchi, L. M. Casper, & R. B. King (Eds.), *Work, family, health, and well-being* (pp. 21 – 42). Philadelphia: Erlbaum.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bittman, M. (2000). Now its 2000: Trends in doing and being in the new millennium. *Journal of Occupational Science*, *7*, 108 – 117.

Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L. C., Folbre, N., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology*, *109*, 186 – 214.

Bittman, M., & Wajcman, J. (2000). The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces*, *79*, 165 – 189.

Blair-Loy, M. (2001). Cultural constructions of family schemas: The case of women finance executives. *Gender and Society*, *15*, 687 – 709.

Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Han, W. J., & Waldfogel, J. (2002). Maternal employment and child cognitive outcomes in the first three years of life: The NICHD study of early child care. *Child Development*, *73*, 1052 – 1072.

Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, *66*, 204 – 225.

Bulanda, R. E. (2004). Paternal involvement with children: The influence of gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 40 – 45.

Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*, 169 – 198.

Carr, D. (2002). The psychological consequences of work-family trade-offs for three cohorts of men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*, 103 – 124.

Carr, D., & Springer, K. W. (2010). Advances in families and health research in the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 743 – 761.

Casper, L. M., & Smith, K. E. (2002). Dispelling the myths: Self-care, class, and race. *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*, 716 – 727.

Cassidy, G. L., & Davies, L. (2003). Explaining gender differences in mastery among married parents. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *66*, 48 – 61.

Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Moffitt, R., Lohman, B., Cherlin, A., Coley, R., & Pittman, L. (2003). Mothers' transition from welfare to work and the well-being of preschoolers and adolescents. *Science*, *299*, 1548 – 1552.

Christensen, K. (2006). Leadership in action: A work and family agenda for the future. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 705 – 725). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Christiansen, S. L., & Palkovitz, R. (2001). Why the ''good provider'' role still matters: Providing as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues*, *22*, 84 – 106.

Ciabattari, T. (2007). Single mothers, social capital, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*, 34 – 60.

Clark, S. C. (2002). Employees' sense of community, sense of control, and work/family conflict in Native American organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*, 92 – 108.

Coley, R. L., & Morris, J. E. (2002). Comparing father and mother reports of father involvement among low-income minority families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *64*, 982 – 997.

Conger, R. D., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (1994). *Families in troubled times*. New York: DeGruyter.

Conger, R. D., Wallace, L. E., Sun, Y., Simons, R. L., McLoyd, V. C., & Brody, G. H. (2002). Economic pressure in African American families: A replication and extension of the family stress model. *Developmental Psychology*, *38*, 179 – 193.

Cooke, L. P., & Baxter, J. (2010). ''Families'' in international context: Comparing institutional effects across western societies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 516 – 536.

Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, *112*, 1297 – 1338.

Craig, L. (2006). Does father care mean fathers share? A comparison of how mothers and fathers in intact families spend time with children. *Gender & Society*, *20*, 259 – 281.

Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. F., Head, M. R., & McHale, S. M. (2001). Implications of overwork and overload for the quality of men's family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 404 – 416.

Crouter, A. C., Head, M. R., McHale, S. M., & Tucker, C. J. (2004). Family time and the psychosocial adjustment of adolescent siblings and their parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 147 – 162.

Daly, K. J. (2001). Deconstructing family time from ideology to lived experience. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 283 – 294.

Davis, K. D., Goodman, W. B., Pirretti, A. E., & Almeida, D. M. (2008). Nonstandard work schedules, perceived family well-being, and daily stressors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 991 – 1003.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Bulters, A. J. (2004). The loss spiral of work pressure, work-home interference and exhaustion: Reciprocal relations in a three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*, 131 – 149.

Dentinger, E., & Clarkberg, M. (2002). Informal caregiving and retirement timing among men and women: Gender and caregiving relationships in late midlife. *Journal of Family Issues*, *2*, 857 – 879.

Drago, R., & Kashian, R. (2003). Mapping the terrain of work/family journals. *Journal of Family Issues*, *24*, 488 – 512.

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2001). Work-life balance in the new millennium: Where are we? Where do we need to go? Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinkley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980 – 2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 124 – 197.

Eggebeen, D. J., & Knoester, C. (2001). Does fatherhood matter for men? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 381 – 393.

Erickson, R. J., Nichols, L., & Ritter, C. (2000). Family influences on absenteeism: Testing an expanded process model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *57*, 246 – 272.

Fagan, J., & Press, J. (2008). Father influences on employed mothers' work family balance. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 1136 – 1160.

Ferree, M. M. (2010). Filling the glass: Gender perspectives on families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 420 – 439.

Gangl, M., & Ziefle, A. (2009). Motherhood, labor force behavior, and women's careers: An empirical assessment of the wage penalty for motherhood in Britain, Germany, and the United States. *Demography*, *46*, 341 – 370.

Gareis, K. C., & Barnett, R. C. (2002). Under what conditions do long work hours affect psychological distress? A study of full-time and reduced-hours female doctors. *Work and Occupations*, *29*, 483 – 497.

Gaunt, R. (2008). Maternal gatekeeping: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 373 – 395.

Gauthier, A. H., Smeeding, T. M., & Furstenberg, F. F. (2004). Are parents investing less time in children? Trends in selected industrialized countries. *Population and Development Review*, *30*, 647 – 671.

Gennetian, L., Crosby, D., Huston, A., & Lowe, E. (2004). Can child care assistance in welfare and employment programs support the employment of low-income families? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *23*, 723 – 743.

Gennetian, L. A., Duncan, G., Knox, V. Vargas, W. Clark-Kauffman, E., & London, A. S. (2004). How welfare policies affect adolescents' school outcomes: A synthesis of evidence from experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *14*, 399 – 423.

Gershuny, J. (2000). *Changing times: Work and leisure in postindustrial society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Glauber, R. (2008). Gender and race in families and at work: The fatherhood wage premium. *Gender and Society*, *22*, 8 – 30.

Gordon, R. A., & Chase-Lansdale, L. (2001). Availability of child care in the United States: A description and analysis of data sources. *Demography*, *38*, 299 – 316.

Gordon, R. A., & Hognas, R. S. (2006). The best laid plans: Expectations, preferences, and stability of child-care arrangements. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 373 – 393.

Gordon, R. A., Kaestner, R., & Korenman, S. (2007). The effects of maternal employment on child injuries and infectious disease. *Demography*, *44*, 307 – 333.

Gordon, R. A., Kaestner, R., & Korenman, S. (2008). Child care and work absences: Trade-offs by type of care. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 239 – 256.

Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Career involvement and family involvement as moderators of relationships between work-family conflict and withdrawal from a profession. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*, 91 – 100.

Gupta, S. (2007). Autonomy, dependence, or display? The relationship between married women's earnings and housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 399 – 417.

Gupta, S., Smock, P. J., & Manning, W. D. (2004). Moving out: Transition to nonresidence among resident fathers in the United States, 1968 – 1997. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 627 – 638.

Han, W. J. (2005). Maternal nonstandard work schedules and child cognitive outcomes. *Child Development*, *76*, 137 – 154.

Hardoy, I., & Schone, P. (2008). Subsidizing ''stayers''?: Effects of a Norwegian child care reform on marital stability. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 571 – 584.

Heymann, J. (2000). *The widening gap: Why America's families are in jeopardy and what can be done about it*. New York: Basic Books.

Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Martinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *63*, 220 – 241.

Hoffman, S. D. (2009). The changing impact of marriage and children on women's labor force participation. *Monthly Labor Review*, *132*, 3 – 14.

Hook, J. L. (2006). Care in context: Men's unpaid work in 20 countries: 1965 – 2003. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 639 – 660.

Howes, C., Sakai, L. M., Shinn, M., Phillips, D., Galinsky, E., & Whitebook, M. (1995). Race, social class and maternal working conditions as influences on child development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *16*, 107 – 124.

Hyde, J. S., Else-Quest, N. M., Goldsmith, H. H., & Biesanz, J. C. (2004). Children's temperament and behavior problems predict their employed mothers' work functioning. *Child Development*, *75*, 580 – 594.

Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations*, *28*, 40 – 63.

Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2004). *The time divide: Work, family, and gender inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Joshi, P., & Bogen, K. (2007). Nonstandard schedules and young children's behavioral outcomes among working low-income families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 139–156.

Juhn, C., & Potter, S. (2006). Changes in labor force participation in the United States. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *20*, 27–46.

Karasek, R. A., Jr. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*, 285–308.

Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces*, *78*, 931–949.

Keene, J. R., & Reynolds, J. R. (2005). The job costs of family demands: Gender differences in negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*, 275–299.

Kirchmeyer, C. (2006). The different effects of family on objective career success across gender: A test of alternative explanations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 323–346.

Knoester, C., & Eggebeen, D. J. (2006). The effects of the transition to parenthood and subsequent children on men's well-being and social participation. *Journal of Family Issues*, *27*, 1532–1560.

Knoester, C., Petts, R. J., & Eggebeen, D. J. (2007). Commitments to fathering and the well-being and social participation of new, disadvantaged fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 991–1004.

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 347–367.

Kuperberg, A., & Stone, P. (2008). The media depiction of women who opt out. *Gender and Society*, *22*, 497–517.

Lambert, S. J. (2009). Making a difference for hourly employees. In A. C. Crouter & A. Booth (Eds.), *Work-life policies* (pp. 169–195). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Landale, N. S., & Oropesa, R. S. (2001). Father involvement in the lives of mainland Puerto Rican children: Contributions of nonresident, cohabiting, and married fathers. *Social Forces*, *79*, 945–968.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lewis, S., Kagan, C., & Heaton, P. (2000). Dual-earner parents with disabled children: Family patterns for working and caring. *Journal of Family Issues*, *21*, 1031–1060.

Lundberg, S., & Rose, E. (2000). Parenthood and the earnings of married men and women. *Labor Economics*, *7*, 689–710.

MacDermid, S. M., & Harvey, A. (2006). The work-family conflict construct: Methodological implications. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, &

S. Sweet (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 567–586). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mandel, H., & Semyonov, M. (2005). Family policies, wage structures, and gender gaps: Sources of earnings inequality in 20 countries. *American Sociological Review*, *70*, 949–967.

Mandel, H., & Semyonov, M. (2006). A welfare state paradox: State interventions and women's employment opportunities in 22 countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, *111*, 1910–1949.

Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2003). Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The U.S. experience. *Social Forces*, *81*, 999–1030.

Mattingly, M. J., & Sayer, L. C. (2006). Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 205–221.

Meyers, M. K., Heintze, T., & Wolf, D. A. (2002). Child care subsidies and the employment of welfare recipients. *Demography*, *39*, 165–179.

Milkie, M. A., Mattingly, M. J., Nomaguchi, K. M., Bianchi, S. M., & Robinson, J. P. (2004). The time squeeze: Parental statuses and feelings about time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 739–761.

Milkie, M. A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work-family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 476–490.

Milkie, M. A., Raley, S., & Bianchi, S. M. (2009). Taking on the second shift: Time allocations and time pressures of U.S. parents of preschoolers. *Social Forces*, *88*, 487–517.

Misra, J., Moller, S., & Budig, M. J. (2007). Work-family policies and poverty for partnered and single women in Europe and North America. *Gender & Society*, *21*, 804–827.

Moen, P., Kelly, E., & Chermack, K. (2009). Learning from a natural experiment: Studying a corporate work-time policy initiative. In A. C. Crouter & A. Booth (Eds.), *Work-life policies* (pp. 97–132). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Morris, P. A., Huston, A. C., Duncan, G. J., Crosby, D. A., & Bos, J. M. (2001). *How welfare and work policies affect children*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Morrissey, T. W. (2008). Familial factors associated with the use of multiple child-care arrangements. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *70*, 549–563.

Mullen, J., Kelley, E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2008). Health and well-being outcomes of the work-family interface. In K. Korabik, D. D. Lero, & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory and best practices*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Nomaguchi, K. M. (2006). Maternal employment, nonparental care, mother-child interactions, and

child outcomes during preschool years. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 1341 – 1369.

Nomaguchi, K. M. (2009). Change in work-family conflict among employed parents between 1977 and 1997. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 15 – 32.

Nomaguchi, K. M., Milkie, M. A., & Bianchi, S. M. (2005). Time strains and psychological well-being: Do dual-earner mothers and fathers differ? *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*, 756 – 792.

O'Laughlin, E. M., & Bischoff, L. G. (2005). Balancing parenthood and academia: Work/family stress as influenced by gender and tenure status. *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*, 79 – 106.

Pavalko, E. K., & Artis, J. E. (1997). Women's caregiving and paid work: Causal relationships in late midlife. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, *52B*, S170 – S179.

Pearlin, L. I. (1999). The stress process revisited: Reflections on concepts and their interrelationships. In C. S. Aneshensel & J. C. Phelan (Eds.), *Handbook of the sociology of mental health* (pp. 395 – 415). New York: Plenum.

Perry-Jenkins, M., Goldberg, A. E., Pierce, C. P., & Sayer, A. G. (2007). Shift work, role overload, and the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 123 – 138.

Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 981 – 998.

Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Kossek, E. E., & Sweet, S. (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multidisciplinary perspectives and approaches*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Polatnick, M. R. (2002). Too old for child care? Too young for self-care? Negotiating after-school arrangements for middle school. *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*, 728 – 747.

Press, J. E., Fagan, J., & Laughlin, L. (2006). Taking pressure off families: Child-care subsidies lessen mothers' work-hour problems. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 155 – 171.

Presser, H. B. (2000). Nonstandard work schedules and marital instability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 93 – 110.

Presser, H. B. (2003). *Working in a 24/7 economy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Probst, T. M. (2005). Economic stressors. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 267 – 297). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., & Pulkkinen, L. (2008). Work-family conflict and psychological well-being: Stability and cross-lagged relations within one- and six-year follow-ups. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*, 37 – 51.

Raver, C. C. (2003). Does work pay psychologically as well as economically? The role of employment in predicting depressive symptoms and parenting among low-income families. *Child Development*, *74*, 1720 – 1736.

Reynolds, J. R. (2005). In the face of conflict: Work-family conflict and desired work hour adjustments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 1313 – 1331.

Reynolds, J. R., & Aletraris, L. (2007). Work – family conflict, children, and hour mismatches in Australia. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*, 749 – 772.

Reynolds, J. R., Burge, S. W., Robbins, C. L., Boyd, E. M., & Harris, B. (2007). Mastery and the fulfillment of occupational expectations by midlife. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *70*, 366 – 383.

Riley, L. A., & Glass, J. L. (2002). You can't always get what you want: Infant care preferences and use among employed mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *64*, 2 – 15.

Rindfuss, R. R., Guilkey, D., Morgan, S. P., Kravdal, O., & Guzzo, K. B. (2007) Child care availability and first-birth timing in Norway. *Demography*, *44*, 345 – 372.

Roehling, P. V., Jarvis, L. H., & Swope, H. E. (2005). Variations in negative work-family spillover among White, Black, and Hispanic American men and women: Does ethnicity matter? *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*, 840 – 865.

Rose, K. K., & Elicker, E. (2008). Parental decision making about child care. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 1161 – 1184.

Ross, C. E., & Mirowsky, J. (2002). Age and the gender gap in the sense of personal control. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*, 125 – 145.

Roxburgh, S. (2004). ''There just aren't enough hours in the day'': The mental health consequences of time pressure. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *45*, 115 – 131.

Roxburgh, S. (2005). Parenting strains, distress, and family paid labor: A modification of the cost-of-caring hypothesis. *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*, 1062 – 1081.

Ruhm, C. J. (2009). Maternal employment and child development. In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work* (pp. 331 – 354). New York: University Press of America.

Sandberg, J. F., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Changes in children's time with parents: United States, 1981 – 1997. *Demography*, *38*, 423 – 436.

Sandberg, J. F., & Hofferth, S. L. (2005). Changes in children's time with parents: A correction. *Demography*, *42*, 391 – 395.

Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time, and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work, and free time. *Social Forces*, *84*, 285 – 303.

Sayer, L. C., Bianchi, S. M., & Robinson, J. P. (2004). Are parents investing less in children? Trends in mothers' and fathers' time with children. *American Journal of Sociology*, *110*, 1 – 43.

Sayer, L. C., England, P., Bittman, M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2009). How long is the second (plus first) shift? Gender differences in paid, unpaid

and total work time in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *40*, 523 – 545.

Sayer, L. C., Gauthier, A. H., & Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (2004). Educational differences in parents' time with children: Cross-national variations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 1152 – 1169.

Schieman, S., Milkie, M. A., & Glavin, P. (2009). When work interferes with life: The social distribution of work-nonwork interference and the influence of work-related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review*, *74*, 966 – 988.

Schieman, S., & Reid, S. (2009). Job authority and health: Unraveling the competing suppression and explanatory influences. *Social Science and Medicine*, *69*, 1616 – 1624.

Schieman, S., Whitestone, Y. K., & Van Gundy, K. (2006). The nature of work and the stress of higher status. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *47*, 242 – 257.

Schneider, B. (2006). In the moment: The benefits of the experience sampling method. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 469 – 488). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Scott, E. K., London, A. S., & Hurst, A. (2005) Instability in patchworks of child care when moving from welfare to work. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 370 – 386.

Steinmetz, H., Frese, M., & Schmidt, P. (2008). A longitudinal panel study on antecedents and outcomes of work-home interference. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*, 231 – 241.

Stevens, D. P., Minnotte, K. L., Mannon, S. E., & Kiger, G. (2007). Examining the ''neglected side of the work-family interface'': Antecedents of positive and negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*, 242 – 262.

Strazdins, L., Clements, M. S., Korda, R. J., Broom, D. H., & D'Souza, R. M. (2006). Unsociable work? Nonstandard work schedules, family relationships, and children's well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*, 394 – 410.

Sweet, S., & Moen, P. (2006). Advancing a career focus on work and the family: Insights from the life course perspective. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet. (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 189 – 208). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thompson, J. A., & Bunderson, J. S. (2001). Work-nonwork conflict and the phenomenology of time: Beyond the balance metaphor. *Work and Occupations*, *28*, 17 – 39.

Thorstad, R. R., Anderson, T. L., Hall, M. E. L., Willingham, M., & Carruthers, L. (2006). Breaking the mold: A qualitative exploration of mothers in Christian academia and their experiences of spousal support. *Journal of Family Issues*, *27*, 229 – 251.

Townsend, N. (2002). *The package deal: Marriage, work and fatherhood in men's lives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Uttal, L. (1999). Using kin for child care: Embedment in the socioeconomic networks of extended families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 845 – 857.

van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work-family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*, 462 – 476.

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 822 – 836.

Waldfogel, J., Han, W. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). The effects of early maternal employment on child cognitive development. *Demography*, *39*, 369 – 392.

Wallace, J. E., & Young, M. C. (2008). Parenthood and productivity: A study of demands, resources, and family-friendly firms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*, 110 – 122.

Wharton, A. S., & Blair-Loy, M. (2002). The ''overtime culture'' in a global corporation: A cross-national study of finance professionals' interest in working part-time. *Work and Occupations*, *29*, 32 – 63.

Wharton, A. S., & Blair-Loy, M. (2006). Long work hours and family life: A cross-national study of employees' concerns. *Journal of Family Issues*, *27*, 415 – 436.

Wight, V. R., Raley, S. B., & Bianchi, S. M. (2008). Time for children, one's spouse, and oneself among parents who work nonstandard hours. *Social Forces*, *87*, 243 – 274.

Witt, L. A., & Carlson, D. S. (2006). The work-family interface and job performance: Moderating effects of conscientiousness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *11*, 343 – 357.

Yeung, J. W., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 136 – 154.