

WOULD MORE 'FAMILY-FRIENDLY' WORKING ARRANGEMENTS
BENEFIT BUSINESS AND FAMILIES?

ESRC Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge
Working Paper No. 106

Fiona Scheibl
ESRC Centre for Business Research
University of Cambridge
Austin Robinson Building
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DE

Shirley Dex
Judge Institute of Management Studies
University of Cambridge
Trumpington Street
Cambridge
CB2 1AG

Phone: 01223 335287
Fax: 01223 335768
Email: fs220@econ.cam.ac.uk

Phone: 01223 339628
Fax: 01223 339701
Email: sd129@eng.cam.ac.uk

September 1998

This Working Paper relates to the CBR Research Programme on Corporate
Governance, Contracts and Incentives

Abstract

This paper considers the extent of flexible working practices often called family-friendly working practices and evidence from published literature to address the question of whether we need more of these arrangements. A review is carried out to see whether problems exist for the workforce which such policies could help to resolve, whether employers perceive problems in offering such arrangements and whether such problems could be overcome. The conclusions are that more family-friendly arrangements would be welcomed by employees, that employers do perceive problems in designing flexible working arrangements but that there are also ways of overcoming many of these problems to work towards new relationships of trust and commitment between workers and employers.

Keywords:

flexibility; family-friendly; caring; organisational change; workforce.

Acknowledgements

This work has been carried out with a grant from the Newton Trust to the ESRC Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge. We wish to thank Bob Rowthorn and Maria Laura DiTommaso for valuable comments on an earlier draft.

WOULD MORE 'FAMILY-FRIENDLY' WORKING ARRANGEMENTS BENEFIT BUSINESS AND FAMILIES?

1. Introduction

There has been increasing interest in the growth of flexible working practices in the UK and in other countries (Dex and McCulloch, 1995). In some cases employers have introduced flexibility in order to survive in increasingly competitive environments (Casey *et al*, 1997). In other cases, flexibility has been introduced to address some of the problems employees face in attempting to reconcile the demands of work and family. It is these latter working arrangements, often called *family-friendly* working practices, which are the focus of this paper. Originally these arrangements were aimed at helping the newer workforce of women with children, but gradually the needs of male employees and a wider range of responsibilities have been considered. Against the background of the facts about the extent of such working arrangements, this paper seeks to review the literature to see first whether more working practices of this kind are needed and secondly the obstacles to be overcome if we seek to increase the provision of family-friendly working practices.

Action to enable men and women to reconcile the demands of work with the demands of their home life has been noted as a relevant and important issue for the European Union whose most recent employment directives have been concerned with the work-family issue because it offers scope to realise equality of opportunity as well as acting as a generator of new employment through increased demand for childcare and eldercare services (Moss 22, 1996)¹. It is undoubtedly the case that societies face a challenge if they are to balance paid work and caring needs (Daly 1996). It is here that family-friendly working arrangements may have a contribution to make.

The remainder of this paper presents the evidence on family-friendly policies under a number of sub-headings. Section 2 discusses the definitions of family-friendly working, together with an overview of previous and current pressures motivating the development of family-friendly working practices. The discussion in Section 3 summarises the extent of family-friendly policies in 1990s Britain. In Section 4 we consider whether there is a need for more family-friendly policies and whether problems exist which family-friendly policies would help to resolve. Section 5 examines the problems employers perceive in implementing such policies compared with the evidence on the actual costs and benefits. In Section 6 we consider whether and how the obstacles to introducing family-friendly policies could be overcome. Our conclusions are presented in Section 7.

2. Definitions of Family Friendly Working

The wide range of policies that have been assumed under the heading of 'family-friendly' precludes a concise definition. There are policies concerned with employees' hours of work (job sharing, part-time work, flexi-time), leave entitlements (parental leave, career break), financial assistance (child care, maternity pay) and particular responsibilities, such as elder care or children.

There have also been attempts to conceptualise family-friendly working arrangements. We review here the main attempts, pointing out a few but not all of their weaknesses since a full discussion of all of the issues would be time-consuming. Simkin and Hillage (1992, 13) defined family-friendly policies as 'a formal or informal set of terms and conditions which are designed to enable an employee to combine family responsibilities with employment'. The points here are that there is a need to consider formal policies as well as more informal working practices and that employers need to have the motive of helping their employees. Forth *et al* (1997) extended this definition, making the point that it is possible to distinguish between a 'focused' and 'unfocused' form of provision. A focused provision is

directed toward helping the particular group of parents with young children, while an unfocused provision could benefit a wider range of employees with different needs, including the fulfilment of care for elderly relatives (Forth *et al* 1997, 4-5). Harker (1996,47) offered an abstract definition of family-friendly working whose main themes are that family-friendly policies are about balance, synergy and equity. The conception of balance is thought to be important because it reinforces the distinctive quality of the family-friendly initiative which is; to provide employees with flexibility *at the same time* as providing some scope to cut costs for employers through staff retention and reduced turnover. The issue of gender equity is clearly thought to be important, flowing in tandem with the EU directive on parental leave for both men and women to have the option to reconcile work and home. The notion of synergy is introduced to capture the idea that family-friendly policies may have benefits both for family life and for business although Harker's definition neglects to highlight the corporate impetus for the development of family-friendly working.

Flexible working arrangements can also be used by employers principally to meet the firm's demand for flexibility rather than with a direct policy goal of being family-friendly (Purcell 1997). Forth *et al* (1997) observe that family-friendly working arrangements should be distinguished from the flexible working practices such as temporary work and over-time where flexibility is of most benefit to the employer (Casey *et al* 1997). In fact, some forms of flexibility, such as annual hours schemes and shift work, can obstruct family life (Heyes, 1997; Purcell, 1997, 25; Donaldson, 1996).

The terminology used to describe family friendly working is now the subject of debate (Lewis and Lewis, 1996). Moss (1996) suggests that the term 'reconciliation' is more useful than 'family-friendly' because it encompasses the conflict of interests between the employer and worker. Fletcher and Rapoport (1996) prefer the term 'work-life initiative' derived from the American literature. The term 'family-

friendly' is used throughout this paper. The term family-friendly has the advantage that it can be viewed as relevant to all employees, and not just those with children, at some point over their lifecycle.

There is in the literature, therefore, a recognition that not all flexible working arrangements will be genuinely friendly to families and that the introduction of flexible policies has been for a variety of motives. It is our view that it is the outcomes and not necessarily the motives for introducing working arrangements which need to be evaluated as to whether or not they are friendly to families. However, in this paper, we do not make this evaluation for each of the working practices considered. Also the fact that such arrangements have benefits for employers is not, in our view, a reason to regard them as being disadvantageous to families. However, it seems most likely that working arrangements will have the best chance of being family-friendly in outcome if they have been developed in dialogue with, or in response to, employee concerns.

3. How Extensive are Family-Friendly Working Policies and Practices?

3.1 The background

Family-friendly working has been an essentially corporate led development (in the UK, US and Australia) motivated by national concern about the shrinking pool of labour caused by the declining fertility rate (Berry-Lound 1990, Spearritt and Edgar 1994), and in response to having women employees facing issues of family-formation (Forth *et al* 1997). Research in Britain also identified the pro-active role played by unions in the development of family-friendly working arrangements, especially in the public sector in Britain (Forth *et al* 1997).

The Conservative government in Britain ratified various corporate initiatives with the launch of the Opportunity 2000 scheme in 1991.

The scheme currently has over 300 members from large organisations across the range of industries and types² who are committed to positive action including widening recruitment pools, making better use of resources and facilitating women's return to work after childbirth by offering flexible work arrangements, care breaks, and the option of movement between part-time and full-time contracts.

Corporate action in the US was galvanised by the publication of 'Workforce 2000' by the US Department of Labour and the Hudson Institute, which drew attention to the nation's shrinking labour pool caused by the declining fertility rate. Since the early 1990s the emphasis in the US has shifted away from providing 'family friendly' to creating policies known as 'work/life'. This conceptualisation, adopted by the flagship companies, steers clear of attributing special attention to workers with family responsibilities which can help to avoid the problem of backlash from single people³. However, it may incur other problems.⁴

The development of a public-private coalition on the work-family issue is also clearly apparent in Australia. The Australian state sponsors awards to corporations who have the best record on family-friendly issues. The state made a firm commitment to the family-friendly concept by introducing a range of statutory provisions in the 1980s. This culminated with the ratification of ILO 156 in 1990 which clarifies the aim of national policy as 'enabling persons with family responsibilities to do so without being subject to discrimination, and to the extent possible, without conflict between their employment and family responsibilities'. The main concerns identified for Australian policy are those of child care and elder care (Spearritt and Edgar 1994, 16).

In conclusion, corporate involvement in family-friendly provision in Britain and Australia is noteworthy because it represents a marked departure from the prevailing corporate norms of the century. The corporate interest in the adoption of an 'inclusive approach' to

business has been highlighted and promoted in the UK by organisations such as the 'Centre for Tomorrow's Company' and is said to signify the ethos of the 'caring and sharing '90s.⁵ However, this is not to say that companies fail to consider family-friendly policies in the context of business, profits and market shares (Googins *et al*, 1995). It would appear that the strongest motivation for employers in recent years has been the concerns regarding skill shortages.

The much slower pace of change in the UK and the US which compares poorly with Sweden, France and other parts of Europe has led some commentators to conclude that the market cannot deliver real reform (Kingston, 1990). It has also been suggested that the reforms undertaken have been motivated by efforts to control labour supply which involved no more than a repackaging of traditional working practices under a new label appropriate for the modern age (Simkin and Hillage, 1992, 31). These claims are explored in more detail below.

3.2 Levels of family-friendly policies

The extent of family-friendly working arrangements can be measured both through the extent of employees who benefit, and through the proportion of employers who offer them. Here we focus on employers since organisations are the main focus of this paper. A cautious interpretation of the available information in the early 1990s suggested that family-friendly policies and practices were not widespread among British employers and were most prevalent in the public sector and larger companies (Brannen *et al*, 1994). This view has been supported more recently by the findings of two nationally representative studies by the Policy Studies Institute (McRae 1991, Forth *et al* 1997). Whilst mothers were originally the focus of these provisions, over time there has been increased availability to fathers and other carers.

Taking working arrangements separately, nine out of ten employers in 1996 provided at least one family-friendly arrangement; two-thirds provided two or more. These proportions were boosted considerably by including maternity and paternity-related provisions (Forth *et al* 1997). The most common provision was flexible or non-standard working hours with 71 per cent of employers having such arrangements. The same PSI study reported that voluntary provision of all of four categories of family-friendly initiatives, defined as 'a model employer', (maternity benefits, paternity leave, childcare arrangements and non-standard working hours) was found among just 5 per cent of employers. The model employer had a very clear profile, being large and unionised. While the private sector made a lower level of provision than the public sector there was a slightly better level of provision when the private company was unionised and of a large size (Forth *et al* 1997, 152-155).

However, we should draw attention to the distinction between policy and practice. Having a policy does not necessarily commit employers to promoting the practice of family-friendly employment. Culture and conditions in organisations can be such that employees do not ask to take up the provisions offered for fear that their career prospects may be affected. Equally, small organisations may not bother to enact policies but may engage in family-friendly working practices. Studies have tended to enquire about policies rather than practices.

3.2.1 Extended maternity leave and career breaks

The survey conducted by Forth *et al* (1997) found that 9 per cent of establishments in Britain provided maternity leave beyond the statutory minimum in 1996. In many organisations career break schemes have grown out of maternity leave arrangements but in some the concept of a career break is broader. A career break is usually defined as an extended period of unpaid leave from work. Most schemes allow for a break of between six months and up to five years, with a variety of methods of keeping in touch. In most cases the

reason for the break is assumed to be maternity and child care. The career break offers the worker the option to care for their child themselves and regain a foothold on the employment ladder (NWW, 1992). Career breaks are most often available to women and to professional women in particular. The 1991 PSI study found that just 15% of employers gave career breaks; this figure had increased to 17% by 1996.⁶ The provision of career breaks was found to be twice as frequent in the public sector as in the private sector in the 1996 study (Forth *et al*, 1997).

The clearing banks were among the first to introduce career breaks. National Westminster Bank took the lead in the development of the initiative in the early 1980s motivated by the need to retain women who might not return to work after childbirth (Marcus 1994). The National Westminster career break policy was originally restricted to women working full-time who had management potential. The duration of the break was five years and a return to a comparable post was guaranteed (Marcus 1994).

Research suggests that non finance professionals in the private sector have far fewer provisions of career breaks; a study undertaken by the Young Women Lawyers group reported a low level of provision together with a high level of ignorance about parental leave; just 8% of the largest 200 solicitors firms provided parental leave schemes and 60% of those surveyed said they would not be considering introducing parental leave (McGlynn 1997). This finding is consistent with the lower incidence of family-friendly working in the private sector reported by Forth *et al* (1997).

Forth *et al* (1997) found there were differences in the availability of career breaks to men and women. For example, one third of mothers who had returned to work reported that their employer made provision for career breaks for some of their employees compared with 15 per cent of fathers. Career breaks were far more likely to be offered in the public sector where women were more likely to work than men. On

the other hand, career breaks were also more common in large firms (over 500 employees) and relatively uncommon in small firms (less than 25) and women tend to work in small firms to a greater extent than men.

3.2.2 Reduced hours working

The UK has one of the highest proportions of part-time employment and women's part-time employment in Europe (although definitions of part-time vary). Although the general proportion of part-time work is increasing the female share of part-time employment has decreased and men's share is growing at a faster rate (Dex and McCulloch 1995). Employers use of part-time workers grew by 25 per cent between 1984 and 1994 and 'flexible working' (i.e. variable hours over the week) grew by 87% over the same period. A nationally representative TUC study (TUC 1995) claims that part-time working is spreading throughout the employment hierarchy while the PSI study (Casey et al 1997) draws attention to the fact that part-time working remains concentrated in the low paid low skilled sector, and the main changes occurring in the higher echelons of the workplace should be understood as a growth in the flexibility of working hours.

TUC (1995) found that 74 per cent of the managers surveyed had used part-time workers at all levels of the hierarchy; some 49 per cent had part-time professionals and managers. A total of 60 per cent used part-time workers in administration. Only 1 in 5 managers used part-time workers for technical and technological posts. Where the job involved customer care and public relations managers were less willing to use part-time workers; only 19 per cent of managers used part-timers in these fields of work.

However, there are different types of part-time employment and differences between countries in the motives for introducing part-time work and in the hours regarded as part time. A cross-national study by Bielensky (1994) showed that where part-time employment was

instigated by employers to meet perceived company needs, it tended to be low skilled and of variable hours to meet the need for flexibility. However, when it was introduced to meet the demands of employees, it was higher skilled and tended to have longer, fixed hours. Britain has tended to have a lot of low hours part-time jobs in the low wage sector. None the less, many women have expressed satisfaction with this way of combining paid work and family responsibilities. However, in some cases, they have paid a heavy price in a long-term career sense (Dex and McCulloch, 1995).

3.2.3 Paternity leave

The recent PSI study indicated that a quarter of all UK establishment (31% of those employing men) provided male employees with an average of 4 days off work when a new baby arrived (Forth *et al* 1997). Although 93 per cent of men took leave when their partners had a child, the bulk of this leave was allocated as annual holiday rather than paternity leave because the duration of the break taken exceeded the four day allowance. Where employers offered the option of a career break it was usually open to both men and women (Forth *et al* 1997). This may indicate some move towards acknowledging men's responsibilities in the family in the corporate and public sector. A similar expansion of male workers rights to flexible working has been noted in the US under the work/life 'diversity' rubric which has taken hold in flagship companies (Fletcher and Rapoport, 1996).

3.2.4 Elder care

Bevan *et al* (1996) found that one quarter of their surveyed organisations provided special leave for employees with elder care responsibilities and the public sector had the highest rate of provision, as in other areas. Attention has been given to some of the more innovative schemes; for example at Barclays Bank and Pilkington Glass.⁷

3.2.5 Financial assistance

In 1996, a survey found that 6 per cent of British establishments offered enhancements to statutory maternity pay. One quarter of public sector organisations made such provision compared with 4 per cent of private sector organisations. Also this provision was far more likely to be offered in large compared with small establishments. Forth *et al* (1997) estimate that approximately 10 per cent of British establishments offer practical assistance to their employees with child care. Not all of the assistance involved helping employees with the cost of childcare. The provision of assistance was restricted to large public sector organisations.

4. Is the Lack of Family-Friendly Working Arrangements a Problem?

There is evidence that long hours at work can create problems for families and that there is a sizeable group who would prefer to work shorter hours than they currently work. Against this seeming demand for more flexibility in hours of work, there is the relatively low take up of some of these policy options.

4.1 Work-family conflicts

Studies have been reporting work-family conflict accompanying stress (Jones and Fletcher, 1996; Pattison and Gross, 1996)⁸. Duxbury *et al* (1994) show that mothers experience more role overload than fathers and most interference from work to family and most interference from family to work. This is because their role demands are higher and they have less control over their jobs. The benefits of having more control over when and where employees work was reported in Glass and Estes (1996) where mothers who were allowed to work at home after childbirth had lower turnover and higher productivity. The particular effects of hours at work in the more general work-family conflicts are examined below.

4.2 Effects of longer hours

Hours of work have varied enormously over time. There has been a general reduction in average weekly hours this century, although more recently, Britain's average weekly hours have been rising again. Lifetime hours and annual hours have also fallen for many workers. However, average hours can be misleading. Britain has seen a large increase in very low weekly hours (mostly women although increasingly men at the bottom end of the wage spectrum) and an increasing proportion working very long weekly hours at the top end of the occupational hierarchy (Dex and McCulloch, 1995; Dex *et al*, 1995).

The culture of long working hours per day and per week may pose a threat to the stability of family life. A study of 6000 couples aged 33 found that more than one in four fathers work more than 50 hours a week: their absence had a detrimental effect on joint family activities (Ferri and Smith, 1996). Men who work long hours admit to having poor relationships with their children which causes family distress (DeLong and DeLong, 1992). Long working hours among men also places a disproportionate burden on women who often combine the double shift of care work with paid work (Lister 1990; Lewis, 1997).⁹ The fact that annual hours or lifetime hours have fallen does not particularly help this situation. These are not family-friendly changes since they give more time to workers at times they may not need more time. There is a sense in which families increasingly live in a situation of 'compressed time' as work pervades both the public and private sphere (Daly 1996, 116-117). This process is producing stresses and strains.¹⁰ Women appear to be experiencing more stress than men (Corti *et al*, 1994).

4.3 Preference for shorter hours

Research indicates that one third (30%) of all employees would like to work under thirty hours a week (TUC, 1995). This unmet preference

is strongest among women - 53 per cent of women compared with 14 per cent of men want to work less than 30 hours per week. However, the gap between preferred hours and actual hours of work is greatest among those working long hours. Two thirds of people working long hours want to work less. By implication this includes a large proportion of men; only a small core of women have a working week greater than 45 hours. The nationally representative TUC survey indicates that only 17 per cent of men and 2 per cent of women want a working week of more than 45 hours (TUC, 1995).

The same TUC data show that many people would work fewer hours if they had the choice; fifty three per cent of women and 14 per cent of men would choose to work part-time i.e. less than 30 hours per week (ibid.). There is an important point to note about these preferences. Workers were not asked whether they would prefer to work fewer hours given that they would receive lower pay. For many, this distinction would be crucial to their answer in that families cannot always survive reductions in income. Sixty one percent of the sample gave reasons that explained their lack of choice. These data indicate that employer inflexibility (29%) and financial constraints (i.e. could not afford to work reduced hours) (35%) are the main reasons for lack of choice. Studies of low paid workers also shows that they tend to work much longer hours than those who are higher paid (Dex *et al*, 1998). Families face considerable pressures on family life from the need to generate income and the longer working hours which ensue. Hence shortages of money and employer constraints through the packaging of hours of work combine to put pressure on family life at certain points in the lifecycle.

4.4 Elder care

In the 1990s it is estimated that 7 million people are caring for elderly relatives in the UK; 3 million men and 4 million women (Berry-Lound, 1993). Of the one in seven adults (over 16) who were found to be caring for some sick, disabled or elderly person in 1991, over 40

per cent were employed (Corti *et al*, 1994). A large group may have had to withdraw from the workforce because these responsibilities prevented them from being employed and being a carer. These figures can be replicated in other countries and in all cases, they are likely to increase in the future.

4.5 Low take up

Commentators have pointed out that women are more likely than men to take up family-friendly provisions (Forth *et al*, 1997) although in the cases of emergency childcare leave and career breaks, the take up is similar and low across men and women. Take-up of career breaks has been low for both men and women; Forth *et al* (1997) reported that only one per cent of men and women had taken a career break. On the whole, more women than men have access to many of these provisions. Despite having little entitlement to paternity leave, fathers have been found to be very committed to taking time off around the time of birth of their children; 91 per cent of fathers were found to take on average 8 days leave at this time (Forth *et al*, 1997), much of it in the form of annual holiday leave.

The low take-up of many family-friendly policies needs to be examined. It is probable that reasons for low take up will be influenced by family structure. For example, dual income professional families will be able to purchase private childcare which reduces their need to take advantage of career breaks, part-time or job share options. Alternately it could be that professional employees feel there is some stigma or career penalty attached to taking up such policies, or that their line manager or organisational culture implicitly or even explicitly discourages take-up. This is likely to be more pronounced during recessions and when there is rumour of downsizing. In such circumstances employees will fear for their job security. Also, some will fear being ineligible for redundancy packages if they are away from work. On the other hand, families with low incomes will be unable to afford to take large reductions in

income which would result from taking up reduced hours or career breaks. Under these conditions families come to rely upon the support of friends and family to meet their childcare needs so that they can remain in full-time employment. In summary, the implication of low take-up is that the costs of such policies to employers will be low. At the same time, the organisation may fail to realise any potential benefits from having such policies.

4.6 Improvements for employees

Reduced and more flexible working hours, at different points in the life cycle, and to a lesser extent career breaks offer considerable scope for the reconciliation of home and work for both men and women. The value of each of these initiatives for the employee is that they limit the extent of *time*, *role* and *behaviour* strain associated with the dual role of worker-carer. The benefits to employers, which include a reduction in projected costs by minimising job turnover and maximising the retention of skilled labour, are discussed below.

5. Problems of Implementing Family-Friendly Working Arrangements

5.1 Problem areas

Increasing the number of organisations which offer family-friendly options may not be an easy task. There are problems both internal and external to the organisation (Figure 1). It appears that there are three main levels at which employers may perceive obstacles to the introduction of family-friendly policies. Some employers may perceive that the business case is against it. This may or may not be true in their case. Secondly, some employers may be committed to traditional ways of working because that is the culture of their organisation. Finally, there may be structural constraints imposed by the size of firm, the labour market conditions or the social policy environment which militate against introducing more flexible options.

We consider these obstacles in turn below using information derived from surveys of flexible working practices undertaken by management consultants, professional bodies and employers themselves in the USA and the UK (Hall and Parker 1993, Morgan and Milliken 1992, Boyer 1993; Lewis and Lewis, 1996, Bailyn 1993, Bailyn *et al* 1996).

5.2 Employers' perceptions of the business case

The recent PSI study reported that equal numbers of British employers saw advantages and disadvantages in providing family-friendly working arrangements. Employers were most likely to perceive benefits for improved staff morale and loyalty together with improved staff relations. The main disadvantages related to increased administration and the disruption through having to cope with staff absences (Forth *et al* 1997). This theme of increased administration through needing more workers or more cover recur in other studies (Bailyn, 1993; Holterman, 1995, 104; NWW, 1993, 82). Along side this view that there will be increased costs, employers who do not have family-friendly working arrangements have also been found to think that these policies will not give them any significant benefits (Forth *et al*, 1997; Wilkinson *et al*, 1997). The view that there will be increased costs may be related to the transition costs of moving from one sort of working arrangement to another, although this has not been researched.

A comparative review of family-friendly working in Europe that draws upon the findings of empirical studies suggests that costs are an obstacle for the wider introduction of career breaks (Schiersmann 1996).¹¹ One major problem facing employers is the prospect that they will be unable to find replacement workers, and that any such replacement will be costly to train (Schiersmann 1996, 55). Holterman (1995) estimates that it takes on average six weeks to get a replacement up to the productivity levels of the outgoing occupant.

Schiersmann (1996) also noted that the duration of leave offered by the career break is a deterrent for employers because they believe that staff lose their human capital. The potential for the volume of parents on leave to expand rapidly, as a result of more generous policies, is also seen as an obstacle. An over-estimation regarding the number of workers who might want to use career breaks or part-time working can impede employer action.¹²

Research conducted in the early 1990s indicated that corporations continue to perceive obstacles to the implementation of dependent care policies, benefits, and services (Shellenborger 1992). The main obstacles noted in a survey of the Fortune 500 companies included; inadequate information about employees needs; the costs associated with many forms of supports; concerns about equity issues; and insufficient evidence of the long term benefits derived from such supports (Shellenborger, 1992). There is also the matter of selling the issues to line managers even when headquarters or senior management has accepted the case for change (People Management 10:10: 96).

5.3 Actual costs and benefits

As noted above employers' perceptions that the expansion of benefits would increase costs and reduce productivity may be inaccurate. Due to the potential for error on these issues, there is a growing awareness of the need to carry out cost-benefit studies for the particular organisation (Bevan *et al* 1996, Business in the Community 1993; CCC, 1993). The authors have carried out a separate review of studies on the business case for family-friendly policies and have found a sizeable number of studies which have found evidence that implementing such policies has had definite improvements in business performance (Scheibl and Dex, 1998); for example, on turnover, absenteeism, retention and productivity. These studies point to the need for organisations to be at least open-minded to consider the

business case for family-friendly options even though the outcome will vary by organisation.

Research suggests that employers' fears that they will be swamped by a deluge of requests for career breaks or part-time working are largely unfounded; very few workers with family responsibilities can accommodate reductions in income (Spearritt and Edgar 1994). Schiersmann (1996) further suggests that because women are most likely to take career breaks and have lower wage costs in relation to men, this cost barrier can be overcome for some employers.

There is still the issue of whether employees' productivity (or human capital) declines as a result of taking a break from employment. There is some evidence that women who have long breaks from employment suffer declines in confidence (Stilwell 1996). This was worse where managers and peers were un-supportive. Also rapid changes in the job can create problems for workers who take time off (Healy and Kraithman 1996). In this situation, some retraining before resuming employment can help. However, women who felt a loss of confidence on the return to work quickly regained their skills and self confidence within weeks (Stilwell 1996, 22). Research has also noted that in comparison with men, who tend to over-estimate their abilities, women under-estimate their skill capacity and their ability to complete new tasks; this is an important factor in the context of returning to work after a period of absence (White *et al.*, 1992).

5.4 Cultural obstacles

Research suggests that corporate norms endorse the notion of a linear career which is termed the 'male model of work' (Bailyn 1993). This model encompasses beliefs about time and productivity and a conception of the ideal worker; employees are believed to be most productive when they work full time, long daily hours and continuously from the end of education to retirement, making no concessions to family involvement.

Corporate culture also upholds a view of work and family as segmented.¹³ This conception is influenced by organisational theory which treats agents as either completely work focused, or home-centred; it defines no intermediate position (Friedlander, 1994). The application of this perspective in business contexts means that the role of parent and worker often remain mutually exclusive, particularly in work contexts that are intensely 'time greedy' and require workers to put in long sequences of 'face-time' (Bailyn, 1993).

Management styles are also embedded within corporate culture and are often reliant upon a relationship of dependence and control. The need to control is increased by the pressure of workload (Bailyn, 1993, 33-34). The emphasis on controlling staff and the priority given to 'face-time' as an indicator of commitment sets up a barrier for women or men seeking to work reduced hours over the parenting cycle. The excessive time demands of management appear to be a form of performance criteria and control by keeping workers visible (Bailyn 1993). It follows that employees are under pressure to invest longer hours in order to be seen as highly committed and ambitious. This is not a relationship based on trust.

These sorts of cultural pressures can influence the extent to which workers will take up policies, even when they are offered. Women indicate that inside the workplace talking about family issues is taboo. Working mothers 'compartmentalise' home from work and do not 'agonise' over children with their peers when at work (Bailyn, 1993, 25).

5.5 Structural obstacles

5.5.1 Size of firm

It is undoubtedly the case that large firms are more able than small firms to bear any disruption and increased administration costs from introducing flexibility for workers. There is some evidence to suggest

that large firms are leading the move away from the eight hour day in Britain while smaller companies are holding onto the traditional working day (Casey *et al* 1997). This may be an important issue in the UK where the majority of firms are small to medium sized.

However, research indicates that a few small companies have taken the initiative where sickness costs were a pressing issue; for example, a North Western Local Authority which had only 15 employees was concerned about the costs of implementation. The authority now offers staff a short day working; short week working; annualised hours; and term time working; all of which have had a positive impact in reducing sickness costs (NWW, 1993). It is not impossible to introduce family-friendly options into small and medium-sized enterprises, but it may well be more difficult to achieve. These cases suggest that it is still a worthwhile exercise for small firms to examine their own business case for flexibility.

5.5.2 Business cycle factors

The impact of business cycle factors is evident to the extent that innovative financial services companies withdrew their commitment to family-friendly initiatives and the wider Opportunity 2000 programme during the recessionary periods of the early 1990s. Priorities changed away from staff retention to downsizing.¹⁴ This may be a long-term loss of human resources management innovation. However, for some, recession has brought with it a greater concern with the retention of staff who had company-financed training; for example, United Biscuit increased maternity pay for those in senior management. Bevan *et al* (1996) noted that the implementation of family-friendly policies holds out the possibility of increasing morale and reassuring staff who remain after downsizing. It can be part of a new psychological contract with the workforce which can help to rebuild trust and morale, and contribute to business case benefits.

5.5.3 Social policy context

National social policy and legislation often provide an important context for provisions of this kind. The lower extent of family-friendly provisions in Britain compared with other European countries is sometimes blamed on the lack of a clear lead from government policy. The voluntary nature of family friendly policies in the UK means that the 'trickle down' effect can be slow and will be subject to local labour market conditions.

Schiersmann (1996) concludes that the extensive parental leave and reduced hours working options in Scandinavian countries provide the optimum conditions for the fusion of work and family. Raabe's (1996) review of the beneficial effects such policies have had in Germany support this view. French public policy offers employees wider scope for a reconciliation of home and work due to extensive public childcare provision. In Germany (and to some extent Britain) where women have lengthy informal and formal leave periods from the labour market, and public childcare is scant, the policy environment does not seek to reconcile the two spheres. In many ways it respects, or perhaps even reinforces them (Schiersmann 1996). On the other hand, the USA has not had a strong lead from government policy in this area and yet many organisations have taken the responsibility for flexibility for the workforce seriously.

6. Overcoming the Obstacles by Organisational Changes

Leaving the issue of public policy and business cycle effects on one side, we now consider the extent to which organisations themselves are able to address the obstacles to introducing more flexibility for their workforce. Our review of the obstacles has shown that the following are genuine obstacles to introducing more family-friendly practices in organisations; perceptions about the business case especially in small and medium sized enterprises in view of additional disruption and administrative costs, organisational culture, and

employee skill loss over career breaks. We consider each of these in turn below with a view to assessing the extent to which the obstacle can be overcome.

6.1 Perceptions about the business case

That the introduction of family-friendly policies will incur additional costs needs to be examined for each organisation. Unless the proposals are costed and set against any resulting savings this obstacle is unlikely to be overcome. Many employers are beginning to realise that the size of caring needs of the elderly will undoubtedly force costs on them in the future whether or not they adopt family-friendly policies. In this sense, time may be its own persuader. Giving more publicity to cases of benefit may be a useful prompt for employers to be more open-minded about the issue, enough to examine the case. In addition the more common such arrangements become the easier it will be for other employers to adopt them. There will be more experience and models on which to draw which will make implementation and transition costs lower.

6.2 Size of firm

Is it realistic to expect more small and medium sized organisations to adopt family-friendly policies? This issue is linked to the business case arguments as we noted above. It is undoubtedly the case that the active involvement of unions in large and public sector organisations has pushed them to consider family-friendly policies. This is a push factor which is largely absent in small organisations. However, an increase in such working practices will help to promote such arrangements amongst small and large firms as this increases the models available and reduces the transition costs of change.

6.3 Organisational change approach

Lewis and Lewis (1996) present a collection of papers which argue the need for a change in organisational values as arising from 'the profound and ongoing changes in families, in the composition of the workforce, in employing organisations and in the nature of work'. Two main strategies are advocated to bring about this organisational change; the transformation of organisational culture which requires the development of human resource management strategies to install employees' subjective sense of entitlement to flexible working practices and the installation of new conceptions of productivity and commitment which are not linked to the long-hours working (Lewis and Taylor, 1996, Lewis 1997). Secondly they argue for expanding family-friendly working from a narrow focus on the business case to encompass quality of life and gender equity issues.

Lewis and Lewis (1996) suggest that the synergy argument offers a means to overcome the remaining obstacles within organisations. The 'synergy' concept maintains that the goals of business, equality and quality of life can be compatible (Bailyn, 1993). This approach challenges the assumption that family and business interests are necessarily in conflict (Bailyn *et al*, 1996; Fletcher and Rapoport, 1996; Lewis and Lewis, 1996). However, because company attention to social problems reflects self-interest, obtaining a change response depends, in part, on the presence of factors that motivate the interest of the private sector. Strategies for tackling such problems have been offered; for example by Googins *et al* (1995, 8). Bevan *et al* (1996)'s suggestion that family-friendly policies can be part of a new psychological contract between employers and employees to rebuild trust, especially after downsizing, is another example of potential benefits. In this case, the adoption of measures to help employees would signal to them that their employer values them. Business benefits can follow from employees feeling more valued in the workplace.

6.4 The limitations of the organisational change approach

The organisational change model outlined above has been criticised for its tendency to approach the devaluation of old values as if 'culture was like couture - last season's threadbare dowdy suit should be discarded for the current, bright, high fashion number' (Woodall, 1997, 9). The prospect of swift and easy change would only be realistic if culture was a set of consciously held beliefs whereas it 'is more than the attitudes and values people consciously hold about their workplace. It goes deeper to the level of unconscious belief and behaviours' (Woodall, 1997, 9). It must be noted that the latter points are acknowledged by Lewis and Taylor (1996) together with an acceptance that change will be difficult to realise and unlikely to be quick or simple (Lewis and Taylor 1996, 112).

There is a consensus that barriers to change exist and must be the subject of further research (Lewis and Taylor 1996, 112; Woodall *et al* 1997). Some of the barriers confronting the culture change model are highlighted by research conducted by Woodall (1997), Guest (1996) and Purcell (1997). Two relevant points emerge from these accounts.

Woodall's case study of corporate commitment to Opportunity 2000 in three large corporations indicates that re-structuring and de-layering and the competitive nature of the business environment can force the family friendly issue down the list of priorities. Guest suggests that despite the rapid pace of restructuring the traditional 'career structure' is still prevalent and remains the preferred mode of working for many leading companies. Managers continue to practice 'Taylorism' 'chaining people to their desks and just turning the wick up under them to get more out of them' (Guest 1996). This suggests that workers' demands for flexibility may be out of synch with the expectations and demands of some management. Drawing on the findings from the Career Research Forum (embracing 33 private sector companies including Hewlett Packard, Rover and ICL), Guest

also suggests that companies are least likely to take on new ways of working while undergoing major changes. However, this contrasts strongly with the US research findings of Bailyn *et al* (1996) who concluded that organisations are most likely to take on board family friendly initiatives while experimenting with more general organisational changes. The strong contrast in the reported findings of Guest and Bailyn points to the importance of the organisational context - and most notably the presence or absence of support from senior management - influencing the development of family-friendly working.

6.5 Skill loss in employees

The evidence here, as far as it goes, suggests that skill loss through having periods out of work is not a large problem, nor is it permanent or hard to reverse. In fact, in some cases, a spell out of work can add a valuable perspective and overview which is difficult to achieve in a day-to-day run of things. Some have also argued that women who take a break to manage the home are gaining in management skill. The same argument can apply to those who work part time. Valuable time management skills can be developed through combining paid work and family care, or even through doing family care on its own (Hessing, 1994). Skill acquisition of these kinds has been increasingly recognised (Davidson and Cooper, 1993). Additional help for employees to keep in touch with the workplace and changing contexts could reduce the skill and confidence losses to a minimum, even zero. In cases where skill loss was found to be more substantial, it might be reasonable to expect returners to accept lower pay for a short period, until they had recouped their skill level. On the basis of the current evidence about the very short length of time required to regain skill levels, this would not be needed.

6.6 Line manager support

There is also a need to promote employers' investment in training managers to deal with employees work-family conflicts and needs more effectively. Managers' commitment to such policies cannot be taken for granted: they must be supported and educated about workers' needs (Woodall, 1997).

6.7 Other means of change

Management barriers to the family-friendly initiative can be overcome if it is framed as an issue of providing conditions of work that are comparable to the main competition. Action is even more probable if competition concerns are reinforced by staff surveys that highlight the views of disgruntled and highly skilled staff who might leave for better work conditions elsewhere.

An agenda for action within organisations to expand family-friendly working was developed by the United Nations during the year of the family in 1994; this focused mainly on organisational action and is summarised in Figure 2.

The UN agenda makes the insightful recommendation that 'managers should lead by example' and cut their own working hours as well as offering flexibility to staff. This highlights the fact that behaviour and expectations are set by the top layers of the hierarchy and should be the target for reform. Where changes are not made across all sectors of the organisation, women and men who use career breaks or reduced hours working risk being seen as taking time out from the 'fast track' (Marcus 1994). Under these conditions, men and women will remain very reluctant to take up flexible options on offer and the reconciliation of work and home will not be adequately realised.

7. Conclusions

We have considered the various components in the arguments for and against increasing the range of family-friendly working practices based on published studies. The extent of these practices varies across countries, organisations of different size and across public and private sector. However, such arrangements do not characterise the majority of organisations of any specific type. There appears to be a demand for more such arrangements from employees, and possibly from the workforce which is not employed. But there are a range of obstacles if organisations are to go down this route. In each case, however, there are potential solutions, potential business benefits or ameliorating conditions which may make the transition less painful than employers might perceive it to be.

The business case for the expansion of family-friendly working is most concerned with bottom-line cost advantages for change. The strength of the business argument is that it communicates in a language which managers understand and appeals to existing value and cognitive frameworks. However, the reconciliation of work and home would undoubtedly be helped through the instigation of a public policy framework. This is particularly necessary in the case of advocating the reconciliation of home and work as an employee 'right'. The most compelling evidence of the important role played by public policy is provided by the experience of Scandinavian countries where statutory rights provide the conditions for ease of take-up and a fuller (if imperfect) reconciliation of work and family. It may be the case that without a public policy framework there is a risk that initiatives will become a low priority in times of economic turbulence. The increased awareness of the needs of men, together with the needs of those caring for older people across Europe and the US, can be read as a step forward in the development of a sense of an entitlement as a *life-long* and *equality of opportunity* issue and trust between employers and workers.

Notes

1. This view is developed in the European Commission's White paper on *Growth, Competitiveness and Employment* and proposes that '15 million new jobs by the year 2000 could come from expanded employment in a range of services dealing with new needs [arising from] changes in life-styles, the transformation of family structures, the increase in the number of working women and the new aspirations of the elderly and very old people' (quoted in Moss 22, 1996). It is worth noting that some commentators are highly sceptical of the potential for the newly expanded services to offer quality employment; for example Purcell suggests that any jobs created are likely to be rather 'crummy' (Purcell 1997, 2). Also, it is likely that the extent of new jobs is exaggerated since there may be offsetting job losses elsewhere.
2. These include the BBC, BT, British Airways, the ESSO petroleum company, Marks and Spencer, ICI and IBM (Purcell 1997, 27).
3. The problem of backlash from single people is noted by Hill and Parker (1993). They point out that many single people feel they are going without while parents enjoy flexibility. It follows that a work-family policy emphasis may increase workplace tension.
4. Under a management of diversity banner 'work-life' programmes could force the issue of equality of opportunity out of the frame and obstruct the need for a clear policy on the family.
5. The Centre for Tomorrow's Company has highlighted research which suggests that companies who have placed some value on the well-being of employees and other stakeholders have been the most profitable in the long-term (Guardian 17.1.98).

6. It should be noted that the 1991 PSI study may have overestimated provision because the employer sample over-represented employers of women. The most recent research conducted by the Policy Studies Institute is drawn on a representative study of British firms and provides a fairly comprehensive review of the current state of provision (Brannen *et al* 1994, 52). The 1996 PSI employers survey covered a representative sample of establishments of all sizes and 'in virtually all industrial sectors, both public and private. The achieved sample of 1311 interviews gave a response rate of 52% 'and can be taken with reasonable confidence as representative of the population of establishments in great Britain' (Forth *et al* 1997).
7. Barclays Bank introduced 'responsibility breaks' for all employees with a minimum of two year's service. This allowed employees to take a career break or switch to part-time hours for up to six months. Pilkington Glass offers its employees respite care and other welfare services through a charitable trust set up by its founder.
8. These are only a few of a large number of studies, mainly by psychologists, which have emerged on this topic.
9. A study undertaken by Friedman (1991) suggests that long working hours are related to work-family conflict. A review of the literature documenting the incidence of work-family conflict undertaken by Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1994) suggests that this conflict affects the well-being of men and women in both domains.
10. Work family conflict can occur because the employee finds one role so demanding of time that they are unable to give sufficient time to the second role. Although these issues have not been researched in depth, Lister (1990) and Hochschild (1989) have

highlighted the fact that women who do paid and unpaid work experience 'time poverty'. There is also the potential for one role to arouse strain due to depression or anxiety feelings which in turn affect the performance of the second role. Finally, certain forms of behaviour associated with work may be incompatible with family life (Lobel 1992). An example of the latter is provided by DeLong and DeLong (1992). Their study indicates that the decisive organisational skills that managers depend upon in work are unsuited to emotional interaction with children. Subsequently, male (and female) managers can have difficulty crossing the boundary between home and work. This research indicates that people who work long-hours are often unable to communicate on an emotional level with their children. However, communication improved as an outcome of workshop discussions which encouraged them to recognise the need for interpersonal skills such as listening to their children's needs rather than acting the role of a manager in the home 'barking out orders' (DeLong and DeLong).

11. The study 'Hohe und Zahlungsdauer des Erziehungsgeldes' was carried out by the Institute für Entwicklungsplanung und Strukturforchung, by Sudmann (1991).
12. 'I think sometimes that companies worry that if they offer flexible working 99 percent of their workforce are going to ask for it. In addition, they anticipate, wrongly, that its going to be an unmanageable process. But the majority of people will continue to work full-time' (NWW,1993, 82).
13. The 'segmented' view of work and family is one of five different approaches identified by Young and Kleiner (1992). Segmentation theory maintains that home and work are completely separate and do not influence one another. By contrast spillover theory maintains that there is no boundary between home and work. Hence what happens in work will

affect home life and visa versa. Compensation theory suggests that home and work complement one another and negative home life is offset by positive work life. Instrumental theory suggests that the two environments produce mutually beneficial outcomes; i.e. income from work allows a more fulfilled homelife. Finally, conflict theory maintains that home and work are in total conflict because the norms and responsibilities of the two spheres are completely incompatible; to succeed in one environment one must give up something in the other.

14. Thus a number of the schemes set in train at the height of the fears of the 'demographic time bomb', did not survive the recession of 1990-3. In particular, Midland bank had halted its programme for 200 crèches 'halfway'; National Westminster has cut staff in its EOP unit and abandoned plans for crèches; and Sainsbury's has put trials of term-time working 'on-ice'.

FIGURES

Figure 1. Summary of Barriers

Factors Internal to Organisation

- Costs of replacements for career break places
- Family friendly policies perceived as an 'efficiency wage' not an employees 'right'
- Dominance of 'linear career' or male model of work
- Linkage made between time, productivity and commitment in corporate culture
- Perception among managers that FFP will cause disruption
- Management Styles based on control and dependence
- Size of firm

Factors External to Organisation

- Tightness of labour market conditions
- Ongoing process of competition and change in the business environment
- Working time regimes specific to the industry and production process
- Social policies and legislative framework

Figure 2. Steps Toward Family-Friendly Working

- monitor recruitment and retention
- develop work flexibility at all levels of hierarchy
- restructure pay and benefits to reward output not input of long hours
- train senior staff to support flexible working
- consul and gather information from other bodies
- provide clear information to staff
- remake organisational policy through a 'work-family lens'
- develop a mission statement
- promote and identify role models and mentors in the organisation
- monitor progress and disseminate reports
- publish externally
- create a family friendly environment - baby changing rooms/pushchair & wheel chair access
- develop links with local community groups

Bibliography

- Bailyn, L. (1993) *Breaking the mold: women, men and time in the corporate world*, Free Press.
- Bailyn, L. Rapoport, R. Kolb, D. Fletcher, J. *et al.* (1996) *Relinking work and family; a catalyst for organisational change*. Working paper 3892-96. Cambridge, MA: MIT Sloan School of Management.
- Berry-Lound, D. (1990) *Work and the Family: Carer-Friendly Employment Practices*, London IPM National Committees for Equal Opportunities and Pay and Employment Conditions
- Bevan, S. Kettley, P. and Patch, A. (1997) *Who cares? The business benefits of carer-friendly practices*, Brighton: The Institute for Employment Studies.
- Bielensky, H. (1994) *New forms of work and activity*, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin.
- Boyer, I. (1993) *Flexible working for managers*, London: The Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.
- Brannen, J. Meszaros, G. Moss, P. and Poland, G. (1994) *Employment and family life: A review of research in the UK (1980-1994)*. Sheffield: Employment Department. Research series No. 41
- Casey, B. Metcalf N. Millward, N. (1997) *Employers use of flexible Labour* London: Policy Studies Institute
- CBI (1995) *The CBI/Centrefile survey of sickness absence*. London: CBI.

- CCC (1993) *Corporate Culture and Caring: The Business Case for family-friendly provision*. Business in the Community, with Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Cooper,C.L. and Davidson,M.J. (1982) *High pressure: Working lives of women managers*, London: Fontana.
- Corti, L. Laurie,H. and Dex,S. (1995) *Employment and caring*, London: Employment Department Research Paper No.39.
- Daly, K.J. (1996) *Families and Time : Keeping pace in a hurried culture*, Sage Publications
- Davidson,M.J. and Cooper,C.L. (1992) *Shattering the glass ceiling: The woman manager*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Davidson,M.J. and Cooper,C.L. (eds.) (1993) *European women in business and management*, London: P.C.P.
- Delong T. J. and Delong C. C. (1992) 'Managers as Fathers: Hope on the home front' *Human Resource Management*, 31, 3 171-181
- Dex, S. McCulloch, A. (1995) *Flexible Employment in Britain: A statistical analysis* Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission Discussion series No 15
- Dex,S. Robson,P. Wilkinson,F. and Salido,O. (1998) 'Labour markets, social policies and the low paid; A cross-national comparison', Working Paper, Judge Institute for Management Studies, University of Cambridge.
- Donaldson, M. (1996) *Taking our time : remaking the temporal order* University of Western Australia Press

- Duxbury, L. Higgins, C. and Lee, C. (1994) 'Work family conflict. A comparison by gender, family life and perceived control', *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol.15 No.3 449-4**.
- England, P. (ed.) (1993) *Theory on gender/feminism on theory*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Ferri, E. and Smith, K. (1996) *Parenting in the 1990s*, London: Family Policies Studies Centre.
- Fletcher, J. K. and Rapoport, R. (1996) 'Work Family issues as a catalyst for organisational change' in Lewis, S. and Lewis, J. 1996 *The Work-Family Challenge: Rethinking employment*, London: Sage.
- Friedlander, F. (1994) 'Towards whole systems and whole people' *Organisation*, 1:59-64
- Friedman, D. (1991) 'Linking work-family issues to the Bottom Line', New York Conference Board Report 962 cited in Spearritt, K. and Edgar, D. 1994 *The Family-Friendly Front: A review of Australian and International Work and Family research*, National Key Centre in Industrial Relations, Monash University, Australia.
- Forth, J. Lissenburgh, S. Callender, C. Millward, N. (1997) *Family Friendly Working Arrangements in Britain* London: Department for Education and Employment Research Report No 16
- Glass, J. L. and Estes, B. S. (1996) 'Workplace support childcare and turnover intentions among employed mothers of infants', *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol.17 No.3 317-35.

- Googins, B. K. Hudson, R. B. and Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (1995) 'Strategic responses: Corporate Involvement in Family and Community Issues', Work-Family Policy Paper Series, Boston University Centre on Work and Family.
- Greenhaus, J. H. and Parasuraman, P. (1994) 'Work-Family Conflict, Social Support and well-being' in Davidson, M. and Burke R. (eds) *Women in management: Current research issues*. London : Paul Chapman.
- Guest, P. (1996) 'Don't write off the traditional career' *People Management* 22 February
- Hall, D.T. and Parker,V.A. (1993) 'The role of workplace flexibility and managing diversity'. *Organisational Dynamics*, Vol. 22 No.1.
- Harker, L. (1996) 'The family friendly employer in Europe' in Lewis, S. and Lewis, J. (eds) *The Work-Family Challenge: Rethinking employment*, London: Sage.
- Healy, G. and Kraithman D. (1989) *Women returners in the North Herts labour market a report for the training agency*, Local Economic Research Unit, University of Hertfordshire,
- Healy, G. and Kraithman D. (1996) 'Different careers equal professionals: women in teaching' in Ledwirth, S. Colgan, F. 1996 (eds) *Women in Organisations: Challenging gender politics*, Macmillan
- Hessing, M. (1994) 'More than clockwork; Women's time management in their combined workloads', *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 37, No.4, 611-33.

- Heyes, J. (1997) 'Annualised hours and the 'knock'; the organisation of working time in a chemicals plant' *Work Employment and Society* 11,1,65-81
- Hochschild, A. (1989) *The Second Shift: Working parents and the revolution at home* Piatkus Ltd London
- Holterman, S. (1995) 'The costs and Benefits to British employers of measures to promote equal opportunity', *Gender work and organisations* 2, 3
- Hooyman, N. R. and Gonyea, J. (1995) *Feminist perspectives on family care: Policies for gender justice*. Newbury Park, CA Sage
- Jones, F. and Fletcher, B. (1996) 'Taking work home: A study of daily fluctuations in work stressor effects on moods and impacts on marital partners', *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, Vol.1.
- Kingston, P. W. (1990) 'Illusions and ignorance about the family responsive workplace' in Goldsmith E. (ed) (1989) *Work and family theory research and applications*, London Sage - Special issue of Journal of Social Behaviour.
- Kiser, S. J. (1996) 'Friendly to whose families? A case study of the delivery of work family benefits in a model firm'. Department of Economics University of Massachusetts Amherst
- Lane, C. (1993) 'Gender and the labour market in Europe: Britain, Germany and France compared' *Sociological Review*. 274-301
- Lewis, S. (1997) 'Family friendly employment policies: a route to changing organisational culture or playing about at the margins?' *Gender, Work and Organisation*, 4, 1,13-23.

- Lewis, S. and Lewis, J. (1996) *The work-family challenge: rethinking employment*, London: Sage.
- Lewis, S. and Taylor K. (1996) 'Evaluating the impact of family-friendly employer policies: a case study' in Lewis and Lewis (1996) (eds) *The Work Family Challenge*, Sage
- Lister, R. (1990) 'Women, economic dependency and citizenship', *Journal of Social Policy*, 19, 4, 445-467.
- Lobel, S. A. (1996) *Work/life and diversity: perspectives of workplace responses*, Boston: Centre on Work and Family.
- Lobel S. A. (1992) 'A value laden approach to integrating work and family life' *Human Resource Management*, 31, 3, 244-265
- McRae, S. (1991) *Maternity rights in Britain: The PSI report on the experience of women and employers* London Policy Studies Institute
- Marcus, T. (1994) 'Family friendly policies what are their implications for organisations and individuals?' Paper presented at Social Policy Conference University of Liverpool 1994
- Merriden, T, (1997) 'The employment climate: vacancies in the skills department' *Management Today*
- McGlynn, C. (1997) 'Time is ripe for parental leave' *The Times* 27-5-97
- Morgan H. and Milliken F.J (1992) 'Keys to action understanding differences in organisational responses to work family issues' *Human Resource Management* 31, 3, 227-248

- Morris, B. (1997) 'Is your family wrecking your career?' *Fortune* March 17,
- Moss, P. (1996) 'Reconciling employment and family responsibilities: a European perspective' in Lewis, S. and Lewis, J. (eds) *The Work-Family Challenge: Rethinking employment*, London: Sage.
- Metcalf, H. (1990) *Retaining women employees: measures to counteract labour shortages* (IMS Report No. 190) Brighton: Institute of Manpower Studies.
- Neal, M. B. Chapman, W.J. Ingersoll-Daylon B. and Emlen A. C. (1993) *Balancing work and caregiving for adults with elders*, Newbury park Sage
- New Ways to Work (1992) *Taking a break: an introduction to employment breaks*, London. New Ways to Work
- New Ways to Work (1993) *Change at the top: working flexibly at senior and managerial levels*, London: New Ways to Work.
- Pattison, H. and Gross, H. (1996) 'Pregnancy, work and women's well-being: A review', *Work and Stress*, Vol.10 No.1.
- People Management (1996) 'Family Favourites', *People Management* 10th October
- Purcell, K. (1997) 'The implications of employment flexibility for equal opportunities', Paper for British Universities Industrial Relations Association Annual Conference University of Bath 4-6th July
- Raabe, P. H. (1996) 'Constructing pluralistic work and career arrangements' in Lewis and Lewis (1996).

- Scheibl, F. and Dex, S. (1998) 'Is there a business case for firms to have family friendly policies?' Working Paper Judge Institute, University of Cambridge.
- Schiersmann, C. (1996) 'A comparison of the conditions for reconciling professional and family life in Europe - with special consideration of regulations governing parental leave' *Transfer* Vol. 1
- Shellenborger S. (1992) 'Lessons from the workplace: how corporate policies and attitudes lag behind workers changing needs' *Human Resource Management* 31,3, 157-169
- Simkin, C. and Hillage, J. (1992) *Family-friendly working: new hope or old hype?* (IMS Report No.224) Brighton: Institute for Manpower Studies.
- Spearritt, K. and Edgar, D. (1994) *The family-friendly front: a review of Australian and international work and family research*, National Key Centre in Industrial Relations, Monash University, Australia.
- Stilwell, S. (1996) *The factors contributing to women's sense of self confidence on return to the workplace* University of Hertfordshire M. A. Dissertation
- TUC (1995) *The pros and cons of part-time working : a TUC survey*, London: Trades Union Congress.
- Woodall, J. (1997) 'Organisational restructuring and the achievement of an equal opportunity culture' *Gender Work and Organisation* 4, 1, 1-12

- White, B. Cox, C. and Cooper C. (1992) *Women's career development: a study of high flyers*, Oxford: Blackwell publications.
- Wilkinson, H. Radley, S. Christie, I. Lawson, G. and Sainsbury, J. (1997) *Time out: The costs and benefits of paid parental leave*, London Demos.
- Young, L. and Kleiner, H. (1990) 'Work and family issues for the 1990s' *Women in Management Review* 7, 5, 24-28

