Social Science Research 40 (2011) 444–459

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Social Science Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ssresearch

Are motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses warranted? Comparing pro-work behaviors and conditions of mothers, fathers, and non-parents

Julie A. Kmec *

Washington State University, Department of Sociology, Pullman, WA 99164-4020, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 27 July 2010
Available online 23 November 2010

Keywords:
Motherhood
Fatherhood
Gender
Pro-work behaviors and conditions

ABSTRACT

Research has confirmed a motherhood penalty and fatherhood bonus at work. Employers, it appears, regard mothers and fathers differently from one another *and* differently from non-parents. We have yet to systematically explore whether mothers exhibit fewer pro-work behaviors than fathers and non-parents or whether fathers engage in more of them than mothers and non-parents. This article draws on nationally representative data from full-time employed adults to investigate mother, father, and non-parent differences in work effort, work intensity, job engagement, and four measures of work enhancement from home. Mothers and fathers are similar on five out of seven outcomes tapping pro-work dimensions. When they differ, mothers report greater job engagement and work intensity than fathers. Mothers are no different from non-parents on all outcomes. All findings hold net of individual, job, and family controls. I conclude that reducing workplace gender inequality will require organizational changes that pay explicit attention to workers' care-giving responsibilities.

1. Introduction

Cultural expectations of the "ideal" worker and the "ideal" mother are at odds. The "ideal" worker works long hours, is dedicated, willing to put the personal on hold for the good of the employer, and has few (if any) interruptions from home, childbearing, or childrearing (Acker, 1990; Hochschild, 1997; Williams, 2001; Crittenden, 2001; Blair-Loy, 2003). The "ideal" mother, according to cultural expectations, spends most of her time and emotional energy caring for children even if she has a professional career (Hays, 1996; Ridgeway and Correll, 2004). By contrast, "ideal" workers and "ideal" fathers are a much better fit and cultural expectations of fatherhood tend to coincide with men's work roles (Simon, 1995; Milkie and Peltola, 1999). A "good" father works to support his family. In fact, our economic system rewards fathers for over-investing in their job and society does little to punish them for disinvesting in family (Jacobs and Gerson, 2001; Hundley, 2001; Williams, 2002; Wallace and Young, 2008). Society's—and employers'—different views of parenthood and job compatibility for women and men have implications for the employment outcomes and job rewards of mothers and fathers. Indeed, a growing body of evidence suggests that employers reward men for being fathers and penalize women for being mothers (Williams, 2001; Crittenden, 2001; Crosby et al., 2004; Correll et al., 2007; Budig and Hodges, 2010). Despite a growth in interest in the differential treatment of working mothers and fathers, surprisingly little research has investigated differences in mother's and father's pro-work behaviors—behaviors consistent with the 'ideal" worker—or, for that matter, whether parents display fewer pro-work behaviors and conditions than non-parents. This article contributes to our understanding of the gendered parenthood-job compatibility link by evaluating mother, father, and non-parent differences in seven pro-work behaviors and

* Fax: +1 509 335 6419.
E-mail address: jkmec@wsu.edu

0049-089X/$ - see front matter © 2010 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.11.006

conditions with the goal of ascertaining how cultural bias enters into understanding motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses at work.

The current investigation of the pro-work behaviors and conditions of similarly situated mothers and fathers extends what we already know about work behaviors in three crucial ways (see Bielby and Bielby, 2002). First, unlike most investigations that assume the effect of children is similar for women and men, the present analysis makes a distinction between mothers and fathers. Researchers have focused mainly on worker commitment or work effort yet these only guide moment-to-moment behaviors; for example, knowing the amount of effort one puts forth at work requires making assumptions about that worker's daily workplace behavior (see Bielby, 1992). So in addition to studying the broader concepts of work effort, job engagement, and work intensity, the second contribution this article makes is that it investigates additional moment-to-moment behaviors to tap exactly how workers gain—or, in some cases, avoid interruption—at work because of their home life. Third, the present analyses draw on data collected in the mid-2000s, roughly 30 years after a majority of women and men first began combining the roles of work and family (Bianchi, 2000). Assessments of pro-work behaviors and conditions prior to women's shift in roles or close in time to the shift and subsequent legislation governing work and family (e.g., the 1993 Family Medical leave Act) may not accurately assess current pro-work behaviors and conditions. These advances provide leverage on unanswered questions concerning women's career progressions post childbearing, with implications for workers' roles as parents more generally.

This study asks the question: Do mothers report lower—and fathers greater— pro-work behaviors and conditions than parents of the opposite sex and non-parents? To empirically investigate this question, I use data from a random sample of US workers collected in the mid-2000s. The next section of the article reviews recent research examining wage, hiring, promotion, and evaluation differences between mothers, fathers, and non-parents. I then review research exploring differences in a variety of pro-work behaviors and conditions between mothers and fathers. Following this I examine three explanations for worker variation in pro-work behaviors and conditions: (1) individual abilities, (2) employment conditions, and (3) competing demands from family and household responsibilities. Next I describe the data and variables, present results from multivariate models, and discuss the implications of the findings. Findings demonstrate that overall, fathers and mothers report similar levels of pro-work behaviors and conditions. Fathers report fewer sleep disruptions from home than mothers, but net of controls all mothers and fathers are similar on this outcome. Mothers work more intensely and are more engaged at work than fathers. Mothers are no different from non-parents on all pro-work behaviors and conditions. All relationships hold net of individual, job/workplace, and family characteristic controls.

1.1. Evidence of a motherhood penalty and fatherhood bonus in three work outcomes

The media, regulatory agencies, and scholars have become increasingly aware of employment discrimination against mothers. One of the *New York Times* buzzwords of the year in 2007 was "maternal profiling," a term describing employment discrimination against a mother or woman who will have a child (Barrett, 2007). That same year, in response to a rise in lawsuits alleging discrimination against family caregivers (see Still, 2005), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) published an enforcement guide to describe actions that constitute unlawful disparate treatment of workers with family care-giving responsibilities (EEOC, 2007). The guide reiterated the Supreme Court's 2003 decision that employment decisions based on stereotypes about working mothers are illegal because "antidiscrimination laws entitle individuals to be evaluated as individuals rather than as members of groups having certain average characteristics" (Lust v. Sealy, Inc., 383 F.3d 580, 583 (7th Cir. 2004) cited in EEOC, 2007). The guide also noted that discrimination against both female and male caregivers could constitute unlawful disparate treatment, a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Following suit, researchers have recently focused attention on employment discrimination against mothers. I review this research below.

1.1.1. Wages

Cross-sectional analyses find significant wage penalties associated with being a mother, net of a mother's human capital. Drawing on data from female respondents employed in both 1980 and 1982, Korenman and Neumark (1992) reported that children directly lower a woman's wages. Even after controlling for unobserved heterogeneity, the authors observed a roughly 20% difference in the wages of childless women and women with two or more children (net of education, experience, tenure, and marital status). Controlling for women's human capital attributes, researchers have found a penalty of 2–11% for women with children compared to women without children (see Budig and England, 2001; Waldfogel, 1995, 1998; Loughran and Zissimopoulos, 2007).[1] Analysis of pooled cross-section data spanning 20 years (1968–1988) found a non-liner effect of education on wage penalties; mothers without a high school degree *and* those with 16 or more years of schooling experienced no wage penalty net of human capital controls while those without at least 12 years of schooling suffered a wage penalty of 4% for one child and nearly 11% for two or more children (Anderson et al., 2003). In their analysis of longitudinal PSID data, Lundberg and Rose (2000) found that several years after the birth of their first child, mothers' wages fell by 5%, but continuously employed mothers suffered no wage penalty. Among the self-employed, mother's earnings relative to non-mother's decreased as family size increased (the opposite was true for fathers who experienced a wage *increase* as family size increased) (Hundley,

[1] Waldfogel (1998) also found a net positive effect of two or more children (and no effect of one child) on men's wages in 1980 and 1991.

2000). Crittenden (2001) reported that the mother–non-mother pay gap for women under age 35 was larger than the wage gap between young men and women. Finally, in one of the only investigations of the motherhood wage penalty to control for worker productivity and other work-related traits, Correll and colleagues (2007) concluded from their laboratory experiments that undergraduate students penalize mothers compared to non-mothers. Male and female students recommended salaries that were about 7% lower for mothers than equally qualified non-mothers yet they recommended fathers receive significantly higher salaries than men without children.

Some research finds no evidence of a motherhood wage gap, however. Mothers in the 2000 wave of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth with a college education earned roughly 4% *more* than college-educated women without children (Amuedo-Dorantes and Kimmel, 2005). Blair-Loy and Wharton (2004) found no motherhood earnings penalty among the finance managers and professionals in their study. Kalist (2008) could fully explain the motherhood wage gap among professional LPGA golfers by controlling for their productivity (i.e., golf score). The latter two studies draw on small, non-systematic samples—in one case finance managers and the other professional golfers—so one should exercise caution when generalizing their findings to all mothers.

1.1.2. Hiring and promotion

In general, research on the effects of parenthood on hiring or promotion find a penalty for mothers and, if anything, leniency toward fathers. Firth's (1982) audit study of accounting firms found that parenthood lowered the likelihood a woman—but not a man—was contacted for an interview. Male and female students in Correll et al.'s (2007) experimental study were less likely to promote, hire, or recommend mothers for management positions compared to non-mothers. Correll et al.'s (2007) audit of roughly 640 employers revealed similar findings; employers called back non-mothers at roughly twice the rate as equally qualified mothers. In fact, they concluded that parenthood lowers women's *but not men's* odds of receiving a callback about a job inquiry. Fuegen et al. (2004) asked undergraduate students to rate fictitious job applicants and found that they were less willing to hire and promote a mother than a non-mother but parental status made no difference for the hiring and promotion of men. What is more, the students held fathers to lower hiring standards (in terms of time commitment and performance) than mothers and non-fathers.

1.1.3. Evaluation

For the most part, mothers suffer a workplace evaluation penalty but fathers do not. Correll et al. (2007) found that students rated mothers as less competent and committed to work than childless women, they held mothers to stricter performance and punctuality standards, and they gave mothers less leniency in tardiness to work than non-mothers. Students rated fathers as more committed and allowed fathers more leniency in terms of tardiness than men without children. Overall, students rated fathers significantly higher than mothers on all measures of competence, commitment, performance, and hirability, and assigned greater pay to fathers than mothers. The same students rated non-mothers as more competent, more committed, and more likely to be hired and promoted than fathers, suggesting the differential evaluation reflects more than just the gender of the job applicant—parenthood status matters above and beyond gender status. College students' evaluations of fictitious descriptions of married employed parents revealed that they rated fathers as more professionally competent than mothers (Etaugh and Folger, 1998). Fuegen et al. (2004) also found that undergraduate students held mothers to stricter performance standards than fathers. Undergraduate students rating fictitious consultants presented as either men or women without children or mothers and fathers rated working mothers less competent than working non-mothers while they rated non-fathers and fathers as equally competent (Cuddy et al., 2004). Undergraduates requested working with mothers less often than non-mothers, were less likely to promote mothers than non-mothers, and were less likely to recommend mothers compared to non-mothers for continued education and training. They preferred the working father over the working non-father for these three workplace outcomes.

In summary, the literature finds that mothers suffer a wage penalty and fathers a wage bonus net of their human capital characteristics. This penalty extends to mothers' ability to get jobs, promotions, and workplace evaluation. By and large, employers contact mothers less often for jobs than fathers and non-mothers. Laboratory studies also confirm that mothers are lower in the queue for promotion than non-mothers but parenthood either does not affect or increases men's hirability and likelihood of promotion. Finally, laboratory experiments have demonstrated that mothers are evaluated lower in terms of job competence, commitment, performance, and other positive workplace behaviors than fathers and non-parents.

1.2. Mothers and pro-work behaviors and conditions

The literature reviewed above suggests that cultural beliefs about mothers, especially the notion that mothering takes priority over everything else, have lead to the perception that employed mothers are less competent, less committed to paid work, and less work-oriented than fathers (Hays, 1996; Blair-Loy, 2003; Correll et al., 2007, p. 1306; Kobrynowicz and Biernat, 1997; Wallace, 2008).[2] Despite this perception, most research assumes through model specification that parenthood has the same effect on women's and men's pro-work behaviors. Few have explored gender differences in the effect of children

[2] Employed mothers work fewer hours than female non-parents but fathers work more hours than childless men, net of education, occupation, and age (Kaufman and Uhlenberg, 2000, p. 943).

on women's and men's pro-work behaviors and conditions. Those that have primarily draw on data collected between 1968 and 1997 and explore one of two outcomes—commitment or work effort. I review the research on mother–father differences in pro-work behaviors and conditions below.[3]

Drawing on 1973 and 1977 Quality of Employment Survey data, Bielby and Bielby (1984) found that women did not lower their work commitment once they became mothers; those that gave birth between 1962 and 1964 and those with large families were more committed to work than other women in 1964. In a sample of roughly 40,000 women and men who graduated from American colleges and universities in 1961, Bielby and Bielby (1988) reported that having school-aged children, primary responsibility for a child on workdays, and the amount of time spent caring for a child on workdays did not reduce mother's work effort but that having pre-school-aged children lowered mothers' work effort. What is more, housework decreased men's *but not women's* work effort (Bielby and Bielby, 1988). In another study drawing on 1991 General Social Survey data, researchers found that being a mother was unrelated to a woman's organizational commitment net of her work position, career experiences, pay, family affiliations, race, and education (Marsden et al., 1993). In their study of British workers in the 1997 British Skills Survey data set and American workers in the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) data set, Kmec and Gorman (2010) observed no difference in discretionary work effort—going above and beyond what is required of them—between employed mothers and fathers net of controls for individual traits, family demands, and job requirements. Drawing on a sample of roughly 1800 practicing lawyers in Alberta, Canada in 2000, Wallace (2008) tested mother–father differences in work commitment. She concluded that practicing lawyer mothers were more committed to their law careers than fathers despite the fact that mothers reported having less work control, spouses with longer work hours, and less workplace support than fathers.[4] Using the 1992 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW), Keene and Reynolds (2005) found that married mothers and fathers reported similar self-reported levels of distraction and lower work quality due to family demands. Finally, one published study finds a significant difference in the effort of mothers and fathers. Drawing also on 1992 NSCW data, Maume (2006a) concluded that mothers, but not fathers, restricted their work efforts and that mother's restrictions increased with an increase in the number of children at home.

Findings from the handful of published studies summarized above are inconsistent because they use different samples, sample workers in different time periods, and measure pro-work behaviors and conditions differently. The two most plausible explanations for the inconsistent conclusions are the variation in outcome measurement and the passage of time. On measurement, most studies capture broad mindsets about work as opposed to tangible workplace behaviors and conditions.[5] The one study that uses behavioral measures, Maume (2006a), suffers from measurement problems. He analyzed the number of times a worker did any of the following over the course of a year due to family or personal reasons: worked fewer hours, rearranged one's work schedule, refused extra hours, refused to travel, turned down a promotion, or turned down interesting work assignments. This measure problematically conflates personal and family-driven changes at work. If one parent makes more changes at work due to "personal" reasons, this measure will misstate parental work effort restrictions. The second item—rearrangement of one's work schedule—may not necessarily reflect a reduction in work effort. For example, a respondent would respond "yes" to this item if she worked over her lunch hour and left 1 h early from work. If mothers do more of such schedule arranging than fathers, this measure will overstate mothers' restricted effort. Regarding the last item, a respondent might refuse an interesting work assignment because it pays less. If this is the case, refusal does not denote restricted effort. If parents are less likely to accept lower-paying assignments because they have children to support, this measure will overstate parents' restricted efforts. Furthermore, studies tap different pro-work behavior concepts. Researchers have studied *organizational* commitment (Marsden et al., 1993) *work* commitment (Bielby and Bielby, 1984), and *career* commitment (Wallace, 2008). If mothers define their post-childbearing return to the labor market as a signal of their work or career commitment, mothers may report greater general work or career commitment without actually engaging in any different behavior at work than men or childless women.

Regarding the passage of time, some have drawn on data from women who became mothers in the early 1960s (Bielby and Bielby, 1984) or 1961 college graduates who are likely starting their families in the 1960s (Bielby and Bielby, 1988). The increased labor force participation of mothers, and with it greater access to resources for employed mothers (i.e., increased childcare options), greater cultural acceptance of about mothers' employment (see Cunningham, 2008), and federal legislation (i.e., Family Medical Leave Act) aimed at helping the combination of parenthood and employment did not occur until well after the 1960s. Surveys of workers in the labor market before this labor market shift will not accurately capture the extent to which cultural biases matter for modern workers. What is more, modern mothers may not embrace the separate gendered constructions of "worker" and "mother" to the same extent that women in the 1960s did (McQuillan et al., 2008). With its focus on actual behaviors and a sample from the mid-2000s, the results from the present analyses are more definitive than those above.

[3] I only discuss studies that consider gender differences in the effects of parenthood. Consequently, I do not review the extensive literature exploring the contributing factors to pro-work dimensions and conditions that exclude sex as a predictor or that assumes the effect of children are the same for women and men.

[4] High work commitment among employed mothers is not entirely surprising because women who are *not* committed to work likely leave the labor force post child-bearing. Indeed, the presence of an infant at home decreases a mother's probability of employment by 22% points (Gornick et al., 1998).

[5] For example, one can report that they are "committed" to work but a "committed" worker may not necessarily behave differently from a non-committed one on a daily basis.

1.3. Factors affecting pro-work behaviors and conditions

Several factors affect the extent to which a person can exhibit pro-work behaviors and conditions, including their individual characteristics, features of their jobs, and their family and household responsibilities. I discuss each of these in turn.

1.3.1. Individual characteristics

Two individual abilities specifically affect dimensions of pro-work behaviors and conditions: work experience and education. Increased work experience and education levels increase market human capital. The greater one's market human capital, the more likely they will expend effort at work (see Bielby and Bielby, 1988). At the same time, educational level is positively associated with going above and beyond what is required at work (see Smith et al. (1983) for a review). Age may play a role in determining pro-work behaviors and conditions; work effort has been found to increase among the young, peak among those ages 35–44, than decrease as workers age (Bielby and Bielby, 1988). At the same time, one's race/ethnic background might be related to pro-work behaviors and conditions; perceptions of discrimination are greater among non-whites (Hirsh and Lyons, 2010). Perceived organizational discrimination is associated with lower work commitment and lower engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors (Ensher et al., 2001). Finally, work hours impact pro-work behaviors and conditions because the more hours one works, the greater the opportunity she or he has to engage in such behaviors.

1.3.2. Job/work characteristics

Positive work environments are likely to elicit pro-work behaviors and conditions. In particular, stable jobs (Brockner et al., 1992), jobs that provide a supportive environment or good opportunities (Demerouti et al., 2001; Brown and Leigh, 1996), and those that foster intrinsic work interest (Brockner et al., 1992; Hodson and Sullivan, 1985) should increase pro-work behaviors and conditions. Job autonomy and supervisory authority affect pro-work behaviors and conditions. On the one hand, they allow workers to determine the best strategies for accomplishing work goals so should increase positive behaviors (Perrewe and Ganster, 1991). On the other, by requiring workers to make decisions and take on responsibility authority and autonomy may increase job demands and reduce pro-work behaviors and conditions (Xie and Johns, 1995). Working in a job that demands high skill may increase pro-work behaviors and conditions especially if the worker perceives him or herself as possessing those skills, but high skill demands may lower pro-work behaviors and conditions if a worker feels they interfere with task completion. Finally, working in a professional occupation may give workers greater schedule control and greater access to flexible employment schedules than workers in non-professional ones and, for these reasons, they may elicit greater pro-work behaviors and conditions (EEOC, 2007).

Certain features of jobs—in particular, job difficulty and task overload—may reduce pro-work behaviors and conditions. Physically strenuous job tasks, including those that pose risk, and complex tasks make jobs more difficult (Demerouti et al., 2001; Fox et al., 1993), as do unreasonable job demands and unsupportive work settings. For example, unsupportive work environments increase workplace strain (see Ganster et al., 1986). In addition, stress encountered on the job lowers organizational commitment (Lambert and Hogan, 2009).

1.3.3. Family/home responsibilities

Family and household responsibilities demand time and effort and can deplete one's energy. A worker with high demands at home may use his or her energy reserves at home, leaving less to use for engagement in pro-work behaviors and conditions (see Kmec and Gorman, 2010). For these reasons, workers with children—especially young children—those who are married, and those with high levels of household chore responsibilities may have limited pro-work behaviors and conditions. Family or household induced strain and stress may affect pro-work behaviors and conditions; for example, having a preschooler with a difficult temperament lowered parents' feelings of rewards in combining work and family (Hyde et al., 2004). In contrast, having a supportive, fulfilling family life may increase pro-work behaviors and conditions.

1.3.4. Household resources

Three features of a household may enable the sharing (or contracting out to others) of household responsibilities which, in turn, free a worker's time to engage in pro-work behaviors. These include having a high household income, having a spouse with fewer competing time demands (i.e., few work hours), and having adult children in the household.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Data

Analyses draw on data from the second wave of the National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II) (Ryff et al., 2007). Collected from January 2004 to September 2006, the MIDUS II is a follow-up study of MIDUS I respondents and covers topics such as physical and mental health, life satisfaction, employment, and family. Wave one respondents were drawn from a random-digit-dial, nationally representative sample of non-institutionalized, English-speaking adults ages 25–74, selected from working telephone numbers in the United States. Of the 7108 participants in MIDUS I, 4963 participated in the second wave, yielding a mortality-adjusted response rate of 75% for MIDUS II. Respondents completed both a

phone survey and detailed self-administered questionnaire. At the time of the second wave, respondents were between the ages of 35–86. I use Wave II data because the first wave questionnaire did not include some control and outcome measures and because the second wave was collected more recently than most studies exploring parent differences in pro-work behaviors.

I restricted the sample in several ways for analyses. First, I dropped 2355 non-employed adults, including those temporarily laid off, unemployed workers looking for work, homemakers, and full-time students because they cannot engage in pro-work behaviors. Second, I exclude 85 self-employed respondents because the outcomes of interest have different meanings for those employed by others versus the self-employed. Third, I exclude 159 employed respondents over the age of 65. Fourth, I also exclude from analyses 242 respondents who work part-time (less than 30 h per week) and 44 who work more than 71 h per week at their main job because part-time workers and highly worked people likely have very different levels of pro-work behaviors and work-family spillover than full-time workers. All together, I intentionally exclude 2885 respondents so the final analytic sample consists of 2078 employed adults ages 35–65. To test for potential selection bias based on these deletions, I estimated Heckman selection models for the analytic sample (not shown). The results produced estimates of the inverse Mill's ratio for each respondent and serves as a measure of the probability of selection into the analysis (Breen, 1996). When I include the inverse Mill's ratios in models (for each deletion, separately), they are not significantly related to the outcome and do not change the substantive results. Following standard practice (Allison, 2001), I drop cases with missing data on the outcomes. I drop roughly 475 observations because they are missing data on the outcome variable. I use listwise deletion to handle missing data on predictor variables.

2.2. Dependent variables: pro-work behaviors and conditions

I consider a series of outcomes, each of which shed light on three key cultural biases and expectations about employed mothers and fathers. I have coded all outcomes so that higher values reflect *greater* pro-work dimensions. The first set of outcomes I consider tap cultural expectations about work effort. This set of outcomes comes the closest to the dimensions studied in existing literature but builds on this research by examining specifically how home responsibilities affect one's work effort. Broadly speaking, the second set of outcomes gauges cultural biases about the extent to which home can be a distraction at work. One measure in particular, job engagement, allows a direct test of a common stereotype of mothers: that thoughts of their children sidetrack mothers at work. The final outcome considers how family motivates one to work and directly tests a cultural assumption about fathers: family responsibilities motivate fathers' employment. To my knowledge, this is the first investigation of parental and non-parental differences on this last outcome. In short, this collection of outcomes gives us greater purchase on understanding the pro-work behaviors and conditions of employed mothers, fathers, and non-parents.

2.2.1. Work effort

The first outcome is *work effort*, measured by the respondent's answer to the question: "Using a 0–10 scale where 0 means 'no thought or effort' and 10 means 'very much thought and effort,' how much thought and effort do you put into your work situation these days?"

The second outcome indicates the frequency with which a respondent's *responsibilities at home* reduced the effort he or she could devote to the job. I reverse coded response categories so higher values reflect greater pro-work behavior (i.e., the lack of interference from home) (1 = all of the time, 2 = most of the time, 3 = some of the time, 4 = rarely, 5 = never).

2.2.2. Home as distraction at work

A third outcome is *job engagement* measured with the response to the question: "How often do you get so involved in your work that you forget about everything else, even the time?" Responses are coded: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time. Work engagement of this kind is likely to be positively associated with productivity and performance (see Rucci et al., 1998).

A fourth outcome—*work intensity*—captures the essence of working hard and job productivity (see Brown and Leigh, 1996). I measure intensity with respondents' answer to the question: "How often do you have to work very intensively, that is, you are very busy trying to get things done?" Responses are coded: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time.

The fifth outcome captures the extent to which home life enhances a respondent's job with a respondent's report of the frequency with which he or she experienced the following in the past year: *home life helps a respondent relax and feel ready for the next day's work*. Response categories are coded: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time.

The sixth measure indicates the frequency with which a respondent experienced the following in the past year: activities and chores at *home prevented a respondent from getting the needed amount of sleep* to do his or her job well. I reverse coded response categories so higher values reflect greater pro-work behavior (i.e., the lack of interference from home) (1 = all of the time, 2 = most of the time, 3 = some of the time, 4 = rarely, 5 = never).

2.2.3. Motivation to work because of family

The final outcome measures the frequency with which a respondent experienced the following in the past year: *providing for what is needed at home makes the respondent work harder at his or her job*. Response categories are coded: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time.[6]

2.3. Independent variables

The primary independent variables are a set of dichotomous variables indicating a person's sex and parenthood status, coded "1" if they are a mother, father, childless man, or childless woman and coded "0" otherwise. Mothers are the reference category, so coefficients compare mothers to fathers and non-parents of each sex. I perform statistical tests to investigate whether fathers are statistically different from non-parents of each sex and note significant differences in tables and in the discussion of results.

2.4. Control variables

2.4.1. Individual-level characteristics

Models include a measure of respondent *race/ethnicity* coded "1" if a respondent is non-Hispanic white and "0" if she or he is Hispanic, black, Asian, Native American, Hawaiian, or "other" race. Models include a measure of respondent *age* (in years), age^2, and *work experience* (in years), calculated by subtracting the age a respondent first worked for pay from his or her age at the time of the survey. To measure a respondent's highest level of *education*, I include a set of dichotomous variables coded "1" if a respondent has a HS/GED or less (omitted), some college, AA, BA, MA, or Ph.D./professional degree and "0" if not.

2.4.2. Job/workplace characteristics

I control for a respondent's *occupation* with a set of dichotomous variable coded "1" if he or she holds a job in either a: (a) professional specialty or executive, specialty, or managerial occupation (omitted); (b) technician and related support occupation; (c) sales occupation; (d) administrative support occupation; (e) service occupation; (f) farming, forestry, and fishing occupation; (g) precision production, crafts, and repair occupation; or (h) operator, laborer, and military occupation and "0" if otherwise. Models include a dichotomous measure denoting whether a respondent has *supervisory control* (coded "1") or not (coded "0") as well as a continuous measure of *weekly work hours*.

A series of variables captures aspects of a job that may enhance the work experience, including *job stability* measured with the respondent's answer to the following question: "If you wanted to stay at your present job, what are the chances that you could keep it for the next 2 years?" Responses are coded: 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent. A second variable captures the frequency with which a respondent *learns new things on the job* (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time). A third job feature that may elicit pro-work behavior is the extent to a respondent reports having *had opportunities as good as others* in his or her current job (1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = some, 4 = a lot).

Models include a measure of the frequency with which a j*ob provides a variety of things that interest the respondent* (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time). A 6-item scale measures *job autonomy*. The scale is the averaged responses to the following questions about a respondent's job: (1) "How often do you have to initiate things, such as coming up with your own ideas, or figuring out on your own what needs to be done?" (2) "How often do you have a choice in deciding how you do your tasks at work?" (3) "How often do you have a choice in deciding what tasks you do at work?" (4) "How often do you have a say in decisions about your work?," (5) "How often do you have a say in planning your work environment, that is, how your workplace is arranged or how things are organized?" and (6) "How often do you control the amount of time you spend on tasks?" Responses are coded: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time (scale reliability = 0.86).

Certain job requirements may discourage pro-work behaviors, including not having *enough time to get everything done at work* in the past year (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time), *exposure to risk* of accidents or injuries on the job (over the past 10 years) (1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = some, 4 = a lot), and a respondent's perception that different people or groups at *work demand things that are too hard to combine* as well as the frequency with which a respondent has *too many demands* made on him or her (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time). Models include a dichotomous variable coded "1" if a respondent reported having any s*erious ongoing stress at work*—things like consistently extreme work demands, major changes, or uncertainties that most people would consider highly stressful in the last year—and "0" if not. Another dichotomous variable taps *problems with coworkers*

[6] MIDUS II respondents answered questions about the frequency of stopping paid work to care for children, cutting back work hours to care for children, working longer hours to meet the needs of children, and switching jobs to be more available to children. I did not analyze these variables because a respondent was asked if he or she had *ever* engaged in the behaviors while raising children. Not restricting these behaviors to a particular time introduces bias. For example, a respondent who engaged in these behaviors when their children were infants would answer "yes" even if they do not presently engage in such behaviors. Nor does the question structure allow an investigation of how current job attributes affect pro-work behaviors because I only have data about a respondent's current job.

and is coded "1" if a respondent reported having serious ongoing problems getting along with someone at work and "0" if not.

Job skill requirements may affect pro-work behaviors so I capture job skill requirements with two variables. The first is a 10-item scale denoting the amount of *physical skill requirements* of the job, including the frequency with which a job requires: a lot of physical effort; lifting loads weighing 50 or more pounds; lifting loads weighing between 10 and 49 lb; lifting loads weighing up to 10 lb; crouching, stopping, kneeling; standing for long periods of time; using stairs or includes; walking; sitting for long periods of time; and reaching (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time) (scale reliability = 0.91). A second measures the frequency with which a respondent's job demands a *high level of skill or expertise* (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some of the time, 4 = most of the time, 5 = all of the time).

2.4.3. Family/home responsibilities and attributes

Models include a continuous variable indicating the *time (number of hours) a respondent spends doing household chores* in a typical week. Models control for the *number of children under 18 at hom*e along with a set of dichotomous variables indicating the *age of these children* (coded "1" if children are under one, 1–4, or 5–17). Models also include a set of dichotomous variables denoting a respondent's *marital status* coded "1" if a respondent is married or cohabiting and "0" if they are separated/divorced/widowed, or never married (never married is the reference category). A 4-item scale taps *family strain*. Scale items include the frequency a respondent reports that: (a) family members make too many demands; (b) family members criticize [the respondent]; (c) family members let [the respondent] down; and (d) family members get on [respondent's] nerves (scale reliability = 0.78). Responses are coded: 1 = often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely, 4 = never. Finally, a 2-item scale measures *home fulfillment*. Scale items include the frequency with which a respondent reports that: (a) others respect his or her work at home and (b) he or she feels pride about work at home (scale reliability = 0.81). Responses are coded 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = some, 4 = a lot.

2.4.4. Household resources

Models include a measure of *household income* created by summing a respondent's, spouse's (if present), and other family member's (if present) personal earnings income, pension income, social security income (top coded at $300,000). Models include a continuous variable measuring *spouse work hours* (coded "0" if a respondent's spouse is unemployed or if he or she does not have a spouse). Finally, models include a dichotomous variable coded "1" if a respondent has any *co-residing adult children in the household* and "0" if not.

2.5. Methods of analysis

I estimate ordered logistic regression models for six of the seven outcomes measured with an ordered response and ordinary least squares regression models for the work effort outcome, a continuous variable ranging from 0 to 10. The MIDUS dataset contains five post-stratification weights that compensate for inequality selection probabilities, non-response, and telephone non-coverage (see "Documentation of post-stratification weights" page 1). Following the advice of Winship and Radbill (1994), I present weighted descriptive statistics but control for sample stratification parameters (respondent race/ethnicity, age, education, and sex) rather than employ sampling weights to avoid biasing the standard errors in the regression models. Moreover, weighting the sample does not substantially alter the findings for six of the seven outcomes. Multicollinearity is not a problem; all VIFs are less than 10 with an average VIF of less than 2.18 for the seven models.

3. Results

I present (weighted) descriptive statistics for mothers, fathers, male and female non-parents in Table 1. My discussion focuses on the outcome variables, first comparing mothers to fathers and than parents to non-parents.

3.1. Bivariate results

3.1.1. Mothers versus fathers

Mothers report the significantly higher levels of work effort but similar levels of (lack of) reduced job effort due to home responsibilities as fathers. Mothers have significantly higher levels of job engagement than fathers. Parents of both sexes report similar levels of work intensity, home life relaxation for job preparedness, and home life disruptions to sleep needed to perform their job. Mothers and fathers are not different in the frequency with which they work harder at their job because of home needs, a surprising similarity given this outcome embodies cultural expectations of fathers.

3.1.2. Parents versus non-parents

Mothers report greater work effort levels than female non-parents, but similar levels as male non-parents. Compared to mothers, female non-parents report the same frequency in reduction of job effort due to home responsibilities. Mothers and male non-parents are not different on this outcome. Mothers and female and male non-parents report similar levels of job engagement. Mothers report significantly higher levels of work intensity than childless women but mothers and childless

Table 1
Weighted means for full-time employed mothers, fathers, non-parents, MIDUS II.

	Mothers	Fathers	Female non-parent	Male non-parent
Work effort	8.50*,^ (2.32)	7.92 (2.22)	7.64 (2.75)	8.20 (2.17)
Home responsibilities (do not) reduce job effort 1 = all of the time, 5 = never	4.07 (0.90)	4.00% (0.75)	4.24 (0.76)	3.99 (0.68)
Job engagement	3.05* (0.97)	2.83 (0.88)	2.95 (0.92)	2.94 (0.83)
Work intensity	3.83! (0.83)	3.72 (0.81)	3.63 (0.88)	3.54 (0.70)
Home life helps relax and ready for job 1 = never, 5 = all of the time	3.76 (0.99)	3.76 (0.95)	3.88 (0.90)	3.68 (0.97)
Home (does not) interrupt sleep needed to do job 1 = all of the time, 5 = never	3.76! (0.92)	3.76 (0.74)	3.85 (0.86)	4.00 (0.71)
Work harder at job because of home needs 1 = never, 5 = all of the time	3.28 (1.21)	3.16 (1.17)	2.91 (1.16)	3.11 (1.06)
Individual attributes and abilities				
Work experience (in years)	31.06^,! (12.79)	30.41~ (12.76)	28.48 (12.82)	28.11 (12.74)
Education				
Less than HS degree	0.06^,! (0.02)	0.12~,% (0.03)	0.00	0.00
HS/GED	0.35^,! (0.02)	0.25~,% (0.03)	0.08 (0.04)	0.13 (0.05)
AA	0.07 (0.01)	0.06 (0.01)	0.14 (0.05)	0.14 (0.04)
Some college	0.20 (0.02)	0.18 (0.02)	0.24 (0.06)	0.24 (0.05)
BA/some graduate training	0.17^,! (0.02)	0.20 (0.04)	0.29 (0.06)	0.29 (0.06)
MA	0.12* (0.02)	0.06% (0.01)	0.19 (0.05)	0.10 (0.03)
Professional degree/PhD	0.03! (0.16)	0.03~ (0.18)	0.06 (0.18)	0.10 (0.25)
Age (in years)	48.53*, ^,! (12.93)	46.96~ (12.41)	45.98 (13.09)	44.80 (12.57)
Non-Hispanic white	0.86 (0.33)	0.89 (0.31)	0.88 (0.31)	0.91 (0.31)
Weekly work hours	41.04*,! (6.84)	45.50~,% (8.29)	41.37† (8.12)	43.71 (6.53)
Job/workplace characteristics				
Job stability	4.49 (0.98)	4.44 (0.94)	4.53 (0.93)	4.52 (0.82)
Good opportunities	1.84 (0.87)	1.77 (0.83)	1.70 (0.81)	1.89 (0.86)
Job offers learning opportunities	3.38 (0.91)	3.24 (0.85)	3.34 (0.76)	3.38 (0.76)
Job provides interesting things	3.53 (1.08)	3.39 (1.01)	3.42 (1.02)	3.65 (1.07)
Job autonomy	3.64 (0.84)	3.72 (0.80)	3.64 (0.63)	3.65 (0.88)
Supervisory control	0.45^ (0.49)	0.51% (0.50)	0.32 (0.46)	0.46 (0.50)
High skill required	3.65* (1.09)	3.91 (0.97)	3.86 (1.01)	3.76 (0.92)
Occupation				
Professional/exec.	0.43* (0.49)	0.34 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)	0.34 (0.48)
Technician and related support	0.06 (0.22)	0.03~ (0.19)	0.04 (0.26)	0.11 (0.28)
Sales	0.08 (0.26)	0.05% (0.27)	0.10 (0.26)	0.12 (0.28)
Administrative support	0.25*,! (0.44)	0.08% (0.25)	0.20† (0.41)	0.08 (0.30)
Service	0.09 (0.26)	0.06 (0.23)	0.11† (0.28)	0.04 (0.27)
Farming, forestry, and fishing	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.10)	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)
Precision production, crafts, and repair	0.03*,! (0.14)	0.23% (0.38)	0.04† (0.17)	0.16 (0.31)
Operator, laborer, and military	0.06*,! (0.22)	0.20% (0.33)	0.08† (0.23)	0.14 (0.31)
Too many work demands	2.92 (0.99)	2.85 (0.92)	2.71 (0.90)	2.84 (0.77)
Job physical skill requirements	2.58*,! (0.77)	2.99% (0.81)	2.51† (0.66)	2.91 (0.79)
Exposure to risk	1.90*,! (1.00)	2.71% (0.94)	1.98† (0.96)	2.62 (1.11)
Enough time to do everything	3.34 (0.98)	3.31 (1.02)	3.39 (0.85)	3.35 (0.87)
Work demands don't combine	2.62* (0.94)	2.79 (0.94)	2.60 (0.86)	2.68 (0.88)
Coworker problems	0.13 (0.31)	0.11 (0.31)	0.18 (0.37)	0.15 (0.34)
Work stress	0.51 (0.50)	0.45% (0.49)	0.64† (0.50)	0.42 (0.50)
Family/household measures				
# of children under 18 in home	2.47 (1.65)	2.62 (1.48)	–	–
Age of children in home				
Children under one	0.38* (0.45)	0.50 (0.48)	–	–
Children 1–4	0.13 (0.29)	0.13 (0.30)	–	–
Children 5–17	0.37* (0.45)	0.28 (0.44)	–	–
Marital status				
Married/cohabiting	0.67*, ^,! (0.48)	0.83~,% (0.39)	0.32 (0.46)	0.34 (0.49)
Divorced/widowed/separated	0.29*,! (0.47)	0.15 (0.38)	0.19 (0.44)	0.18 (0.39)
# of hours doing chores/week	11.85* (13.13)	8.67 (7.54)	9.96 (3.51)	10.23 (1.65)
Family strain	2.16 (0.63)	2.10 (0.60)	2.07 (0.64)	2.14 (0.67)
Home fulfillment	3.05* (0.78)	3.30~,% (0.71)	2.93 (0.85)	3.02 (0.88)
Household resources				

Table 1 (*continued*)

	Mothers	Fathers	Female non-parent	Male non-parent
Household income ($)	84663.91 (39040.38)	90629.16[%] (30332.29)	74187.83 (7586.34)	80912.27 (6907.06)
Spouse work hours	24.52[^,!] (23.98)	25.66[~,%] (19.12)	12.01 (18.33)	9.79 (17.81)
Co-resident adult children	0.32[*] (0.54)	0.22 (0.46)	–	–
n	832	916	165	165

[*] Mother and father difference significant at $p < .05$.
[†] Male and female non-parent difference significant at $p < .05$.
[^] Mother and female non-parent difference significant at $p < .05$.
[~] Father and male non-parent difference significant at $p < .05$.
[!] Mother and male non-parent difference significant at $p < .05$.
[%] Father and female non-parent difference significant at $p < .05$.

men exert similar levels of work intensity. Mothers and non-parents of both sexes report that their home life helps them relax for work. Mothers say that their home life more frequently disrupts the sleep they need to perform their job compared to male non-parents, but report a similar frequency of this outcome as childless women. Mothers say with similar frequency as male and female non-parents that they work harder on the job because of home needs. Fathers are similar to female and male non-parents on six of the seven pro-work behavior outcomes. Female non-parents report greater job engagement than fathers.

I now turn my attention to results from multivariate analyses assessing the effects of parental status for women and men, individual characteristics, job/workplace characteristics, home/family characteristics, and household support on the seven outcomes. Recall, "mother" is the omitted category so the coefficient on "father" is the effect of fatherhood on the outcome compared to effect of being a mother, the "male non-parent" coefficient represents the effect of being a male non-parent on the outcome compared to the effect of being a mother, etc. To streamline the presentation of results of nested models for seven outcomes and over thirty control variables, Table 2 include a reduced form of the multivariate models.[7] I present coefficients for the primary independent variables and when significant, the main effect (and multiplicative term) of variables that moderate the effect of the gender-parent status independent variables on outcomes. Coefficients for control variables are included in models, but not shown in tables. Full model results are available upon request from the author.

3.2. Multivariate results

I have presented results to reflect the extent to which they shed light on three key cultural biases about employed mothers and fathers: (1) expectations about their work effort, (2) whether their home life is a distraction at work, and (3) their motivation to work because of family.

3.2.1. Work effort

Work effort. Looking first at the baseline model (Model A) including only a measure of parenthood-gender status, we see that fathers and childless men engage in less work effort than mothers. The relationship holds net of controls for individual characteristics (Model B). Net of controls for individual characteristics and job characteristics, mothers and childless men report similar levels of work effort but fathers report less effort than mothers (see Model C). The significant difference between mothers and fathers goes away with the addition of measures of family/home responsibilities and attributes (Model D). In analyses not shown, I added the number of children in the household, a variable used to create the parenthood measures, and children age controls separately to ensure these measures are not driving results. Their addition does not explain the mother–father significant differences. Mothers and fathers report similar levels of work effort in the full model (Model E). Father's compared to mother's work effort depends on the presence of children ages 5–17 in the home, however. Fathers with school-aged children report lower effort than mothers while fathers without school-aged children report similar work effort as mothers. Net of all controls, mothers engage in similar work effort levels as non-parents of both sexes. Results from statistical tests (not shown) reveal that the net effect of fatherhood on work effort is no different than male or female non-parents.

Home responsibilities (do not) reduce job effort. In the baseline model (Model A), fathers, childless women, and childless men are not significantly different than mothers in terms of the frequency with which they report having reduce job effort due to home responsibilities. The pattern of non-difference continues, for the most part, with the addition of individual

[7] Nested models are appropriate in this case because if motherhood or fatherhood is endogenous to pro-work behaviors, simultaneously controlling for job/workplace characteristics and parenthood will mask the causal order. To illustrate, simultaneous controls for job/workplace characteristics cannot distinguish if mothers are in "bad" jobs that do not elicit pro-work behaviors *or* if mothers exert less effort and, subsequently, get "bad" jobs. In the models I present in Table 2, the addition of job/workplace characteristics does not change the parenthood-outcome relationship in six of seven outcomes. In the one exception (the outcome measuring the extent to which home life relaxes a respondent for work), mother-father differences that become significant (at the $p < .05$ level) with the addition of job/workplace characteristics are no longer statistically significant in the full model.

Table 2
Models predicting seven pro-work behaviors and conditions, MIDUS II.

	A	B	C	D	E
Work effort					
Work effort[a]					
Father	−0.40*** (0.10)	−0.61*** (0.11)	−0.47*** (0.12)	−0.14 (0.15)	0.01 (0.18)
Female non-parent	−0.29 (0.170	−0.20 (0.20)	−0.20 (0.19)	−0.17 (0.36)	−0.26 (0.42)
Male non-parent	−0.59*** (0.18)	−0.54** (0.12)	−0.211(0.20)	−0.35 (0.37)	−0.37 (0.44)
Children ages 5–17				0.03 (0.22)	0.21 (0.29)
Father × children ages 5–17				−0.47* (0.22)	−0.70*** (0.26)
n	1650	1591	1321	1012	787
Adjusted *r*-square	0.01	0.04	0.18	0.20	0.20
Home responsibilities (do not) reduce job effort[b]					
Father	−0.19 (0.11)	−0.03 (0.12)	−0.04 (0.14)	−0.15 (0.17)	−0.13 (0.19)
Female non-parent	0.21 (0.18)	0.61** (0.21)	0.49* (0.23)	−0.31 (0.44)	−0.03 (0.54)
Male non-parent	0.01 (0.18)	0.41 (0.22)	0.47 (0.24)	−0.32 (0.45)	0.07 (0.55)
n	1597	1544	1324	1012	787
Pseudo *r*-square	0.002	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.10
Home as distraction at work					
Job engagement[b]					
Father	−0.43*** (0.10)	−0.57*** (0.11)	−0.56*** (0.14)	−0.47** (0.16)	−0.36* (0.18)
Female non-parent	0.11 (0.18)	−0.04 (0.21)	0.07 (0.24)	0.71 (0.44)	0.68 (0.51)
Male non-parent	−0.40* (0.18)	−0.66** (0.22)	−0.44 (0.24)	0.09 (0.44)	−0.02 (0.52)
n	1598	1545	1325	1013	788
Pseudo *r*-square	0.01	0.02	0.10	0.10	0.10
Work intensity[b]					
Father	−0.35*** (0.10)	−0.50*** (0.12)	−0.63*** (0.15)	−0.63*** (0.17)	−0.62** (0.20)
Female non-parent	−0.04 (0.18)	−0.29 (0.21)	−0.30 (0.24)	0.21 (0.45)	0.30 (0.54)
Male non-parent	−0.64*** (0.18)	−0.88*** (0.22)	−0.98*** (0.26)	−0.57 (0.46)	−0.56 (0.57)
n	1897	1544	1325	1013	788
Pseudo *r*-square	0.01	0.02	0.17	0.17	0.19
Home life relaxes and readies respondent for job[b]					
Father	0.13 (0.10)	0.15 (0.11)	0.29* (0.14)	0.01 (0.16)	−0.02 (0.19)
Female non-parent	0.33 (0.18)	0.64** (0.21)	0.51* (0.23)	0.10 (0.45)	−0.07 (0.52)
Male non-parent	−0.18 (0.18)	0.04 (0.21)	0.11 (0.24)	−0.45 (0.46)	−0.77 (0.54)
n	1592	1539	1321	1010	785
Pseudo *r*-square	0.002	0.01	0.06	0.12	0.13
Home (does not) interrupt sleep needed to do job[b]					
Father	0.33** (0.10	0.41*** (0.12)	0.48*** (0.14)	0.18 (0.16)	0.21 (0.19)
Female non-parent	0.21 (0.18)	0.60** (0.21)	0.49* (0.24)	−0.40 (0.45)	−0.28 (0.53)
Male non-parent	0.48** (0.18)	0.85*** (0.21)	0.78** (0.24)	0.07 (0.45)	0.20 (0.54)
n	1594	1541	1321	1009	784
Pseudo *r*-square	0.004	0.02	0.05	0.10	0.11
Motivation to work because of family					
Providing for home results in harder work at job[b]					
Father	0.11 (0.09)	0.04 (0.11)	−0.04 (0.13)	0.05 (0.15)	−0.14 (0.17)
Female non-parent	−0.26 (0.17)	−0.46* (0.20)	−0.63** (0.22)	−0.8 (0.40)	−0.70 (0.49)
Male non-parent	−0.38* (0.17)	−0.55** (0.21)	−0.66** (0.23)	0.02 (0.43)	−0.39 (0.52)
n	1588	1536	1320	1008	784
Pseudo *r*-square	0.002	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.05

Model B adds to Model A measures of race/ethnicity, age, age^2, work experience, education. Model C adds to Model B measures of occupation, supervisory control, weekly work hours, job stability, learning opportunities on the job, opportunity availability on job, job provision of interesting tasks, job autonomy, job exposure to risk, extent to which job allows time enough to do all job tasks, extent to which job allows combination of work tasks, work demands, work stress, problems with coworkers, job physical skill requirements, and requirement of high skill on the job. Model D adds to Model C measures of weekly hours doing household chores, number of children in the home, ages of children in the home, marital status, family strain, and home fulfillment. Model E adds to Model D measures of household income, spouse work hours, and the presence of co-resident adult children.

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$ (one-tailed test).
[a] OLS.
[b] Ordered Logistic regression.

characteristics (Model B), job characteristics (Model C), family/home responsibilities and attributes (Model D), and household resources (Model E). Net of all controls, mothers are similar to fathers and non-parents on the frequency with which they report that their responsibilities at home reduce the effort they can devote to the job. Results from statistical tests (not shown) reveal that fathers and non-parents are no different on this outcome.

3.2.2. Home as distraction at work

The next four outcomes tap cultural biases about the extent to which home life does—or does not—distract or take away from one's job.

Job engagement. Baseline model (Model A) results reveal that fathers and childless men are less engaged in work than mothers. The addition of controls for individual characteristics (Model B) does not significantly change these relationships. Controls for job characteristics added in Model C mediate the relationship between childless men and mothers, but fathers still report less work engagement than mothers net of this additional set of controls. Fathers remain less engaged in work than mothers net of the addition of both family/home responsibilities and attributes (Model D) and household resources (Model E) to the model. Mothers' job engagement is no different than that of non-parents net of all controls. Analyses (not shown) reveal that fathers are similar to male non-parents in the final model (Model E) but that childless women report significantly greater job engagement than fathers net of all controls.

Work intensity. Fathers and male non-parents work less intensively than mothers absent any controls (Model A), net of individual characteristics (Model B), and net of job characteristics (Model C). The addition of family/household characteristics in Model D mediates the relationship between childless men and mothers, but the significant difference in work intensity between fathers and mothers remains with the addition of family/home responsibilities and attributes and household resources (see Models D and E). Fathers are not significantly different from non-parents of either sex on levels of work intensity.

Home life relaxes and readies respondent for the job. In the baseline model, we observe no differences between non-parents, fathers, and mothers (Model A). The addition of individual-level characteristics in Model B reveals a significant difference between mothers and childless women; childless women say their home life more frequently relaxes them for their jobs than mothers. In Model C, which adds job characteristics, fathers and childless women emerge as being significantly different from mothers. Both report greater frequency of relaxation brought on by home life. The addition of family characteristics (Model D) mediates this relationship. Finally, net of all controls (Model E), mothers are similar to fathers and non-parents on the frequency with which they report that their home life relaxes and readies them for the next day's work. Fathers are not significantly different than male or female non-parents on this outcome.

(Lack of) sleep disruptions from home. In the baseline model (Model A), fathers and childless men report less frequent sleep disruptions from home than mothers (the outcome is coded so positive coefficients on predictor variables reflect a more positive pro-work condition). Model B adds measures of individual characteristics to the model and with their addition, we observe a significant difference between mothers and all others; fathers, childless women, and childless men are all *less* likely to have sleep disruptions from home than mothers. The addition of job characteristics responsibility measures in Model C does not change these relationships. However, with the addition of family/home responsibilities and attribute measures (Model D), the significant difference between mothers and fathers and non-parents goes away. In analyses not shown, I added the set of household resource controls to the model predicting sleep disruptions one at a time and found that the addition of the measure tapping family strain (a scale tapping the frequency of family demands, family criticism, being let down my family members, and family members getting on the respondent's nerves) explains away the significant father–mother difference. When similarly situated mothers and fathers have similar family environments, mothers' sleep interruptions are no greater than father's. Finally, net of all controls (see Model E), mothers are similar to fathers and non-parents on the frequency with which they report that their home activities and chores prevent them from getting the amount of sleep needed to perform their job. Fathers and non-parents of either sex are no different on this outcome.

3.2.3. Motivation to work because of family

The final outcome directly tests the cultural stereotype of the male breadwinner; that family motivates fathers—but not mothers—to work harder on the job.

Providing for home results in working harder at job. Baseline estimates (Model A) demonstrate no significant difference between fathers, childless women, and mothers on this outcome. Without controls, childless men report less frequent engagement in working harder on the job because of home than mothers. In the presence of individual-level characteristic controls (Model B), fathers remain no different from mothers, but childless women and men report less of this behavior than mothers. The relationships hold in Model C when job characteristics are held constant. With the addition of family/home responsibilities and characteristic controls to the model (Model D), the significant difference between non-parents and mothers goes away. Net of all controls (Model E), mothers are similar to fathers and non-parents on the frequency with which they report that providing for what is needed at home makes them work harder on the job. Fathers are no different than female and male non-parents in their report of having home needs make them work harder on the job.

In models not shown, I estimated statistical interactions between parenthood and individual attributes, job/workplace characteristics, home/family characteristics, and household resources. Aside from the interactions I report above (with the age children in the household), none were statistically significant. Non-significant interactions suggest that the pro-work behaviors and conditions of mothers, fathers, and non-parents are not dependent upon levels of their individual characteristics, job features, family/home responsibilities and attributes, and household resources.

Statistical tests also reveal few differences in the effects of being a male versus female non-parent on the seven outcomes. In only two cases is there a difference: childless women report a marginally significantly greater frequency of work intensity and relaxation and readiness on the job because of the home than their childless male counterparts. By and large, though, gender and pro-work behaviors and conditions are unrelated among non-parents.

4. Discussion and conclusions

Do mothers report lower—and fathers greater—pro-work behaviors and conditions than parents of the opposite sex and non-parents? Despite mounting evidence of motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses at work, researchers have largely ignored gender differences in the effect of children on pro-work behaviors and conditions and when they have, they have broadly conceptualized pro-work behaviors and conditions. To better assess the question of mother's and father's positive workplace behaviors, one strategy is to these behavior and condition differences in mothers, fathers, and non-parents in a random sample of U.S. workers while controlling for a range of individual, job, and home factors that also affect these behaviors. This article used 2004–2006 MIDUS II data to conduct such an analysis. The multivariate results demonstrated that mothers and fathers are more similar than they are different on moment-to-moment pro-work behaviors. What is more, mothers' and fathers' pro-work behaviors and conditions are not different from those of male and female non-parents. In short, it appears that mothers can and do simultaneously value paid employment and motherhood (McQuillan et al., 2008).

The first set of outcomes shed light on biases about workers' effort; cultural biases expect mothers to put forth less of it at work. That mothers do not suggests they may have adapted their home demands to meet and sometimes even exceed their employers' needs, even though they spend more time doing household chores than fathers (see Table 1). With the data at hand, I cannot determine *how* mothers manage to do this. Nonetheless, I consider three possible explanations for the lack of mother–father differences in work effort. First, mothers' parenting skills at home may cross over into the workplace. The multitasking, task prioritizing, creativity, and interpersonal skills needed to raise a family and run a household promote efficiency, focus, and organization—skills highly prized in the workplace (Crittenden, 2004). That motherhood provides relevant "training" for paid work is not a new observation. A study of sixty professional women leaders reported that motherhood made them better executives (see Crittenden, 2004). Mothers may be drawing on the skills they use at home to help, rather than hurt, them at work. Fatherhood likely provides a training ground for men, but since they engage in less childcare and housework, on average, than mothers (see Bianchi, 2000), mothers gain more "experience" from home than fathers.

Second, others have concluded that women perceive that their employers hold them to a higher work standard than men (see Gorman and Kmec, 2007). Mothers, aware of negative stereotypes society and employers have of their commitment to work, might perceive this true to a greater extent. That is, mothers may sense that their employers hold them to a higher standard at work—even higher than even women without children. If women overestimate their employers' performance expectations, they may overcompensate at work by exerting greater effort to avoid being sanctioned by their employers.

Third, mothers may behave differently than fathers and non-parents both at home and on the job in order to maintain high levels of energy and effort at work. For example, women may reduce their standards for housework relative to their standards prior to becoming a parent in order to conserve the energy they need to put forth effort on the job. At work, mothers may delegate tasks far more than others to maintain high effort and energy levels. Or, knowing their family and home demands their attention, mothers may work wisely, staying on task and wasting little time on the job so they can complete job tasks while at work (see Crittenden, 2004). Alternatively, mothers may give up leisure time (Maume, 2006b) to avoid having their home demands detract from their effort levels at work.

The second set of outcomes gauges the extent to which home is a distraction at work. Cultural biases expect mothers to be distracted by their family responsibilities and certainly not for her home life to relax and ready her for work. Results demonstrate that compared to fathers, mothers report with greater frequency that they are often so involved at work they forget about everything else, even the time. Mothers also work more intensively than fathers. Fathers and male non-parents report that their home life does not interrupt the sleep they need to do their job as much as mothers. However, the addition of controls for family and household characteristics explains the significant difference between mothers and fathers and male non-parents on this outcome implying that mothers get less sleep because they have children but when they have comparable home lives, fathers and mothers are no different in terms of sleep loss. Mothers also report that their home life relaxes and readies them for work equally as much as fathers' home lives do. That mothers are not distracted at work by their home lives suggests that motherhood and employment need not be in competition (see McQuillan et al., 2008). In other words, employed mothers can perform on the job without, as employers fear, being mentally at home with her children.

The final outcome—motivation to work because of family—taps stereotypes of employed fathers; cultural biases expects that family responsibilities motivate fathers, but certainly not mothers, on the job. That mothers and fathers are equally motivated to work hard on their jobs to provide for home suggests that the "burden" of breadwinning is no longer a man's burden; hardly surprising given mothers' widespread entry into the labor market and the increasing number of households that rely on two incomes to cover living expenses.

Finally, the comparison of parents to non-parents of the same sex reveals the extent to which gender versus parenthood affects pro-work behaviors and conditions and, in turn, what motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses reveal about gender and work. Net of all controls, fathers exhibit similar pro-work behaviors and conditions as childless women (on six of seven outcomes) and childless men. Any significant difference between mothers and non-parents of either sex in pro-work behaviors and conditions is explained by the addition of controls for family/home responsibilities and attributes (Model D). If the pro-work behaviors and conditions of non-parents, mothers, and fathers are virtually indistinguishable (or, in some cases favor mothers), the penalties for motherhood reviewed in the introduction reinforce the idea that sexism at work manifests itself in a subtle fashion; as judgments of mothers versus fathers, not as women versus men (see Fuegen

et al., 2004). This means that it to reduce gender equality at work will require the implementation of policies whose goals go beyond reducing gender discrimination. Employers will need to implement policies that specifically ban differential treatment of workers based on their care-giving responsibilities, including positive preferential treatment of fathers (i.e., allowing fathers, but not mothers, greater options for flexible scheduling or assuming that absent fathers are working but absent mothers are caregiving). Employers will also need to challenge the persistent workplace culture that still views men and fathers as "ideal" workers and motherhood as incompatible with paid work (see Kelly et al., 2010).

Although this study's findings demonstrate little to no gender difference in parental status in pro-work behavior and condition outcomes (and no difference between mothers and non-parents or, for the most part, fathers and non-parents), the study's limitations should be noted. First, the data lack a measure of worker productivity or workplace performance. Ideally, models should examine whether mothers, fathers, and non-parents differ in their capacity to perform and ability to produce work outcomes. Unfortunately, I know of no dataset of a large, random sample of workers with adequate measures of work performance or productivity (see Kalist, 2008; Wallace and Young, 2008 for studies of parent productivity differences in small, unique samples). Given the subjectivity of both productivity and performance, potential bias in both self- and employer-reports of both, and the fact that productivity and performance vary across jobs, this limitation is likely to continue to trouble researchers.

Second, non-parents, fathers, and mothers may misreport pro-work behaviors. Given cultural biases that expect men to be "ideal" workers, childless men and fathers may overstate their pro-work dimensions. Given cultural expectations that fathers must support their families, overstatement of pro-work dimensions might be even greater among fathers. For women, the direction of misreport is more ambiguous. Women without children may feel some need to downplay their pro-work dimensions to avoid punishment for not conforming to employers' stereotype of them as non-"ideal" but on the other hand, childless women may overstate dimensions of pro-work if they do not want to be penalized as mothers are. Employed mothers face a host of criticisms from employed childless women (see Kelly et al., 2010) and non-employed mothers (see Peskowitz, 2005). Consequently, mothers may *under* report pro-work behaviors because they wish to avoid a "bad mother," label by seeming too dedicated to the workplace. On the other hand, employed mothers, aware of stereotypes that they are non-competent and non-work oriented (see Correll et al., 2007), may *overstate* pro-work behaviors to avoid backlash from coworkers and employers who buy into the stereotypes. I have no reason to suspect one type of bias over another.

Despite these limitations, this study has added to the body of evidence assessing gender differences in parent's work role performance and serves as a starting point for work that incorporates measures of worker productivity and workplace arrangements. This study measured pro-work behaviors and conditions with a series of variables, including work effort, work intensity, job engagement, and four ways in which one's home life either enhances or does not detract from work. Future researchers have several challenges. The first is to assess if mothers, fathers, and non-parents differ on additional workplace behaviors and conditions, namely job productivity. High levels of productivity are, arguably, what employers seek most from their employees but scholars have yet to study productivity differences between mothers and fathers for a broad sample of workers. A second challenge is to uncover the workplace contextual factors that might moderate the relationship between pro-work behaviors and parenthood (Bielby and Bielby, 2002). In particular, we should pay close attention to how the gender label of the job task and job sex composition might moderate the parenthood-work behavior relationship. Both the gender label and sex composition of a job shape a worker's perception of what is "typical" work effort or dedication (see Kmec and Gorman, 2010). Finally, future research should identify what organizational factors impact employers' evaluations of mothers, fathers, and non-parents. In other words, do employers in workplaces that offer alternative work scheduling have different expectations about parents' productivity and commitment (see Kelly et al., 2010)? The growing body of research that investigates these questions will inform employers' perceptions and expectations of working parents and mothers' choices as they pursue their careers.

Finally, I turn to the question I posed in the article's title: are motherhood penalties and fatherhood bonuses warranted? I find no behavioral reasons for such treatment of mothers and fathers in the workplace. Employers are incorrect in their assumptions that mothers will put in less at work than men or be distracted by thoughts of home and children. So while women may exit the labor force more frequently than fathers after becoming parents (Kaufman and Uhlenberg, 2000) and, on average, work fewer hours than their father counterparts, what mothers do at work is comparable to non-parents and fathers. Knowing this, the focus of employers' policy efforts should be making employment more attractive (i.e., flexible) to caregivers—especially mothers—not on eliciting control over the work behaviors of women, "mommy-tracking" women into jobs with less organizational salience, or steering women into less meaningful careers if they become mothers.

Acknowledgment

I thank Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson for her thorough comments.

References

Acker, J., 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, and bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. Gender & Society 4, 139–158.
Allison, P., 2001. Missing Data. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Amuedo-Dorantes, C., Kimmel, J., 2005. The motherhood wage gap for women in the United States: the importance of college and fertility delay. Review of Economics of the Household 3, 17–48.

Anderson, D.J., Binder, M., Krause, K., 2003. The motherhood wage penalty revisited: experience, heterogeneity, work effort, and work-schedule flexibility. Industrial Labor Relations Review 56, 273–294.
Barrett, G. 2007. All We are Saying. New York Times. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/23/weekinreview/23buzzwords.html> (retrieved 30.04.10).
Bianchi, S.M., 2000. Maternal employment and time with children: dramatic change or surprising continuity? Demography 37, 401–414.
Bielby, D.D., Bielby, W.T., 1984. Work commitment, sex role attitudes, and women's employment. American Sociological Review 49, 234–247.
Bielby, D.D., Bielby, W.T., 1988. She works hard for the money: sex differences in allocation of effort to work and family. American Journal of Sociology 93, 1031–1059.
Bielby, D.D., 1992. Commitment to work and family. Annual Review of Sociology 18, 281–302.
Bielby, Denise D., Bielby, William T., 2002. Telling stores about gender and effort. In: Guillén, M., Collins, R., England, P., Meyer, M. (Eds.), The New Economic Sociology. Russell Sage, New York, pp. 193–217.
Blair-Loy, M., 2003. Competing Devotions: Career and Family among Women Executives. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Blair-Loy, M., Wharton, A.S., 2004. Mothers in finance: surviving and thriving. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 596, 151–171.
Breen, R., 1996. Regression Models: Censored, Sample Selected, or Truncated Data. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Brockner, J., Grover, S., Reed, T.F., Dewitt, R.L., 1992. Layoffs, job security and survivors' work effort: evidence of an inverted U relationship. Academy of Management Journal 35, 413–425.
Brown, S.P., Leigh, T.W., 1996. A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology 81, 358–368.
Budig, M., England, P., 2001. The wage penalty for motherhood. American Sociological Review 66, 204–225.
Budig, M., Hodges, M., 2010. Differences in disadvantage: variation in the motherhood penalty across white women's earnings distribution. American Sociological Review 75, 705–728.
Correll, S., Benard, S., Paik, I., 2007. Getting a job? Is there a motherhood penalty? American Journal of Sociology 112, 1297–1338.
Crittenden, A., 2001. The Price of Motherhood: Why the Most Important Job in the World is Still the Least Valued. Metropolitan Books, New York.
Crittenden, A., 2004. If You've Raised Kids, You Can Manage Anything: Leadership begins at Home. Gotham Books, New York.
Crosby, F.J., Williams, J.L., Biernat, M., 2004. The maternal wall. Journal of Social Issues 60, 675–682.
Cuddy, A.J.C., Fiske, S.T., Glick, P., 2004. When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. Journal of Social Issues 60, 701–718.
Cunningham, M., 2008. Changing attitudes toward the male breadwinner, female homemaker family model: influences of women's employment and education over the lifecourse. Social Forces 87, 299–323.
Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., Nachreiner, F., Schaufeli, W., 2001. The job demands-job resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology 86, 499–512.
Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J., Donaldson, S.I., 2001. The effects of perceived discrimination on grievances, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior. Human Resource Development Quarterly 12, 53–72.
Etaugh, C., Folger, D., 1998. Perceptions of parents whose work and parenting behaviors deviate from role expectations. Sex Roles 39, 215–223.
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2007. Enforcement Guidance: Unlawful Disparate Treatment of Workers with Caregiving Responsibilities. <http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/caregiving.html> (retrieved 12.06.10).
Firth, M., 1982. Sex discrimination in job opportunities for women. Sex Roles 8, 891–901.
Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., Deaux, K., 2004. Mothers and fathers in the workplace: how gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related characteristics. Journal of Social Issues 60, 737–754.
Fox, M.L., Dwyer, D.J., Ganster, D., 1993. Effects of stressful job demands and control on physiological and attitudinal outcomes in a hospital setting. Academy of Management Journal 26, 289–318.
Ganster, D.C., Fusilier, M.R., Mayes, B.T., 1986. Role of social support in experience of stress at work. Journal of Applied Psychology 71, 102–110.
Gorman, E., Kmec, J.A., 2007. We (have to) try harder: gender and workers' assessment of required work effort in Britain and the United States. Gender & Society 21, 828–856.
Gornick, J.C., Meyers, M.K., Ross, K.E., 1998. Public policies and the employment of mothers: a cross-national study. Social Science Quarterly 79, 35–54.
Hays, S., 1996. Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
Hirsh, E., Lyons, C.J., 2010. Perceiving discrimination on the job: legal consciousness, workplace context, and the construction of race discrimination. Law & Society Review 44, 269–298.
Hochschild, A.R., 1997. The Time Bind: When Work becomes Home and Home Becomes Work. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
Hodson, R., Sullivan, T., 1985. Totem or tyrant? Monopoly, regional, and local sector effects on worker commitment. Social Forces 63, 716–731.
Hundley, G., 2000. Male/female earnings differences in self-employment: the effects of marriage, children, and the household division of labor. Industrial Labor Relations Review 54, 95–114.
Hundley, G., 2001. Domestic division of labor and self/organizationally employed differences in job attitudes and earnings. Journal of Family Issues 26, 793–819.
Hyde, J.S., Else-Quest, N.M., Goldsmith, H.H., Biesanz, J.C., 2004. Children's temperament and behavior problems predict their employed mothers' work functioning. Child Development 75, 580–594.
Jacobs, J.A., Gerson, K., 2001. Overworked individuals or overworked families? Work and Occupations 28, 40–63.
Kalist, D.E., 2008. Does motherhood affect productivity, relative performance, and earnings? Journal of Labor Research 29, 219–235.
Kaufman, G., Uhlenberg, P., 2000. The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. Social Forces 78, 931–949.
Keene, J.R., Reynolds, J.R., 2005. The job costs of family demands: gender differences in negative family-to-work spillover. Journal of Family Issues 26, 275–299.
Kelly, E., Ammons, S.K., Chermack, K., Moen, P., 2010. Gendered challenge, gendered response: confronting the ideal worker norm in a white-collar organization. Gender & Society 24, 281–303.
Kmec, J.A., Gorman, E., 2010. Gender and discretionary work effort: evidence from the United States and Britain. Work and Occupations 37, 3–36.
Kobrynowicz, D., Biernat, Monica, 1997. Decoding subjective evaluations: how stereotypes provide shifting standards. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 33, 579–601.
Korenman, S., Neumark, D., 1992. Marriage, motherhood, and wages. The Journal of Human Resources XXXVII, 233–255.
Lambert, E., Hogan, N., 2009. The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent: a test of a causal model. Criminal Justice Review 34, 96–118.
Loughran, D.S., Zissimopoulos, J.M., 2007. Why wait? The effect of marriage and childbearing on the wages of men and women. Journal of Human Resources 44, 326–349.
Lundberg, S., Rose, E., 2000. Parenthood and the earnings of married men and women. Labour Economics 7, 689–710.
Marsden, P., Kalleberg, A., Cook, C., 1993. Gender differences in organizational commitment: influences of work positions and family roles. Work and Occupations 20, 368–390.
Maume, D.J., 2006a. Gender differences in restricting work efforts because of family responsibilities. Journal of Marriage and Family 68, 859–869.
Maume, D.J., 2006b. Gender differences in taking vacation time. Work and Occupations 33, 161–190.
McQuillan, J., Greil, A.L., Shreffler, K.M., Tichenor, V., 2008. The importance of motherhood among women in the contemporary United States. Gender & Society 22, 477–496.
Milkie, M.A., Peltola, P., 1999. Playing all the roles: gender and the work-family balancing act. Journal of Marriage and the Family 61, 476–490.
Perrewe, P., Ganster, D., 1991. The impact of job demands and behavioral control on experienced job stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior 10, 213–229.
Peskowitz, M., 2005. The Truth Behind the Mommy Wars: Who Decides What Makes a Good Mother? Seal Press, Berkeley, CA.
Ridgeway, C.L., Correll, S.J., 2004. Motherhood as a status characteristic. Journal of Social Issues 60, 683–700.

Rucci, A.J., Kim, S.P., Quinn, R.T., 1998. The employee–customer-profit-chain at Sears. Harvard Business Review 76, 83–97.
Ryff, C., Almeida, D.M., Ayanian, J.S., Carr, D.S., Cleary, P.D., Coe, C., Davidson, R., Krueger, R.F., Lachman, M.E., Marks, N.F., Mroczek, D.K., Seeman, T., Seltzer, M.M., Singer, B., Sloan, R.P., Tun, P.A., Weinstein, M., and Williams, D., 2007. Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS II), 2004–2006 [Computer file]. ICPSR04652-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-03-22. doi:10.3886/ICPSR04652.
Simon, R.W., 1995. Gender, multiple roles, role meaning, and mental health. Journal of Health and Social Behavior 36, 182–194.
Smith, C., Organ, D., Near, J., 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology 68, 653–663.
Still, M., 2005. Litigating the Maternal Wall: US Lawsuits Charging Discrimination against Workers with Family Responsibilities. Unpublished Manuscript University of California, Hastings College of Law. <http://www.uchastings.edu/site_files/WLL/FRDreport.pdf>.
Waldfogel, J., 1995. The price of motherhood: family status and women's pay in a young British cohort. Oxford Economic Papers 47, 584–610.
Waldfogel, J., 1998. Understanding the 'family gap' in pay for women with children. Journal of Economic Perspectives 12, 137–156.
Wallace, J.E., 2008. Parenthood and commitment to the legal profession: are mothers less committed than fathers? Journal of Family Economic Issues 29, 478–495.
Wallace, J.E., Young, M.C., 2008. Parenthood and productivity: a study of demands, resources, and family-friendly firms. Journal of Vocational Behavior 72, 110–122.
Williams, J., 2001. Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About It. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Williams, J., 2002. 'It's snowing down south': how to help mothers and avoid recycling the sameness/difference debate. Columbia Law Review 102, 812–833.
Winship, C., Radbill, L., 1994. Sampling weights and regression analysis. Sociological Methods & Research 23, 230–257.
Xie, J.L., Johns, G., 1995. Job scope and stress: can job scope be too high? Academy of Management Journal 38, 1288–1309.