

MAUREEN PERRY-JENKINS<sup>ID</sup> University of Massachusetts Amherst

NAOMI GERSTEL University of Massachusetts Amherst\*

---

## Work and Family in the Second Decade of the 21st Century

*In the second decade of the 21st century, research on work and family from multiple disciplines flourished. The goal of this review is to capture the scope of this work–family literature and to highlight both the valuable advances and problematic omissions. In synthesizing this literature, the authors show that numerous scholars conducted studies and refined theories that addressed gender, but far fewer examined racial and class heterogeneity. They argue that examining heterogeneity changes the understanding of work–family relations. After briefly introducing the broad social, political, and economic context in which diverse work–family connections developed, this review uses this context to address the following three main themes, each with subtopics: (a) unpaid work including housework, parenting as work, and kin work; (b) paid work including work timing and hours, money (i.e., motherhood penalty, fatherhood bonus, marriage bonus, kin care penalty), relationships (i.e., coworkers, supervisors), and work experiences (i.e., complexity, autonomy, urgency); and (c) work–family policies (i.e., scheduling and child care). Given*

*the breadth of the work–family literature, this review is not exhaustive but, rather, the authors synthesize key findings on each topic followed by a critique, especially with regard to the analyses of differences and inequalities around gender, race, ethnicity, and social class.*

In the second decade of the 21st century, much research analyzed the relationship of work and family, addressing both paid and unpaid work as they shape, and are shaped by, families. Researchers addressed work–family linkages in the context of a dramatically shifting political, social, and economic landscape: from Obama to Trump, the end of a Great Recession to an economic expansion, and a series of social movements—#MeToo, Black Lives Matter, and the Alt Right—all of which highlighted gender, race, and class inequalities. Because these shifting social conditions and movements mark a time of tremendous transition, and perhaps transformation, they challenged us to find and synthesize theory and research of the past decade that addressed difference and inequality.

In synthesizing this literature, we show that numerous scholars conducted studies and refined theories that addressed gender, but far fewer examined racial and class heterogeneity or their intersection. Focusing on heterogeneity and inequality, our review highlights both the valuable advances of this decades' work–family research, its problematic omissions, and fruitful directions for future research. We propose that

---

Psychological and Brain Sciences, 611 Tobin Hall,  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003  
(mpj@psych.umass.edu).

\*Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts,  
Amherst, MA 01003.

*Key Words: Family Policy, Gender, Inequalities, Race, Social Class, Work-Family Issues.*

addressing heterogeneity often changes our understanding of work–family relations.

A number of economic and social conditions of the past decade shaped work–family relations and the inequalities within them. These include the much-discussed growing income inequality—with the top 1% controlling a disproportionate share of the world’s wealth, along with a decline, since the 1990s, in the movement of workers out of low-wage jobs. The official rate of unemployment is hovering at a historic low in the United States—declining from close to 10% at the start of the decade to below 4% at its end, although long-term unemployment remains higher than before the Great Recession. These economic trends exist in a growing gig economy in which more family members are employed in jobs that are part time, nonunionized, in the low-wage service sector, and with more erratic wages, diminishing benefits, and less standard (9 to 5) shifts than in previous decades (Boushey, 2016, Howell & Kalleberg, 2019; Kalleberg, 2011; Kalleberg & von Wachter, 2017; Schultz, 2019; Wilson, 2019).

RWe emphasize research showing that the effects of these trends are felt unevenly. For example, when compared with Whites and Asian Americans, African American and Latinx families are more often the target of growing precarious employment, lower wages, more erratic schedules, and greater job unpredictability. Unemployment remains higher at the end of the decade for Blacks and Latinx than Asian Americans and Whites. Some suggest these uneven effects will intensify: During the next few decades, demographers predict a decline in the White population and an increase in children of color and multiracial children (Frey, 2018; Wilson 2019).

Tied to these social and economic trends, the demography of families across the life course shifted dramatically in the past decade (for review, see Seltzer, 2019). As other *Journal of Marriage and Family* decade reviews discuss in greater detail, the age of marriage increased and cohabitation reached an all-time high among both the young and the old. Divorce rates declined slightly, with approximately two marriages for every divorce; however, there was a rise in divorce among middle-aged and older adults (Schweizer, 2019). Childbirth and child rearing outside of marriage were on the rise, with almost half of births in the United States occurring outside of marriage. Extended

households, consisting of a range of kin, steadily increased across the life course. Finally, our society is aging: By 2030, one of every five residents will be of retirement age, and older people are projected to outnumber children for the first time in U.S. history. These economic and social demographics provide the context for work and family research of the past decade as they shape differences in how the worlds of work and family intersect for the poor and the rich, Whites, Latinx, African Americans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans, married, cohabiting and unpartnered women and men, and LGBTQ+ and hetero families. We explore research that highlights the heterogeneity of work–family relationships as they are enacted in distinct social contexts and play out in unique ways during the life course.

In this review, we address not only “paid work” (mostly outside the home but sometimes inside) but also “unpaid work,” including housework, parenting as work, and kin work. Given research showing the vast and increasing diversity in family membership and structure (Sarkisian & Gerstel 2012), we look beyond the nuclear family to include research on single parent and extended families as these also shape, and are shaped by, work processes at home and on the job.

Writing this review, we became acutely aware of significant disciplinary differences—in language, methods, and theory—that exist in work–family research. These differences emerged in our own discussions, reflecting distinctive views coming from psychology and sociology. Not only did we have to come to understandings of the ways each of us used concepts such as “culture,” “supportive work ties/networks,” and “race/ethnicity,” but we also we had to reconcile debates about the ways micro-level indicators, such as biomarkers and individual preferences, are implicated in macro-level processes and how best to measure each of these. Although challenging, we came to see this interdisciplinary effort as a strength, using it to our advantage as we synthesized this literature.

#### *Methodology Used in Our Review*

An initial literature search for the terms “work and family” or “family and work,” in *Sociological Abstracts* for peer-reviewed publications since 2010 revealed 46,224 articles; a similar

search in PsychINFO revealed 26,641 articles. These numbers clearly demonstrate the popularity of this research topic as well as its sheer enormity. To focus our efforts, we decided to limit our review primarily to articles in highly ranked sociology, psychology, and family studies journals, with occasional forays into reviews of books as well as history and economics journals. We examined the *Journal of Marriage and Family* as well as the *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *The British Journal of Sociology*, *Child Development*, *Community*, *Work & Family*, *Demography*, *Developmental Psychology*, *Family Relations*, *Gender & Society*, *The Gerontologist*, *Journal of Family Issues*, *Journal of Family Psychology*, *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, *Social Forces*, and *Work and Occupations* and followed citations in these journals to relevant cited pieces. We also included the top Kanter Work–Family Award winners over the past 10 years that were not in our list of journals.

As a first step, we each independently scanned all articles in *Journal of Marriage and Family* from the past decade and identified those addressing work–family issues. We shared our lists, assessed our reliability (which sometimes required hashing out the meaning of work and family), and made decisions regarding what themes related to paid and unpaid work were necessary to include. We then each reviewed the remaining journals and developed an exhaustive list of articles from each journal.

Armed with hundreds of articles, we organized them into broad themes. Although our review pulled more from U.S. than international journals, we highlight international studies that provide useful examples of how societal contexts shape work–family linkages. We identified the following three themes, each with subtopics: (a) unpaid work, including housework, parenting work, and kin work; (b) paid work, including time and timing, income and wage penalties (i.e., motherhood penalty, fatherhood bonus, marriage bonus, kin care penalty), relationships on the job (i.e., coworkers, supervisors), and job experiences (i.e., complexity, autonomy, urgency); and (c) work–family policies.

Given the breadth of the work–family literature, what follows is not an exhaustive review. Rather, on each topic, we review key theories and findings followed by a discussion of those pieces that address gender, race, ethnicity, and social class. We suggest that many of our

theories used to understand work–family relations based largely on White, heterosexual nuclear families, do not hold up, or need to be reevaluated as we examine variability within and across groups. Throughout the review we note the ways in which categorizations and operationalizations of gender, social class, and race and ethnicity as well as restricted views of family structure and sexuality limit understanding of work and family. We use the authors' own definitions of race, class, and gender, but we highlight when they are problematic.

We also point to ways that methodological decisions impose limits on our understanding of difference and inequality. Although sample sizes often make it difficult for quantitative researchers to assess racial distinctions, we highlight the studies that move us past these limits to reveal significant differences as well as commonalities. Qualitative research provides evocative narratives about work and family within single racial or class groups, yet often this approach cannot locate or explain differences among groups. The tension of revealing the similarities and differences that exist across groups while reflecting the range of experiences within groups is a continual challenge, and we highlight examples where mixed methods make it possible to address these issues.

Throughout this review we ask the following: What do we know and whom do we know it about? In what ways does the research of the past decade reflect the diversity in work and family experiences and to what extent does it still reflect the realities of life for only select groups? What do the theories, concepts, and methods used in our journals (and supported by our funding agencies) reveal about work–family connections? What do they obscure? How do they shape the ways in which researchers approach work and family research? Challenging and ambitious questions, they will not be fully answered here but represent important steps for envisioning the multilayered, bidirectional systems that link work and family.

#### UNPAID WORK AND FAMILIES

We discuss research on three types of unpaid family work—housework, parenting work, and kin work—and the literature that either addresses each as a form of familial work or analyzes how each influences and is influenced by paid work. To be sure, these three types of

work are intricately bound together. Time use studies reveal that many parents report multitasking (e.g., folding laundry while monitoring bath time; Offer & Schneider, 2011), illustrating that housework and child care co-occur, even when studied separately. Despite these connections, we review each type of unpaid work separately in part because much of the research is organized that way, but also because they have distinctive meanings in people's lives.

### *Housework*

We might expect that shifts in families and the economy—whether the increase in women's employment, their rising share of family income, or the growth of nonstandard shifts—would decrease the gender gap in housework. For more than half a century, scholars have predicted a declining gender divide in domestic work with men doing more and women doing less. Gender, then, was the main theme in the story of research on housework. It still is.

To some extent, predictions about the effects of women's employment were met. Comparisons from the 1960s through the first two decades of the 21st century show that women reduced the hours they spent taking care of the home while men increased their share, both in the United States and across a wide array of other countries, with the total amount of time spent on housework declining, primarily because women do less (Altintas & Sullivan, 2016; Bianchi, Sayer, Milkie, & Robinson, 2012; Carlson & Lynch 2017; Geist & Cohen, 2011). Nonetheless, women—employed or not, working part-time or full-time, night shift or day shift—continue to do significantly more than employed men, especially the tasks researchers label “feminine,” which are the time-consuming, routine tasks such as cooking and cleaning and the mental labor of planning and managing (Blair-Loy, Hochschild, Pugh, Williams, & Hartmann, 2015; Daminger, 2019; Offer, 2014). This gendered distribution of labor starts early with young children, with daughters doing more housework than sons (Lam, Greene, & McHale, 2016). This inequality harms women—whether through costs to relationship satisfaction, intimacy (Carlson, Hanson, & Fitzroy, 2016), sexual satisfaction (Barrett & Raphael, 2018) or, as we show below, through the loss of money and time.

Why does this gender divide persist? Scholars have developed several theories to explain it, including time availability, resource and bargaining, and a gender perspective; all partially explain the division of housework, but none fully explain the inequities (Ferree, 2010; Geist & Ruppanner, 2018). During the past decade, a number of researchers examined the implications of a gender deviance neutralization perspective to explain the division of housework (Brines, 1994), which posits that not doing housework is a way that unemployed adult men perform masculinity, and doing more housework is a way that high-earning women display their femininity. Empirical work in this area has largely rejected this theory (Gough & Killewald, 2011; Hook, 2017; McClintock, 2017; Schneider, 2011, 2012; but with some exceptions, see Fauser's [2019] analysis of time availability and particular tasks and Pfeffer's [2010] analysis of transgendered men). Focusing instead on how paid work structures explain the gendered division of household labor, a number of researchers showed that what appears to be personal choice about “doing gender” is often a result of organizational and job constraints (e.g., see Pedulla & Thébaud, 2015; Stanczyk, Henly, & Lambert, 2017). Geist and Ruppanner (2018, p. 251) argue that, “institutional factors including institutionalized racism, gaps in wages, and government poverty thresholds (e.g., health care, welfare) restrict individual decisions about how to allocate time (to work or housework)” and especially disadvantage low-wage workers and workers of color.

Empirical studies during the past decade specified the importance of social class, both within families and between them, as a key factor shaping the division of labor. The question of whether the gender revolution has led to a more equal division of labor across classes remains open to debate (Cherlin, 2014); however, recent research suggests the division of housework is becoming more egalitarian among middle- and low-income workers (Carlson, Miller, & Sassler, 2018). Yet, a qualitative comparison of middle-class and working-class cohabitators found that middle-class men were more willing than working-class men to cede to their partners' demands that they do more housework (Miller & Carlson, 2016).

Alert to the class divide within families, researchers have for some time debated whether it is spouses' relative earnings or each ones'

absolute earnings that predict the division of domestic labor. Supporting an autonomy perspective while critiquing a household bargaining perspective, research showed that a woman's own absolute earnings matter more than her relative earnings (when compared with her spouse) for hours spent on housework, enabling her to buy out of housework, as reviewed in Sullivan (2011), but Usdansky and Parker (2011) showed that the power of relative earnings depends on wives' education and parental status. For women without a college degree and with children aged younger than 18, relative income predicted involvement in housework, but for all other groups of women, relative income was unrelated to housework. In short, the authors argued that relative income only matters for women who face "dual pressures toward gender traditionalism"—having low education and children (see also Lam, McHale, & Crouter, 2012). In a related study, using longitudinal data, Carlson and Lynch (2017) found a reciprocal relationship for wives between housework and personal earnings; for husbands, the causation was unidirectional: More housework lowers earnings. Spouses' economic position, then, is partially dependent on the domestic work of their spouses.

Some research further unpacked an intersectional story not only of gender and class but also sexuality and race. Studies of same-sex couples show that although they tend to divide housework more equally than heterosexual couples, class shapes their division. The partner with less income does more housework, especially feminine tasks (Goldberg, Smith, & Perry-Jenkins, 2012). Many studies of housework use race as a control variable (rather than as substance for analysis) or create dichotomies that obscure variation (White vs. people of color), but there are some particularly useful exceptions that demonstrate significant variability in housework within "people of color." Sayer and Fine (2011) found that net of controls, Latinx and Asian women did more cooking and cleaning than White or Black women, whereas there was little variation by race among men. The gender gap in housework was lowest for Blacks (Black women did less at all levels of earnings) and highest for Latinx and Asian married couples. Asian women with White partners spent less time on housework than those with Asian partners. The authors speculate that "doing gender" differs across families of different

racial and ethnic variation because the meaning and salience of housework differs. Insight into why these differences exist comes from looking at interracial couples. For example, Latinx women with White partners did less housework than those with Latinx partners, and White women partnered with Black men spent less time on housework than those with White partners (Bolzendahl & Gubernskaya, 2016). Future research needs to explore the negotiations and power dynamics that occur in these interracial couples to produce these outcomes in housework while considering how they interact with class.

Theories explaining gender inequality in housework change when considering race and ethnicity. Wight, Bianchi, and Hunt (2013) found that increases in relative resources (wives' education or earnings when compared with their husbands) were associated with declines in time that White women spent on housework, but were weak predictors for Blacks, Asians, and Latinx women. Gough and Killewald (2011) compared Whites, Blacks, and Latinx and showed that although the total time spent in household production increased during unemployment for Blacks and Whites, it did not for Latinx or immigrants. These studies suggest that we must go beyond general structural theories that emphasize time availability and relative resources if we are to explain racial differences in the gender divide in housework. Specification of cultural differences tied to race, including conceptions of time, resources, and power or ideas about fairness would likely help us revamp our theories of gender and housework.

Finally, research has examined the outsourcing or use of market substitutes for housework (Kornrich & Roberts, 2018), that is, hiring others to do the cooking, cleaning, and caring for families. This research is useful for understanding and specifying inequalities. Studies show that outsourcing often involves "racialized gender" or the transfer of the unpaid work of relatively affluent (mostly White) wives and mothers to women of color and immigrants (Glenn, 2010). This work, while offering those hired job opportunities and emancipation from their families, simultaneously maintains a class divide among women—between those women with more resources who purchase services and those women who typically receive low wages to provide them (Gonalons-Pons, 2015). As Parnenas (2015) argued, migrant Filipino domestic

workers, often separate from their families and move from one patriarchal system to another “bound by race and class in transnational capitalism” (p. 84).

Outsourcing also may affect the gender divide within couples who hire women to do the work of the home, but there is little agreement among researchers about this process. Some argue that outsourcing reinforces the gender divide by reducing the pressure on men to do more housework (Bianchi et al., 2012). Others suggest outsourcing reduces the time spent on domestic tasks by women who hire other women, but it does not ameliorate gender gaps in housework time because women continue to do more than men (Craig & Baxter, 2016; Gonalons-Pons, 2015). These disagreements may be due to the different tasks included in the analyses. Killewald (2011) found women’s outsourcing only weakly associated with their time in housework, particularly cooking and cleaning. Others found outsourcing did not reduce the total work load of either spouse, at least when compared with others who did not hire out the labor, perhaps because their analysis combined outsourced housework and child care (Sullivan & Gershuny, 2013). Delineating the effects of outsourcing on particular chores (e.g., cleaning, diapering) as well as using longitudinal time use data to assess selection and causal effects will help resolve these debates.

Overall, outsourcing of family labor is promoted by changes in the economy, including the movement of women into demanding and often unpredictable jobs, shifting migrant flows consisting more of women than men, and the rise of the service sector that offers women job opportunities. Outsourcing maintains class inequalities as it offers low pay to domestic workers while enabling the women who hire them to do less housework and obtain higher paying jobs. Although disagreements remain about outsourcing effects on within-household gender inequality, allowing privileged men to get out of housework by assigning it to immigrant women of color maintains overall gender inequality. Research on negotiations about the division of domestic work—not only between the partners who hire and manage these services but also between the low-wage women who do the work and the affluent couples who hire them—could further our understanding of the

processes that produce and reproduce these inequalities of class and race.

### *Parenting Work*

Fertility rates declined during the past decade and parents are having fewer children, a trend occurring in most industrialized countries (Hamilton, Martin, Osterman, & Rossen, 2019), although childlessness rates declined, especially among highly educated women (Pew Research Center, 2015). During the past decade, Schneider (2015) showed that the Great Recession reduced fertility rates due in part to increased economic hardship and uncertainty. Despite the economic recovery that has ensued since the recession, however, birth rates have not rebounded, leading to the fewest U.S. births in about 30 years (Hamilton et al., 2019). Economists suggest that millennials’ high debt loads and increased financial anxiety have resulted in low fertility rates (Mansour, 2018). Thus, research on parent work during the past decade occurred when families were becoming smaller—a trend that affects employment rates, the absolute amount of child care, as well as how it is shared in families.

Resource theory posits that understanding the division of unpaid work, whether child care or housework, requires understanding partners’ resources and constraints at home and at work. Thus, research needs to attend to the ways that key factors, such as marital status, age and presence of children, hours and timing of paid work, wages, and types of unpaid work (e.g., child care vs. housework), shape the allocation of parent work. Lack of specification regarding various types of heterogeneity results in discrepant findings. For example, studies that examine the division of labor in coupled partners (whether married or cohabiting) overlooks the finding that cohabitators share more equally than married couples (Davis, Greenstein, & Marks, 2007).

Most of the research on unpaid labor examines parenting work separately from housework, an approach that Sullivan (2013) argues is necessary given the different preferences and processes that contribute to housework and child-care tasks. Intriguing class differences in family labor emerge when examining child care and housework separately. Using longitudinal time diary data from dual-earner couples, Sullivan (2013) found that although men’s participation in housework has increased

overall, men with lower education show a greater increase when compared with their more-educated counterparts. In contrast, highly educated women showed more of a decline in housework than less-educated women. However, highly educated men's and women's time spent in child care increased significantly more than less-educated parents. These data highlight how class and gender shape changes in the division of housework and child care in distinct ways.

Similar to housework, parent work is gendered: Mothers do more than fathers across all stages of child development (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Craig & Mullan, 2011), although increases in mothers' relative earnings, employment status, and work hours are all associated with fathers performing more solo child care, physical care, and managerial care (Hook, 2012; Raley, Bianchi, & Wang, 2012). In heterosexual, dual-earner families, fathers do more child care than ever before (Kotila, Schoppe-Sullivan, & Kamp Dush, 2013; Kulik & Sadeh, 2015; Yavorsky, Kamp Dush, & Schoppe-Sullivan, 2015); yet women continue to do more of the hands-on tasks and mental labor (i.e., planning, organizing; Offer, 2014). Despite the increase in men's participation in child care, we uncovered no study of dual-earner families where men did more than women. Moreover, the increase in single-mother families means that the overall gender divide in parent work is likely even larger than studies that focus only on two-parent families would suggest.

Unlike housework, the very nature of parenting work changes across childrearing stages. When children are younger, and there are high physical care demands, mothers perceive more job pressure, less supervisor support, and diminished career options than when their children are school aged (Nomaguchi & Fetto, 2019). As children grow, physical care demands are replaced by parents' focus on supervision and enhancing cognitive (e.g., reading, homework) and socioemotional (e.g., friendships, emotion regulation) development. Research suggests that long work hours and high work-family conflict reduce this type of parent work (Ferreira et al., 2017; Viera et al., 2016). Yet others found that mothers' employment enhanced the quality of mothering for children from infancy to fifth grade and suggested that across social class levels, children benefited from mothers' multiple roles (e.g., worker, parent; Buehler,

O'Brien, Swartout, & Zhou, 2014). These discrepant findings point to the need for greater specificity in how the relationship between parent work and paid work varies by children's developmental stage, work conditions, and family characteristics.

Research indicates that parents' perceptions of the fairness of the division of parent work matters more for work and family satisfaction than the actual division itself. For example, even when parent work is unequal, many women and men rate it as "fair"; moreover, it is these perceptions of fairness, not the actual division, that predict relationship quality (Newkirk, Perry-Jenkins, & Sayer, 2017) and parental depression and relationship outcomes (Biehle & Mickelson, 2012). Perceived fairness with the division of child care mediates the relationship between housework and sexual satisfaction (Carlson, Miller, Sassler, & Hanson, 2016). Gender modifies some of these relationships. For example, in the case of violated expectations, unmet expectations (when husbands do less than wives expected) predicted greater depression and poorer relationship satisfaction for wives (but not husbands), whereas over-met expectations (when wives do more than husbands expected) predicted more positive outcomes for husbands (but not wives; Biehle & Mickelson, 2012). Moreover, it is not only the gender of the parent but also the gender of the child that shapes these relationships: Specifically, parents are more likely to rate child care as fair especially when fathers contribute more to the care of sons (DeMaris & Mahoney, 2017).

Based on intensive interviews, Gerson (2011) argues that gendered notions of paid and unpaid work are still in flux and changing in different ways for men and women. In short, when thinking that ideal notions of egalitarian relationships and work-family balance will not be realized, young women are more likely to say they will forgo marriage and "fall back" on self-reliance; in contrast, young men say they are likely to revert to older notions of placing men's careers first. Research during the next decade will reveal important insights into how millennial parents match more egalitarian ideology to the realities of work and family life.

Parenting work is more than discrete activities such as diapering or feeding; it includes emotional, moral, cognitive, and community responsibilities that researchers rarely capture (Doucet, 2015). This research suggests that

parenting work requires a village, especially when parents are working full-time, indicating that our studies need to broaden to include all those involved in parenting work. In another vein, few studies examine children's assessment of parental work, even though earlier work suggested that these perceptions are consequential for children's well-being (Galinsky, 1999). Zvonkovic, Swenson, and Cornwell (2017) found that children had gendered interpretations of their parents' job involvement, calling mothers "rushed" and distracted, but calling fathers "chill" (see also Strazdins, Baxter, & Li, 2017). In a rare qualitative study examining fathers' engagement with their college-aged sons across race, Ide, Harrington, Wiggins, Whitworth, and Gerstel (2018) found that when compared with White and African American sons, Asian American sons were more likely to disparage their fathers for what they perceived as their overinvolvement in breadwinning, which detracted from their engagement in family life (Chung, 2016; but see also Park [2018], who found that Asian sons and daughters at elite schools valued their father's career engagement as it provided resources for children's careers). There has been little research examining children's perspectives on work and family; we have much to learn about how these perceptions differ by gender, age, race, and class and the implications for child well-being and family dynamics.

The meaning that parents ascribe to paid employment also affects how mothers and fathers manage the division of parenting work. Mothers' orientation to work and family—whether work oriented, parent oriented, or role balanced—differentially predicts mothers' satisfaction with the division of parent work, with work-oriented mothers more distressed with unequal child care than parent-oriented mothers (Lee, McHale, Crouter, Hammer, & Almeida, 2017).

In sum, it is the meaning mothers, fathers, and children give to parent work and paid work, not simply the hours devoted to each or the distribution across parents, that is related to individual and relationship outcomes, but we still know far less about the meanings that fathers ascribe to their jobs and how that meaning relates to their involvement and satisfaction with parenting work, its division, or the effects on children. The little research in this area indicates that men view a key aspect of being a "good father" as being a good provider (Lemay, Cashman,

Elfenbein, & Felice, 2010), suggesting that for men participating in paid work is one way to be a good father, whereas for many women the opposite holds true (but see Edin & Nelson [2013], discussed later). Fatherhood research is a fruitful direction for work–family scholars as it would help us to better understand negotiation and inequality in parenting, changing models of fatherhood, their links to race and class, and their impact on children.

Important new research on parent work looks beyond heterosexual, married, biological families. For example, cohabiting, biological fathers and married and cohabiting stepfathers do more parent work with their children than married, biological fathers (Berger & McLanahan, 2015). Same-sex couples have a more equal division of child care when compared with heterosexual partners (Farr & Patterson, 2013), although the partner who performs more paid work does less child care; the partner doing more "feminine" chores (e.g., laundry, cleaning) also does more child care (Goldberg et al., 2012). More equal coparenting relations emerge in dyads that include women (e.g., heterosexual, lesbian) versus gay couples (Farr & Patterson, 2013).

A handful of studies highlight the value of considering social class as an important factor shaping the meaning and implications of parent work (see Sullivan, 2010). Some literature points to the importance of examining heterogeneity within social class categories, finding, for instance, that working-class, employed mothers who perceive the division of infant care as fair (in no cases was it equal) report less relationship conflict than those who perceive it as unfair. In contrast, for working-class fathers the division of infant care and perceptions of that division were unrelated to conflict (Newkirk et al., 2017). Damaske (2011) challenged the common notion that middle-class women "choose" to work while working-class women must have jobs: If economic need is the driving force shaping women's paid work trajectories—she asks, why are middle-class women more likely to remain employed continuously than working-class women. She also finds similarities: Across class lines, women justify their actions by saying they make choices "for the family." She argues that this cultural discourse reinforces gender inequality.

Finally, little research explores paid work and parenting in families of color and still less analyzes its intersection with class. The handful of

studies we found regarding race and parent work showed that Black and White men were more likely to be involved with their infants if they were employed and present at the birth (Bellamy, Thullen, & Hans, 2015). Black stepfathers played active roles in parenting work (Forehand, Parent, Golub, & Reid, 2014), although no comparisons to other racial groups were examined. Among Latinx fathers, a greater sense of machismo, reflecting more traditional masculine ideology, was related to less parent work (Glass & Owen, 2010). These studies shed light on parent work within racial and ethnic groups, however, it is unclear how they compare to each other. In a comparative analysis, new fatherhood increased White fathers' hours in paid work but was unrelated to African American fathers' work hours (Glauber & Gozjolko, 2011). Further analysis, however, revealed a class by race effect: Higher income African American fathers did increase work hours, but lower income African American fathers did not. What explains these racial and class differences?

Ethnographic research offers some alternative theories and findings on fathering and mothering across race and class. In their intensive observations and interviews with poor, unwed, young fathers, Edin and Nelson (2013) suggested that they—both Black and White—focus on a relational model of fathering, emphasizing loving friendly relations and quality time with children while downplaying other aspects of parenting work, including breadwinning and practical demands. The authors are careful to note that their findings about class, race, and fatherhood may well be based in the poor areas in Philadelphia they studied; as they wrote: “In this narrative, where black and white men live in more similar contexts than in most places, racial differences are far outweighed by shared social class” (Edin & Nelson, 2013, p. 17). Lareau (2011) also used her ethnographic work to argue that class trumps race in regard to parenting work. More highly educated parents, across race, practice intense parenting, focused on skill training, and organized activities with their children. Less-educated parents practiced less-intensive parent work. The question of how such differences in parent work are a function of differing class values or the privilege of time and money that allows for intensive parenting is a critical question.

Other researchers suggest that Lareau as well as Edin and Nelson downplayed the

distinctive power of race in understanding parent work (Cheadle & Amato, 2011) and demonstrate the power of race in parenting by focusing on Black mothers (Barnes, 2016; Dow, 2019) or comparing across racial groups (Robinson & Harris, 2013). At the very least, these different findings call for more research and theory that teases apart how class and race operate independently and in interaction to shape parent work and children's developmental outcomes. To understand these differences, authors call for more work that addresses the meaning of providing and parenting for parents of different races and classes in different social contexts. In sum, although this literature points to different connections between paid work and parent work based on race, class, or the intersection of the two, we are left to speculate about why these differences exist. Are there different predictors of parenting work based on class or race? Mixed methods—large-scale surveys to establish statistical distributions coupled with interviews and ethnographies in varied contexts to assess difference and process—will be instrumental in parsing the contributions of race and class.

For working parents, child care must often be outsourced, and it is one of the most expensive costs families bear (Herbst, 2018). It is an especially heavy burden for low-income families and, as we discuss later in this review, child-care policies have yet to address this problem. Moreover, the intimate activity of parenting raises unique issues for working parents. Despite the commonly held view of a hostile worlds dichotomy, where the intimate activities of the family are seen as antithetical to the market place, Zelizer (2005) argues that intimate relations often involve economic exchanges—child care being one of them. With the rise in professional couples who work long hours and often have unpredictable schedules, child care and other parenting work (e.g., birthday party planning, after school care, college application assistance) have increasingly been turned over to the market. Three key tensions in outsourcing parent work have been identified—(a) control, (b) intimacy, and (c) substitutability—and it was found that parents are constantly reorganizing and reassembling care to maintain and protect parenthood (Epp & Velagaleti, 2014). Some research has found class difference in outsourcing parenting; employed, married mothers feel more accountable to an intensive mothering model, and even when outsourcing parenting

duties, strive to be “in charge” of all child-care issues. In contrast, single and lower income mothers are less likely to pay for outsourced parenting, rely on kin and creative scheduling to manage child care, and feel less accountable to the intensive mothering model. For these women, being a financial provider is part of their parenting work (Christopher, 2012). As outsourcing parent work becomes more common (Hochschild, 2012) research will be needed to address how the demands of parent work and resources available differ by class and race and the implications of this practice for parents, caregivers, and children.

### *Kin Work*

Less work–family research examines what we call “kin work”—the unpaid work that relatives do to care for one another. Those who study this work include a range of care (such as help with activities of daily living, child care, or emotional support) and a range of relatives, primarily grandparents (Craig & Jenkins, 2016; Meggiolaro, 2018) and occasionally siblings (Grigoryeva 2017; Leopold, Raab, & Engelhardt, 2014; Pillemer & Suitor 2014). Other relatives are rarely included in research on kin work; when included, they are grouped as “other kin.” This is a significant omission—both theoretically and substantively. Moussa (2018) calculated that 35% of the kin work done by those aged between 50 and 64 years is provided to relatives other than parents and parents-in-law (see also Cross, 2018). Limited research suggests that many people expend significant energy caring for these “other” relatives, providing financial support, household chores, child care, companionship, and medical care—whether living together or in separate households (Cross, Nguyen, Chatters, & Taylor, 2018; Pavalko & Wolfe, 2015).

Insor as research on kin work is attuned to inequality, it too tends to focus on gender. Whether because of cultural differences rooted in socialization and ongoing expectations or structural patterns rooted in employment and relative resources, women do more direct care for kin, even if men do more as they age (Glauber, 2019; Kahn, McGill, & Bianchi, 2011). The hours women spend caring for their parents and ill or disabled household members has declined among recent cohorts, although intense care has not (Pavalko & Wolf, 2015). Research

documents variation among men: Retired men give more care to kin than employed men (Kahn et al., 2011). Married men do more kin work than unmarried men, whereas the reverse is true for women (Penning & Wu, 2015), suggesting that women—but not men—pull spouses into familial caregiving. Examining the division of sibling care for parents, Grigoryeva (2017) went beyond prior research and specified the following three gender effects: Sisters were more likely to give care to parents; daughters directed more care to mothers, whereas sons directed care to fathers (meaning mothers get more care); and brothers provided less care if they had a sister, whereas sisters provided more care if they had a brother. Grandmothers do more of the hands-on labor of caring for kin, feel more time pressure, and lose more personal time than grandfathers (Craig & Jenkins, 2016).

Some find that kin care is associated with lowered employment for both women and men (Craig & Jenkins 2016; Griogorveya, 2017; van Houtven, Coe, & Skira, 2013). Although women’s increased labor force participation has pushed grandparents into more active roles caring for their grandchildren, that is counteracted by the growing number of employed grandparents who provide less care than those not employed (Craig & Jenkins, 2016). Overall, the pulls of normative pressures as well as the constraints and opportunities of paid employment shape the unpaid kin work of women and men at all stages of the life course.

Although a significant amount of research has addressed the gender divide in kin care, what of race and class? The narrow emphasis on the nuclear family and the omission of extended kin in the study of families and work means that our research and theory obscure the experiences of families of color or those with fewer economic resources who tend to rely more on kin than Whites or those more economically advantaged (Bell, Whitney, & Young, 2019; Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2012). There are useful empirical exceptions, however, that we can build on: Using a longitudinal survey, Maume (2016) showed not only that men’s kin work increased over time but also that men in blue-collar occupations provided significantly more hours of care to their elderly relatives than men in white-collar occupations. Maume (2016) hypothesized that working-class men were more likely to be employed in part-time jobs and night shifts, which allowed them to

do more kin work. Researchers have also documented that non-Hispanic, Black fathers report more cooperation with relatives, but also more conflict with coparents' kin than non-Hispanic Whites (Fagan, Levine, Kaufman & Hammar, 2016; Gonzalez & Barnett, 2014). Qualitative and ethnographic research provide insight into why these differences exist. In a qualitative study, Mendez-Luck, Applewhite, Lara, and Toyokawa (2016) examined Mexican American women's kin work and revealed that most held to a strong ideal of "familism"—they believed in being "always there" for an extended-family network, including not only parents but also aunts, uncles, cousins, and in-laws. Most also reported a lack of support from family networks, creating conflict in those very networks they idealized.

The few researchers who examine the association of kin work with class and race disagree about whether class trumps race (Edin & Schaefer, 2015) or whether at every class level, Black and Latinx are more likely to give and receive kin care (Cross, 2018). Empirical research is still needed; both large-scale surveys that can help us establish robust differences by class and race (and their intersection with gender) and intensive interviews and observations that elucidate processes and go beyond self-reports. These are needed to develop theoretical models about the extent to which differences in kin work are rooted in constraints or opportunities, such as those embedded in employment experiences and household structure as well as how cultural meanings attached to family shape what one "should" do for kin and what one actually does.

Some research analyzes the outsourcing of kin work—a process in which families hire people to provide care for their relatives. Macro-processes shape these micro-relations: Research emphasizes not only how women's movement into the formal labor force leads to the substitution of paid care for their unpaid care, especially to elderly parents (Folbre, 2012), but also how hospitals, payers, and Medicaid have moved paid care work out of institutions into homes and families. Only some states allow family members to be paid by Medicaid for their carework (Bell et al., 2019; Howes, 2015; Kodate & Timonen, 2017). Research has looked at the people, often women of color and immigrants, hired to take care of others' kin, and found those hired as caregivers not only typically earn low wages, but often have

a difficult time caring for their own families (Clawson & Gerstel, 2014). Others examined the work of finding and managing such paid help, showing this is often a time-consuming task that daughters are more likely to do than sons (Bookman & Kimbrel, 2011). These changes have two competing effects. On one hand, these institutional practices, policies, and laws may reduce the burden of caring for kin, especially on employed women, and may enable more working-class people to hire caregivers. On the other hand, they may reinforce inequality at home and at work between affluent women and those they hire and between those who can and cannot afford to outsource labor as well as between women and men. Research has yet to fully document the effects of changing institutional policies and family processes on inequalities both within and among households.

Demand for unpaid kin care is likely to expand with our aging population, resulting in what Pavalko and Wolfe (2015, p. 1360) refer to as a "crisis zone" where the demand for care increases while the availability of family to give care declines (Bell et al., 2019; Freedman & Spillman, 2014). We know little about how recent changes in various aspects of paid work—whether reduced benefits, increased unpredictability, or nonstandard schedules—shape or are shaped by kin work, although some observational research shows that unpredictability in one family member's work time routinely creates unpredictability in the schedules of other relatives who provide care. (See Clawson and Gerstel's [2014] discussion of the diffusion of responsibility in a "web of time.") As research in this area develops in the next decade, longitudinal surveys, intensive interviews, and diary data from both caregivers and care receivers will be needed to establish patterns of kin work, the trends, their causes, and their effect on inequalities.

#### PAID WORK AND FAMILIES

Turning to paid employment, we review research on the following four themes: (a) the time and timing of paid work, (b) wage penalties and bonuses, (c) relationships on the job, and (d) job experiences. We focus our review on paid work but recognize that there is some research on the effect of unemployment on families, which we briefly highlight at the end of this section.

### *The Time and Timing of Paid Work*

Time strain and scarcity emanating from jobs are key contributors to work–family conflict. Research addresses the number of paid hours people work as well as shifts or “non-standard” hours (i.e., weekends, evenings, and nights), which workers tend to dislike but accept. They typically take these shifts not because they let them attend to family concerns but because they are the only jobs available to them (Craig & Brown, 2014; Strazdins et al., 2017). A small but growing literature also examines instability, flexibility, and control over work schedules and their effects on families (Gerstel & Clawson, 2014; Kossek & Lautsch, 2018; Lambert, Haley-Lock, & Henly, 2012; Lyness, Gornick, Stone, & Grotto, 2012; Sweet, Besen, Pitts-Catsoupes, & McNamara, 2014).

Extant research suggests that on the temporal dimensions of paid work, inequality within and among families prevails. Ongoing gender differences in responsibility for jobs and families mean men are more likely than women to work full-time and overtime, although Cha and Weeden (2014) found that from 2006 to 2009, the proportion of men who put in long hours slightly declined (even if still higher than women). Having a husband who works long hours increases a woman’s likelihood of quitting, whether or not she is a professional; having a wife who works long hours does not increase the likelihood of quitting, at least for professional men. This gender divide intensifies among professionals with children: Overwork reinforces gender and class inequality.

Mothers, especially of young children, are still more likely than fathers to scale back hours (Young & Schieman, 2018). Women are more likely to feel stressed not only in response to their own long work hours but also to their partners’; in contrast, men are less likely to say they feel stressed by their wives’ work hours (Craig & Brown, 2017; Shafer, Kelly, Buxton, & Berkman, 2018). When mothers reduce work hours, upon becoming parents, their well-being decreases; in contrast, new fathers’ reduction in their work hours is unrelated to their well-being (Keizer, Dykstra, & Poortman, 2010). Not only the number of hours but also control over them matters and is gendered: Across 21 countries, Lyness et al. (2012) found that women have less control than men over work hours. Experimental research showed that giving employees some control over work hours decreased both men’s

and women’s work–family conflict, and introducing workplace flexibility initiatives reduced negative work–home spillover (Moen, Fan, & Kelly, 2013).

Numerous scholars argue that schedule flexibility is necessary for gender equality both on the job and at home (Kelly, Moen, & Tranby, 2011; Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl 2013). Although men are less likely to ask for workplace flexibility, high-income employees—more often men—are most likely to obtain workplace flexibility policies that support their families (Glauber, 2011). These studies show that workplace changes can promote equality, but equality can also come from family members who negotiate about job hours to promote gender equality at home. For example, workers may seek different shifts to increase fathers’ involvement at home (Weinshenker, 2016). Yet some negotiations may also promote inequality, such as when mothers choose to work the night shift to keep a greater share of parenting work during the day and maintain their visibility as mothers (Lowson & Arber, 2014).

Parents’ job hours also affect children, but this often depends on the gender of both the parent and the child. Children whose mothers have fluctuating work schedules exhibit significantly more behavior problems than mothers with more set hours (Johnson, Li, Kendall, Strazdins, & Jacoby, 2013); maternal night shifts are related to more depressed, anxious, and aggressive behavior in young children (Dunifon, Kalil, Crosby, & Su, 2013), and more negative mother–child interactions (Gassman-Pines, 2011b). When mothers work nonstandard rather than day shifts, children are more likely to get insufficient sleep (Kalil, Dunifon, Crosby, & Houston Su, 2014), have lower reading scores (Han & Fox, 2011), and be overweight (Champion, Rumbold, Steele, Giles, Davies, & Moore 2012)—although fathers’ nonstandard work hours do not have these effects (Miller & Chang, 2015). It is the number of hours fathers work that is related to child outcomes. Johnson et al. (2013) found that mothers’ work hours were unrelated to children’s behavior problems; however, children—especially sons—whose fathers worked long hours (more than 50 hours a week) exhibited more externalizing behavior. These effects likely vary over children’s life course, and more research on children of different ages and the pattern of mothers and fathers’ work hours could help us understand their effects.

A fair amount of research stresses the importance of class in the allocation of work hours and schedules. Compared with professionals, low-wage workers are less likely to have paid leaves, vacation time, job flexibility, control over work hours, or predictable and stable work hours, all of which help families (Gerstel & Clawson, 2018). Research shows that low-wage workers who take advantage of what they called “flexibility,” that is, the right to request schedules to address family responsibilities, were less likely to get hired and, if hired, were given fewer shifts than workers able to come in any time (Lambert et al., 2012; Williams, 2010). Moreover, most work–family research has focused on the middle class, which has led to an emphasis on those who work too many hours rather than the reduction in work hours and part-time precarious work faced by working-class men (Warren, 2015). Precarious job time is key to understanding work–family relations: At least among retail workers, job time, especially schedule instability, has a stronger effect on work–family conflict than low wages (Schneider & Harknett, 2019). Among low-wage women, however, increases in wages predicted better mental and physical health for mothers, but change toward greater work consistency (more and steady hours) was related to mothers spending less time at family dinners and maintaining fewer family routines (Coley & Lombardi, 2014). Although more than half of this study’s sample were Black and Latinx women, they did not analyze whether these patterns and associations varied by race.

Turning to race and ethnicity, new research points to important differences. Blacks are more likely to work nonstandard hours (especially at night) and have more unpredictable work schedules than Whites (Boushey, 2016; Lambert, Fugiel, & Henly, 2014; McCrate, 2012; Su & Dunifon, 2017), but the measurement of race (e.g., White vs. other race; Black, Hispanic, other) often makes it impossible to specify differences across and within groups. Buehler et al. (2014) discussed how controlling for race and class masked important group differences. There are important exceptions. As discussed previously, Glauber and Gozjolko (2011) found that White fathers—especially those who do not hold egalitarian ideologies—increased their work hours when they became fathers, but Black men, especially if low income, who became fathers, whether egalitarian or traditional, did not

increase their work hours. As they explained, “the breadwinner-homemaker gender ideology ... never accurately captured the experience of African Americans” (Glauber & Gozjolko, 2011, p. 1145). In sum, both the length and timing of work hours hold different implications for low-income workers when compared with high-income workers, and these effects seem to hold across gender. In the next decade, research needs to confirm how race not only shapes hours and scheduling but also how those differences affect family life and vice versa. We are reminded, yet again, that if researchers are to understand work time and its relationship to families, we need to attend to not only the temporal conditions of employment but also the ways that both culture and structure shape time across racial groups.

#### *Money and Wages*

Much research during the past couple of decades has addressed how marriage, parenthood, and even kin work produce wage penalties and bonuses. This decade, researchers have specified these patterns by focusing on the ways these effects are rooted not only in gender but also race, class, and sexuality. Many find that not only is social disadvantage costly economically but also some have argued that “privilege (on race, wage or skill) has its price” (England, Bearak, Budig, & Hodges, 2016, p.1181).

*Motherhood penalty.* Research documents a motherhood penalty, defined as mothers earning less than nonmothers, although some operationalize it as the amount each additional child lowers women’s earnings. Using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) to follow a cohort of women from 1968 to 2003, Kahn, Garcia-Mangano, and Bianchi (2014) found that this penalty was largest when these women were young, but that it disappeared when they reached their 40s and 50s.

Scholars tested numerous theories to explain this penalty. First, some theorized that energy depletion, resulting from mothers’ greater domestic and caregiving work, leads them to take less demanding jobs with lower wages. Second, some suggested that motherhood is associated with lower wages because employers engage in statistical or status-based discrimination, based on beliefs that childless women are more dedicated workers. Third, some asserted that human capital and selection explain lower

maternal wages; here mothers invest less than nonmothers in market capital either before or after becoming mothers (see a review of theoretical arguments in Gough & Noonan, 2013). Researchers have found some evidence to rebut or refine these theories. For example, Kühhirt & Ludwig (2012) offered some support for an energy depletion theory, as they found the penalty is reduced when housework hours are controlled; Kmec (2011) found no support for the human capital argument; neither mothers (nor fathers) showed less work intensity or effort on the job than nonparents. The differential in wages between mothers and childless women declined substantially during the past couple of decades, but primarily for married, White mothers (Pal & Waldfogel, 2016).

Findings on the relationship between social class and the wage penalty are mixed. Some have found that higher earning women suffer a smaller motherhood penalty than do mothers earning less (Budig & Hodges, 2010). Killewald and Bearak (2014) argued, however, that this finding was based on erroneous methodology, and they found that wage penalties were not larger for low-wage women (see rebuttals by Budig & Hodges [2014] and England et al. [2016]). Characteristics of jobs and employment, other than wages, also shape this penalty: Women who work in female-dominated jobs pay a larger motherhood wage penalty than women who work in other jobs (Glauber, 2012; see also Buchmann & McDaniel, 2016), whereas mothers suffer less of a penalty when they have greater job autonomy, lower teamwork requirements, and less competitive pressure (Yu & Kuo, 2017). Using the NLSY to follow a cohort of women from 1968 to 2003, Kahn, Garcia-Mangano, and Bianchi (2014) found the penalty was largest when women were young. Examining changes in the motherhood penalty from 1980 to 2014, Glauber (2018) found that the penalty was eliminated for high-earning, but not low-earning, women (see also Buchmann & McDaniel, 2016; but see Jee, Misra, & Murray-Close, 2019).

What of the interplay of gender, class, and race? Testing an intersectional model with panel data, England et al. (2016) found that highly skilled and highly paid White mothers pay a larger motherhood penalty than less-skilled White women because their higher rates of return on experience make even short periods out of the labor market for childrearing

particularly costly, but they also showed that Black women faced lower penalties, and these did not differ by skill or wages. They suggested that Black women are less economically dependent on their partners but write “given that we failed to find an explanation of black women’s lower and less variable penalties, we limit findings...to white women” (England et al., 2016, p. 1164). In a rare study that compared Asian American and White women scientists and engineers Greenman (2011) found that Asian Americans were less likely to leave the labor market in response to parenthood and, as a result, had a higher rate of earnings growth and a lower motherhood penalty. Some research also suggests that the penalty for motherhood is organized around sexuality: Lesbian mothers experience less of a penalty when compared with heterosexual mothers. In some sense, then, the privileges associated with both class and heterosexuality are costly (Waite & Denier; 2015).

In sum, the motherhood penalty has been the site of a great deal of work–family research during the past decade and that research shows that motherhood remains costly, especially for White women and mothers who earn relatively high wages. There is still much debate, however, both about heterogeneity in the motherhood penalty and what explains this variation. It may be that high-earning women who have other job resources (such as flexibility and autonomy) are protected from a penalty, but no one has tested these effects (Glauber, 2018). Explanations for variation by class and race may rest not simply on specifying characteristics of employment but also characteristics of families—whether dependence on partners or the involvement of a range of family members in the care of children.

*Fatherhood bonus.* A smaller literature on the wage effects of parenthood on men suggests it brings a modest wage bonus (Killewald, 2013), which has increased since the 1990s (Glauber, 2018). Using longitudinal survey designs, some point to a selection effect, such that men with high-earning potential are more likely to become fathers (Mari, 2019), whereas others argue that processes within marriage and parenthood, such as partner specialization and sharing a residence, produce these bonuses (Killewald, 2013). Similar to the motherhood penalty, this bonus is unequally distributed, but here it is concentrated among the privileged: White and Latinx fathers, especially those with college degrees or in

occupations that deemphasize physical rather than cognitive skills (Hodges & Budig, 2010; Killewald, 2013), married biological fathers who live with their wives (Killewald, 2013), and heterosexual fathers (Waite & Denier, 2015) get more of a bonus. Cooke and Fuller (2018) theorize that these differential bonuses across groups are evidence for the display and reinforcement of hegemonic forms of privileged masculinity (see also Fuller & Cooke, 2018). Although survey research in this area made clear advances during this decade in specifying and theorizing the size, social location, and changes in the fatherhood bonus, future research is needed to explore the processes and mechanisms within both households and jobs that are responsible for these bonus differentials.

*Marriage bonus.* Quantitative research has documented a wage bonus associated with marriage. Marriage is associated with more of a boost for men (Killewald & Gough, 2013; for variation by cohort, see Budig & Lim, 2016). Some suggest a causal effect, attributing the gender divide to women's specialization in household labor and men's specialization in breadwinning after marriage, but others emphasize a selection effect with men who have promising careers being more likely to marry (Ludwig & Brüderl, 2018) or marrying when their wages are already rising (Killewald & Lundberg, 2017). Qualitative research revealed that men's marriage bonus was tied to wives holding their husbands accountable to "responsible" fatherhood, which pressured them to earn money, which in turn meant wives (or other women relatives) did more domestic work, making it easier for husbands to earn the marriage bonus (Ashwin & Isupova, 2014). More of this type of qualitative research that observes marital dynamics can help resolve remaining theoretical and empirical puzzles about the underlying processes that produce this bonus.

Across the life course, Cheng (2016) showed that marriage accelerates wage growth for White and Black men as well as Black women; in contrast, after getting married, White women first experience a wage gain but then a growing wage penalty. As she writes: "specialization theory is more consistent with White families and may not be an appropriate perspective for understanding the wage impact of marriage for Black women" (Cheng, 2016, p. 50)—another reminder that research that specifies racial distinctions refines our theories of work–family connections.

*Kinwork penalty.* Research on the wage effects of kin care is far less developed but suggests that it carries more of a financial penalty for women than men (Glauber, 2019; Van Houtven et al., 2013). The number of kin cared for also increased women's, but not men's, risk of wage loss (Waite & Denier, 2015). These findings further specify the argument that unequal family work is associated with economic inequality. Research is needed to document whether there are class and racial divides in this penalty akin to those in the mother penalty and, if found, the extent to which differences are rooted in employment conditions and/or cultural models of family and kinship.

#### *Relationships on the Job*

The following sections examine research on the diverse ways that supervisors and coworkers influence workers' job and family experiences, for better and for worse.

*Supervisors.* Numerous studies in the past decade point to the critical role of supervisors in influencing workers and work–family linkages. Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, and Hammer (2011, p. 304), in a meta-analysis of more than 85 studies, examined the roles of organizational support in work–family conflict and concluded "supervisors are the mechanism for shaping views of general and work–family-specific support and its association with work–family conflict." Moreover, they found that support specifically focused on work–family issues (as opposed to support for job demands) is most important in reducing work–family conflict.

Research shows supervisor support is related to a host of positive outcomes for workers and families across gender, class, and family form. Specifically, high supervisor support buffered the effects of job pressure on new mothers' depression in low-income families (Perry-Jenkins, Smith, Goldberg, & Logan, 2011), ameliorated the effects of daily work–family conflict on employed parents' negative affect (Almeida et al., 2016), and predicted better mental health among a sample of lesbian and gay new parents (Goldberg & Smith, 2013). Powerful supervisors limited stigma in using work–family supportive policies among professionals (Briscoe & Kellogg, 2011), and in the service sector, supervisor support predicted innovative work behavior (Mishra, Bhatnagar, Gupta, & MacDermid Wadsworth, 2019).

Supervisor support has also been related to workers' parenting behaviors across gender and class. Gassman-Pines (2011a), using daily diary data from a diverse sample of mothers of preschoolers, found that supervisor criticism predicted harsh and withdrawn parenting behaviors, whereas supervisor recognition predicted warmer parenting. In a related study of low-income, rural, primarily White fathers, Goodman et al. (2011) found that supportive supervisors predicted more sensitive parenting skills among fathers.

The National Institutes of Health funded the Work, Family and Health Network, an initiative aimed at advancing our understanding of causal linkages between work and home. Numerous intervention studies using randomized controlled trials revealed that supervisors are key conduits shaping worker and family outcomes. Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, and Zimmerman (2011) found that an intervention aimed at improving supervisor behavior in grocery stores resulted in higher job satisfaction, better physical health, and lower turnover intentions for employees who initially reported high levels of work–family conflict. This finding was complicated by the fact that employees who began the project with lower work–family conflict reported more negative outcomes (e.g., lower job satisfaction, poorer health, higher intent to quit). The authors suggested that there might be a backlash from employees feeling the company resources did not apply to them; whatever the reason, these results are a reminder that interventions can have unexpected and unintended consequences for distinct subgroups of workers.

In a large, white-collar information technology firm, Kelly et al. (2011, 2014) found that an intervention giving employees more control over when and where they worked and enhanced supervisor support predicted less burnout, higher job satisfaction, and more intent to stay on the job for workers in the intervention when compared with the control group. The intervention was most effective for fathers, sandwich generation employees caring for children and elders, and employees reporting low supervisor support and high work–family conflict at baseline. This same intervention for working parents had a direct effect on their 9- to 17-year-old children, leading these children to report more positive affect, less of an increase in negative affect, and less reactivity to stressors when compared with the control group families (Lawson et al., 2016).

Across studies, supervisor support had a positive effect on worker well-being, parenting, and child outcomes, and, for the most part, these findings held up across gender and social class. The very little we could find on race suggests that the context of the workplace, high or low in gender and racial diversity, may moderate the effect of relationships between supervisors and workers (Paustian-Underdahl, King, Rogelberg, Kulich, & Gentry, 2017). Important new directions for research on supervisors include examining the “match” between supervisor and supervisee in terms of race and gender as well attending to the diversity of the broader work context.

*Coworkers.* In the United States, the majority of workers (90%) have coworkers; in general, women report more coworker support than men (McGuire, 2007, 2012). When compared with their White counterparts, Blacks tend to have fewer social ties on the job primarily because many workplaces are less diverse and social ties are more common between workers of the same race (Sloan, Evenson Newhouse, & Thompson, 2013). A large literature in organizational behavior indicates that positive coworker relationships improve job satisfaction and well-being (Sloan et al., 2013). In a rare study exploring social class differences, among blue- and white-collar workers in Australia, coworker support predicted greater job satisfaction and less emotional exhaustion for both groups (Zacher, Jimmieson, & Bordia, 2014).

In contrast to the significant research on supervisors, little attention has focused on coworkers' role in family life. Clawson and Gerstel (2014) found that among low-wage health care workers, coworkers (more than supervisors) helped workers manage unpredictable events, such as mandatory overtime or taking care of a sick child. Coworkers often covered a shift or took extra hours so those they replaced could attend to family matters. Watson and Swanberg (2011) found that union contracts often contain language allowing shift swaps between coworkers. Sometimes coworkers build ties through union collaborations fighting unfair organizational policies affecting families, although the form of support depends on the unions' gender and class composition—with women's unions more likely than men's to support policies that are responsive to family responsibilities (Clawson & Gerstel, 2014; Crocker & Clawson, 2012).

Some research suggests coworkers may be especially salient for workers with young children. For example, among low-income women, coworker support predicted fewer depressive symptoms across the transition to parenthood (Perry-Jenkins et al., 2011). Moreover, Goodman et al. (2011) found for fathers, it was coworkers (not supervisors) who buffered the effects of stressful work conditions on mental health.

In an innovative study, ten Brummelhuis and Greenhaus (2018) examined how demands and resources in one role, that of coworker, related to the quality of relationship in another role, that of spouse, and vice versa. A gendered pattern emerged: Emotional demands in one role reduced emotional support offered in the other, but only for men. In contrast, emotional support in one role enhanced emotional support in the other role for women, but not men. The authors note, “unlike men, women in our samples seem to adopt a kin-keeping role in that they used resources in one domain to give more emotional support to the other domain” (ten Brummelhuis & Greenhaus, 2018, p. 1278); replicating the research on unpaid kin work, women are “kin keepers” across domains.

In sum, the research on supportive work relationships indicates that supervisor support enriches employees’ work–family lives. These results held up for women and men and for those in high and low socioeconomic status occupations. The role of race and ethnicity in shaping supervisory relationships deserves more attention. It will be important to consider this relationship in cross-race dyads where the person of color tends to have less power. Coworkers, similar to extended kin, have been given short shrift in the literature and is an area ripe for research.

The past decade has witnessed a significant increase in self-employed workers (Torpey & Roberts, 2018), a context where the nature of work and family relations is quite different given the lack of coworkers or direct supervision. Data suggest that self-employed workers enjoy better health (Rietveld, van Kippersluis, & Thurik, 2014), although perhaps because healthier individuals chose to be self-employed. The small amount of research linking self-employment to family life shows both pros and cons: More flexibility to manage family roles but greater isolation and often a lack of job stability (Hillbrecht & Lero, 2014). Given the rise in the gig economy and the predictions that the

self-employment is on the rise, more research is needed on this group of workers.

### *Experiences on the Job: Autonomy, Pressure, and Complexity*

Whether in the office or on the factory floor, research points to the ways in which job experiences, such as autonomy, pressure, and complexity, influence families. Several terms are often used interchangeably to reflect workers’ experiences of autonomy on the job, including *control*, *initiative*, *decision-making*, *self-direction*, and *authority*. Kohn and Schooler (1982, p. 1259), groundbreaking scholars in this area, defined autonomy as “the use of initiative, thought, and independent judgment at work.” In reviewing research in this area, we used individual researchers’ terminology but note that researchers conceptualize these terms in similar ways and all essentially capture Kohn and Schooler’s notion of autonomy on the job. Numerous studies highlight how job authority and autonomy and decision-making predicted better mental health among new parents (Perry-Jenkins et al., 2011), better marital relationships (Sun, McHale, Crouter, & Jones, 2017), and better cognitive outcomes in children (Yetis-Bayraktar, Budig, & Tomaskovic-Devey, 2013). At the same time, privilege can be costly, as Glavin and Schieman (2012) found that greater authority and autonomy at work predicted greater role blurring between work and family, creating more work–family conflict. On the other hand, Schieman and Young (2011) found that more authority at work buffered the negative relationship between economic hardship and family-to-work conflict; this suggests that authority at work may provide resources that allow employees to manage family stressors more effectively. Again, findings differ by class. One explanation for these differences may be that autonomy in professional jobs comes with great responsibility in terms of supervision, budgetary goals, and deadlines, whereas autonomy in hourly jobs is not equated with significant added job pressures. In short, autonomy may mean different things across class, and we need more research to discern these processes.

In contrast to job autonomy, job pressure, defined as having too much to do and not enough time to do it, is related in nonlinear and interactive ways to worker well-being and family relationships. Specifically, having too

much pressure or too little is related to more negative mood and poorer parenting, suggesting that jobs with low pressure, perhaps because they are boring, can negatively impact workers just as high-pressure settings can (Gassman-Pines, 2013). In addition, high coworker support buffers the negative effects of high pressure on low-income workers (Perry-Jenkins et al., 2011), suggesting workers function well in high-pressure jobs if provided support. Finally, some research points to crossover effects for job pressure in married couples: Men married to women under greater job stress increased their support to their wives, yet wives were not similarly responsive to husbands' job stress (Wang & Repetti, 2014).

Research consistently revealed connections between parents' work experiences, parenting quality, and children's social, emotional, and cognitive outcomes. For example, women in the nursing home industry who reported more positive job experiences had better moods at home, that in turn predicted better mental and physical health in their teenagers (Lawson, Davis, McHale, Hammer, & Buxton, 2014); similarly, parents with energizing and engaging jobs spend more time with their children and have higher quality parent-child relations (Roeters, van der Lippe, and Kluwer, 2010). In contrast, others found no relationship between work pressure and mother-child conflict, but pressure was related to a broader measure of "home chaos" (i.e., lack of structure, high conflict) that predicted poorer child outcomes (Nelson, Boyer, Villarreal, & Smith, 2017).

This research suggests that autonomy at work enhances the well-being and relationships of women and men and can buffer the effects of job pressure, for professionals and hourly workers alike; in terms of racial and ethnic diversity we know much less. A common practice across many studies was to create White versus non-White control variables, potentially masking variation by race and ethnicity. Looking within a sample of African American, dual-earner couples, Sun et al. (2017) found that wives' work pressure predicted less marital satisfaction only when their husbands also reported high work pressure; conversely, for husbands, high pressure was linked to less marital satisfaction only when wives' pressure was low. The authors posited that wives' low pressure made men's pressure more salient and, given more egalitarian norms in African American couples,

this difference violated those norms. In addition, when both spouses experienced self-direction at work, marital satisfaction was highest; satisfaction was lowest when one partner reported high self-direction and the other was low. This study was novel in its focus on marital outcomes in African American couples, and it would be fruitful to examine these same processes across couples of different races and ethnicities.

Turning to race differences in work experiences and child outcomes, research has shown that among Mexican-origin families, fathers' occupational self-direction predicted less parent-adolescent conflict and, in turn, better adolescent adjustment. Parents' experiences of racial discrimination at work predicted poorer adolescent outcomes through different mechanisms for mothers and fathers, showing the importance of assessing work culture in relation to race and gender. In an interesting twist, findings for fathers revealed that workplace pressure was related to increased connections to their child's life, perhaps reflecting Mexican fathers' values of serving as authority figures and role models to their children and "determination to make sure their children are on the right track" (Wheeler, Updegraff, & Crouter, 2015, p. 454). Similar to research with White samples, Wheeler, Updegraff, and Crouter (2011) found parents' positive job experiences were related to the parent-child relationship quality through the mediator of parents' well-being.

Racial discrimination as a job condition received some attention this past decade. Racism on the job was related to worse moods at home on the days when it occurred as well as more problem behaviors in children whose parents experienced discrimination (Gassman-Pines, 2015). We need more research that explores how experiences of racism and discrimination on the job impacts workers and consequently their family relationships.

We found only one study examining job urgency among gay and lesbian workers that showed the negative effects of urgency can be intensified in discriminatory settings. High-urgency jobs were associated with more depressive symptoms among workers in work contexts that were "unfriendly" to lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) workers (i.e., more homophobia at work; Goldberg & Smith, 2013). Recent studies examining discrimination on the job, whether classism, homophobia, sexism, or racism, highlight these conditions as an often

overlooked, but especially potent aspect of the work culture. Results suggest that job autonomy and self-direction are limited by discrimination and racism on the job and that the negative effects of job pressure are intensified by discrimination. Such results highlight that mere statistical controls for racial or ethnic group membership (i.e., dummy codes) cannot detect differences in explanatory variables that likely emerge when examining interactions. Research has only touched the tip of the iceberg in this regard.

### *Unemployment and Families*

We focused our review on paid work, but note that there is research on the effects of unemployment on families. Unemployment is associated with reduced fertility, a reallocation of housework to the unemployed spouse, and an increase in housework hours for unemployed spouses (although the increase among unemployed wives is double that of unemployed men; Gough & Killewald, 2011; Schneider, 2015). It also decreases divorce (Amato & Beattie, 2011), although Cohen (2014) suggested that it may have disparate effects on divorce depending on the level of education. The effects of long-term unemployment, which have remained high since the Great Recession, vary by marital status and gender. Marriage protects the well-being of both women and men experiencing long-term unemployment (Basbug & Sharone, 2017). Yet, with controls for income, the protective benefits of marriage disappear for men, suggesting that marriage benefits for men are tied to the additional income that wives provide rather than the other support they may offer. Pugh (2015) argued that our “churning society,” with its high rates of job instability and unemployment, has led men and women to accept job insecurity as normal, even though they recognize its ill effects on their families, but she also found that they do much emotion work to try and prevent it from destroying their families.

### *Work–Family Policy*

Most discussions of work–family policy focus on the following two issues: (a) time, including workplace schedules and leaves (maternal, paternal, and occasionally elder care leaves), and (b) child care. These foci entail a narrow view of policy relevant to work and families. Many

laws and state regulations, as well as corporate policies, shape the relationship of work and families. These include, for example, unemployment benefits, tax and health insurance laws, same-sex marriage legalization, and immigration laws. Given limited space, we focus on time and child-care policies explicitly designed to address work–family challenges, but note that this decision hides some inequalities we emphasize in this review. We also focus on research at the state and federal levels rather than employer policies and refer readers to the *Journal of Marriage and Family* decade review on family policies.

*Time policies.* Our understanding of the effects of state provision of paid leave relies primarily on data from outside the United States because the United States is the only Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) country without a national paid parental leave policy (although some states have limited paid leave policies). A review of the impact of parental and medical leave policies in OECD countries concluded that paid parental leave improves women’s economic outcomes (i.e., increases employment rates, job retention, wages), reduces infant mortality, and helps parents address competing demands of work and family (Nandi et al., 2018). As paid leave rolls out state by state in the United States, recent studies have captured the effects of this natural experiment on families. Waldfogel, Doran, and Pac (2019) presented evidence that paid leave laws are related to the enhanced, economic well-being of families, improved maternal and infant health, and increased father involvement, but especially given the gender divide in parenting and kin work, laws allowing leaves that are too long may reinforce inequality. International research suggests a potential tipping point, where leaves for 6 to 12 months may have negative effects on women’s labor force commitment (Gangl & Ziefle, 2015). Although the benefits of paid leave are positive, studies of unpaid leave, offered through the Family and Medical Leave Act, show it has little effect on women’s economic participation (Nandi et al., 2018). Moreover, Rossin (2011) suggested that unpaid leave may actually increase disparities because it only benefits those mothers who can afford to take it (Milkman & Applebaum, 2013).

Although most research on parental leaves focuses on mothers, a growing literature analyzes the consequences of paternal leave for fathers and children. Research in Europe (Huerta

et al., 2014) and the United States (Petts & Knoester, 2018) finds paternal leaves associated with greater father engagement in caregiving and more responsibility when children are infants and toddlers (Rehel, 2014), even among nonresident fathers (Knoester, Petts, & Pragg, 2019). Using a quasi-experimental design that compares parents with children born before and after the Norwegian introduction of 4 weeks exclusive paid paternal leave, Kotsadam and Finseraas (2012) found the reform associated with a reduction in household conflict and more sharing of household labor. Rege and Solli (2013) found this reform not only increased father's likelihood of taking leave but also decreased their future earnings. In a study of Danish fathers, Andersen (2018) found paid leaves reduced the within-household gender wage gap by increasing mothers' wages, leading to an increase in total household income. Unfortunately, most of these cross-sectional studies cannot establish causality or control for selection effects whereby fathers who hold favorable views of gender equality are more likely to take leaves (Huerta et al., 2014; Petts, Knoester, & Li, 2018).

Turning to issues of scheduling, there are two key policy challenges: (a) number and timing of work hours (e.g., flexibility, guaranteed minimum hours at predictable times) and (b) control of hours. National, state, and local campaigns in the United States have focused on helping workers get stable, predictable schedules, with some cities and states imposing requirements for advanced notice of schedules and "predictability pay" for hours when workers report to work but are then sent home (National Women's Law Center, 2019). A key problem with work hour laws is a lack of enforcement. About one fifth of hourly workers do not receive the overtime pay they are owed (Rohwedder & Wenger, 2015); about a quarter of workers in the private sector do not even receive the unpaid family leave the law mandates (Armenia, Gerstel, & Wing, 2014).

*Child-care policies.* Some scholars suggest that child-care assistance is a critical form of work–family support (Henly, Sandstrom, & Pilarz, 2017). With the high cost of child care in concert with women's greater responsibility for parenting work, subsidies make it easier for women to maintain stable employment, even in jobs that require nonstandard and variable work hours (Henly, Kim, Sandstrom, Pilarz, & Claessens, 2017). The provision of low-fee, universal child care in Canada substantially

increased women's employment (Fortin, 2018), and countries with widespread child-care supports do not have a significant gap in income between partnered and single-mother households, whereas those with limited public child care, such as the United States and United Kingdom, do (Moller, Misra, Wemlinger, & Strader, 2016). Given that the United States has no universal child care for nonpoor families, much research on child-care policy in the United States focuses on low-income families.

As far back as the 1960s, and the war on poverty, publicly funded early education programs such as Head Start and Early Head Start were instituted to support poor families (Brooks-Gunn & Waldfogel, 2014; Zhai, Brooks, Gunn & Waldfogel, 2014). The passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, which created work requirements and time limits for welfare benefits, led to the development of the Child Care and Development Fund to provide child-care subsidies to low-income families (Healy & Dunifon, 2014). Research on these early child development programs showed positive effects on children's cognitive development and educational attainment in both the short and long run, especially among those from disadvantaged families (Brooks-Gunn, Markman-Pithers, & Rouse, 2016). Moreover, the positive effects of Early Head Start (EHS) last longer for Black children than for those from other racial groups (Love, Chazan-Cohen, Raikes, & Brooks-Gunn, 2013), but most states cover a small percentage of the actual cost of child care, and Mendez and Westerberg (2012) emphasized the strength of barriers to Head Start access for Latinx families. Of critical importance to work–family researchers is that even the minimal investments in early education programs in the United States are not supportive of working parents nor do they function as a type of "work–family policy" because they rarely align with parental work schedules. Moreover, the trends in child-care subsidy policy are such that parents who need home-based care as a work–family support are having a harder time getting it. Subsidies increasingly go toward funding centers, and families with schedules that do not align with center hours (or public pre-kindergarten hours) are left without support (Henly & Adams, 2018).

The United States still lags far behind. Research clearly shows that work–family policies matter for the economic, social, academic,

and psychological well-being of families. In their examination of 22 countries, Glass, Simon, and Andersson (2016) showed that the negative relationship between parenthood and happiness entirely disappeared with the introduction of work schedule policies that allowed parents to better combine paid work with family obligations (e.g., paid parental leave, guaranteed paid sick and vacation days). Employer scheduling policies that allow flexibility and worker control also can enhance family well-being and child outcomes (Kelly et al., 2011; Moen et al. 2016). Based on their systematic review, Brooks-Gunn, Han, and Waldfogel (2010) recommended that policymakers expand public child care for all parents, but movement toward these policies is limited. Collins (2019) pointed to the persistence of distinctive cultural models across countries—with a U.S. model of private rather than public responsibility for families. In contrast to mothers from some Western European countries, Collins showed that middle-class, employed mothers in the United States reported much more conflict and stress for a number of reasons: They blame themselves for difficulties combining work and family, they feel gratitude for any policies offering work–family accommodations, and they do not question U.S. norms and discourse that disguise the social and structural causes of their difficulties combining work and family. Advocating a new set of norms, Boushey (2016) argued that work–family policies—such as paid leave and child care—benefit not only middle-class, low-income, and professional families but also firms and the economy.

#### CONCLUSION

We began this review by proposing to examine not only broad themes in the work–family literature during the past decade but also the ways in which heterogeneity, in terms of gender, race, and social class, informs and modifies our current understanding of work–family connections. The proliferation of work–family scholarship during the past 10 years has informed numerous debates about paid and unpaid work; yet, in almost every case, the main story was followed by caveats and exceptions as researchers examined class, gender, and race differences. We conclude that although many work and family theories continue to inform our understanding of how these critical dimensions of our lives

interact, those theories should be analyzed with ongoing consideration of heterogeneity. As Bronfenbrenner (2005) argued, the action is in the interactions, suggesting the value of considering how race, ethnicity, class, and gender, alone and in combination, modify work–family relations. Such research will illuminate when and why work–family processes operate similarly across social contexts and when and why they differ.

In the 10 years we reviewed, the research addressed work–family connections at the micro-level (with attention, for example, to individual stress and health), to the midrange level (with a focus on workplace conditions and family dynamics), to the most macro-level level (with research addressing the consequences for families of broad changes in the economy such as growing income inequalities, declining unionization, and the growth of the gig economy). In this closing section, our aim is to highlight what we see as some of the important insights that have emerged during the past 10 years and to propose fruitful directions for future theory and research.

#### *Unpaid Work*

First, in terms of unpaid family work—housework, parenting work, kin work—some consistent findings emerged. Overall, the research showed that women still do more of all types of unpaid work than men, both women and men prefer parent work to housework, and family care for kin is on the rise. Importantly, research this decade has provided new context and caveats to understand and specify some of these broad conclusions. Researchers sought to unpack a simple gender binary—an essentialist view comparing men to women—and their findings reveal an intersectional story. For example, some scholars showed housework is often shared more equally in same-sex, especially lesbian (but not in transgender) households. At the same time, however, the workplace resources of each partner (whether heterosexual or same sex) shape this division of labor—suggesting that some gender divides in housework are fluid, rooted in structural conditions such as money, work hours, flexibility, work pressure, and autonomy, all of which are associated with class. Important research also pointed to differences in housework as a function of race. For example, research found that Latinx and Asian

women do significantly more housework than White or Black women, but the racial and ethnic match of spouses predicts significant differences in who performs housework, highlighting the complex intersections of race and gender. Such findings call into question the common methodological approach of controlling for race in multivariate models without discussing its effects or comparing “Whites” to “people of color.”

Future research should go beyond describing heterogeneity to explaining why these differences exist and persist. To what extent are they rooted in different beliefs held by family members and those who employ them about the meanings of gender, race, and class as well as work and family? Or, to what extent are these differences rooted in economic and structural inequalities and discrimination? As we have argued throughout this review, it is likely that all of these factors are at play. Multimethod research, including quantitative data with large enough samples to capture group differences as well as intensive interviews and observations with detailed attention to meanings, negotiations, and processes, are needed to help us understand where similarities and differences emerge as well to address these “why” questions.

Research we reviewed shows parents value the work of parenting and prioritize it over other work of the home. These studies remind us that work and family are two life domains that both matter profoundly and yet are in many ways incompatible; research needs to emphasize both the emotional pulls and practical decisions people make about their work–family engagement. For example, we reviewed research that found women’s preferences and sense of fairness matter more for the level of work–family conflict than the actual division of labor, but at the same time women are more likely to say an unequal division of labor is “fair” because it is better than expected or better than what their friends or mother experiences. Moreover, during the past 50 years, more highly educated men have significantly increased their time in child care compared with less-educated men, whereas less-educated men have increased their time in housework compared with their highly educated counterparts. After discussing these findings, Sullivan (2010, p. 730) concluded, “there are different processes of change at work for different subgroups of the population.” Why do these different processes exist? What

does it tell us about the changing meanings, preferences, and practices of both gender and family? Of social class? In the next decade, we hope to see more research that explores not only how work–family preferences and processes differ within different racial, ethnic and class subgroups but also why they differ.

Parenting work was also shown to vary by family structure, race, and time. As we discussed, researchers found married, biological fathers were less involved with their children than either cohabiting, biological fathers or married and cohabiting stepfathers. Such findings make it clear that our understanding of parent work will be incomplete if we only focus on intact nuclear families. Research on parent work also highlights that the nature of this work changes over time. Patterns are not static and parents and caregivers adjust and modify their care based on needs of the child, who else is involved in care, and the demands of paid work—all factors that can and do change. Thus, longitudinal studies that allow us to explore bidirectional processes linking paid and unpaid work are vital.

Finally, we need to know more about kin work. The care load is hitting women and low-income families disproportionately; given the aging of the baby boomers and the need for paid and unpaid caregivers, inequality may well intensify. In terms of race, research found more kin care among Black fathers than White and that values of familism undergird Mexican-American women’s high kin-care load. Studies also show how kin care can create family conflict. To understand how paid and unpaid work are related to family life, we need to capture all the work that occurs, all the people that do it, and the varied feelings associated with it; this means that our studies should capture not only spouses, partners, and grandparents, but a range of other relatives. Understanding these processes requires theoretical frameworks that seek explanation, possibly rooted both in the power of culture (such as familism) as well as the power of structure (i.e., extent that differences are tied to strategies for economic survival and dependence on a network of kin).

#### *Paid Work*

Turning to the literature on paid work and family life, we reviewed research related to the time and timing of work, work hours and money,

relationships on the job, and work experiences. From our perspective, some of the most groundbreaking studies during the past decade described how the linkages between paid work and family processes vary for different groups in different contexts. Some research we reviewed found beliefs about breadwinner and homemaker roles, such as the hours, money, and experiences associated with them, differed for Whites and Blacks. For example, when they became fathers, White men increased their work hours, but Black men did not. Again, why these differences exist will require further research; mixed method designs that blend quantitative results with qualitative explanations have been and will prove particularly useful for understanding the varied processes undergirding these distinctive patterns.

Key advances came from experimental interventions that made it possible to describe cause-and-effect relationships between work and family. These studies showed that providing schedule control to workers and training supervisors to be more attuned to their employees' work-family struggles resulted in less stress and improved health among workers as well as improved family outcomes, such as better parenting and child outcomes. Although these findings demonstrated that supervisor support benefited all, we also learned that supervisor and coworkers' support of families is more likely to come to White men and less often to women and workers of color.

Studies that focus on class identified some key issues that could be overlooked if we do not dig deeper. For example, almost all surveys of work hours require respondents to indicate whether they work either a standard or a nonstandard schedule. How does a low-wage worker who works two jobs answer that question? Studies of low-wage families suggest researchers need to consider second jobs, unpredictable hours as well as "under the table jobs." Moreover, research revealed the ways family members' work hours and schedules shape one another. Those connected, and the effects on them, vary depending on the worker's class, gender, and race.

As we reviewed this research, it became clear that negative conditions of employment (e.g., unpredictable schedules, overload, or little autonomy) have received far greater attention than positive work characteristics. As exceptions, we were encouraged by the workplace

intervention studies documenting that enhancing supervisor skills and providing workers some schedule control held positive implications for workers, their relationships, and their children. Future work that unpacks both positive and negative work conditions and experiences will provide insight into how to tailor our interventions and supports for workers.

### *Moving Forward*

Across all the themes we used to organize this article, it was clear that inequality shapes families and work, sometimes in unanticipated ways. Numerous studies showed how economic inequality creates family difficulties for those less advantaged, whether through the production of higher levels of work family conflict or increased divorced. Contesting a history of research emphasizing the deficits of poor and working-class families, some research we reviewed also revealed ways that economic privilege has its price. Researchers showed that women who make more money pay a higher motherhood penalty than those who make less; others showed women whose husbands are professionals may find they need to quit their jobs to accommodate their husbands' long hours. Still others showed that working-class partners may be more likely than professionals to reverse the conventional gender inequality in domestic labor and job involvement, and some research suggested that a cost of affluence is that those with more economic resources have fewer connections to extended kin than those with fewer resources. Future theory and research should unpack the relationship of privilege and work-family ties.

Research this past decade revealed methodological decisions and innovations that moved the field forward. Often, however, methodological decisions to control for heterogeneity based on sample size masked our understanding of race and class. We propose that exploratory analyses be routinely conducted to test for signals that race or class may moderate the processes being examined. Otherwise, our research continues to make the lives of many—typically those with less power—invisible. If we do not even consider how race, ethnicity, sexuality, and class moderate work-family relationships, we may, at the very least, be masking more complex relationships; in the worst case, we may be developing incorrect and incomplete theories

and proposing policies that reproduce inequality. The National Institutes of Health now requires that any data collected have representation of racial and ethnic groups reflective of the population, and yet we still read many studies with too few non-White participants. Although a growing number of family–work researchers compare Whites and Blacks, sometimes to Latinx, very few examine Asian Americans and almost none look at Native Americans.

In addition, we recommend that researchers develop research designs that examine the relational nature of work–family connections. Much research focuses on the individual, missing the ways in which individual experiences ramify to others, both at home and at work. Network studies along with ethnographic research that look at both work and family, and move the focus of analysis beyond the individual, are areas ripe for investigation.

Our separation of paid work and unpaid work was useful for the purposes of exposition, but not all of family work is unpaid. Changes in the economy—from globalization and immigration to the rise of dual-earner couples—means more family work is outsourced or becoming market work. Research suggests that such outsourcing of housework, parent work, or kin work may offer women, often immigrants and women of color, more opportunity both at work and at home while reinforcing gender, class, and racial inequality. This labor—and the research that examines it—reveals the ways that the privileges of some groups are contingent on the services of those less privileged. It reminds us again that our theories and methods need to move beyond the individual—to look at relationships in and outside the home—if we are to understand the varied connections of family and work.

Clearly, there is a tension between describing broad work and family trends and patterns while capturing individual and group variability, and there is still much to be learned from both approaches. Moving forward, it is vital that researchers consider the intersection of time and place as they impact work–family relations. As we do this work, Ferree (2010) reminded us to stay attuned to social structures that bolster inequality while attending to individual agency in resisting inequality. We encourage researchers to explain their rationale for inclusion and exclusion and describe their methods for creating categories while considering how processes may differ for different groups. Studies of “work” and

“family” that seek to uncover some pure process connecting these two social worlds likely mislead us. Our hope, as we move into the next decade, is that we dig into the “messiness” of intersecting identities and contexts, describe the unique processes that connect work and family within these social niches, and use the information to develop fair and effective policies for all.

## REFERENCES

- Almeida, D. M., Davis, K. D., Lee, S., Lawson, K. M., Walter, K. N., & Moen, P. (2016). Supervisor support buffers daily psychological and physiological reactivity to work-to-family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(1), 165–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12252>
- Amato, P. R., & Beattie, B. (2011). Does the unemployment rate affect the divorce rate? An analysis of state data 1960–2005. *Social Science Research*, 40(3), 705–715 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgea&AN=edsgecl.283768981&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Andersen, S. H. (2018). Paternity leave and the motherhood penalty: New causal evidence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(5), 1125–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12507>
- Armenia, A., Gerstel, N., & Wing, C. (2014). Workplace compliance with the law: The case of the family and medical leave act. *Work and Occupations*, 41(3), 277–304 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888413502657>.
- Ashwin, S., & Isupova, O. (2014). “Behind every great man...”: The male marriage wage premium examined qualitatively. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(1), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12082>
- Altintas, E., & Sullivan, O. (2016). Fifty years of change updated: Cross-national gender convergence in housework. *Demographic Research*, 35, 455–470. Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.26332084&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Barnes, R. (2016). *Raising the race*. New Brunswick: NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barrett, A. E., & Raphael, A. (2018). Housework and sex in midlife marriages. *Social Forces*, 96(3), 1325–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sox088>
- Basbug, G., & Sharone, O. (2017). The emotional toll of long-term unemployment: Examining the interaction effects of gender and marital status. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 3(3), 222–244.
- Bell, J. F., Whitney, R. L., & Young, H. M. (2019). Family caregiving in serious illness in the United States: Recommendations to support an invisible

- workforce. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, 67, S451–S456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.15820>
- Bellamy, J. L., Thullen, M., & Hans, S. (2015). Effect of low-income unmarried fathers' presence at birth on involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(3), 647–661. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12193>
- Berger, L. M., & McClanahan, S. S. (2015). Income, relationship quality, and parenting: Associations with child development in two-parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(4), 996–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12197>
- Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 705–725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00726.x>
- Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces*, 91(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sos120>
- Biehle, S. N., & Mickelson, K. D. (2012). First-time parents' expectations about the division of child-care and play. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026608>
- Blair-Loy, M., Hochschild, A., Pugh, A. J., Williams, J. C., & Hartmann, H. (2015). Stability and transformation in gender, work, and family. *Community, Work & Family*, 18(4), 435–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1080664>
- Bolzendahl, C., & Gubernskaya, Z. (2016). Racial and ethnic homogamy and gendered time on core housework. *Socius*, 2, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023116676277>
- Bookman, A., & Kimbrel, D. (2011). Families and elder care in the twenty-first century. *The Future of Children*, 21(2), 117–140.
- Boushey, H. (2016). *Finding time: The economics of work-life conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(3), 652–688.
- Briscoe, F., & Kellogg, K. C. (2011). The initial assignment effect: Local employer practices and positive career outcomes for work–family program users. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2), 291–319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411401250>
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Markman-Pithers, L., & Rouse, C. E. (2016). Starting early: Education from pre-kindergarten to third grade. *The Future of Children*, 26(2), 3–19.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Han, W. J., & Waldfogel, J. (2010). First-year maternal employment and child development in the first 7 years. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 75(2), vii–ix. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5834.2010.00562.x>
- Buchmann, C., & McDaniel, A. (2016). Motherhood and the wages of women in professional occupations. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(4), 104–127. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.4.04>
- Budig, M. J., & Hodges, M. J. (2010). Differences in disadvantage: Variation in the motherhood penalty across white women's earnings distribution. *American Sociological Review*, 75(5), 705–728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410381593>
- Budig, M. J., & Hodges, M. J. (2014). Statistical models and empirical evidence for differences in the motherhood penalty across the earnings distribution. *American Sociological Review*, 79(2), 358–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414523616>
- Budig, M. J., & Lim, M. (2016). Cohort differences and the marriage premium: Emergence of gender-neutral household specialization effects. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(5), 1352–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12326>
- Buehler, C., O'Brien, M., Swartout, K. M., & Zhou, N. (2014). Maternal employment and parenting through middle childhood: Contextualizing factors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(5), 1025–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12130>
- Carlson, D. L., & Lynch, J. L. (2017). Purchases, penalties, and power: The relationship between earnings and housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(1), 199–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12337>
- Carlson, D. L., Hanson, S., & Fitzroy, A. (2016). The division of child care, sexual intimacy, and relationship quality in couples. *Gender & Society*, 30(3), 442–466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243215626709>
- Carlson, D. L., Miller, A. J., & Sassler, S. (2018). Stalled for whom? Change in the division of particular housework tasks and their consequences for middle- to low-income couples. *Socius*, 4, 237802311876586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023118765867>
- Carlson, D. L., Miller, A. J., Sassler, S., & Hanson, S. (2016). The gendered division of housework and couples' sexual relationships: A reexamination. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(4), 975–995. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12313>
- Cha, Y., & Weeden, K. A. (2014). Overwork and the slow convergence in the gender gap in wages. *American Sociological Review*, 79(3), 457–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414528936>
- Champion, S. L., Rumbold, A. R., Steele, E. J., Giles, L. C., Davies, M. J., & Moore, V. M. (2012). Parental work schedules and child overweight and obesity. *International Journal of Obesity*, 4, 573–889. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2011.25>

- Cheadle, J., & Amato, P. (2011). A quantitative assessment of Lareau's qualitative conclusions about class, race, and parenting. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(5), 76–906. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X103>
- Cheng, S. (2016). The accumulation of (dis)advantage: The intersection of gender and race in the long-term wage effect of marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 81(1), 29–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415621263>
- Cherlin, A. J. (2014). *Labor's love lost: The rise and fall of the working-class family in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Christopher, K. (2012). Extensive mothering: Employed mothers' constructions of the good mother. *Gender & Society*, 26(1), 73–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08911243211427700>
- Chung, A. (2016). *Saving face: The emotional costs of the Asian immigrant family myth*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Clawson, D., & Gerstel, N. (2014). *Unequal time: Gender, class and family in employment schedules*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Cohen, P. N. (2014). Recession and divorce in the United States, 2008–2011. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 33(5), 615–628 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjrs&AN=edsjrs.26159766&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Coley, R. L., & Lombardi, C. M. (2014). Low-income women's employment experiences and their financial, personal, and family well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(1), 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034998>
- Collins, C. (2019). *Impossible ideals: How women work and Care in Europe and America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cooke, L. P., & Fuller, S. (2018). Class differences in establishment pathways to fatherhood wage premiums. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(3), 737–751. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12475>
- Craig, L., & Baxter, J. (2016). Domestic outsourcing, housework shares and subjective time pressure. *Social Indicators Research*, 125(1), 271–288.
- Craig, L., & Brown, J. E. (2014). Weekend work and leisure time with family and friends: Who misses out? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(4), 710–727. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12127>
- Craig, L., & Brown, J. E. (2017). Feeling rushed: Gendered time quality, work hours, nonstandard work schedules, and spousal crossover. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(1), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12320>
- Craig, L., & Jenkins, B. (2016). Grandparental childcare in Australia: Gender differences in the correlates of providing regular grandparental care while parents work. *Community, Work & Family*, 19(3), 281–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1027176>
- Craig, L., & Mullan, K. (2011). How mothers and fathers share childcare: A cross-national time-use comparison. *American Sociological Review*, 76(6), 834–861. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411427673>
- Crocker, J., & Clawson, D. (2012). Buying time: Gendered patterns in union contracts. *Social Problems*, 59(4), 459–480. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2012.59.4.459>
- Cross, C. J. (2018). Extended family households among children in the United States: Differences by race/ethnicity and socio-economic status. *Population Studies*, 72(2), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2018.1468476>
- Cross, C. J., Nguyen, A. W., Chatters, L. M., & Taylor, R. J. (2018). Instrumental social support exchanges in African American extended families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 39(13), 3535–3563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X18783805>
- Damaske, S. (2011). *For the family? How class and gender shape women's work*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Daminger, A. (2019). The cognitive dimension of household labor. *American Sociological Review*, 4(3), 609–633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419859007>
- Davis, S. N., Greenstein, T. N., & Marks, J. P. G. (2007). Effects of union type on division of household labor: Do cohabiting men really perform more housework? *Journal of Family Issues*, 9, 1246.
- DeMaris, A., & Mahoney, A. (2017). Equity dynamics in the perceived fairness of infant care. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(1), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12331>
- Doucet, A. (2015). Parental responsibilities: Dilemmas of measurement and gender equality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(1), 224–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12148>
- Dow, D. M. (2019). *Mothering while Black*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dunifon, R., Kalil, A., Crosby, D. A., & Su, J. H. (2013). Mothers' night work and children's behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(10), 1874–1885. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031241>
- Edin, K. J., & Nelson, T. J. (2013). *Doing the best I can: Fatherhood in the inner city*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Edin, K. J., & Shafer, H. L. (2015). *\$2.00 a day: Living on almost nothing in America*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- England, P., Bearak, J., Budig, M. J., & Hodges, M. J. (2016). Do highly paid, highly skilled women experience the largest motherhood penalty? *American Sociological Review*, 81(6), 1161–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416673598>
- Epp, A. M., & Velagaleti, S. R. (2014). Outsourcing parenthood? How families manage care assemblages using paid commercial services. *Journal of*

- Consumer Research*, 41(4), 911–935. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677892>
- Fagan, J., Levine, E. C., Kaufman, R., & Hammar, C. (2016). Low-income, nonresident fathers' coparenting with multiple mothers and relatives: Effects on fathering. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(6), 665–675. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000231>
- Farr, R. H., & Patterson, C. J. (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: Associations with adopted children's outcomes. *Child Development*, 84(4), 1226–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12046>
- Fausser, S. (2019). Time availability and housework: The effect of unemployment on couples' hours of household labor. *Social Science Research*, 83(1), 102304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.04.017>
- Ferreira, T., Cadima, J., Matias, M., Vieira, J. M., Leal, T., Verschuere, K., & Matos, P. M. (2017). Trajectories of parental engagement in early childhood among dual-earner families: Effects on child self-control. *Developmental Psychology*, 54(4), 731–743. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000458>
- Ferree, M. M. (2010). Filling the glass: Gender perspectives on families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 420–439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00711.x>
- Folbre, N. (2012). *For Love or money: Care provision in the United States*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Fortin, P. (2018). Quebec's childcare program at 20. *Inroads: The Canadian Journal of Opinion*, 42, 52–64.
- Forehand, R., Parent, J., Golub, A., & Reid, M. (2014). Correlates of male cohabiting partner's involvement in child-rearing tasks in low-income urban black stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(3), 336–345. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036369>
- Freedman, V. A., & Spillman, B. (2014). Disability and care needs among older Americans. *Milbank Quarterly*, 92, 509–541. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12076>
- Frey, W. (2018). *The US will become minority White in 2045*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Fuller, S., & Cooke, L. P. (2018). Workplace variation in fatherhood wage premiums: Do formalization and performance pay matter? *Work, Employment and Society*, 32(4), 768–788. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018764534>
- Galinsky, E. (1999). *Ask the children: What America's children really think about their working parents*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Gangl, M., & Ziefle, A. (2015). The making of a good woman: Extended parental leave entitlements and mothers' work commitment in Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(2), 511–563. <https://doi.org/10.1086/682419>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2011a). Associations of low-income working mothers' daily interactions with supervisors and mother-child interactions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00789.x>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2011b). Low-income mothers' nighttime and weekend work: Daily associations with child behavior, mother-child interactions, and mood. *Family Relations*, 60(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00630.x>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2013). Daily spillover of low-income mothers' perceived workload to mood and mother-child interactions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(5), 1304–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12068>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2015). Effects of Mexican immigrant parents' daily workplace discrimination on child behavior and family functioning. *Child Development*, 86(4), 1175–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12378>
- Geist, C., & Cohen, P. N. (2011). Headed toward equality? Housework change in comparative perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(4), 832–844. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00850.x>
- Geist, C., & Ruppner, L. (2018). Mission impossible? New housework theories for changing families. *Journal of Family Theory*, 10(1), 242–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12245>
- Gerson, K. (2011). *The unfinished revolution: Coming of age in a new era*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gerstel, N., & Clawson, D. (2014). Class advantage and the gender divide: Flexibility on the job and at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 120(2), 395–431. <https://doi.org/10.1086/678270>
- Gerstel, N., & Clawson, D. (2018). Time management: Work schedules and families. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44, 77–97.
- Glass, J., & Owen, J. (2010). Latino fathers: The relationship among machismo, acculturation, ethnic identity, and paternal involvement. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(4), 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t61078-000>
- Glass, J., Simon, R. W., & Andersson, M. A. (2016). Parenthood and happiness: Effects of work-family reconciliation policies in 22 OECD countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122(3), 886–929. <https://doi.org/10.1086/688892>
- Glauber, R. (2011). Limited access: Gender, occupational composition, and flexible work scheduling. *Sociological Quarterly*, 52(3), 472–494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2011.01215.x>
- Glauber, R. (2012). Women's work and working conditions: Are mothers compensated for lost wages? *Work and Occupations*, 39(2), 115–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411422948>

- Glauber, R. (2018). Trends in the motherhood wage penalty and fatherhood wage premium for low, middle, and high earners. *Demography*, 55(5), 1663–1680. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0712-5>
- Glauber, R. (2019). The wage penalty for parental caregiving: Has it declined over time? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(2), 415–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12555>
- Glauber, R., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2011). Do traditional fathers always work more? Gender ideology, race, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(5), 1133–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00870.x>
- Glavin, P., & Schieman, S. (2012). Work–family role blurring and work–family conflict: The moderating influence of job resources and job demands. *Work and Occupations*, 39(1), 71–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406295>
- Glenn, E. N. (2010). *Forced to care: Coercion and caregiving in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2013). Work conditions and mental health in lesbian and gay dual-earner parents. *Family Relations*, 62(5), 727–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12042>
- Goldberg, A. E., Smith, J. Z., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2012). The division of labor in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual new adoptive parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 812–828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00992.x>
- Gonalons-Pons, P. (2015). Gender and class housework inequalities in the era of outsourcing hiring domestic work in Spain. *Social Science Research*, 52(1), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.01.008>
- Gonzalez, H., & Barnett, M. A. (2014). Romantic partner and biological father support: Associations with maternal distress in low-income Mexican-origin families. *Family Relations*, 63(3), 371–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12070>
- Goodman, W. B., Crouter, A. C., Lanza, S. T., Cox, M. J., Vernon-Feagans, L., & Family Life Project Key Investigators. (2011). Paternal work stress and latent profiles of father–infant parenting quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(3), 588–604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00826.x>
- Gough, M., & Killewald, A. (2011). Unemployment in families: The case of housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(5), 1085–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00867.x>
- Gough, M., & Noonan, M. (2013). A review of the motherhood wage penalty in the United States. *Sociology Compass*, 7(4), 328–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12031>
- Greenman, E. (2011). Asian American–White differences in the effect of motherhood on career outcomes. *Work and Occupations*, 38(1), 37–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888410384935>
- Grigoryeva, A. (2017). Own gender, sibling’s gender, parent’s gender: The division of elderly parent care among adult children. *American Sociological Review*, 82(1), 116–146.
- Hamilton, B. E., Martin, J. A., Osterman, M. J. K., & Rossen, L. M. (2019). *Births: Provisional data for 2018. Vital statistics rapid release; no 7*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work–family intervention processes: The roles of work–family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020927>
- Han, W. J., & Fox, L. E. (2011). Parental work schedules and children’s cognitive trajectories. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(5), 962–980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00862.x>
- Healy, O., & Dunifon, R. (2014). Child-care subsidies and family well-being. *Social Service Review*, 88(3), 493–528. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677741>
- Henly, J. R., & Adams, G. (2018). *Increasing access to quality child care for four priority populations: Challenges and opportunities with CCDBG reauthorization*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Henly, J. R., Sandstrom, H., & Pilarz, A. (2017). Child care assistance as work–family support: Meeting the economic and caregiving needs of low-income working families in the US. Chapter 11. In M. L. Heras, N. Chinchilla, & M. Grau (Eds.), *Work-family balance in light of globalization and technology* (pp. 241–262). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Henly, J. R., Kim, J., Sandstrom, H., Pilarz, A., & Claessens, A. (2017). What explains short spells on child care subsidies? *Social Service Review*, 91(3), 488–533 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgea&AN=edsgea510882320&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Herbst, C. M. (2018). The rising cost of child care in the United States: A reassessment of evidence. *Economics of Education Review*, 64, 13–30.
- Hillbrecht, M., & Lero, D. S. (2014). Self-employment and family life: Constructing work-life balance when you’re ‘always on.’. *Community, Work & Family*, 17(1), 20–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2013.862214>
- Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The outsourced self: Intimate life in market times*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.
- Hodges, M. J., & Budig, M. J. (2010). Who gets the daddy bonus? Organizational hegemonic masculinity and the impact of fatherhood on earnings. *Gender & Society*, 24(6), 717–745. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210386729>

- Hook, J. L. (2012). Working on the weekend: Fathers' time with family in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 631–642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00986.x>
- Hook, J. L. (2017). Women's housework: New tests of time and money. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(1), 179–198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12351>
- Howell, D., & Kalleberg, A. (2019). Declining job quality in the United States: Explanations and evidence. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(4), 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2019.5.4.01>
- Howes, C. (2015). Home care: The fastest growing low-wage industry. *New Labor Forum*, 24(2), 98–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796015579692>
- Huerta, M. C., Adema, W., Baxter, J., Han, W. J., Lausten, M., Lee, R., & Waldfogel, J. (2014). Fathers' leave and fathers involvement: Evidence from four OECD countries. *European Journal of Social Security*, 16(4), 308–346.
- Ide, M. E., Harrington, B., Wiggins, Y., Whitworth, T. R., & Gerstel, N. (2018). Emerging adult sons and their fathers: Race and the construction of masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 32(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217743245>
- Jee, E., Misra, J., & Murray-Close, M. (2019). Motherhood penalties in the U.S., 1986–2014. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(2), 434–449. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12543>
- Johnson, S., Li, J., Kendall, G., Strazdins, L., & Jacoby, P. (2013). Mothers' and fathers' work hours, child gender, and behavior in middle childhood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(1), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01030.x>
- Kahn, J. R., García-Mangano, J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2014). The motherhood penalty at midlife: Long-term effects of children on women's careers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12086>
- Kahn, J. R., McGill, B. S., & Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Help to family and friends: Are there gender differences at older ages? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00790.x>
- Kalil, A., Dunifon, R., Crosby, D., & Houston Su, J. (2014). Work hours, schedules, and insufficient sleep among mothers and their young children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(5), 891–904. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12142>
- Kalleberg, A. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Kalleberg, A., & von Wachter, T. (2017). The U.S. labor market during and after the great recession. In *The Russell Sage Foundation journal of the social sciences*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Keizer, R., Dykstra, P. A., & Poortman, A. (2010). The transition to parenthood and well-being: The impact of partner status and work hour transitions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(4), 429–438. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020414>
- Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., & Tranby, E. (2011). Changing workplaces to reduce work–family conflict: Schedule control in a white-collar organization. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2), 265–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411400056>
- Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., Oakes, J. M., Fan, W., Okechukwu, C., Davis, K. D., & Mierzwa, F. (2014). Changing work and work–family conflict: Evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Sociological Review*, 79(3), 485–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414531435>
- Killewald, A. (2011). Opting out and buying out: Wives' earnings and housework time. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(2), 459–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00818.x>
- Killewald, A. (2013). A reconsideration of the fatherhood premium: Marriage, coresidence, biology, and fathers' wages. *American Sociological Review*, 78(1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412469204>
- Killewald, A., & Bearak, J. (2014). Is the motherhood penalty larger for low-wage women? A comment on quantile regression. *American Sociological Review*, 79(2), 350–357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414524574>
- Killewald, A., & Gough, M. (2013). Does specialization explain marriage penalties and premiums? *American Sociological Review*, 78(3), 477–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413484151>
- Killewald, A., & Lundberg, I. (2017). New evidence against a causal marriage wage. *Demography*, 54(3), 1007–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0566-2>
- Kmec, J. A. (2011). Are motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses warranted? Comparing pro-work behaviors and conditions of mothers, fathers, and non-parents. *Social Science Research*, 40(2), 444–459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.11.006>
- Knoester, C., Petts, R. J., & Pragg, B. (2019). Paternity leave-taking and father involvement among socioeconomically disadvantaged U.S. fathers. *Sex Roles*, 81, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1199-018-0994-5>
- Kodate, N., & Timonen, V. (2017). Bringing he family in through the back door: The stealthy expansion of family care in Asian and European long-term care policy. *Journal of Cross-Gerontology*, 32(3), 291–301.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. (1982). Job conditions and personality: A longitudinal assessment of their

- reciprocal effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87(6), 1257–1286.
- Kornrich, S., & Roberts, A. (2018). Household income, women's earnings, and spending on household services, 1980–2010. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(1), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12450>
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work–family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2018). Work–life flexibility for whom? Occupational status and work–life inequality in upper, middle, and lower level jobs. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 5–36. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0059>
- Kotila, L. E., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., & Kamp Dush, C. M. (2013). Time in parenting activities in dual-earner families at the transition to parenthood. *Family Relations*, 62(5), 795–807. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12037>
- Kotsadam, A., & Finseraas, H. (2012). The state intervenes in the battle of the sexes: Causal effects of paternity leave. *Social Science Research*, 40(6), 1611–1622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.06.011>
- Kühhirt, M., & Ludwig, V. (2012). Domestic work and the wage penalty for motherhood in West Germany. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(1), 186–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00886.x>
- Kulik, L., & Sadeh, I. (2015). Explaining fathers' involvement in childcare: An ecological approach. *Community, Work & Family*, 18(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2014.944483>
- Lam, C. B., Greene, K. M., & McHale, S. M. (2016). Housework time from middle childhood through adolescence: Links to parental work hours and youth adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(12), 2071–2084. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000223>
- Lam, C. B., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2012). The division of household labor: Longitudinal changes and within-couple variation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(5), 944–952. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01007.x>
- Lambert, S. J., Fugiel, P. J., & Henly, J. R. (2014). *Precarious work schedules among early career employees in the US: A national snapshot*. Chicago, IL: Employment Instability, Family Well-being, and Social Policy Network.
- Lambert, S., Haley-Lock, A., & Henly, J. (2012). Schedule flexibility in hourly jobs: Unanticipated consequences and promising directions. *Community, Work and Family*, 15(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2012.662803>
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lawson, K. M., Davis, K. D., McHale, S. M., Almeida, D. M., Kelly, E. L., & King, R. B. (2016). Effects of workplace intervention on affective well-being in employees' children. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(5), 772–777. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000098>
- Lawson, K. M., Davis, K. D., McHale, S. M., Hammer, L. B., & Buxton, O. M. (2014). Daily positive spillover and crossover from mothers' work to youth health. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(6), 897–907. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000028>
- Lee, S., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., Hammer, L. B., & Almeida, D. M. (2017). Finding time over time: Longitudinal links between employed mothers' work–family conflict and time profiles. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(5), 604–615. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000303>
- Lemay, C., Cashman, S. B., Elfenbein, M. E., & Felice, M. E. (2010). A qualitative study of the meaning of fatherhood among Young urban fathers. *Public Health Nursing*, 27, 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1446.2010.00847.x>
- Leopold, T., Raab, M., & Engelhardt, H. (2014). The transition to parent care: Costs, commitments, and caregiver selection among children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(2), 300–318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12099>
- Love, J., Chazan-Cohen, R., Raikes, H., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2013). What makes a difference: Early head start evaluation findings in a developmental context. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 78(1), 7–8.
- Lowson, E., & Arber, S. (2014). Preparing, working, recovering: Gendered experiences of night work among women and their families. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 21(3), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12032>
- Ludwig, V., & Brüderl, J. (2018). Is there a male marital wage premium? New evidence from the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 83(4), 744–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418784909>
- Lyness, K. S., Gornick, J. C., Stone, P., & Grotto, A. R. (2012). It's all about control: Worker control over schedule and hours in cross-national context. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 1023–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412465331>
- Mansour, R. (2018). Economic insecurity and fertility: Does income volatility impact the decision to remain a one-child family? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 39(2), 243–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9559-y>
- Mari, G. (2019). Is there a fatherhood wage premium? A reassessment in societies with strong male-breadwinner legacies. *Journal of Marriage*

- and Family, 81, 1033–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12600>
- Maume, D. J. (2016). Can men make time for family? Paid work, care work, work-family reconciliation policies, and gender equality. *Social Currents*, 3(1), 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496515620647>
- McClintock, E. A. (2017). Occupational sex composition and gendered housework performance: Compensation or conventionalism? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(2), 475–510. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12381>
- McCrate, E. (2012). Flexibility for whom? Control over work schedule variability in the US. *Feminist Economics*, 18(1), 39–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2012.660179>
- McGuire, G. M. (2007). Intimate work: A typology of the social support that workers provide to their network members. *Work and Occupations*, 34(2), 125–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888406297313>
- McGuire, G. M. (2012). Race, gender, and social support: A study of networks in a financial services organization. *Sociological Focus*, 45(4), 320–337. [doi.org/silk.library.umass.edu, https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2012.712865](https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2012.712865)
- Meggiolaro, S. (2018). Childcare by grandparents in married and cohabiting couples: Evidence from Italy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 69(3), 580–600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12292>
- Mendez, J. L., & Westerberg, D. (2012). Implementation of a culturally adapted treatment to reduce barriers for Latino parents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(4), 363–372. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029436>
- Mendez-Luck, C. A., Applewhite, S. R., Lara, V. E., & Toyokawa, N. (2016). The concept of familism in the lived experiences of Mexican-origin caregivers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(3), 813–829. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12300>
- Milkman, R., & Appelbaum, E. (2013). *Unfinished business: Paid family leave in California and the future of US work-family policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Miller, A. J., & Carlson, D. L. (2016). Great expectations? Working- and middle-class cohabitators' expected and actual divisions of housework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(2), 346–363. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12276>
- Miller, D. P., & Chang, J. (2015). Parental work schedules and child overweight or obesity: Does family structure matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(5), 1266–1281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12215>
- Mishra, P., Bhatnagar, J., Gupta, R., & MacDermid Wadsworth, S. (2019). How work-family enrichment influence innovative work behavior: Role of psychological capital and supervisory support. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(1), 58–80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.23>
- Moen, P., Fan, W., & Kelly, E. L. (2013). Team-level flexibility, work-home spillover, and health behavior. *Social Science & Medicine*, 84, 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.02.011>
- Moen, P., Kelly, E. L., Fan, W., Lee, S. R., Almeida, D., Kossek, E. E., & Buxton, O. M. (2016). Does a flexibility/support organizational initiative improve high-tech employees' well-being? Evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Sociological Review*, 81(1), 134–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415622391>
- Moller, S., Misra, J., Wemlinger, E., & Strader, E. (2016). Policy interventions and relative incomes of families with children by family structure and parental education. *Socius*, 2, 237802311666915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023116669150>
- Moussa, M. M. (2018). The relationship between elder care-giving and labour force participation in the context of policies addressing population ageing. *Ageing & Society*, 39, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0144686x18000053>
- Nandi, A., Jahagirdar, D., Dimitris, M. C., Labrecque, J. A., Strumpf, E. C., Kaufman, J. S., & Heymann, S. J. (2018). The impact of parental and medical leave policies on socioeconomic and health outcomes in OECD countries. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 96(3), 434–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12340>
- National Women's Law Center. (2019). *State and local laws advancing fair work schedules*. Fact Sheet, October. Washington, DC: NWLCL. Retrieved from <https://nwlcl.org/resources/state-and-local-laws-advancing-fair-work-schedules/>
- Nelson, J. A., Boyer, B. P., Villarreal, D. L., & Smith, O. A. (2017). Relations between mothers' daily work, home, and relationship stress with characteristics of mother-child conflict interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(4), 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000276>
- Newkirk, K., Perry-Jenkins, M., & Sayer, A. G. (2017). Division of household and childcare labor and relationship conflict among low-income new parents. *Sex Roles*, 76(5–6), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0604-3>
- Nomaguchi, K., & Fetto, M. N. (2019). Childrearing stages and work-family conflict: The role of job demands and resources. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(2), 289–307.
- Offer, S. (2014). The costs of thinking about work and family: Mental labor, work-family spillover, and gender inequality among parents in dual-earner families. *Sociological Forum*, 29(4), 916–936. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12126>
- Offer, S., & Schneider, B. (2011). Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns: Multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. *American Sociological*

- Review*, 76(6), 809–833. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411425170>
- Pal, I., & Waldfogel, J. (2016). The family gap in pay: New evidence for 1967 to 2013. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(4), 104–127. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.4.04>
- Park, J. (2018). Public fathering, private mothering: Gendered transnational parenting and class reproduction among elite Korean students. *Gender & Society*, 32(4), 563–586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218771551>
- Parrenas, R. (2015). *Servants of globalization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., King, E. B., Rogelberg, S. G., Kulich, C., & Gentry, W. A. (2017). Perceptions of supervisor support: Resolving paradoxical patterns across gender and race. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90(3), 436–457. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12179>
- Pavalko, E. K., & Wolfe, J. D. (2015). Do women still care? Cohort changes in US women's care for the ill or disabled. *Social Forces*, 94(3), 1359–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov101>
- Pedulla, D., & Thébaud, S. (2015). Can we finish the revolution? Gender, work–family ideals, and institutional constraint. *American Sociological Review*, 80(1), 116–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414564008>
- Penning, M. J., & Wu, Z. (2015). Caregiver stress and mental health: Impact of caregiving relationship and gender. *The Gerontologist*, 56(6), 1102–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnv038>
- Perry-Jenkins, M., Smith, J. Z., Goldberg, A. E., & Logan, J. (2011). Working-class jobs and new parents' mental health. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(5), 1117–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00871.x>
- Petts, R. J., & Knoester, C. (2018). Paternity leave-taking and father engagement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(5), 1144–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12494>
- Petts, R. J., Knoester, C., & Li, Q. (2018). Paid paternity leave-taking in the United States. *Community Work & Family*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2018.1471589>
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *Childlessness falls, family size grows among highly educated women*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Pfeffer, C. A. (2010). "Women's work"? Women partners of transgender men doing housework and emotion work. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(1), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00690.x>
- Pillemer, K., & Suitoer, J. J. (2014). Who provides care? A prospective study of caregiving among adult siblings. *Gerontologist*, 54(4), 589–598.
- Pugh, A. (2015). *The tumbleweed society: Working and caring in an age of insecurity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Raley, S., Bianchi, S. M., & Wang, W. (2012). When do fathers care? Mothers' economic contribution and fathers' involvement in child care. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5), 1422–1459. <https://doi.org/10.1086/663354>
- Rehel, E. M. (2014). When dad stays home too: Paternity leave, gender, and parenting. *Gender & Society*, 28(1), 110–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213503900>
- Rege, M., & Solli, I. (2013). The impact of paternity leave on fathers' future earnings. *Demography*, 50(6), 2255–2277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0233-1>
- Rietveld, C. A., van Kippersluis, H., & Thurik, A. R. (2014). Self-employment and health: Barriers or benefits? *Health Economics*, 24(10), 1302–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3087>
- Robinson, K., & Harris, A. L. (2013). Racial and social class differences in how parents respond to inadequate achievement: Consequences for children's future achievement. *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(5), 1346–1371.
- Roeters, A., Van der Lippe, T., & Kluwer, E. S. (2010). Work characteristics and parent-child relationship quality: The mediating role of temporal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(5), 1317–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00767.x>
- Rohwedder, S., & Wegner, J. (2015). *The fair labor standards act: Worker misclassification and the hours and earnings effects of expanded coverage* (Working Paper # R-1114). Washington, DC: RAND. Retrieved from [https://www.rand.org/pubs/working\\_papers/WR1114.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/WR1114.html)
- Rossin, M. (2011). The effects of maternity leave on children's birth and infant health outcomes in the United States. *Journal of Health Economics*, 30(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2011.01.005>
- Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2012). *Nuclear family values, extended family lives: The power of race, class and gender*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sayer, L. C., & Fine, L. (2011). Racial-ethnic differences in U.S. married Women's and Men's housework. *Social Indicators Research*, 101(2), 59–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9645-0>
- Schultz, M. (2019). The wage mobility of low wage Workers in a Changing Economy, 1968–2014. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(4), 159–189. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF2019.5.4.06>
- Schweizer, B. J. (2019). *Marriage-to-divorce rate in the U.S.: Geographic variation 2017. Family profiles, FP-19-03*. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family and Marriage Research. <https://doi.org/10.25035/ncfmr/fp-19-03>

- Shafer, E. F., Kelly, E. L., Buxton, O. M., & Berkman, L. F. (2018). Partners' overwork and individuals' wellbeing and experienced relationship quality. *Community, Work & Family*, 21(4), 410–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2017.1311839>
- Schieman, S., & Young, M. (2011). Economic hardship and family-to-work conflict: The importance of gender and work conditions. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 32(1), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-010-9206-3>
- Schneider, D. (2011). Market earnings and household work: New tests of gender performance theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73(4), 845–860. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00851.x>
- Schneider, D. (2012). Gender deviance and household work: The role of occupation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(4), 1029–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1086/662649>
- Schneider, D. (2015). The great recession, fertility, and uncertainty: Evidence from the United States. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(5), 1144–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12212>
- Schneider, D., & Harknett, K. (2019). Consequences of routine work-schedule instability for worker health and well-being. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 82–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418823184>
- Seltzer, J. A. (2019). Family change and changing family demography. *Demography*, 56(2), 405–426 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ecn&AN=1764929&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Sloan, M. M., Evenson Newhouse, R. J., & Thompson, A. B. (2013). Counting on coworkers: Race, social support, and emotional experiences on the job. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 76(4), 343–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513504937>
- Stanczyk, A. B., Henly, J. R., & Lambert, S. J. (2017). Enough time for housework? Low-wage work and desired housework time adjustments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(1), 243–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12344>
- Strazdins, L., Baxter, J. A., & Li, J. (2017). Long hours and longings: Australian children's views of fathers' work and family time. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(4), 965–982. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12400>
- Su, J. H., & Dunifon, R. (2017). Nonstandard work schedules and private safety nets among working mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(3), 597–613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12358>
- Sullivan, O. (2010). Changing differences by educational attainment in fathers' domestic labour and child care. *Sociology*, 44(4), 716–733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038510369351>
- Sullivan, O. (2011). An end to gender display through the performance of housework? A review and reassessment of the quantitative literature using insights from the qualitative literature. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00074.x>
- Sullivan, O. (2013). What do we learn about gender by analyzing housework separately from child care? Some considerations from time-use evidence. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 5(2), 72–84. Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgh&AN=edsghcl.332152458&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Sullivan, O., & Gershuny, J. (2013). Domestic outsourcing and multitasking: How much do they really contribute? *Social Science Research*, 42, 1311–1324.
- Sun, X., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Jones, D. E. (2017). Longitudinal links between work experiences and marital satisfaction in African American dual-earner couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(8), 1029–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000381>
- Sweet, S., Besen, E., Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & McNamara, T. K. (2014). Do options for job flexibility diminish in times of economic uncertainty? *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(6), 882–903. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017014538335>
- ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2018). How role jugglers maintain relationships at home and at work: A gender comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(12), 1265–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000340>
- Torpey, E., & Roberts, B. (2018). *Small-business options: Occupational outlook for self-employed workers, career outlook*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Usdansky, M. L., & Parker, W. (2011). How money matters: College, motherhood, earnings and wives' housework. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(11), 1449–1473 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgh&AN=edsghcl.276597769&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Van Houtven, C. H., Coe, N. B., & Skira, M. M. (2013). The effect of informal care on work and wages. *Journal of Health Economics*, 32(1), 240–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2012.10.006>
- Vieira, J. M., Matias, M., Ferreira, T., Lopez, F. G., & Matos, P. M. (2016). Parents' work-family experiences and children's problem behaviors: The mediating role of the parent-child relationship. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(4), 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000189>
- Waldfoegel, J., Doran, E., & Pac, J. (2019). *Paid family and medical leave improves well-being of children and families*. Retrieved from <https://www.srdc.org/policy-media/child-evidence-briefs/paid-family-and-medical-leave>

- Waite, S., & Denier, N. (2015). Gay pay for straight work: Mechanisms generating disadvantage. *Gender & Society, 29*(4), 561–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243215584761>
- Wang, S., & Repetti, R. L. (2014). Psychological well-being and job stress predict marital support interactions: A naturalistic observational study of dual-earner couples in their homes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 864. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037869>
- Warren, T. (2015). Work life balance/imbalance. *The British Journal of Sociology, 66*, 691–717 Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ant&AN=XRA116c04y-1177&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Watson, L., & Swanberg, J. (2011). *Flexible work solutions for low wage hourly workers*. Workplace flexibility. Washington, DC: Georgetown Law.
- Weinshenker, M. (2016). Nonstandard parental employment schedules and father involvement. *Community, Work & Family, 19*(4), 396–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1074544>
- Wheeler, L. A., Updegraff, K. A., & Crouter, A. (2011). Work and Mexican American parent–adolescent relationships: The mediating role of parent well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology, 25*(1), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022440>
- Wheeler, L. A., Updegraff, K. A., & Crouter, A. (2015). Mexican-origin parents' work conditions and adolescents' adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 29*(3), 447–457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000085>
- Wight, V. R., Bianchi, S. M., & Hunt, B. R. (2013). Explaining racial/ethnic variation in partnered women's and men's housework: Does one size fit all? *Journal of Family Issues, 34*(3), 394–427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12437705>
- Williams, J. C. (2010). *Reshaping the work–family debate: Why men and class matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, J. C., Blair-Loy, M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2013). Cultural schemas, social class, and the flexibility stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*, 209–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12012>
- Wilson, V. (2019). Black unemployment is at least twice as high as White unemployment at the national level and in 14 states. Retrieved from Economic Policy Institute website: <https://www.epi.org/publication/valerie-figures-state-unemployment-by-race/>
- Yavorsky, J. E., Kamp Dush, C. M., & Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2015). The production of inequality: The gender division of labor across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 77*(3), 662–679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12189>
- Yetis-Bayraktar, A., Budig, M. J., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2013). From the shop floor to the kitchen floor: Maternal occupational complexity and children's reading and math skills. *Work and Occupations, 40*(1), 37–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888412465879>
- Young, M., & Schieman, S. (2018). Scaling back and finding flexibility: Gender differences in parents' strategies to manage work–family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 80*(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12435>
- Yu, W., & Kuo, J. C.-L. (2017). The motherhood wage penalty by work conditions: How do occupational characteristics hinder or empower mothers? *American Sociological Review, 82*(4), 744–769. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122417712729>
- Zacher, H., Jimmieson, N. L., & Bordia, P. (2014). Time pressure and coworker support mediate the curvilinear relationship between age and occupational well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(4), 462–475. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036995>
- Zelizer, V. A. R. (2005). *The purchase of intimacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zhai, F., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Waldfogel, J. (2014). Head Start's impact is contingent on alternative type of care in comparison group. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(12), 2572–2586. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038205>
- Zvonkovic, A. M., Swenson, A. V., & Cornwell, Z. (2017). Children's experiences of time when a parent travels for work. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 79*(4), 983–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12386>