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In the face of an ongoing globalisation and the associated growing international competition, organisational efficiency and speed of getting things done has become increasingly important to remain economically successful. In a great number of professional organisations, a new culture has been created in which time spent at work is viewed as a yardstick of organisational commitment and devotion to a career. New management principles have been introduced, such as up-or-out career systems, life-long learning, and performance-related pay systems, which are expected to stimulate workers to work longer hours and enhance mutual competition among co-workers. In combination with the new incentives for achievement, the increased sense of control and responsible autonomy over the organisation of work seems to have made some jobs more encumbering than before. Employees need to deal with these growing demands from the workplace, and as a consequence for some people work has become home and home has become work (Hochschild 1997; Peters 2000).

Employees not only have to deal with changing workplaces, at the household level changes have been taking place as well. The increase in women’s labour force participation is among the most visible. Over the last three decades, labour force participation among women in Western societies has increased and in some countries has even doubled (European Commission 2005; Van der Lippe and Van Dijk 2001). In 2004, activity rates of women in the 15-64 age range exceeded 60% for the enlarged European Union (Employment and Social Affairs 2005). For the USA, Canada and Australia these rates have already surpassed 70% (International Labour Office 2005). This has led to an increasing number of dual-earner and dual-career couples who are in a continuing process of balancing work and family life. Actually, the increase of women on the labour market has made ‘time’ a new issue of negotiation at the kitchen table. Although the number of children per family has decreased in recent decades, more time and money is invested in the care and education of children than ever before (Bianchi 2000). Next to the increasing time demands in the spheres of work and care, leisure has become a time that has to be spent in an active and encompassing way and which is used to
shape one’s identity.

We have witnessed an increase of time demands in the private sphere as well as the workplace (Epstein 2004). Many people feel torn between work and family not just because their households increasingly juggle competing responsibilities, but also because job expectations and parenting standards have become more demanding (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). These new developments in work and family life create increased feelings of time pressure and time competition (Daly 1996). Until recently, the ‘stress society’ was considered an exclusively American phenomenon (Schor 1992; Hochschild 1997; Presser 2003), but at present Europeans too are experiencing an ever-greater time pressure (Peters 2000; Garhammer 2002; Van der Lippe et al. 2006). Although Gershuny (2000) argues that over the past fifty years the Western world has seen an increase in leisure time over the life cycle, it feels as if we are constantly running out of time. Time pressure has become a serious problem in our society, and it is only likely to increase in scope and impact (Van der Lippe and Glebbeek 1999). This is a serious problem, and it is necessary to gain understanding not only of its causes, but also its consequences and possible solutions. In order to have adequate insight into families’ problems and successes, it is necessary to treat the two life spheres of work and family together (Moen 2003; Berg et al. 2003). Relationships with spouses and children have an impact on workers’ experiences and relationships at work and vice versa (Fox and Dwyer 1999; Marshall and Barnett 1993; Roehling et al. 2003).

The central aim of this book is to deepen our understanding of the conditions that influence the successes and difficulties people experience when making accommodations of their work and private lives. Such conditions may derive from the organisation, the household, or both – in other words, this calls for a multi-level and multi-actor approach. Our focus will be not only on causes of disturbed balances between work and care, but also on solutions households and organisations (can) choose in response to competing claims arising from the work and family domains. This may provide us with leads to policymakers and implementers in the sense that certain elements of the organisation and the household can be seen as parameters that are susceptible to directed interventions.

Although the phenomenon of time poverty to which our title Competing claims refers seems to be an irreversible trend in all Western societies, its magnitude and the underlying causes and solutions may vary across countries due to differences in welfare state regimes and versions of capitalism. Moreover, organisational structures and cultures may also affect the relation between work and family life differently, just like differences in rules and relationships within households. The studies presented in this book will help to disentangle the time competition mechanisms in various national, organisational and household contexts.

In this introductory chapter we will continue presenting a picture of state-of-the-art time use studies, work-life balance and feelings of time
pressure. Next, we will turn to causes of competing claims at both the organisational and household levels. Well-known strategies and solutions to cope with such claims will be subsequently discussed. This will be followed by an overview of the book.

TIME AND TIME PRESSURE

Like money, time is a valuable resource that triggers questions about how it should be allocated and spent. Unlike money though, the overall supply of time cannot be expanded. As there are only so many hours in a day, days in a week and weeks in a year, time use can only be intensified through multiple tasking, capital-intensive consumption or more intense experiences (cf. Linder 1970). It is therefore not surprising that time appears to be central in work-family issues (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Working Europeans currently spend an average of 59 hours a week on paid work and care (Social and Cultural Planning Office 2005). Americans have a heavier workload because they allocate more time to paid work, so they have less leisure time available. For example, Americans spend 37% more time on paid work than Dutch people (Social and Cultural Planning Office 2005).

Of course, there are clear differences in time allocation patterns between men and women. The traditional male breadwinner role is continuously emphasised in Western societies, and employed women are mainly responsible for domestic duties. Both in the USA and Europe, working men spend on average 8 to 15 hours more on paid work a week than working women. At the same time, compared with women, men spend nine fewer hours on domestic work and care. These differences are more pronounced in Mediterranean than in Nordic countries and the USA (Social and Cultural Planning Office 2005; Batalova and Cohen 2002). It is not surprising that women’s time use is much more dependent on the family situation than men’s. Especially in countries like the Netherlands and Germany, mothers of young children work part-time or quit working altogether. This holds less true for countries like the USA, Finland and Eastern European nations (Breedveld and Groot 2004).

Studying time use over a longer period reveals that time spent by men on paid work has decreased over the last century in Western countries (Gershuny 2000; Ecorys 2005), whereas the average amount of time that women spend doing paid labour has increased, especially over the last few decades. This latter trend can be mainly attributed to the fact that the number of women with paid jobs has increased dramatically, and not to working women having increased their time spent on the job (Ecorys 2005). Interestingly, women spend less time on domestic duties but allocate more time to child care activities (Gershuny 2000). Since the 1960s, men have slightly increased their contribution to domestic duties, but not as much as women have decreased their time spent on household
chores (Bianchi et al. 2000). With women entering the labour market, the housewife’s ‘traditional’ time reservoir no longer functions as a ‘time buffer’ between the different life spheres: the coordination of work and home activities has become much more difficult. Especially at rush hours, combining work and family has become a heavy burden (Moen 2003).

Although objective and subjective time pressure are correlated (Peters and Raaijmakers 1998), being busy does not necessarily mean that people feel pressed for time (cf. Garhammer 2006). Next to the paid and unpaid workload, the intensity of paid and unpaid work is as important as the amount of time it takes. Subtle changes in the amount of time spent at work may obscure more basic changes in the effort, energy and concentration that is expected from workers. Consequences of work overload that are studied range from feelings of stress, work-home interference, time pressure, and burn-out and other health problems (MacDermid 2005). In the USA, for example, 60% of men and women report at least some conflict balancing work, personal and family life; about 30% do not have enough time to fulfil obligations and about 25% feel burned out or stressed by work (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). In Europe, 28% of employees report stress and 22% general fatigue. These percentages are higher for those working irregular times or doing shift work (Boisard 2003). Research generally reports higher stress levels in society over time, but results are not conclusive as to whether this is the case for everyone. Although people are busy doing paid work and domestic tasks and participating in social events, it is not true that everyone experiences severe violations of their paid work obligations by family responsibilities, or vice versa. Moreover, work appears to interfere more with home than the other way around (Van der Lippe et al. 2006), as the home situation is not always adjusted to unexpected but important professional deadlines (Moen 2003). People experience more interference of work with home in terms of domestic tasks than childcare responsibilities. It seems as if people do not want their work to intrude with the care for their children. Strikingly, the highest percentage of workers facing pressures related to combining work and care in Europe is found in Sweden. Since combining work and family life is an important and well-discussed issue, feeling stressed and hurried may have become part of the culture (Van der Lippe et al. 2006).

This does not necessarily imply that people with more time pressure feel less happy in life. Garhammer (2002) speaks about the ‘time-pressure happiness paradox’ in modern Western European societies. The feeling of being rushed through multiple tasking and role overload, as well as people’s novelty-seeking behaviour, has become a central part of modern life. According to Garhammer, the Danish, the Dutch and the Swedish are the happiest people in the world. Personal growth and achievement generate flow. Mobilising one’s resources to develop skills and participating intensely in modern society bring about happiness. Time pressure is the other side of this coin.
CLAIMS FROM THE ORGANISATION

Time allocation, time pressure and time competition are related to competing claims arising from the work and household domains. To clarify the influence of the organisation, it is helpful to assume that organisational structures and culture constitute the setting in which workers weigh alternatives and make decisions concerning the time spent on work and the timing of their efforts for the organisation (Williamson 1985). Workers have to adjust their work and family commitments in the context of specific job demands and the larger workplace structures and cultures in which these jobs are embedded (Schor 1998). Organisations try to direct the efforts of their employees to meet their demands through financial as well as non-financial incentives (Sorensen 1994). Of course, it is difficult to untangle the extent to which a choice to put in long hours on the job reflects workers’ individual preferences for work over other activities in life, and to what extent it can be viewed as a response to these incentives (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Several incentives are stressed as important in the literature (e.g. Cappelli et al. 1997; Sennett 1998), and they are often linked to the change from the traditional bureaucratic-Tayloristic workplace to the modern post-Fordist firm, which presents workers with a different context for making decisions. Post-Fordist firms are characterised by performance-related pay systems that pose a financial incentive for workers to devote long working hours to the organisation (cf. Van Echtelt et al. 2007), and by non-financial incentives like decreased job security, manifest for example in the idea that predictable career paths have been giving way to more uncertain and competitive promotion systems. All these incentives are expected to increase the time employees spend on their jobs, as well as feelings of time pressure.

Moreover, the extent to which employees are being held responsible for meeting profit or production targets and managing their own workloads is expected to be important for time allocation purposes. The degree of regulation and control possibilities does differ between workers, although it is generally believed that the number of employees with some autonomy has increased (Perlow 2001). New organisational forms with more autonomy for employees are very different from the Taylorist systems of work organisation in which workers had little say over how the work was done. At the same time, the question arises of whether autonomy increases time competition. On the one hand, Hochschild (1997) argues that in these new, more autonomously-oriented organisational forms workers are pressed to spend more time at work than with their family, such that ‘work becomes home and home becomes work’. The greediness of the new employment relationship is even said to manifest itself in the loss of ‘boundary control’ between employees’ work and private lives (Perlow 2001). On the other hand, Berg et al. (2003) stress
that new organisational forms, the so-called high-performance work organisations, facilitate the combination of work and care. High-performance organisations are characterised by high levels of autonomy for employees and by more family-friendly practices, which are expected to result in a better work-life balance and fewer time conflicts. Job autonomy and time sovereignty are important thereby, as they enable employees to determine the timing and location of their work. This may explain why individuals with extensive autonomy experience relatively little work-family conflict and time pressure (Peters and Van der Lippe 2007b). It enhances feelings of work satisfaction, which can spill over and affect family satisfaction (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999).

The way in which organisations provide a supportive work environment such as a family-friendly workplace is likely to be a helpful resource in balancing work and family life for employees and proves to enhance feelings of satisfaction (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999). Moreover, when colleagues support each other, this will form another helpful resource for them as employees (Schaufeli and Bakker 2004). In the Cornell Couples and Careers Study, Valcour and Batt (2003) show that organisational family responsiveness, involving formal and informal policies and practices, supports work-life integration for family employees. It influences Swedish men to make use of parental leave facilities as well (Haas and Hwang 1995).

CLAIMS FROM THE HOUSEHOLD

Employees’ private household situations are also likely to affect time pressure. Some employees will be more willing to and capable of responding to incentives to work longer hours, whereas others may face household circumstances that limit their possibility to work unrestrainedly.

In studying family life and household behaviour, it may be helpful to view employees basically as acting rationally. In a way, this may seem counterintuitive, as the behaviour of household members is imbued with symbolic meanings, social bonds and affection, and therefore usually considered to be devoid of any rationality (De Ruijter 2005). However, the assumption that household behaviour is goal-directed provides us with a constructive framework when it is viewed as a method of analysis rather than a claim that individuals are motivated by selfishness or material gain (Becker 1993). This viewpoint is often taken in economic household production models (e.g. Becker 1965, 1981), but has not been developed into much of a coherent set of organisational principles that are comparable to those used in research firms and bureaucracies. In a sense, Hochschild’s (1997) concept of the ‘Taylorisation of the household’ bridges the gap between organisational studies and work-and-family research, although her account is still rather impressionistic. According to Orrange et al. (2003), the family resource management literature helps to
understand how families combine work and private life. Instead of having a passive orientation towards family members, this literature assumes an active and proactive role for household members. This idea in family resource management studies resembles in a way the body of thoughts that is so central to New Home Economics. Just like organisations direct their employees to meet their demands, so do partners regulate each others’ activities in order to meet household demands.

Demands are expected to vary with the life stage. Time pressure is most likely to occur among people who are between their late twenties and early forties. These age brackets are most likely to marry, become parents and consequently shoulder the responsibilities of caring for young children (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Moen and Roehling 2005). Especially women’s time pressure is affected by the presence of young children (Peters and Van der Lippe 2007b). While both men and women are likely to feel torn between family and work, they probably respond to parenthood in different ways, despite any convergence between men’s and women’s work commitments (Jacobs and Gerson 2004).

Household resources are able to reduce time pressure. They constitute a whole system of social and financial assistance that can be mobilised by the household to lift its burden. Those with more resources tend to see themselves as more successful in their professional and private lives (Moen et al. 2003). A higher income, for example, enables households to outsource certain domestic duties. Help from other family members, friends and neighbours can also form an important resource in facilitating the combination of work and care. Flexibility can help thereby, and refers to how the household is prepared to and can cope with unforeseen events (e.g. overtime, a sick child, a day off from school). Of course, the possibility to respond swiftly to unexpected events is not only of strategic importance for firms, but also for households. According to Gill (1998), competing claims from the workplace and household are better dealt with when households are characterised by flexible rules, that is, when there are no rules regarding weekend working, or when household chores should get done and by whom. Another type of household rules that seems to be important in this process is the quality requirements with respect to all household and caring tasks. Just like the products of firms, household products and services have to meet certain quality requirements as determined by the household members. These rules define the minimally acceptable level that has to be met regarding the performance of household tasks, like the quality of a home-cooked meal or the effort that has to be put into cleaning activities (cf. Wotschack et al. 2007). This all assumes that partners have common interests and share the same ideals and goals in life. However, diverse interests among spouses are possible and the way partners deal with conflicts is likely to influence the outcome of these coordination processes (ibid.).
NEW STRATEGIES: CAUSE OR SOLUTION?

Depending on their individual job traits and household situation, some employees will obviously be more subject to time competition than others (Peters and Van der Lippe 2007b). However, as resourceful actors, both employers and employees will look for strategies to cope with competing work and household demands. Solutions can vary in scope, from rather informal accommodations for individual workers to strategies involving policies, structures and cultures in organisations or households (Naegele 2003). In answer to the more highly educated and diverse workforce, more and more organisations have introduced new policies that allow workers increased time-spatial sovereignty and job autonomy as a solution to time pressure. We do not aim to give an overview of all these strategies but stress significant ones, such as home-based telework, flexible schedules at the workplace level, and outsourcing of domestic and caring tasks at the household level. Note that such strategies not only form a solution to the competing claims of work and family life, but may also intensify work and affect the boundaries between work and private life.

Home-based telework policies, for instance, allow workers to perform (part of their) work from their private homes. One of the reported benefits of this new type of work is that it will save (commuting) time that can be spent on other activities like family obligations. For some though, working from home may engender new problems as it allows work to intrude into the home (Peters and Van der Lippe 2007a). Moreover, not all employees are given access to home-based telework, so new ‘benefits’ can also reproduce traditional labour market inequalities (cf. Peters and Van der Lippe 2007a). Another solution refers to the use of flexible benefit schemes that allow employees to trade time for money and money for time (cf. Hillebrink et al. 2007). Employers may also offer their employees time sovereignty by allowing flexible work schedules. Results show that the degree of working time flexibility varies greatly between EU countries. For example, working-time arrangements allowing employees to accommodate their working hours to personal needs are used by 50% of employees in Finland and Sweden, but in only about 10 to 15% in Greece or Portugal (Reidmann et al. 2006). Other well-known policies are directed at facilitating the combination of employees’ work and caring responsibilities by providing childcare and parental leave facilities and offering part-time jobs.

Households too can develop strategies to cope with competing demands. Household outsourcing appears to be an important strategy to deal with competing claims at work and at home (De Ruijter 2005). The use of childcare facilities is often a necessary condition to be able to participate on the labour market, but households also use frequently the option of outsourcing cooking and cleaning tasks. Outsourcing domestic tasks has increased in recent years. Having domestic help and
consuming ready-made meals have become inextricable parts of our daily lives. Households can also choose to balance work and home using their own rules regarding division of labour and resorting to negotiation processes (Kluwer 1998; Wotschack et al. 2007). In this way, spouses regulate or ‘govern’ their input in the household.

We conclude this section by stressing that certain strategies discussed are likely to reproduce gender inequality within organisations and in the labour market in general (Haas et al. 2000). This holds true even for more progressive countries in this field, like Sweden and Norway. For men it is still more difficult to get a part-time job; women on the other hand are less likely to have access to home-based teleworking facilities (Peters and Van der Lippe 2007a). Generally speaking, work organisations are more likely to offer all kinds of arrangements to higher educated employees and professionals (Den Dulk et al. 2006).

Explaining difficulties and successes that men and women experience with the combination of work and care is a complex yet challenging task. In the foregoing we have sketched the contours of a ‘model’ that can be used to deepen our understanding. Our premise is that we are studying resourceful actors that balance costs and benefits to meet the often-conflicting demands arising from the work and home domains. Organisational conditions that are expected to influence time competition include work demands and incentives for longer hours such as the reward system, the career system and the employment contract, as well as the degree of control in terms of autonomy and time sovereignty and amount of support offered by organisations and colleagues. Household conditions include home demands such as the presence and age of children, and social and economic resources as well as flexibility and quality rules as determined by the household members. In answer to the increased competition between claims arising from the household and organisational contexts, contemporary employers and employees can develop different strategies that may involve various work-family arrangements. Balancing costs and benefits of employees will also depend on the institutional context with its own policies, culture and economy (Van der Lippe and Van Dijk 2002). The challenge of the authors in this book is to provide more insight into parts of this model by presenting the latest research in the field of time use, time pressure and work/life policies and strategies. A broad range of research problems has resulted. Some authors decided to focus more on making the relation between objective and subjective time pressure explicit, others on the culture of the organisation as a decisive factor in feelings of time pressure of employees. Some of us study telework as one of the strategies to meet the dual demands.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

In line with the foregoing, we have divided the book in three parts.
Together they are meant to help elucidate the increasingly problematic feelings of ‘competing claims’ on time. We will start with time and time pressure itself – how is time divided between spouses, trends towards increasing time pressure, and how can time pressure be explained. We will then shift our attention to causes of time pressure. These will be studied at both the household and the organisational level. Within the organisation, causes are related to demands of the organisation and its culture, but also to the autonomy given to employees. At the household level, family demands are likely to be important as well as how the household is managed. The third part of the book is devoted to strategies and solutions to the problem of time competition. These solutions can lie at the household level as well as the organisational level. In this way, comprehensive insight into mechanisms and strategies to cope with time pressure is provided. Many of the contributions in this book concern one specific country. Although we are fully aware that country and organisational contexts matter, we believe that many of the theoretical mechanisms studied, for instance in a particular country or organisational context, are applicable in others as well. Empirical outcomes too may provide us with interesting knowledge that is useful in other contexts.

Part One will provide us with an up-to-date picture of time use trends and the time pressure phenomenon itself. What is time competition; how is time pressure experienced across countries; what are the underlying causes; and what are the implications for individuals’ and households’ well-being? In Chapter 2, Manfred Garhammer describes major trends in time pressure in the societies of the European Union, the United States and Japan, and their relationships with quality of life. His main assumption is that along with global competition of national economies, overwork and time pressure are proliferating. Some evidence is provided that – in contrast to the thesis of an emerging leisure society – people spend more of their daily time on paid and unpaid work, including work-related activities. When drawing conclusions about quality of life, a broad concept is used combining both subjective and objective indicators, i.e. well-being and economic and time resources. Accordingly, a concept of time pressure is elaborated that includes the feeling of being calm and relaxed. People’s quality of life is a function of both time and money – they can suffer from time poverty and money poverty, and Garhammer provides arguments and evidence that Europeans increasingly do.

In Chapter 3, Liana Sayer presents time-use trends in the USA. She specifically focuses on trends in multiple tasking and gender differences therein. Through multitasking, i.e. combining activities in one time slot, parents try to cope with competing work and family time demands. It is likely that multitasking is a gendered strategy. To investigate whether changes in gender specialisation in paid and unpaid work are associated with longer work days and more multitasking among parents, U.S. time diary data from 1975 and 1998-2000 are used. Work time and multitasking have indeed increased for mothers and fathers during this
period, and accounting for multitasking increases gender differences in total work time. Nonetheless, because mothers in male breadwinner couples spend more time multitasking than those in dual breadwinner couples, Sayer concludes that multitasking may not be a strategy adopted by time-pressed mothers to cope with duelling work and family time demands.

Koen Breedveld focuses in Chapter 4 on the specific relation between atypical working hours and time pressure in the Netherlands, a country where measures were introduced to make working hours more flexible and extend trading hours. This was done partly in response to the weakness of the economy (at that time). To what degree has paid work actually moved into the evenings, nights and weekends, and what are its effects on the pace of life and on social life in Dutch society? Results using time-use surveys from 1975 to 2000 indicate that roughly half of employees work evenings, nights and weekends. However, the share of odd working hours is only 10% and this figure has not increased over time. Most people, especially the higher educated, work odd hours as an extension of their regular working day. The results in no way suggest that working odd hours is associated with feeling time-pressured.

In Chapter 5, Maarten Moens studies time pressure within the Belgian context, asking how objective time pressure is related to feelings of time pressure. Using data of Flemish time-use surveys, he shows that objective time pressure amplifies feelings of time pressure. Time spent on obligations is still experienced as a curtailing of individual freedom. Especially for dual-earner families and people in the busy age bracket, severe workloads are the most important mechanism in explaining their feelings of time pressure. Within organisations, a high degree of time sovereignty – with its possibilities to attune professional life with family life – seems insufficient towards compensating for negative effects of higher professional responsibilities.

Part Two focuses on causes related to the organisation and household sphere. These chapters do not intend to explain time pressure as in the first part of the book, but focus their attention on mechanisms which are likely to influence the finding of time. Judith Treas and Christin Hilgeman start in Chapter 6 with workers’ preferences for work and family time in the USA. Using American data from the International Social Survey Program, Treas and Hilgeman conclude that longer work hours do not automatically translate into a desire for more family time. First, although the constraints of a 24-hour day imply a trade-off between work and family time, not everyone thinks about work and family in this zero-sum way. While men sometimes voice a desire for more family time, only women who want more family time desire less time on the job. Second, all things considered, longer work hours do not translate into a desire for more family time. Changes in the length of the workweek do not leave individuals feeling more pressed for family time. Third, there is no evidence that the workplace has become a refuge from the family. Hardly
any Americans admit to wanting less time with family, and the desire to work longer hours is not associated with family time preferences. Providing shorter working hours or offering part-time work thus does not appear to be the only solution.

Kea Tijdens continues in Chapter 7, studying the desire to work shorter hours on the job as a logical response to a potential solution to time pressure. To what extent can governance structures within the household as well as organisational characteristics of the workplace explain the varying desire for shorter working hours? Results show that working hours preferences are predominately influenced by working hours characteristics; hourly wages have a large impact on working hours preferences, as the low-earnings category prefers longer hours far more often. Employees in a challenging job prefer shorter hours less often, and vice versa: employees who perceive their job as a burden want to reduce hours. Contrary to public opinion, female employees apparently show a better fit between preferred and usual hours compared to male employees.

Patricia van Echtelt, Arie Glebbeek, Rudi Wielers and Siegwart Lindenberg concentrate in Chapter 8 on why Dutch employees want to work overtime. Work pressure, work pleasure and time-dependent career advancement as characteristics of post-Fordist organisations are expected to increase the scope of overtime work. Using Dutch Time Competition data gathered in 2003 with both organisations and their employees, results show that post-Fordist organisations – the more modern organisations – appear to be indeed more time-claiming. Interesting to note is that the authors find that working unpaid overtime is not due to the fact that employees enjoy their work so much nor to increasing workloads within these organisations. They thus end with a puzzle: if working overtime is not created by these factors, what makes employees in modern organisations work overtime?

In Chapter 9, Suzan Lewis discusses time in the accountancy profession in the UK. Lewis argues that it is important to move towards an exploration of personal meanings of time allocated to work and family life, and the contexts in which these are constructed and reproduced. She especially concentrates on the normative assumptions about long working hours. The dominant culture of time in accountancy appears to be based on a model of the ideal professional as one who has the support of a full-time homemaker. There is evidence though that meanings of time in accountancy are beginning to be reconstructed. The study shows that promoting flexible working practices alone will not create fundamental changes in the culture and practice of working time.

Inspired by the ongoing discussion on the time greediness of firms and its impact on working hours, Philip Wotschack, Jacques Siegers, Babette Pouwels and Rafael Wittek investigate in Chapter 10 to what degree variations in individual labour supply can be explained by variations in employer demands, and how household governance practices moderate
this relationship. They extend the baseline labour supply model as used in mainstream economics, and give a first attempt towards analysing how employer demands and household governance practices affect labour supply. Using time competition data collected in 2003 in the Netherlands, results show that household rules that govern daily time allocation do not seem to have an impact on labour supply – probably due to their twofold (facilitative and restrictive) character – but quality standards do. The effect of employer demands on labour supply varies widely, depending on these standards.

The focus of Part Three is constituted by solutions provided by the workplace and the household to overcome managing family and work pressure. In Chapter 11, Carlien Hillebrink, Joop Schippers, Pascale Peters and Anneke van Doorne present the Dutch version of a flexible benefit scheme allowing workers to trade in time for money and vice versa (the flexible benefits plan). By introducing flexible benefits, employees get to have a greater say over the composition of their pay and the balance between its various components. In this way they can trade time and money. Using data from a public services agency, results indicate that almost half of the employees changed their benefits. Strikingly, participation is higher among men than women, and household characteristics such as having children do not influence the decision. Motivation seems to be more important. Buying time is far less popular than selling time. Looking at the fact that the most popular choice is trading time off for a new computer, it can be concluded that the benefits plan does not act as a work-family arrangement.

Esther de Ruijter and Tanja van der Lippe focus in Chapter 12 on domestic outsourcing as a strategy to combine work with private life. They move beyond existing research by including trust in their explanation of household outsourcing. Using Time Competition data from 2003, they conclude that trust matters in household outsourcing. The possibility of directly observing the efforts of the outsourcing supplier decreases the likelihood of undesirable behaviour. As a result, the probability increases of outsourcing tasks such as housecleaning and home maintenance, both of which allow for direct monitoring. Interestingly enough, the general belief of households in the trustworthiness of other people has proved to be an important factor in explaining outsourcing tasks that involve risk. Households with a high level of general trust are more likely to outsource childcare, cleaning and home maintenance. These tasks all entail the actual involvement of suppliers in the privacy of the home or a ‘labour of love’, which highlights the importance of trustworthiness.

In Chapter 13, Peter Standen shows that home-based telework offers a different and important perspective on time pressure, highlighting work-role conflicts and new forms of role conflict and ambiguity that arise when work and family or leisure are co-located. Changes in flexibility and permeability of work-role and work-family boundaries are also expected to affect the social support enjoyed by teleworkers. The experience of time
in telework appears as a paradoxical mix of benefits and problems, partly because for many people it has both outcomes, and partly because teleworkers’ circumstances are as diverse as the institutions of work and home. Both public and academic discussions continue nonetheless to portray telework as either a win-win solution to time competition or too problematic to be widely adopted. Standen develops a theoretical framework to explain the relation between home-based telework and time pressure that takes into account feelings as well as role conflicts.

Pascale Peters and Tanja van der Lippe analyse in Chapter 14 the influence of coordination, control and trust problems on employees’ access to weekly home-based telework from a combined perspective of transaction cost theory and New Economic Sociology. Access is more likely when additional coordination and control problems are smaller. Indicators of the so-called ‘telework risk’ are time sovereignty, job autonomy, need for accessibility and output management, measured at both the job category and the individual levels. Trust-enhancing effects are also studied by looking into the social embeddedness of the current employment relation, i.e. its past and future duration. Multi-actor data are used that were collected in the 2003 Time Competition data set among employees in Dutch organisations. The chapter shows that coordination, control and trust problems do indeed affect employees’ access to telework. Whereas coordination problems are a significant job-level trait, trust problems play a role at both levels. A longer work history with the current employer increases the odds of trust in teleworkers and hence of access to home-based telework.

In Chapter 15, David Ory and Patricia Mokhtarian study the effect of telecommuting as an organisational strategy to save commuting time in the USA. They find that telecommuters consistently live farther from work (in terms of time and distance) compared to former and future telecommuters. These longer one-way distances are ameliorated by telecommuters travelling at higher speeds and commuting less frequently than their counterparts. Those who telecommute at some point in the ten-year period average only slightly fewer commute person-minutes travelled over the decade than those who do not telecommute at all. This finding suggests either that telecommuting is at best an ineffective travel reduction policy (i.e. those who engage in it do not travel much less), or that telecommuting disproportionately attracts those who would otherwise commute even more (making it an effective tool).
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