



A Historical Framework for Understanding the Incongruence Between Work-Family Role Practices and Beliefs in American Society

By

Kellyann Berube Kowalski
Department of Management and Marketing
Charlton College of Business
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
285 Old Wesport Road
North Dartmouth, MA 02747

Jennifer A. Swanson
Department of Business Administration
Stonehill College
320 Washington Street
Easton, MA 02375

Laura Lynn Beauvais
Provost's Office
University of Rhode Island
35 Campus Avenue
Kingston, RI 02881

Abstract:

This paper introduces a historical model of the relationship between work and family. The model summarizes the movement through three eras of production which resulted in different role relationships between work and family: (1) role solidarity of the pre-industrial era, (2) role segmentation of the industrial era, and (3) role overlap of the post-industrial era. The model shows that the public/private ideology associated with the role segmentation of the industrial era stands strong in the post-industrial era. It is argued that the incongruence of the public/private ideology and the role overlap of the post-industrial era has contributed to work/family conflict. Implications for management and future research are discussed.

I. Introduction

American society has evolved over time from one of farming to factory work and most recently to an information based economy. These changes have had widespread effects on every aspect of human life. It has been argued that the unique societal conditions of the new information age, termed the post-industrial era, are causing a breakdown of the traditional boundaries between the public and private spheres (Zedeck, 1992). Each of us who participates in both work outside of the home and family, have public and private lives (Benn & Gaus, 1983). In other words, we operate in both the public and private spheres, each involving a set of demands, roles, and activities (Zedeck, 1992). As we progress through the post-industrial era the structure of family and work relations, or public and private spheres, has been changing (Haraway, 1990). Contrary to prior belief, the public and private spheres are not separate, they overlap in our day to day lives (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Sekaran, 1986). This realization that work and family are in fact interrelated has led to an increasing number of organizational researchers studying the relationship between work and family. The model advanced here extends previous models of the work/family relationship by framing it in a historical perspective. Such a perspective provides a historical framework through which to understand the present and the future enabling us to learn from the past.

In this paper we introduce a conceptual model (Table I) which summarizes the historical and societal roots of the relationship between work and family. Specifically the model summarizes the changes in American society's modes of production and how these changes have affected public and private role relationships. The main premise of this article is that eras of production have contributed to the development and breakdown of the public/private dichotomy. We will argue that with the progression of the post-industrial era, the boundaries between public and private have become unclear; that the public/private dichotomy is breaking down. Despite this breakdown, the ideology associated with this dichotomy stands strong and its incongruence with the role relationships of the post-industrial era is contributing to work/family conflict.

TABLE I

Historical and Societal Roots of the Relationship between Work and Family

Historical Era of Production	Role Practice	Public/Private Ideology	Outcome
Pre-Industrial	Role Solidarity	No Public/Private Ideology	Work/Family Congruence
Industrial	Role Segmentation	Public/Private Ideology	Work/Family Congruence
Post-Industrial	Role Overlap	Public/Private Ideology	Work/Family Conflict

We will examine public and private spheres at the individual level in United States society. Specifically we will look at individual roles in the work and family spheres. Although public and private have been defined in different ways, generally, in the context of roles, public refers to work roles and private refers to family roles. A role can be defined as the activities and relations expected to be carried out by a person who occupies a particular position in society (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

The remainder of this article draws on previous literature to explain and elaborate the constructs and relationships depicted in Table I. Specifically we will discuss the historical eras of production, the work and family role relationships during each of these eras, and the dominant ideology or expectations for public and private roles. We will show that the incongruence of the role overlap of the post-industrial era and the public/private ideology is contributing to work/family conflict. Finally, implications for managers and future research will be discussed.

II. Historical Eras of Production

Changes in the relationship between work and family domains and thus, the public and private spheres, can be seen as related to major changes in society's modes of production. Most researchers agree that we have entered our third major production change, characterized by the post-industrial era. The previous two eras of production are known as the pre-industrial

era and the industrial era. According to Bohem and Viveros-Long (1981), during this time we have also moved through three stages in Western family history: (1) when workplace and home were one and the same, (2) when men's work took place away from the home, and (3) when women with children work away from the home and both men and women bring paid work into the home.

These changes in work and family did not happen suddenly, but were outcomes of the changes in production we have experienced over the past decades and centuries (Popenoe, 1985). Although the eras are examined separately, it should be noted that they overlap and there are not clear beginning and ending times. As individuals of all races, ethnicities, and classes did not experience these phases in the same manner (Amott & Matthaei, 1996), this article will focus on the experiences of the white middle class, but will address ethnic and racial differences and similarities where appropriate. We will now discuss the three eras of production.

Pre-Industrial Era

Also referred to as the agricultural age, the first era of production in Western society took place when white Westerners went from a society of herding and roaming to one of farming communities (Ramsower, 1985; Salmon, 2000). During this time, work, whether farming, crafts, or trade, was characteristically done in the home (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984; McLaughlin, Melber, Billy, Zimmerle, Wings, & Johnson, 1988; Popenoe, 1985). Men, women, and children all worked together toward the production of household goods and the livelihood of the family (McLaughlin et al., 1988). The family was the main unit of production, with each individual often carrying out different tasks. According to Fox and Hesse-Biber (1984), during this era women's work was highly valued. Women were the ones primarily responsible for childrearing, cooking and cleaning in addition to making lace, soap, candles, shoes, and spinning and weaving (Amott & Matthaei, 1996; Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984; Kwolek-Folland, 1998). Although there was some production of goods for the market and some people worked outside the home as teachers and printers for example, most work during the pre-industrial era was non-paid work (Amott & Matthaei, 1996; Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984).

During the pre-industrial era, life was very different for some racial and ethnic groups as many blacks were slaves split up from their families (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). For most of the pre-industrial era, the majority of marriages between black slaves were not legally valid which meant that slave husbands and wives could be separated at any time and their children could be sold (Kamensky, 2000; Salmon, 2000). Other groups of people, including the poor, worked as servants for the wealthy white families (Amott & Matthaei, 1996) or engaged in heavy agricultural work (Kamensky, 2000). Thus, for the women and men of these marginalized groups, work was located outside of the home, and both men and women worked for wages, or in the case of slaves, for basic survival.

Industrial Era

Commonly referred to as the Industrial Revolution, it was during this industrial era that Westerners went from a lifestyle of farming to one of industrial cities and central business districts (Goldberg, 2000; Ramsower, 1985). Industrialization created a new world where nothing was left unchanged (Goldberg, 2000). Most wage or market work increasingly took place in factories or offices physically separate from homes. Many of the activities which were done in the home by both men and women during the pre-industrial era were moved to the factories due to advances in technology (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984; Kwolek-Folland, 1998).

During this era, individuals entered the world of work unevenly depending on their gender, marital status, race, ethnicity, and class (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). Men increasingly participated in wage work outside the home and therefore were more involved in the public sphere of business. On the other hand, women were primarily involved in the private sphere related to the home where they took care of the non-paid work of childbearing, childrearing, cleaning, and cooking (Goldberg, 2000). During this time most women participated in non-wage work in the home. However, women were not entirely excluded from the workplace but the paid work that women were engaged in during this time was “almost always connected to women’s traditional work in the home” (Goldberg, 2000; p. 187).

The percentage rates for those engaged in wage labor varied greatly across racial-ethnic groups. In 1920, the percentage of women working outside the home for wages ranged from 12

percent for American Indians to 39 percent for African Americans (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). In all racial-ethnic groups non-married women were much more likely to perform wage work than married women and men were at least two times as likely as women to work outside the home for wages (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). Few women who did work were married and even less were mothers of dependent children; most were young, single, and poor (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). Furthermore, most women were limited to those occupations that were deemed appropriate for females and jobs that were not wanted by men (Sigerman, 2000). Once married, most women were expected to stay home and take care of the family (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984; Goldberg, 2000) and most married women could not envision a life of paid employment outside of the home (Smith, 2000).

As technology moved production, such as candle, shoe, and lace making out of the home, the roles of women and children were changed to those of consumption instead of production (Goldberg, 2000; Kwolek-Folland, 1998; McLaughlin et al., 1988). As work for economic purposes was no longer done by the family unit, it was during this era that the definition of production, or work, changed (Allen, 1989; Bohem & Viveros-Long, 1981; Shamir, 1992). 'Work' was now characterized by full-time, regular, paid employment, outside the home and the home became a place for privacy to get away from production (Popenoe, 1985; Sigerman, 2000). Thus, what women did in the home was no longer conceptualized as work (Allen, 1989). As noted by Fox and Hesse-Biber (1984), as the household was no longer considered a center of production, the importance of the work that was done there declined. Women's roles became defined more narrowly, as mother and homemaker (Buchanan, 1996; McLaughlin et al., 1988). The sexual division of labor became more extreme than in the pre-industrial era with most mothers in all racial-ethnic groups continuing to bear the responsibility for non-paid domestic work (Amott & Matthaei, 1996).

Post-Industrial Era

The third era of production, the post-industrial or postmodern era, has been characterized by a move from a society based on production of material goods to an information based service economy (Diani, 1992; Harvey, 1989). As industries such as banking, insurance, architecture, finance, and education replace and outnumber manufacturing, advances in technology are leading us full-fledge into an era characterized by computerization where a majority of the work force is employed in the process of information generation, transfer, storage, or retrieval (Ramsower, 1985; Shamir, 1992).

The beginnings of the post-industrial era are usually traced to the end of World War II (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981). The war disrupted traditional roles as many women had to leave the home to fill in at the factories for men who went off to fight (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984). It has been during this era that we have begun to see a large number of women participating in wage work. Since World War II women's participation rate in the waged work force has continued to rise across all racial-ethnic groups. The percentage of women holding paying jobs outside of the home tripled from 1920 to 2000 (McGraw, 2000), with the majority of the increase occurring after World War II. Thus, the war not only brought an increase in the number of women working but also in the type of women worker, with the percentage of married women across all racial-ethnic groups entering the work force being the fastest growing segment (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984).

The participation rate of mothers in the labor force has also changed dramatically. In 1948, only 10.8 percent of women with children under the age of six and 26 percent of women with children ages six to seventeen were active in the paid work force (Buchanan, 1996). It has been since the 1960's that we have really seen an increase in the number of women with small children entering the work force and by 1980 over half of those with children under the age of six were in the work force (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984). By 2008, the participation in the labor force for mothers with children under the age of 18 reached 71 percent, down from a peak of 73 percent in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009c). The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009c) reports that mothers with children ages 6 to 17 have higher labor participation rates

than mothers with children younger than 6 years of age. In addition, mothers who are not married have a slightly higher labor participation rate than married mothers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009c).

As noted by Gerson (1985), women's post-industrial work and family patterns differ qualitatively as well as quantitatively from past developments. Unlike the few women who worked during the industrial age, today's women are more likely to be dually involved in the public and private sphere. Today's woman is interested in having a career and family and is less likely to interrupt her work experience to have children and more likely to carry out multiple roles simultaneously. Although more women are involved in paid work throughout their lives, women of all racial-ethnic groups are bearing the predominant responsibility for the nonpaid domestic work (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). Women are taking on multiple roles simultaneously, adding a whole new set of role demands without an equal decrease in their traditional roles (Fitzgerald & Betz, 1983; McLaughlin et al., 1988). Two decades ago, Hochschild (1989) argued that women essentially take on a "second shift" to meet all the demands of their homemaking and family care responsibilities after putting in their "first shift" of paid work. This remains the case today. Although husbands have increased their participation in household work (Coltrane, 1996, 2000), wives continue to perform significantly more household work (Bartley, Blanton & Gillard, 2005). On the other hand, men have been making some changes in their work roles to accommodate family roles, especially as they have had to adjust to the changes in family relationships pressed on them by working wives (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001).

Another trend of the post-industrial era has been the movement of production back into the home. Telecommunications and information technology have made it possible to work away from the traditional office, freeing us from the necessity to work side by side with others (Kipnis, 1991) and allowing more and more employees to work from remote locations by linking up electronically with the office (Bailyn, 1989). The information and technological explosion has allowed work and workers to become more flexible and less time and location dependent (Kraut, 1989; Olson, 1989; Toffler, 1980). This has led to a phenomenon coined 'telecommuting' (Nilles, Sawy, & Pauchant, 1976), whereby individuals work from their homes and thus

'commute' to the office via their computer over telephone lines. According to WorldatWork (2009), more Americans are telecommuting and are choosing home as their base. The recent introduction of hand-held electronic devices and higher connectivity speeds have made working from home even easier.

In 1980, Toffler was predicting this wave of production back into the home, which he referred to as the 'electronic cottage.' Olson (1989) predicted that we would see an increasing number of people working from home either for all or part of their regular work day and after regular hours. These predictions have been accurate. The number of employee and contract telecommuters who worked from home or remotely once per month reached 33.7 million in 2008, an increase of 43 percent since 2003 (WorldatWork, 2009). Of the 33.7 million Americans that telecommuted in 2008, 24.2 million reported telecommuting one day per week with 13.5 million telecommuting almost every day (WorldatWork, 2009).

III. Role Practices

Each of the three eras can be characterized by the relationship between public and private roles during that time period. Based on Hall and Richter's (1988) typology of boundaries which separate work and family roles, we will discuss the boundaries between public and private spheres in each era. According to Hall and Richter (1988), there are two types of boundaries which separate work and family roles: physical boundaries and psychological boundaries. Physical boundaries between work and family are time and location based, while psychological boundaries stem from the regions of one's identity representing different roles or areas of activity (Hall & Richter, 1988). We will show how we have moved from an era of role solidarity during the pre-industrial era, through one of role segmentation of the industrial era, to the current post-industrial era which can be seen as an era of role overlap. In each of these eras different types of role boundaries as espoused by Hall and Richter are characterized.

Role solidarity

The pre-industrial era was characterized by role solidarity. During this era, work and home were inseparable (Olson, 1989). In fact, most individuals did not distinguish between work and family roles, as they were virtually one and the same. Women and men considered work in the

home as part of family responsibilities, not as a separate activity, not one that conflicted with family time (Coser, 1991). As family members participated together in work and family activities in one location, there were no physical boundaries between work and family roles. In addition, since work was not only performed in the home but was integrated with family life, there were no psychological boundaries between work and family roles. In fact, it is likely that most individuals did not have clearly separate work and family sub-identities (Shamir, 1992). Therefore, during this era there was no distinction between public and private spheres or roles, as it was an era characterized by solidarity of work and family settings and roles. However, as noted earlier when describing the characteristics of the pre-industrial era, an exception to this role solidarity could be found among poor families and slaves who experienced sharp distinctions between work and family roles.

Role Segmentation

The changes in society in the industrial era led to new definitions of work and of roles for both men and women (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984). Thus, the industrial era, when work became separated from home, led to role segmentation. In other words, individuals had different social roles which usually did not overlap. As noted by Amott and Matthaei (1996) and Fox and Hesse-Biber (1984), it was during this era that work and home became more separate and distinct due to physical separation; there were clear physical boundaries between work and family. In most families, the wife did not work outside the home and therefore had no public life (Goldberg, 2000; Sigerman, 2000). Individuals, mostly men, who worked outside the home, experienced public and private as separate spheres and they had clearly separate work and family sub-identities (Shamir, 1992). Although the husband had both a public and private life and therefore carried out both work and family roles, he was able to keep them separate because there were clear psychological boundaries. The man's ability to keep his roles psychologically separate stemmed from the fact that since he had a wife at home he did not need to worry about home activities, such as childrearing, cleaning, and cooking, when he was at work (Goldberg, 2000). His wife was at home to take care of the children and the house, leaving him to concentrate solely on his public life. It is interesting to note that some women

worked as schoolteachers, seamstresses, domestics, and factory operatives during this period, but this work was mostly done by unmarried women, free black women, and newly-arrived immigrant women, and provided little status and poor wages (Hymowitz & Weissman, 1978).

Role Overlap

With such a large number of women entering the work force and the realization of the 'electronic cottage,' most individuals find the post-industrial era one of overlap of work and family roles. There is physical boundary confusion between public and private roles as activities that are considered public and those that are considered private are being done in the same physical location; work is being brought into the home and home issues into the work place. Many individuals find it difficult to determine where one role ends and the other begins. Most individuals are no longer in the situation where the wife stays home while the husband goes off to work. In more and more families both spouses outside the home or perhaps, one, or both, engage in wage earning work within the home. Only 33 percent of families had both spouses working in 1976 (Work & Family Connection, 2000) and by 2008, this number has increased to 51.4 percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009b). Although one may think this would lead to role segmentation for women as it did for men in the industrial era or role solidarity for those who work from home as in the pre-industrial era, we need to consider that role practices consist of more than the physical separation of roles (Shamir, 1992).

In the pre-industrial era, production was integrated within the family unit where all members participated in making goods and services, producing both physical and psychological integration of work and family roles, whereas now in the post-industrial era, most people who work in the home do so in physical proximity to, but often psychological isolation from, other family members for wages from an external employer. In the industrial era, role segmentation was possible because women were able to take care of family needs in the private sphere, while men could focus on production and wage earning in the public sphere. In the post-industrial era, there is no longer anyone at home to take care of private role activity, and thus these activities must be re-allocated somehow between working women and men in dual-earner couples. Individuals carrying out both work and family roles in the post-industrial era

are experiencing boundary confusion between the two roles. They do not perceive or experience these roles in isolation from each other, leading to psychological boundary confusion. When individuals step into the world of work, they do not shed the rest of their identities (e.g., parent and spouse), superimposing the feelings and emotions that they have experienced at home on the work environment (Sekaran, 1986). Although one role may be more salient at a particular time, our roles are not entirely separate and we often have trouble separating them even if we try.

Therefore, although it was argued that during the industrial era the public and private spheres were distinct, this is no longer an unquestioned assumption in the post-industrial world of United States society. If public and private spheres were truly dichotomous, then one would either be in the public sphere or the private sphere, but could not conceptually be in both at once. We can no longer ignore that the two spheres are interrelated and that there are times when it is questionable whether someone is carrying out their public or private roles and whether they are in the public or private sphere. For example, when we are at home cooking supper and talking on the telephone to our boss about the project we are working on, is that public or private? When we are at work working on a report while we are worrying about our child who is at home sick, are we engaged in a public or private role? When we go to visit our child at the company on-site childcare during working hours, are we involved in a public or private role? When we go out to dinner after work with colleagues, is that public or private life? When we telecommute, working from a computer in our home kitchens, is that public or private? It is not so clear cut that when we leave the house and go to work, that is our public lives, and when we come home, that is our private lives.

It is our contention that the public/private dichotomy created by the role segmentation of the industrial era is no longer valid in the post-industrial era. With the contemporary boundary confusion of the post-industrial era, we can no longer conceptualize public and private as separate spheres. The boundaries between public and private roles are breaking down, but the ideology which has been embedded in society as a result of the public/private dichotomy in the

industrial era lingers on, taking much longer to break down. This ideology will be discussed next.

IV. Public/Private Ideology

Most researchers agree that the development of the public/private dichotomy is an outgrowth of the change from the pre-industrial to the industrial era. The separation of work from home led to a bipolar conceptualization of public and private (Benn & Gaus, 1983). Individuals were conceptualized as existing in two separate spheres: the public sphere which was equated with civil society, including work, and the private sphere which was equated with domestic society.

Since there was no distinction between public and private during the pre-industrial era, no beliefs or expectations distinguishing public and private roles developed and there was no public/private ideology during that time. It was during the industrial era that strong beliefs and expectations about public and private roles developed. The role segmentation of the industrial era led to beliefs associated with the public/private dichotomy which came to be accepted as the dominant ideology of the era. As individuals carried out the role practices of that time, they were socialized to accept the following beliefs: (1) women's place is in the home and men's place is in the paid work force, (2) women's work is invisible, and (3) private life has no place in the public sphere. These three beliefs are elaborated below.

Women's place is in the home and men's place is in the paid work force. The separation of work and home during the industrial era resulted in a sexual division of labor (McLaughlin et al., 1988). It led to the belief that men are primarily responsible for working outside the home (public role) while women should give priority to raising the children and taking care of the home (private role) (Cox & James, 1987; Martin, 1992; McLaughlin et al., 1988). In addition, organizational norms developed expecting men to have wives at home so as they could devote themselves fully to their public roles (Kanter, 1977; Margolis, 1979). Thus, the wife became involved in a two-person single career, where her role was to take care of the home in support of her husband and his career.

Women's work is invisible. Although the activities women carry out in the private sphere resemble public work in most aspects except women do not get paid, it became the norm not to view women's domestic labor as meaningful work (McLaughlin et al., 1988). In essence women's work within the home became 'invisible' as the definition of work changed to one of full-time, regular, paid employment (Allen, 1989).

Private life has no place in the public sphere. A third consequence of the public/private dichotomy was what Kanter (1977) called 'the myth of separate worlds' to describe the organizational belief that individuals had no life outside of work. Managers wanted to hear nothing or see nothing of worker" private lives, all they cared about was that individuals perform their work adequately (Popenoe, 1985).

Although women in the post-industrial era are entering the work force in record numbers and we are beginning to realize that public roles and private roles are not separate as we once believed, the ideological force associated with the public/private dichotomy of the industrial era is taking much longer to break down in the eyes of women and men alike. In other words, although public and private roles overlap in our day to day lives, much of the ideology stemming from the role segmentation of the industrial era stands strong.

V. Relationships of Public/Private Ideology and Role Practices

During the pre-industrial era and the industrial era there was congruence between role practices and beliefs. This is no longer true during the post-industrial era where individuals are experiencing incongruence between role practices and the lingering public/private ideology. Despite some progress, societal views still reinforce the idea that taking care of the family is mainly the woman's responsibility, that work done in the home is 'nonwork,' and that family concerns do not belong at work. These beliefs are incongruent with the role overlap of the post-industrial era.

Cox and James (1987) note that traditionally it was not questioned that women were equated with the private and stayed home, while men were equated with the public and went to work. This lingering assumption that women will stay home is no longer unquestioned. Women are beginning to take a larger role in the paid work force of the public sphere as

indicated by the fact that 59.5 percent of women participated in the labor force, comprising 46.7 percent of the total U.S. labor force in 2008 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009c). Even though women are being accepted in the outside world, they carry a 'double burden' in that they are still expected to be the ones who take care of the private world as well as manage their public roles as men do. With the entrance of more women in the paid workforce men's participation in childcare has increased, but only to a very small extent (Pleck, 1997). One survey found that on average men spent 25 minutes engaged in physical childcare activities compared to 72 minutes spent by women during the work week in 2004 to 2008 households with children under the age of six (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009a). This is partly because many men, and women, still believe that women's traits, characteristics, and attributes are best suited to the needs of the private world. Therefore, many men are unwilling to take on domestic duties because they consider it women's work and many women are unwilling to give it up because it is part of their social identity (Amott & Matthaei, 1996). Many men are no longer the sole breadwinners in their homes, but women are often still expected to be largely responsible for the home and family.

More and more people are opting for alternative work situations (e.g., part-time work, telecommuting) in an attempt to balance overlapping roles, yet our view of what constitutes work has not changed. As noted by Stoper (1988), American's find it difficult to change their thinking that work must be full-time (35-40 hours a week) and must be paid. Despite the fact that many of the domestic activities which women traditionally did at home have become paid work performed by individuals in the labor force, the ideology stands that women's domestic work is not meaningful, productive work. Especially when an employed woman works from the home, society tends to view her as a mother, wife, and homemaker in her domestic family role instead of her work role (Christensen, 1988).

Although both men and women are now working and combining public and private roles resulting in role overlap, organizations still expect employees to keep their personal lives at home. Although many women are now working full-time, the reality is that the workplace was created for men with wives at home, not for women with family responsibilities. Organizations

still expect individuals to have someone else at home to take care of family life so it does not interfere with work. The majority of individuals in upper management positions, who have a lot of influence over organizational cultures, are older males who have traditional wives at home and thus cannot understand the needs of the new work force (Kingston, 1990; Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). Even though the number of women CEOs has increased over the years, it still remains that only 3 percent of women were CEOs of Fortune 500 companies and 15.2 percent held board seats at Fortune 500 companies in 2009 (Catalyst, 2010).

During each of the eras of production, the relationship between role practices and the dominant beliefs about public and private roles has had an effect on individuals ability to balance their work and family roles. The outcomes associated with each of the eras will now be discussed.

VI. Work/Family Outcomes

It is a well-established finding in the psychological literature that, generally speaking, people seek consistency between their beliefs and their behaviors. When this consistency is lacking, cognitive dissonance results, which is very uncomfortable for those experiencing it and motivates them to find ways to reduce the discomfort (Festinger, 1957). Post-industrial U.S. society is experiencing a kind of cognitive dissonance where general beliefs about private and public roles (ideology) is inconsistent with behavioral practice (role management). As there was congruence between the role practices and beliefs of the pre-industrial and industrial eras, individuals were able to successfully balance their work and family roles. During the pre-industrial era this congruence resulted in work/family integration since individuals did not distinguish between work and family roles. During the industrial era the congruence between role segmentation and the dominant public/private ideology led to work/family separation because individuals were able to establish solid psychological and physical boundaries between their work and family roles. Now, the incongruence between role practices and beliefs in the post-industrial era has led to problems for those individuals trying to balance their work and family roles. As noted by Richter (1992), the sex segregated ideology which has been instilled in

society as a result of the public/private dichotomy has led to work/family conflict for many individuals, especially women, during the post-industrial era.

According to Ahrentzen (1990), research on individuals carrying out simultaneous multiple roles has led to two theories. The first theory postulates that individuals have a fixed amount of energy and therefore, multiple roles competing for that energy results in conflict and strain (Goode, 1974). In disagreement, the second theory formulates that multiple roles lead to increased self-esteem and social identity (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). The opposition of these two theories can be remedied by considering the context in which the multiple roles occur. The outcomes of playing multiple roles depends not only on the number of roles carried out, but more importantly on the expectations and resources attached to those roles (Ahrentzen, 1990). Since the expectations and beliefs associated with public and private roles in the post-industrial era are incongruent, work/family conflict has been found to be an undesirable outcome of individuals trying to balance public and private roles in the post-industrial era.

Work/family conflict is a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are incompatible, such that compliance with one would make more difficult or render impossible compliance with the other (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Theoretically, if roles were truly integrated as in the pre-industrial era, or truly separate as in the industrial era, then individuals would not experience work/family conflict. It is not simply carrying out multiple roles simultaneously that results in work/family conflict; one of the major antecedents of work/family conflict is the incongruence between overlapping roles and the ideological expectations which have resulted from the public/private dichotomy.

In the past, many women who wanted careers traded having a marriage and children for being successful in the public sphere (Lopata, 1987; McLaughlin et al., 1988). Today, more and more women are no longer willing to sacrifice their private lives in order to have careers; they 'want it all' and are finding that carrying out both public and private roles often leads to work/family conflict. Despite the fact that public and private roles overlap in our day to day lives, the dominant ideology still places expectations on us which stem from role segmentation. While work/family conflict was originally, and is often still, seen as a women's problem, in

recent years the work/family conflict experienced by men has received an increasing amount of attention. Men experience work/family conflict because they often no longer have their wives at home to relieve them of family concerns and thus have found themselves more involved in their family role as well as their work role (McLaughlin et al., 1988).

Work/family conflict is a concern to individuals and organizations as many researchers have found it to have negative effects on both individuals' home and work lives (see Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, & Baltes, 2009 for a review). Implications for managers in the post-industrial era and future research will be discussed next.

VII. Implications for Management and Research

Despite the fact that there is no longer a clear separation between public and private lives in the post-industrial era and the boundaries between the public and private spheres are breaking down, the ideology of the dichotomy is taking longer to break down. The ideology has become problematic for post-industrial society. It has led to unrealistic role expectations and beliefs which contribute to feelings of work/family conflict, especially for women, but also for men. As has been noted, work/family conflict is a concern for organizations. Specifically, researchers have found that work-family conflict is negatively related to health (Madsen, Camerson, & Miller, 2005), work quality (Aryee, 1992), quality of work life (Higgins & Duxbury, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992), job involvement (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005; Mednick, 1987), organizational commitment (Madsen et al., 2005), job satisfaction (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Aryee, 1992; Lapierre, Spector, Allen, Poelmans, Cooper, & Driscoll, 2008; Parasuraman, Greenhouse, & Granrose, 1992; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992) and job performance (Butler & Skattebo, 2004; Mednick, 1987) and positively related to turnover intent (Anderson et al., 2002; Aryee, 1992; Boyar, Maertz, Pearson, & Keough, 2003), job burnout (Lambert, 2010), job distress (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992), stress (Anderson et al., 2002), and drinking problems (Grzymacz & Bass, 2003).

As has been noted, management in organizations expect individuals to keep their home and work lives separate, a phenomenon Kanter (1977) referred to as the 'myth of separate worlds.' Managers can no longer afford to continue this limited view and ignore the interrelationship of

individuals' public and private lives. Societal and management beliefs need to be adjusted with regard to the notion brought about by the industrial era of public and private as separate spheres as individuals are no longer willing to act as if they have no life outside of work. Women and men of the post-industrial era want to "have it all," both fulfilled work and family lives, bringing to the workplace different demands than those of the two-person single career families of the industrial era. They expect employers to understand that their work and family lives are not entirely separate entities and in fact overlap on a day to day basis. They expect organizational policies which will help them deal with, or ideally avoid, work/family conflict .

Employers are feeling pressure from women to offer such family-friendly policies as parental leaves, flextime, flexplace, part-time work, and childcare services. But simply offering these policies is not enough, because as long as the ideology associated with the public/private dichotomy stands strong, individuals will still experience work/family role conflict for two reasons. First, if organizational culture is not supportive of the policies, individuals may find it difficult to utilize them. Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) found that work/family conflict was greater when individuals perceived their organization's culture was not supportive of family needs. It is not enough to have family policies in place if individuals are discouraged from using them because they feel that the organizational culture or their supervisor is not supportive. In order to truly help individuals, organizations need to develop cultures which are truly supportive and understanding of individuals' needs to balance work and family concerns. Simply jumping on the band wagon and offering all kinds of policies and benefits will not be useful if the ideology stands that private life has no place in the public sphere.

Second, policies such as flexplace, job sharing, and part-time work will not be truly effective until managers and societal members reconceptualize the definition of work. As suggested by Waring (1988), perhaps we need to reconsider the notion that child care and housework are 'non-productive' and begin to calculate the economic value of such work. In addition, managers must realize that quality as well as quantity of work is important. What is important is not how much time is spent at work but how much gets done and the quality of the work. As noted by Friedman, Christensen, and DeGroot (1998; p. 8), "many work practices are legacies of

outdated industrial models in which employees had to be physically present during ‘normal’ business hours.” We tend to believe that only work done on a full-time, nine to five or more, basis, away from the home, is serious work. This belief contributes to the problem of part-time workers, job sharers, and telecommuters not being taken seriously and not being considered as individuals who care about their careers. Hill (2004) found that a sample of U.S. IBM professionals working in part-time positions reported less career opportunities and work success than those working in full-time positions. Williams (2000) refers to this issue as the ‘marginalization of part-time work,’ noting that part-timers are often assigned less interesting work, have restricted prospects for advancement, and receive lower pay and less respect.

In order for family friendly policies to be useful for individuals balancing work and family who are still very serious about their careers, individuals who choose alternative work styles should still be considered for promotions, raises, and their work should be taken seriously. Again, simply offering such policies is not enough; we need to reconceptualize the way work is viewed in contemporary society.

If women and men are going to be able to successfully carry out the overlapping public and private roles of the post-industrial era, changes need to be made to the structural characteristics of the family and workplace. As the boundaries between public and private are breaking down, we must begin to conceptualize public and private not as separate, but as overlapping spheres.

In a survey of 564 workers, Premeaux, Adkins, and Mossholder (2007) found that a positive work-family culture may be more instrumental in helping employees balance work and family than family-friendly policies themselves. In addition to offering family friendly policies, managers in these organizations recognize and support the fact that employees have lives outside of work. They focus on results instead of processes thereby allowing individual employees more autonomy and flexibility in how, when, and where they conduct their work.

We must continue to break down the ideology associated with the public/private dichotomy if we are to find solutions to meet the needs of the post-industrial generation. If we want to truly understand why many of the family friendly policies offered by organizations are not being

utilized, more research is needed on organizational culture. Specifically, more qualitative research is needed that focuses on deconstructing and understanding those organizational cultures that truly are family friendly; cultures that not only offer family friendly programs, but are supportive of employees who take advantage of them. Once we understand what a family friendly organization culture is, it opens the door for organizations to change and learn and emulate those that are already successful. Therefore, as researchers an area that is ripe for future research is the use of organizational change theories to enable organizations to change their cultures from ones which are embedded with the public/private ideology to ones which are truly supportive and understanding of work/family overlap.

REFERENCES

- Ahrentzen, S. B. (1990). Managing conflict by managing boundaries: How professional homeworkers cope with multiple roles at home. *Environment and behavior*, 22(6): 723-752.
- Allen, S. (1989). Locating homework in an analysis of the ideological and material constraints on women's paid work. In E. Boris & C.R. Daniels (Eds.), *Homework: Historical and contemporary perspectives on paid labor at home* (pp. 272-291). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Amott, T. & Matthaei, J. (1996). *Race, gender, and work: A multicultural economic history of women in the United States*. Boston: South End Press.
- Anderson, S.E., Coffey, B.S., Byerly, R.T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and information workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28, 787-810.
- Arthur, M.B. & Rousseau, D.M. (1996). *Boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aryee, S. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work/family conflict among married and professional women: Evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations*, 45(8), 813-837.
- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E.S., Tan, H.H. (2005). Rhythms of Life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146.
- Bailyn, L. (1989). Toward the perfect workplace? *Communications of the ACM*, 32(4), 460-471.
- Bartley, S.J., Blanton, P.W., & Gilliard, J.L. (2005). Husbands and Wives in Dual-Earner Marriages: Decision-Making, Gender Role Attitudes, Division of Household Labor, and Equity. *Marriage & Family Review*, Vol. 37(4).
- Benn, S.I. & Gaus, G.F. (1983). The liberal conception of the public and the private. In S.I. Benn & G.F. Gaus (Eds.), *Public and private in social life* (pp. 31-65). New York: St. Martins Press.
- Bohen, H.H. & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). *Balancing jobs and family life: Do flexible schedules help?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Boyar, S.L., Maertz, C.P. Jr., Pearson, A.W., Keough, S. (2003). Work-family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(2), 175-190.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchanan, C.H. (1996). *Choosing to lead: Women and the crisis of American values*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Butler, A.B. and Skattebo, A. (2004). What is acceptable for women may not be for men: The effect of family conflicts with work on job-performance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(4), 553-564.
- Catalyst. (2010). *Women in U.S. Management*. Quick Takes, March.
- Christensen, K. (1988). *Women and home-based work*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family man: Fatherhood, housework, and gender equity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1208-1233.
- Coser, R.L. (1991). *In defense of modernity: Role complexity and individual autonomy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cox, S. & James, B. (1987). The theoretical background. In S. Cox (Ed.), *Public and private worlds Women in contemporary New Zealand* (pp. 1-22). Winchester, MA: Allen & Unwin.
- Diani, M. (1992). Immateriality takes command. In M. Diani (Ed.), *The immaterial society: Design, culture, and technology in the postmodern world*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Festinger, L.A. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Fitzgerald, L.F. & Betz, N.E. (1983). Issues in vocational psychology of women. In W.B. Walsh & S.H. Osipow (Eds.), *Handbook of vocational psychology* (Vol.1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fox, M.F. & Hesse-Biber, S. (1984). *Women at work*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Fredriksen-Goldsen, K.I., & Scharlach, A.E. (2001). *Families and work: New directions in the twenty-first century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Friedman, S.D., Christensen, P., and DeGroot, J. (1998). Work and life: The end of the zero sum game. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov.-Dec., 119(1).

- Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.
- Gerson, K. (1985). *Hard choices: how women decide about work, career, and motherhood*. Berkley, CA: UCAL Press.
- Goldberg, M. (2000). Breaking new ground: 1800-1848. In N.F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goode, W.J. (1974). A theory of strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.
- Grzywacz, J.G. & Bass, B.L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 248-261.
- Hall, D.T. & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(3), 213-223.
- Haraway, D. (1990). A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980's. In L.J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 190-233). New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Hill, J.E. (2004). New-concept part-time employment as work-family adaptive strategy for women professionals with small children. *Family Relations*, 53(3), 282-292.
- Higgins, C.A. & Duxbury, L.E. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional career men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 389-411.
- Higgins, C.A., Duxbury, L.E., & Irving, R.H. (1992). Work-family conflict in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51, 51-75.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking Press.
- Hymowitz, C., & Weissman, M. (1978). *A history of women in America*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress*. New York: Wiley.
- Kamensky, J. (2000). The colonial mosaic: 1600-1760. In N.F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Kingston, P.W. (1990). Illusions and ignorance about the family-responsive workplace. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 438-454.
- Kipnis, D. (1991). The technological perspective. *Psychological Science*, 2(2), 62-69.
- Kraut, R.E. (1989). Telecommuting: The trade-offs of home work. *Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 19-47.
- Kwolek-Folland, A. (1998). *Incorporating Women: A history of women and business in the United States*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Lambert, E.G. and Hogan, N.L. (2010). Work-family conflict and job burnout among correctional staff. *Psychological Reports*, 106(1), 19-26.
- Lapierre, L.M., Spector, P.E., Allen, T.D., Poelmans, S.A.Y., Cooper, C.L., & Driscoll, M.P. (2008). Family-supportive organization perceptions, multiple dimensions of work-family conflict, and employee satisfaction: A test of a model across five samples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 92-106.
- Lopata, H.Z. (1987). Women's family roles in life course perspective. In B.B. Hess & M.F. Ferree (Eds.), *Analyzing gender: A handbook of social science research* (pp. 381-407). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Madsen, S.R., Camerson, J.R., Miller, D. (2005). Work-family conflict and health: A study of workplace, psychological, and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 6(3): 225-247.
- Margolis, D.R. (1979). *The managers: Corporate life in America*. New York: William Morrow.
- Marks, S. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936.
- Martin, J. (1992). The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. In D.M. Kolb & J.M. Bartunek (Eds.), *Hidden conflict in organizations: Uncovering the behind-the-scenes disputes* (pp.165-186). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McGraw, T.K. (2000). *American Business, 1920-2000: How it worked*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc.

- McLaughlin, S.D., Melber, B.D., Billy, J.O.G., Zimmerle, D.M., Wings, L.D. & Johnson, T.R. (1988). *The changing lives of American women*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Mednick, M.S. (1987). Relationships between selected family dynamics and work outcome variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.
- Michel, J.S., Mitchelson, J.K., Kotrba, L.M., LeBreton, J.M., Baltes, B.B. (2009). A comparative test of work-family models and critical examination of work-family linkages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(2), 199-218.
- Nilles, J.M., Sawy, M.E., & Pauchant, F. (1976). *Telecommunications/transportation trade-offs: Options for tomorrow*. New York: John Wiley.
- Olson, M.H. (1989). Work at home for computer professionals: Current attitudes and future prospects. *ACM Transactions on Office Information Systems*, 7(4), 317-338.
- Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J.H., & Granrose, C.S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 339-356.
- Premeaux, S.F., Adkins, C.L., & Mossholder, K.W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(6), 705-727.
- Pleck, J.H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (Third edition). New York: Wiley.
- Popenoe, D. (1985). *Private pleasure, public plight: American metropolitan community life in comparative perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Ramsower, R.M. (1985). *Telecommuting: The organizational and behavioral effects of working at home*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Rice, R.W., Frone, M.R., and McFarlin, D.B. (1992). Work-nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 155-168.
- Richter, J. (1992). Balancing work and family in Israel. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and Organizations* (pp. 362-394). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Salmon, M. (2000). The limits of independence: 1760-1800. In N.F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sekaran, U. (1986). *Dual-career families*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Shamir, B. (1992). Home: The perfect workplace? In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and Organizations* (pp. 272-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sieber, S.D. (1974). Toward of a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 567-578.
- Sigerman, H. (2000). An unfinished battle: 1848-1865. In N.F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, K.M. (2000). New paths to power: 1890-1920. In N.F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stoper, E. (1988). Alternative work patterns and the double life. In E. Boneparth & E. Stoper (Eds.), *Women, power, and policy* (pp. 93-111). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Thompson, C.A.; Beauvais, L.L., & Lyness, K.S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3), 392-415.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009a). *American Time Use Survey – 2008 Results*. June.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009b). *Employment Characteristics of Families Summary*. May.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009c). *Women in the Labor Force: A Databook*. September.
- Waring, M. (1988). *If women counted: A new feminist economics*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- WorldatWork. (2009). *Telework Trendlines 2009*. A Survey Brief, February.
- Work & Family Connection, Inc. (2000). Single mothers % in the workforce hits record high. *Work & Family Newsbrief*, December.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organization* (pp. 1-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zedeck, S. & Mosier, K.L. (1990). Work in the family and employing organization. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 240-251.