

5-1-2012

Work to Live or Live to Work?: The Impact of Gender, Personal Resources, and National Policy on the Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Work Rewards in Post-Industrial Nations

Christy Haines Flatt

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Flatt, Christy Haines, "Work to Live or Live to Work?: The Impact of Gender, Personal Resources, and National Policy on the Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Work Rewards in Post-Industrial Nations" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5036.

<https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/5036>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.

WORK TO LIVE OR LIVE TO WORK? THE IMPACT OF GENDER, PERSONAL
RESOURCES, AND NATIONAL POLICY ON THE IMPORTANCE OF
INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC WORK REWARDS IN
POST-INDUSTRIAL NATIONS

By

Christy Haines Flatt

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Sociology
in the Department of Sociology

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 2012

Copyright 2012

By

Christy Haines Flatt

WORK TO LIVE OR LIVE TO WORK? THE IMPACT OF GENDER, PERSONAL
RESOURCES, AND NATIONAL POLICY ON THE IMPORTANCE OF
INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC WORK REWARDS IN
POST-INDUSTRIAL NATIONS

By

Christy Haines Flatt

Approved:

Kimberly Kelly
Assistant Professor of Sociology
(Co-Chair of Dissertation)

James D. Jones
Professor Emeritus of Sociology
(Co-Chair of Dissertation)

Harald E. Weiss
Assistant Professor of Sociology
(Committee Member)

Sarah Brauner-Otto
Assistant Professor of Sociology
(Committee Member)

Jeralynn S. Cossman
Professor and Interim Head
Department of Sociology
(Graduate Coordinator)

Gary L. Myers
Professor and Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

Name: Christy Haines Flatt

Date of Degree: May 12, 2012

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Sociology

Major Professors: Kimberly Kelly and James D. Jones

Title of Study: WORK TO LIVE OR LIVE TO WORK? THE IMPACT OF GENDER, PERSONAL RESOURCES, AND NATIONAL POLICY ON THE IMPORTANCE OF INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC WORK REWARDS IN POST-INDUSTRIAL NATIONS

Pages in Study: 117

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

This study focuses on the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards among women and men in 12 post-industrial nations in the Global North. Guiding my analyses was Esping-Andersen's theoretical framework and the following three main research questions: (1) how individual attributes and national policies influence the salience individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards; (2) how individual attributes and national policies differ from each other in relative magnitude as predictors of the value individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards; and (3) how individual attributes and national policies impact the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards differs by gender.

For the micro level analysis, I used data from the 2005 International Social Survey Program Work Orientation Module. The twelve countries included in the analysis are Australia, Denmark, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the United States. Macro level policy data are drawn from the 2005 Social Expenditure Database and maternity leave data are from the

2005 International Network on Leave Policy and Research. Analysis was performed using Stata regression with the cluster command.

While not all variables included in the model were statistically significant, the general hypotheses were supported with the following results: (1) micro level variables (education, income, and employment) and macro level variables (paid family leave and the percentage of GDP spent on childcare and pre-primary education) increased the importance individual's assign to intrinsic rewards; (2) the lack of human capital increases an individual's emphasis on extrinsic rewards; (3) while macro level variables have a far greater impact on the importance individuals assign to intrinsic work rewards, both micro and macro level factors are important for explaining the maximum possible variation in the importance individuals assign to intrinsic work rewards; and (4) gender does not change the value an individual assigns to intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. This study represents a new, more comprehensive approach to studying the relationships among micro-level factors, structural opportunities and constraints, intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards, and gender. A review of the literature shows no other studies of this scope.

DEDICATION

I dedicate my research to a number of individuals whose support has been extremely valuable. My family, Bill, Sydney, and Nicholas Flatt, Tom and Carol Haines, Peggy Davis, and Cathy Delisle who stood by me no matter what the challenge. Each person contributed their time and emotional support without which the completion of this project would not have been possible. I am especially grateful to my loving husband, Bill Flatt, who sacrificed his own goals to enable me to pursue my vision quest. In addition, I would like to thank my co-chairs, Kimberly Kelly and James Jones, who worked tirelessly continuously pushing my skills to a new level. I am thankful for their mentorship and that they believed in my ability. I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview.....	1
Statement and Significance of the Problem	4
Conceptual Framework.....	5
Methodology	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
History of the Study of Work.....	10
The Founding of Scientific Management and Human Development	11
The Growth of Quantitative Methods	13
The Rise of Critical Frameworks: Marxism and Feminism.....	14
Macro-Level Analyses of Work.....	16
The Future of the Sociology of Work—Integrating Micro and Macro Level Perspectives	17
Theoretical Perspectives: Nations as Context.....	18
Esping-Andersen Model	19
Social-democratic Nations	20
Conservative Nations	21
Liberal Nations.....	22
Limitations of the Esping-Andersen model	24
The Family and Child Policy Model.....	27
History and Definition of Terms.....	29
Work centrality	29
Summary	31
Job Values.....	32
Human Capital	32
Work Centrality across Disciplines	34
Human Capital, Work Centrality, and Intrinsic/Extrinsic Rewards	34

	Social Class.....	36
	Age.....	38
	Marginalized statuses.....	39
	Integrated Micro/Macro Analyses of Work Centrality and	
	Intrinsic/Extrinsic Rewards.....	40
	Negotiation of Gender Roles, Family, Work, and Work Centrality	44
	Psychological Well-Being and Work Centrality.....	45
	Work Centrality as a Commodity	47
	Substantive Gaps in the Literature and Methodological Short Comings.....	48
	Substantive Gaps.....	48
	Methodological Problems	51
	Research Questions.....	57
III.	METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES	58
	Data.....	58
	Methods.....	60
	Variables	63
	Dependent variables: work centrality	63
	Intrinsic Rewards	63
	Extrinsic Rewards	65
	Independent variables	66
	Gender.....	66
	Age.....	66
	Educational attainment.....	66
	Income.....	67
	Employment.....	67
	Family and Child Policies.....	67
	Analytic Strategy	68
IV.	FINDINGS.....	72
	The Effects of Micro and Macro Level Factors on Intrinsic Rewards	73
	The Effects of Micro and Macro Level Factors on Extrinsic Rewards	75
	Gender Differences in the Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic	
	Rewards.....	77
	Intrinsic rewards among women.....	77
	Intrinsic rewards among men.....	78
	Comparing intrinsic rewards among women and men	79
	Extrinsic rewards among women.....	80
	Extrinsic rewards among men.....	81
	Comparing extrinsic rewards among women and men.....	82
	Summary of Results.....	83
V.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	86

Significant Contributions	86
Multi-Level Analyses of Human Capital	87
Gender Framework	90
Random and National Sample	94
Limitations and Future Research	94
Implications.....	97
REFERENCES	101
APPENDIX	
A TABLES	111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Data Descriptives	112
2	Regression of Intrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors.....	114
3	Regression of Extrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors.....	115
4	Regression of Intrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors, Women-Only and Men-Only	116
5	Regression of Extrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors, Women-Only and Men-Only	117

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Work is central to people's lives, serving as a critical source of identity and meaning as well as providing the material resources necessary to sustain social life. The experience of work, however, varies among individuals depending upon gender, personal statuses and resources, and social context. This study focuses on the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards among women and men in 12 post-industrial nations in the Global North. The research has four main goals. The first goal is to examine how individual attributes affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The second goal is to examine how national policies affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The third goal is to examine how the effects of individual attributes and national policies differ from each other in relative magnitude as predictors of the value individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The fourth goal is to examine how the effects of individual attributes and national policies impact the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards differ between women and men. This study represents a new, more comprehensive approach to studying the relationships among micro-level factors, structural opportunities and constraints, intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards, and gender. This dissertation therefore examines how personal resources and national policies shape the importance individuals

in postindustrial nations attach to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards and whether the relative importance of these factors varies by gender.

This topic is timely in light of the ever-increasing prevalence of paid work in contemporary societies. Beginning with the Industrial Revolution, dramatic shifts in human society moved work from agricultural enterprises wherein the family unit was self-sustained to wage economies where men, and increasingly women, exchanged labor for pay and transformed their pay into material resources. While men have historically made up the majority of paid workers in industrial and later post-industrial nations, women are rapidly catching up to men in terms of paid labor force participation (OECD 2009). In the last 50 years, women's participation in the paid labor force of the Global North has fluctuated. In the 1960s, the highest rates of women's employment were reported in the Scandinavian countries and by the 1980s, virtually all Scandinavian married women were integrated into the labor market while other European countries lagged behind (Svallors 2001). More recent data from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2009) suggests many European countries have converged towards Scandinavian rates of full employment for women. The trend is most evident for women between the ages of 25 and 54 years of age. The "welfare" states of Sweden and Finland initially had the highest rates of women's employment with Denmark and Norway following close behind in later years. Other post-industrial countries, including Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States, showed steady increases in women's labor force participation over the same time period. Taking an average of 2008 labor force participation rates for all 12 countries in this study, 82 percent of women currently participate in the labor force, compared to an average of 53 percent in 1970.

If 82 percent of women in 2008 were working in the paid labor force, 18 percent were not. Of the women who are not currently working in the paid labor force, many of the women viewed the situation as temporary, a “time off” versus an extended “time out” (Stripp 1988). Stripp (1988) concluded that all women should be considered a part of the labor force and many of the women not currently employed soon would be. This shift in gendered labor trends is reflected in the rapidly converging labor force participation rates of women and men across post-industrial nations. In 1961, 97 percent of Irish men and 96 percent of American men were working. In 1970, on average 96 percent of the men in Finland, France, Germany, Sweden, West Germany, and the United States were working at paying jobs. In 1994, when labor force participation rates are available for all 12 countries, the average rate of participation in the paid labor force among men is 94 percent. Between 1994 and 2008, men between the ages of 25 – 54 have an average labor force participation rate of 92 percent (OECD 2009). While women’s rates were initially much lower, each subsequent decade has brought about a rapid convergence in women’s rates, from 42% in 1960 to 82% in 2005.

Interestingly, little evidence exists that women’s entrance into the paid labor force has created the option for men to choose not to work or made work less central in men’s lives. At the same time, women’s opting out of paid work remains acceptable (and economically feasible) for at least some women, although fewer and fewer women do so. Thus, why so many women and men do work is a sociologically relevant inquiry (Harpaz, Honig, Coetsier 2002; Hattrup, Ghorpade, Lackritz 2007; Harpaz and Xuanning 1997; MOWIRT 1987; Percheski 2008; Warr 1982; Westwood and Lok 2003; Westwood and Leung 1993).

Statement and Significance of the Problem

The meaning of work in women and men's lives, the extent to which these meanings vary between women and men, and the factors that may shape these differential meanings remains underexplored. The term work centrality is a general term that refers to the importance individuals attribute to their work generally. Important dimensions of the multidimensional term work centrality are intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and these are the focus of this research. Intrinsic rewards measure whether individuals are working for the enjoyment or satisfaction of the job, and extrinsic rewards refer to working for pay or material rewards that individuals receive for their labor. Existing studies on work centrality are predominantly found in the fields of business, psychology, or organizational behavior (Hatrup, Ghorpade, Lackritz 2007; Harpaz, Honig, Coetsier 2002; Harpaz and Xuanning 1997; MOWIRT 1987; Warr 1982; Westwood and Leung 1993; Westwood and Lok 2003). Frequent variables used in sociological research, such as gender and various measures of structural context, are not well-represented in the business and psychological literature (Hatrup, Ghorpade, Lackritz 2007; Harpaz, Honig, Coetsier 2002; Harpaz and Xuanning 1997; MOWIRT 1987; Warr 1982; Westwood and Lok 2003; Westwood and Leung 1993). It is particularly interesting, given the high rates of employment found among both women and men in post-industrial nations and the evidence that work experiences remain influenced if not outright determined by gender (Epstein 2007), that so few studies have examined gender differences in the importance women and men attach to intrinsic compared to extrinsic rewards, and none have explicitly examined the impact of personal attributes *in conjunction* with structural contexts on these dimensions of work centrality.

Therefore, the goal of my research is to analyze a representative sample of women and men in 12 post-industrial nations to determine how personal resources (i.e. employment, age, and educational attainment) and national policy (social expenditures provided by the state on family and child services and paid family leave) interact with gender to shape the value women and men attach to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards.

Conceptual Framework

Sociological research that has been developed and conducted on a wide variety of topics indicates that the nature of the social context in which individuals exist affects their attitudes and behavior. Thus, variations in the social context often produce differences in individual attitudes and behavior that are not explained by characteristics of the individuals themselves. It is reasonable to suggest that countries or nations possess relatively unique characteristics that are associated with cross-national differences in individual attitudes and behavior. Nations typically differ by type of government, the nature of various political and social policies they have adopted, and many other values, beliefs and practices and thus have different social contexts. Variations in some dimensions of these social contexts have been found to be linked to patterns of work/employment. It is therefore reasonable to expect that social contexts are linked to meanings individuals attach to work centrality and its dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

One theoretical perspective that has guided research on employment patterns among nations is the nation-state theoretical framework developed by Esping-Anderson (1990). It has been used to explain how the variations in men's, and especially women's, employment are related to disparities in institutional arrangements found within different

nation-state models found in the post-industrial world. Esping-Andersen argued that post-industrial nations could be grouped on a continuum into one of three models of nation-states differentiated by the extent to which nations exacerbate or alleviate the importance of personal resources in determining the autonomy and life chances of its citizens and workers. That is, at one extreme one type of nation may have policies in place that hold the state responsible for the well-being of all its citizens and provide a minimal standard of living for all. The social-democratic “welfare” states of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland closely fit this pattern. Occupying more of a mid-point on the continuum are states in which the availability of social support services is determined not by citizenship but by status positions based upon a person’s place in a family, social class, religious identity, or based upon the traditions of a country. Belgium, Germany, and Ireland approximate this model of “conservative” nation-states. At the other extreme are nations in which social services are determined by market forces relatively free from state intervention. The state provides assistance only when the family is unable to provide for itself. The United States and Canada are nation-states that approximate this “liberal” model. Generally, the more benefits the state provides, and the less that such benefits are tied to statuses beyond citizenship, the less important personal resources become. In prior research, the nation-state theoretical framework informed analyses on the likelihood of labor force participation, but the theory is utilized here to explore the relative importance of the centrality of work dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, expanding the Esping-Andersen model. Logically, individuals in states with more generous policies seem likely to emphasize intrinsic benefits and deemphasize extrinsic benefits, while individuals in conservative and liberal states would seem more likely to value extrinsic rewards and place less salience on intrinsic rewards. Thus, these

differing social contexts provided by the various social policies of nation-states are conceptualized as associated with how people feel about their work.

My study addresses a number of gaps in the literature. One, existing literature does not incorporate a gendered study of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Two, scholars use work centrality as an independent variable, but I expand this understanding by using it as a dependent variable. Three, the few studies that have looked at predictors of work centrality have primarily focused on micro level analyses with a minority of studies incorporating macro level variables. In my research, I address this gap by integrating micro variables, such as individual attributes, and macro level variables, such as national policies, and how they are relative to one another.

Methodology

The analyses are based on the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). The ISSP has grown from a joint effort between the Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfragen der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS) of the Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden, und Analysen (ZUMA) in Mannheim, Germany and the General Social Survey (GSS) of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), University of Chicago. Both the ALLBUS and ISSP are replicating time series studies. Data are drawn from the 2005 ISSP: Work Orientations III module and includes women and men over the ages 18 who are not disabled. The dependent variables are 2 separate indexes. The first index is made up of 7 questions measuring intrinsic, and the second index includes 6 questions measuring extrinsic work rewards. The independent variables are measured at both the micro and macro level. Micro-personal variables include marital status plus personal resources commonly termed human capital (Budig et. al. 2011; Misra et. al. 2010; Misra et. al.

2011) including variables such as education level, age, and employment status. The macro-societal level variables represent a series of national family and work policies, including 2005 measures for all 12 nations of government subsidies for childcare and pre-primary education (hereafter childcare) and paid family leave. Cluster regression, where variables are entered into the analyses in groups, are used to test the relationships between the dependent and independent variables, i.e. how each independent variable affects the probability that an individual perceives intrinsic or extrinsic rewards as important. To ascertain whether personal or structural variables are more important in determining work centrality, I compare standardized coefficients within models. To determine how gender affects these processes, I run gender-separate analyses for women and men and compare coefficients across models using z-test scores.

In Chapter Two, I summarize the existing literature on gender and work centrality. Specifically, I start with a brief history of the sociological study of work followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework guiding an understanding of how political structures shape individual attitudes. The review the literature also includes a section on work centrality and clarification of the meaning of terms including intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards, job values, and human capital. I then discuss themes that emerge from the review of the literature on work centrality and identify existing gaps and methodological issues present in the current literature. The chapter concludes with an overview of the research questions guiding this study.

In Chapter Three, I turn to a more detail discussion of my methodology. I explain how I investigate the manner in which human capital and national policies shape the salience of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. I begin with a discussion of the data sets

and the dependent and independent variables used in my study and conclude with a discussion of my analytic strategy.

In Chapter Four, I present the results of my data analyses. The chapter begins with a discussion of how human capital (i.e., age, education, and employment status) and national policy (paid family leave and social expenditure provided by the state for family for family and child services) intersect with gender to shape the values women and men attach to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. I divide the results into a look at the gender-integrated models of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards followed an explanation of gender-separate analyses of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Two key components of the results chapter include the importance of gender and the integration of micro and macro level analyses.

Chapter Five includes a reexamination of my findings. I start with a discussion of the significant contributions, including multi-level application of the human capital concept, the addition of the gender framework, and the use of an updated random and nationally representative sample. Next, I discuss possibilities for future research that include broadening and narrowing the analyses. The chapter concludes with a discussion of implications for future researchers, policy makers, women's advocates, and employers. Implications of my research include the importance of multi-level analyses for an understanding of the structural context of work, why the gendered nature of work needs to be considered, and how prior research on work centrality was representative of the multi-faceted aspect of gender inequality.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To present a rationale for my research questions this chapter includes an overview of broad themes found within the sociology of work followed by a more specific discussion of work centrality and rewards. I begin with a brief history of the sociological study of work and a discussion of the theoretical framework that guides my understanding of different political structures. These sections are followed by a clarification of key terms, including work centrality, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, job values, and human capital. I then discuss the prominent themes that emerge from the review of the literature on work centrality and intrinsic/extrinsic rewards and identify existing gaps in the literature and methodological issues limiting sociological understandings of the intersections of gender and work centrality. The chapter concludes with an overview of the research questions guiding this study.

History of the Study of Work

An overview of the last eighty years of the social scientific study of work highlighting shifts in methods, theory, and subject matter shaped by multiple disciplines is presented in this section. The following key developments are discussed: (1) the founding of scientific management and human relations; (2) the growth of quantitative methods; (3) the start of critical frameworks influenced by Marxism and feminism; (4) macro-level analyses of work; (5) problems associated with multiple disciplines studying

work; and (6) the future of the sociology of work via an integration of micro- and macro-level perspectives.

The Founding of Scientific Management and Human Development

Starting with the earliest period, defined by Simpson (1989) as the period from the 1920s through the 1950s, the study of work was influenced by the anthropologists and sociologists who created the fields of scientific management and human relations. Laying the foundation and considered the “Father of Scientific Management” was Frederick Winslow Taylor (1865-1915) who viewed workers as machines requiring fine-tuning in order to increase efficiency (Wharton 2002). Thematically, a central theme at this time was how broad social forces, such as management practices, impacted workers. This theme can be traced to Mayo’s (1933) study of the Hawthorne Works, a Western Electric factory located outside of Chicago in Cicero, Illinois. Mayo’s study became known as the Hawthorne Experiment and highlighted how social factors can have a crucial impact on production. Thinking that the physical setting of work would have the greatest impact on workers’ performances, Mayo (1933) varied the amount of lighting in a factory and found that worker productivity increased whether the lighting was increased or decreased. Analyses of the results suggested that it was not lighting, but the act of being supervised that changed the behavior of the workers. Although Mayo had been trained as an industrial psychologist he, like many other social scientists of the period, was influenced by social anthropologists at Harvard University’s Business School (Simpson 1989).

Having being influenced by anthropologists at Harvard University’s Business School, social anthropologists at the University of Chicago, formed the “human

relations” group organized under W. Lloyd Warner and included William Foote Whyte. The human relations approach played a significant role in the development of the sociological study of work and two American Sociological Association presidents, George Homans and William Foote Whyte, were both human relations researchers. Studying occupations and social context became more common during the 1930s and 1940s. For example, Whyte (1948) researched the restaurant industry and Sutherland (1937) researched professional thieves. These burgeoning scholarly interests solidified when the human relations group at Chicago founded the journal *Applied Anthropology*, which later became *Human Organization*. As more sociologists began to study work, they brought in sociological concepts such as group norms, culture, and social class. Stouffer et al. (1949) studied the importance of army morale, group norms, and self-evaluation. In addition, Mills (1951) studied white-collar crime and Lynd and Lynd ([1929] 1937) identified how macro-level social forces shaped the problems of the middle and working class workers. The human relations approach was criticized by other scholars, such as Daniel Bell (Simpson 1989). Bell, a Harvard sociologist, was critical of the human relations approach, dubbing the approach “cow sociology,” meaning that managerial sociology treated humans like cattle such that happy cows would produce more milk and contented people would be more productive (Bell 1947:88). Overall, scholarly concerns with work may have begun in business schools and anthropology departments, but soon spread to sociology scholars and thrived despite some sociologists’ reservations.

The Growth of Quantitative Methods

For approximately fifteen to twenty years following World War II, the study of work was influenced by increasing economic productivity, a changing discipline of sociology, and the emergence of critical frameworks based on issues of inequality. Europe and Japan were rebuilding their infrastructures, and the United States government, American corporations, and the American worker were profiting from an ever-expanding base of economic productivity. Against this backdrop and building on the ideas of earlier studies, “the study of work was central to the academic discipline of sociology,” starting in 1945 and culminating with what Halford and Strangleman (2009:812) termed the “golden age” of the study of work in the 1960s.

The “golden age” coincided with, and was impacted by, broad social and economic changes that reverberated throughout the U.S., making it also somewhat of a transition period (Simpson 1989). During these transitional years, rather than scholars observing the work environment through the descriptive methods prominent during earlier periods, quantitative methods grew more prominent among studies of work. Lundberg (1960) pinpoints the growth of quantitative methods in sociology between 1920 and 1960 mirroring the career of William F. Ogburn. Prior to World War II, scholars had been debating the legitimacy of quantitative versus qualitative methods, arguing that certain social phenomena were inherently quantitative. During World War II, S.A. Stouffer, Paul Lazarsfeld, Louis Guttman, and others worked at the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division of the War Department. Emerging from the work funded by the War Department was the fourth volume of *The American Soldier* which “revolutionized in many ways both the theory and practice of scale construction application, and interpretation, and set forward by several decades the

development of quantitative methods in sociology” (Lundberg 1960: 23). After the publication of *The American Soldier*, scholars no longer debated the legitimacy of quantitative methods (Lundberg 1960).

In the sociology of work, researchers produced a number of studies on work attitudes, especially job satisfaction, using quantitative methods such as surveys (Herzberg 1959; Rettig, Jacobson, and Pasamanick 1958; Reynolds and Shister 1949; William 1945). Survey methodology was characterized by precise variables, standardized measures, and generalizable findings. Absent from quantitative analyses was how historical and cultural contexts affected the meanings individuals derived from work that had been possible using ethnographic methods. The developments after World War II combined with sociologists’ emphasis on work productivity led to an increase in the use of quantitative methods and measures to understand work as a social institution (Epstein 1990; Ericson 1990; Simpson 1989).

The Rise of Critical Frameworks: Marxism and Feminism

Theoretically, the transitional years witnessed the simultaneous, yet initially disconnected, emergence of Marxist and feminist critiques of the sociology of work. Marxist critiques surfaced beginning with Braverman’s book *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, originally published in 1974 and revised in 1998. A number of researchers provided critical analyses of capitalism, the deskilling of work and degradation of workers while focusing on distributions of power and workers’ experiences of work (England 1991; Kalleberg 1977; Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983; Kanungo 1987; Leviatan 1985; Morden and Ostiguy 2005; Mottaz 1989; Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero 1994; Shapiro 1977; Quintanilla and Wilpert 1991).

In the 1960s a number of feminist scholars emerged who found the sociological study of work (like sociology generally) to be men-centered and thus incomplete. Feminist scholars relied upon a gendered lens that better reflected women's social experiences. The feminist analytical focus on gender widened the definition of work to include issues such as the gendered division of housework and the balancing of work and parenthood (Lengerman and Niebrugge-Brantley 2004). A few of the critical works during these years included the following: Friedan's (1963) *Feminine Mystique*, Bernard's (1964) *Academic Women*, Rowbotham's (1969) *Women Liberation and the New Politics* (1969), and Rossi's (1962) article the "Equality between the sexes: An immodest proposal." The emerging feminist critique is particularly important for the present study as it established the gendered experiences of work as a legitimate topic of study.

By the 1980s, feminist scholars were making a mark on sociology generally and the study of work specifically. For example, Hochschild (1983) incorporated the feminist model and revived qualitative methods in the study of work to better incorporate the "human side of work" (Epstein 1990: 94) missing from the survey methodology of the 1950s and beyond. Hochschild (1983) advocated placing the study of work within the context of broader labor changes emerging from the growing service economy and within their unique cultural context. Specifically, Hochschild argued that sociology had ignored a critical dimension of social life: the emotions, meanings, and rewards attached to work and how these were determined, by gender. In her landmark study of flight attendants and bill collectors, Hochschild (1983) argued that the gender of the job incumbent shaped the individual's experience and satisfaction with work. Hochschild's research established

the importance of gender in shaping the social experience of work, and thus is a critical development in the study of gender and work and directly relevant to the current study.

Macro-Level Analyses of Work

Thematically, starting in the 1960s the sociology of work began to demonstrate a greater emphasis on economic approaches to work as well as an increasing emphasis on structural factors such as technology, bureaucracy, and labor markets (Ritzer 1989; Simpson 1989). The study of how macro-level economic forces impacted the worker meant the study of work was not centered on the worker as an individual but as an economic entity, a commodity with a definable earning potential, or a worker with a definable set of skills. Schools of management were interested in the supervision of workers, the analyses of formal organization, and the process of making business decisions (Simpson 1989). In 1985, Erik Erikson, then President of the American Sociological Association, presided over the annual meetings and focused the meetings on the theme “Working and Not Working” (Erikson and Vallas 1990: vii). The book *The Nature of Work* (Erikson 1990) emerged from Erikson’s presidency and included articles by “reigning experts on work” (1990 vii). Erikson (1990) identified a number of critical changes affecting the study of work. The sociological study of work was shifting away from a focus on blue-collar factory jobs in the United States to jobs categorized by the use of technology, service provision, and information handling. Scholars became increasingly interested in job conditions and the influence on personality on job performance. Kohn said, “We know the general contours of the problem, in short; we need now to adjust our lens so as to be able to focus on its texture and grain (Ericson 1990:2). However, Ericson (1990) commented that there was little current research on

the macro cultural influences on work attitudes and that this area of study needed further development, particularly in terms of research that incorporates both the micro and macro social forces.

The Future of the Sociology of Work—Integrating Micro and Macro Level Perspectives

Changes since the 1960s in the sociology of work have mirrored general changes in the discipline of sociology. Sociology as a discipline has changed, becoming diversified and without a clear center (Halford and Strangleman 2009). In a special issue of the *British Journal of Sociology* on the study of work, Halford and Strangleman (2009) argued that despite the shortcomings of the field, the study of work still matters. In the midst of a global recession, work or the absence of work opportunities are central concerns. From the individual level to family and government levels, the Great Recession and issues of work are centrally important. Dominating the headlines are stories of excessive salaries and bonuses of executives versus the meager salaries of workers, and debates about how the government may continue to support the unemployed (Halford and Strangleman 2009).

Methodologically and theoretically, scholars have been encouraging a better integration of the macro and micro levels of analyses for 20 years (Abbott 1993; Halford and Strangleman 2009; Ritzer 1989; Simpson 1989; Watson 1989). Without the integration of micro and macro level of analyses, sociological understandings of the world of work remain limited (Watson 2009), especially in terms of the impact of political structures on workers. In other words, sociologists need “to view work as part of the broader ensemble of social relations” (Vallas 1990:358) Along the same lines, Watson (2009) argued that that integrating the micro and macro levels of analyses would

keep the best aspects of both approaches while increasing the potential to add to sociological understandings of how work is influenced by gender, class, race, religion, community, family, globalization, and identity.

Theoretical Perspectives: Nations as Context

The discussion of the theoretical framework will start with Esping-Andersen's (1990) model describing the basis of different political structures. Following the overview of the Esping-Andersen welfare model, I explain how the model breaks down upon close examination, because Esping-Andersen mirrors an ideal type rather than a representation of complete reality. A review of the study by Pettit and Hook (2005) shows how the utilization of specific policies is a better indicator of political structures. While the countries included in this study are all industrialized and relatively wealthy, I have selected countries with different political structures allowing my research to explore how political context shapes an individual's intrinsic and extrinsic work values.

Applying Kohn's thoughts on "Cross-National Research as an Analytic Strategy" (1987), my methodology creates a study where nations are treated as context, as opposed to the nation as the object of study. The nation as context allows for "testing the generalizability of findings and interpretation about how certain social institutions operate or about how certain aspects of structure impinge on personality" (Kohn 1987:714). Applying Kohn's thoughts on cross-national research, my research explores how people experience political structures; particularly with respect to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards.

Esping-Andersen Model

Esping-Andersen (1990) developed a typology of ideal-type states as a framework for understanding how people experience political structure and how it shapes attitudes toward work. Building on Weber's concept of ideal type, Esping-Andersen created three ideal types based upon three criteria centered upon various dimensions of social rights, or: (1) how social rights are granted to citizens; (2) whether social rights are commodified or de-commodified by the free market; and (3) how social inequality within a nation is shaped by social rights. Generally, how a nation addresses the intersection of marketplace demands with citizens' needs shapes the type of family and child policies present in a country.

At the core of Esping-Andersen's (1990) typology is the question of *how* states grant social rights. Such rights, according to this author, are similar to legal rights but pertain to individuals' claims to state-held resources. How a state approaches its role in meeting citizens' needs determines whether a country falls into one of the three ideal-type categories: social-democratic, conservative, or liberal. Social-democratic and conservative nations view social rights as a duty of the state, and liberal nations view social rights as the responsibility of the individual. Both social-democratic and conservative nations grant social rights independent of the market, hence the term de-commodification, but the two state-types grant social rights differently. Social-democratic states grant social rights on the basis of citizenship while conservative nations give access on the basis on status position. Liberal nations view social rights as a commodity subject to market forces. How states grant social rights shape the nature of stratification, and the social policies that emerge from the state. I discuss each ideal-type in more detail below.

Social-democratic Nations

Social-democratic nations provide certain resources to all citizens regardless of previous or current earnings, contributions, or performance with the goal of creating equality and ensuring a minimal standard of living for all citizens. The granting of social rights is separate from the market and not subject to market forces, and are thus de-commodified. A de-commodified state grants access to social rights on the basis of personal needs, such as subsidizing childcare for parents with young children, medical care for the sick, or pensions for the elderly. Nations most closely fitting the social-democratic ideal-type, including Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland, grant social rights on the basis of citizenship and personal need; by virtue of being a citizen of a social-democratic state, the individual is entitled to have certain needs met and the state justifies its expenditures on such programs under an ideology of equality among its citizens.

Social rights affect social stratification in a country by shaping the social policies that emerge. For example, the social-democratic states strive for equality for all citizens and are committed to providing full employment for all citizens. The state takes on the responsibility of caring for children, the elderly, and those who are unable to care for themselves (Esping-Andersen 1990). Commitment to equality for all citizens is clearly evident in the explicit emphasis on gender egalitarian outcomes in such states (Lewis et al 2008). That such measures are effective in addressing gender inequality is made obvious by the high rankings of many such states in the 2008 United Nations Gender Empowerment Index (GEM). The GEM is a ranking of women's ability to participate in and take advantage of economic and political opportunities relative to men. Norway was ranked first, Sweden ranked second, and Denmark ranked fourth. By addressing family

needs, social-democratic nations alleviate many of the forces hindering women's full and equal participation in the paid labor force.

Conservative Nations

Like social-democratic regimes, conservative nations also view social rights as de-commodified and protected by state law; however, conservative regimes grant access to social rights based on individuals' specific status positions, such as a member of a family, class, religion or other social status rather than mere citizenship. For social-democratic nations, the goal is equality for all citizens, but conservative nations wish to uphold traditional status positions and privilege certain social arrangements over others. Thus, access to social rights is stratified between status positions and within status positions to ensure individuals uphold state-sanctioned family roles. The emphasis on status positions grew out of from feudal European monarchs' desire to encourage loyalty by granting different privileges and rights based on class and occupation. For example, civil servants were highly rewarded and social programs were designed that distinguished them from other citizens. As such, these state-types promote traditional gender roles associated with higher levels of gender inequality. Germany is a superlative example of a conservative nation and culturally one of the most traditional of European nations. In fact, Treas and Widmer (2000) identified Germany as "a particularly extreme case in its aversion to maternal employment." The German emphasis on traditional status positions places single women with children and low-income families that require both parents work at a disadvantage with limited day care options and schools that close at noon. Social policies are more likely to benefit families that fit into the two-parent, men

breadwinner/woman homemaker model (Lewis et al 2008). Other nations in this study fitting most closely with the conservative ideal type include Ireland and Finland.

Liberal Nations

While social-democratic and conservative nations view social rights as de-commodified, liberal regimes view social rights as a commodity determined by individuals' performances in the free market forces. For liberal regimes, the maintenance of the free market is paramount, and an individual's survival and ability to meet his/her needs (and those of any dependents) is dependent upon the individual's own efforts. The state is a safety net when the individual is unable to provide, but these state-provided resources are means tested, minimal, and stigmatized. Such policies date back to nineteenth-century poor laws in many countries. Today, the U.S. most closely fits the ideal-type liberal nation (Esping-Andersen 1990). Other nations best characterized as liberal state-types in this study include Canada and United Kingdom.

To illustrate, in the U.S., poor laws have developed into contemporary policies such as the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), Public Law 104-193, and the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1997. The policies provide assistance to needy families, but the benefits are temporary and designed to push welfare-reliant adults into the paid labor force, reduce non-marital pregnancies, and encourage two-parent families. The poor are expected to work for their survival, even if living wage jobs are unavailable. As a result, TANF provides very limited cash payments to poor families for a limited time period – the payments are neither guaranteed nor adequate for survival. The food stamp program is another form of assistance for poor families guarantying a

minimum income (Kamerman and Kahn 2001). Food stamps are a subsidized and means-tested food program for low-income individuals and families. In the U.S. and the other liberal nations such as Canada and United Kingdom, the intent of the old poor laws and policies of today is to push all citizens (or at least those unable to rely on family members and other private sources for financial support) into the work place. Certain standards of living and traditional status positions are not supported by the state and are only available to those who can afford to maintain them privately.

In the case of liberal nations, the commodification of social rights means policies emphasize the right to privacy and freedom from government intrusion but not the right to minimal standard of living. The end result is a lack of comprehensive and universal policies, stratified access to resources needed for family life and work-family balance, and a significantly higher poverty rate, especially among women and children, who have lesser access to resources than men. For example, in the U.S., 21.5 percent of U.S. children are living in families with incomes below the poverty level compared to 6.9 percent of children in all other OECD countries (Kamerman and Kahn 2001). Accordingly, such nations fare with worst in the GEM rankings, with the U.S., Canada and United Kingdom ranking 18, 12, and 15, respectively.

Overall, the Esping-Andersen (1990) typology of “welfare” regimes describes a social-democratic welfare state as having a “universalistic approach to social rights, high levels of de-commodification, and the inclusion of the middle class in social programs” and the state is responsible for the well-being of citizens. Moving toward the middle of the continuum, conservative nations also view social rights as de-commodified and protected by state law; however, conservative regimes grant access to social rights based on individuals’ specific status positions. The liberal welfare state is at the far end of the

continuum, providing only limited social insurance to the most destitute of citizens. Rather than the state being fully responsible, the well-being of citizens is determined by market forces, and the state does not interfere with the market on behalf of citizens, except in very limited ways. Generally speaking, whether a country is classified as a social-democratic, conservative, or liberal nation is determined by how the state defines social rights as a commodity or a duty of the state, and what outcomes the state seeks to enforce with its policies (Esping-Andersen 1990).

Limitations of the Esping-Andersen model

The Esping-Andersen (1990) nation state typology is useful for describing states' stances towards their citizens, identifying the policies that reflect these stances, and prompting questions about the forms of stratification each ideal-type state promotes or alleviates (Gornick 1999; O'Connor, Orloff, & Shaver, 1999; Pettit & Hook 2005; Stier, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001). Despite the strengths of this theoretical framework and the usefulness of describing the origins of states' social policies, the classification system has limitations. Becker (2000:221) argues against the use of typologies because countries "never present ideal types" and significant variation exists between and within nations. The limitations are abundantly clear upon close examination of individual states. Specific countries do not easily fit into the typology's categories and even nations within a single category vary widely in their specific policies. For example, Scandinavian countries support day care, but each country has a unique set of policies. In Sweden, most parents stay home for the first year, but local governments are required to provide enough day care for all children, including those under 12 months. After the first year, most children are in organized day care. Denmark is similar, but more children are in day

care during the first year of life. Norway is the most distinct of the three Scandinavian nations with cash-for-care payments for parents who stay home to care for children. The cash-for-care payments means Norwegian parents are paid to stay home with their children, but results in a shortage of day care centers forcing parents, mainly mothers who may prefer to work, to stop their careers. Despite Scandinavian countries all falling into the social-democratic category, the individual countries have different childcare policies resulting in different options for parents, especially mothers.

In addition to different childcare policies among social-democratic nations, length of paid family leave is uneven. According to 2008 OECD Family Leave Research, Sweden has the most extensive paid family leave at 480 days, but the United Kingdom, a liberal state guided by market forces, ties for second place with Denmark at 364 days of paid family leave¹. Family leave for other nations has Ireland leading the conservative nations at 126 paid days while the liberal nation of Canada mandates a range of 119-125 days followed by France at 112 days. Finland, a social-democratic nation, is an especially deviant case compared with other social-democratic nations with 105 working days of paid leave placing it towards the bottom of the list next to Germany at 98 days. In addition to the U.S. having the shortest family leave at 84 days, the U.S. is the only nation with unpaid family leave (OECD Family Leave 2008). Thus, political structure is not always a predictor of family and child policy and variations in these policies must be carefully considered on a national basis to discern their effects on workers. Even the countries that most closely reflect ideal-types are not perfect cases. In the past,

¹ In addition to variations in paid family leave the terminology and type of leave varies across countries. Types of leave vary and may include maternity, paternity, and/or general parental leave and countries can have a combination of the various types. For example, Sweden has long-term unpaid maternity leave, limited unpaid paternal leave, and extensive paid parental leave. I typically will refer to total family leave to encompass all types of leave; however, when researchers used a specific term I use the identical term.

Germany's emphasis on the traditional two-parent breadwinner husband/homemaker wife model was a good example of a conservative nation; however, German family and child policy has begun to change. Until the early 2000s Germany was closer to an ideal type conservative, but more recently the German people have experienced a significant policy shift away from an emphasis on the traditional division of labor to policies that emphasizes equal parental employment. The 2006 Report on the Family by the Federal Ministry for the Family recognized a more pluralist definition of the family rather than an emphasis on the married, two-parent traditional family with a working husband and stay-at-home wife (Lewis et al 2008).

However, while these critiques of the nation-state typology are valid, the framework itself is still useful. Max Weber encouraged social scientists to create conceptual tools, such as the ideal-type, to enable them to explain the social world. According to Weber (1903), the ideal-type is a construct emerging from the researcher's interests and theoretical orientation and may not exist in reality. The usefulness of the concept comes in the form of the questions it prompts social scientists to ask and the comparisons that can be made between the phenomena under study. For example, the Esping-Andersen typology prompts researchers to ask how citizen's needs are met, who benefits the most, how provision of social rights alleviates or exacerbates inequality, and what family forms are sanctioned by the state. Regardless of whether a given nation fits an ideal-type, the typology prompts a number of relevant questions critical to understanding the nation's political structure and comparing it to other nations. In sum, Esping-Andersen has presented a typology presenting ideal types useful for discussing the origins and goals of family and child policies in post-industrial countries. The use of

the nation typology in conjunction with a focus on specific policies provides an improved framework for studying national context.

The Family and Child Policy Model

In order to avoid the problems inherent in trying to classify countries into a rigid typology, several scholars (Budig, Misra, Boeckmann 2011; Misra, Budig, and Boeckmann 2010, 2011; Pettit and Hook 2005; Stier, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001) have found specific family and child policies to be a more accurate measure of political structure. Studying women's labor force participation and the impact on wages across the life-cycle, Stier et al (2001) found both Esping-Andersen's welfare regime type and family and child policies shaped women's labor force participation with lower state support resulting in high wage penalties due to lack of continuous employment. Stier et al. (2001:1750) found the strongest model to be the one that includes both regime types and family policies, but the researchers also found "that there are important country idiosyncrasies and that country-specific institutions and norms uniquely affect the employment patterns of women." Gornick, Meyers, and Ross (1996) and Pettit and Hook (2005) are more explicit in their findings that significant variation exists within welfare regimes and specific family and child policies, such as family leave and child-care arrangements, are better measurements of variations in political structure.

For example, when Pettit and Hook (2005) tested the predictive value of the Esping-Andersen (1990) typology for explaining women's employment patterns, using measures of maternity and parental leave, the results indicated that the Esping-Andersen model offered significant utility, but significant variation existed within regime types and these variations were best understood by measuring family and child policies within each

nation. Policies pertaining to parental leave and federally funded childcare were both found to have a significant relationship to the probability of employment of married women and mothers of young children. Parental leave had an inverted u-shaped relationship to women's post-maternity employment. The availability of parental leave keeps women with young children connected to the paid labor force; however, when this leave is more extensive, the probability of women with young children returning to paid employment is decreased. More extensive maternity leave appears to reinforce the traditional breadwinner-homemaker model, and these patterns were the most significant in Finland, Germany, Hungary, and the Czech Republic (Pettit & Hook, 2005).

Pettit and Hook (2005) speculated that when women with young children are not continuously involved in the labor force their employment history is impacted throughout their life course. When considering the relationship between publicly funded childcare and women's labor force participation, the relationship was consistent and positively related to the probability of employment. That is, in countries with publicly funded childcare women stayed employed lessening the disruption to employment history over their lifetime. My current research uses specific policies rather than regime types as a measure of political context, although regime types prove useful in interpreting the results of these analyses.

Having provided an overview of the history of the study of work and the theoretical framework that will guide my study; I now turn to a review of the literature on work centrality and gender. First, however, I clarify a number of critical concepts in this body of scholarship. In order to understand the specifics of my approach to work centrality, a section on the definition of terms follows.

History and Definition of Terms

Work centrality

In this section, the development of the term work centrality is discussed with the goal of distinguishing between the terms work centrality, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, job values, and human capital. The concept of work centrality emerged in the 1950s at a time when quantitative methodologies were increasingly applied to the study of work (Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero 1994). Tumin (1955) was one of the first to explore work rewards or the “conditions which impel men [sic] to be conscientious at their tasks” (Tumin 1955:419). Dubin (1956) explored work as a “central life interest” among industrial workers. Rosenberg (1957) was the first to use the terms intrinsic and extrinsic rewards casually while Herzberg (1959) was the first to draw a clear distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards.

During the 1960s and 1970s, or the transitional years, feminist, Marxist, and economic frameworks gained increasing influence in the study of work. In 1978, the Meaning of Work International Research Team (MOWIRT) was founded, and the team developed the most complete articulation of the work centrality term. The goal of the project was to study empirically how “working people experience labor or work, and what significance and meaning working has for them personally” (MOWIRT 1987: 5). With this objective in mind, a team of organizational psychologists from eight countries, including the Netherlands, Slovenia, Belgium, United States, Israel, United Kingdom, Germany, and Japan, was formed (Claes 2010). The team developed the term work centrality into a multidimensional concept referring to paid employment and working in general rather than a specific job. MOWIRT researchers have produced a significant number of publications based on these conceptualizations and subsequent studies (e.g.,

Snir, Harpaz, Ben-Baruch 2009; Parboteeach and Cullen 2003; Arvey, Harpaz, and Liao 2004; Westwood and Leung 1993; Westwood and Lok 2003; Snir and Harpaz 2005; Harpaz and Fu 2002; Raphael and Itzhak 2005; Warr and Lovatt 1977; England 1991; Quintanilla and Wilpert 1991).

Work centrality focused on the following three components: importance of work in an individual's life, societal norms regarding work, and intrinsic or extrinsic work goals. The first component of the MOWIRT study defined work centrality as the meaning and importance of work in a person's life. Work was found to be consistently more important than leisure, community, and religion, ranking second only to family (Harding and Hikspoors 1995; Harpaz 1999; MOWIRT 1987). Societal norms, the second work centrality component, was defined by MOWIRT researchers as the cultural rules regarding whether work is viewed as a person's right or a duty. There are two dimensions to this concept: whether individuals have a right to "interesting and meaningful work" and whether individuals have a duty to work and contribute to society (MOWIRT 1987:22). Work as a right or duty are two ends of a continuum and societal norms influence where individuals fall on the continuum in their personal beliefs (MOWIRT 1987).

The third work centrality component consists of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, two distinct but complementary concepts (Mottaz 1989). Intrinsic rewards emerge from the performance of work-related tasks and refer to the enjoyment or satisfaction individuals directly derive from work activities, separate from pay or other material rewards. Factors shaping individuals' experiences of intrinsic rewards include whether the job is interesting, opportunities to develop one's skills on the job, autonomy and creativity in tasks, and tangible results of one's work. Extrinsic rewards have less to do

with the actual performance of a given job and represent the conditions surrounding a particular job. These conditions include the convenience of working a particular job, financial rewards, and opportunities for promotion (Kalleberg 1977). Thus, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are two parts of a greater whole in the form of work centrality.

Summary

Work centrality is therefore a multi-dimensional concept measuring the importance of work, societal norms regarding work, and intrinsic or extrinsic work goals. Due to the complexity of a comparative project that includes both micro and macro level analyses, and the fact intrinsic and extrinsic work goals have been studied less than the more general concept of work centrality, my research focuses on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. According to Kanungo and Hartwick (1987:764), intrinsic rewards are derived “directly from one’s task activities and [are] self administered” and include “interesting work, a personal challenge, an opportunity for creativity, and personal growth and development.” Extrinsic rewards are separate from the actual task and “administered by others” and include financial pay, mortgage financing, a dental plan, cafeteria subsidies, and a paid parking space (Kanungo and Hartwick 1987:764). In the current research the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic has been operationalized with the following two questions: respondents were asked if they “would enjoy a paid job even if I did not need money” (intrinsic rewards) and if “a job is a way of earning money, nothing more” (extrinsic rewards) (ISSP 2005:2). The term work centrality is predominately found in the business and economics literature. The next term to be discussed will be job values with a similar meaning used by sociologist and psychologist.

Job Values

Halady (2003) merged social psychological research on the qualities of a good job (Johnson 2002; Kohn and Schooler 1969; Mortimer et al 1996) with the stratification literature on status attainment (Hauser, Tasi, and Sewell 1983; Warren, Hauser, and Sheridan 2002). Halady brought the issue of human capital into the work centrality literature but used the term *job values* rather work centrality. Halady defined job values as the importance attached to various rewards of working (e.g. pay, autonomy, and social relationships). The term is similar to intrinsic rewards of a job versus extrinsic rewards with some variation in the distinction of the terms. The term job values have been used in the sociological literature while work centrality has appeared more frequently in social psychology, organization psychology, and organizational sociology. My research builds on Halady's successful merger of the literature on personal attitudes toward job rewards with a focus on human capital variables.

Human Capital

The concept of human capital developed from the neo-classical economics literature. Physical capital refers to material resources such as money, and Becker (1962:9) first distinguished physical capital from human capital, with the latter comprised of "intangible resources" such as knowledge, job training, education, and health that increase an individual's current and future productivity. An inequitable distribution of human capital among individuals contributes to societal economic inequality. While the concept of human capital does not appear in the work centrality literature, it is used to explain women's employment decisions and the motherhood wage penalty in the broader gender and work literature (Budig et al. 2011; Misra et al 2010; Misra et al 2011). Women with more human capital suffer a lower motherhood wage penalty (Budig et al.

2011), and are more likely to stay in the labor market (Misra et al 2010). An increase in human capital was measured by fewer children, more education, more job experience, and full-time employment. Women with more human capital will experience higher opportunity costs if they leave the labor market (Misra et al. 2010 and 2011).

Conversely, women with less human capital are more likely to receive a proportionately higher wage penalty for motherhood and are more likely to exit the labor market altogether (Misra et al. 2010 and 2011). The next section will include a discussion of the relevant literature pertaining to work centrality, job values, and human capital. While human capital has been used to study participation in the labor force, the concept has not been applied to the study of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards with a gendered lens.

Adapting prior research completed by Budig et al. (2011), Misra et al (2010) and Misra et al (2011) on human capital and women's employment, I apply the concept of human capital to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. For the purposes of this study, I define human capital as both tangible and intangible resources and include age, education, job status, and full-time employment, a country's social expenditure on family and child programs, and family leave. Following the methods of Budig et al (2011:14), age is a "proxy for work experience". The extension of human capital to macro level variables is unique to this research. Human capital is defined as a resource and countries with more extensive policies, defined in terms of financial contributions of the state, constitute resources workers have at their disposal. It seems likely that human capital at the micro and macro level have be connected to intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation, and testing this connection is one of the goals of this research.

Work Centrality across Disciplines

Work centrality and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are concepts that have grown out of a literature created by sociologists, psychologists, business researchers, and economists creating variation in the framing of the work centrality concept. Although some current themes in the work centrality literature are characteristic of certain perspectives, the themes can overlap.

Sociologists have framed the study of work centrality around issues of inequality, such as social class, age, and marginalized statuses. More specifically, gender scholars in sociology have framed work centrality research around the negotiation of gender roles, family, work, and work centrality. Psychologists have studied the relationship between work centrality and psychological well-being. Finally, business researchers and economists see work as a tool for management to increase the productivity of workers. Thus, different disciplines frame work centrality with different objectives producing a number of compelling themes. Due to the complexity of the themes and the tendency of scholars to cross over disciplines, this section will review the literature organized by themes rather than by specific disciplines. The last section will discuss the substantive gaps and methodological shortcomings in the existing literature that indicate the need for further investigation. The review will highlight the need for comparative research that studies individual and country level factors through a gendered lens.

Human Capital, Work Centrality, and Intrinsic/Extrinsic Rewards

This section on human capital and work centrality starts with studies exploring the relationship between human capital, measured by social class, age, and gender, and the importance of intrinsic versus extrinsic work rewards followed by a review of literature

emerging from gender studies. The section concludes with a discussion of institutional factors focusing on family and child policies.

The consequences of the lack of human capital have been well documented in the sociological literature. For example, women and African Americans make less money, are subject to job segregation, lack opportunities for promotion, have less authority in the workplace, and are underrepresented in top-level positions relative to men and whites (Althauser and Kalleberg 1981; Skaggs 2009, 2008; Sorenson 1977; Osterman 1980). Key concepts for my study emerged primarily from the current sociological literature and are divided into social class, aging, marginalized status, and family and child policies. Findings from studies incorporating these specific concepts can be grouped into five key themes:

- (1) The family of origin plays the biggest role in shaping job values and whether an adult individual will pursue and value jobs that offer intrinsic or extrinsic job rewards. Individuals coming from a family of origin with less income will value extrinsic rewards more while individuals from families with higher income will be more interested in pursuing jobs that offer intrinsic rewards (Halady 2003; Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001; Smith 2000).
- (2) Social class variables including income and education have been found to shape intrinsic and extrinsic job values (England 1991; Ross and Mirowsky 1996; Shapiro 1977, 1982 and 1989). Individuals with more income and education will emphasize intrinsic values more while extrinsic are emphasized with individuals with less income and education.

- (3) An emphasis on intrinsic versus extrinsic rewards may change as people age. As people age, intrinsic and extrinsic values become increasingly stable shifting towards an emphasis on extrinsic rewards as people near retirement (Halady 2003; Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001; Johnson and Elder 2002; Smith 2000).
- (4) Groups holding marginalized statuses in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status demonstrate lowered work centrality, and are more likely to emphasize extrinsic work rewards over intrinsic rewards when compared to more privileged individuals (England 1991; Ross and Mirowsky 1996; Shapiro 1977; Svallfors, Halvorsen, and Andersen 2001).
- (5) Political and economic context shapes personal decisions regarding work and is reflected in national trends, including as women's labor force participation, use of maternity and paternity leave, and returning to work after paid leave (England 1991; Gash 2008; Hult and Edlund 2008; Parboteeah and Cullen 2003; Pettit and Hook 2005; Steir, Lewin-Epstein and Braun 2001; Westwood and Lok 2003).

I explore these five areas in more detail below.

Social Class

Social class has been found to shape work centrality starting with the family of origin and continuing throughout individuals' lives (Halady 2003). Using the Wisconsin Longitudinal Survey, Halady (2003) interviewed respondents in their senior year of high school and re-interviewed them 35 years later with the purpose of discerning the origins of workers' personal definitions of a good job. By comparing individuals' responses in

1957 to those of 1992, Halady (2003) was able to compare the impact of human capital before the individual entered the adult work world on the attitudes towards job values thirty-five years later.

Halady (2003) found factors such as the amount of parents' schooling, family income, father's income, father's self-employment, an intact family, number of siblings, birth order, mental ability, and gender correlated to job values later in life. Respondents who had more advantages earlier in life valued high risk jobs emphasized autonomy, variety in tasks, higher pay, and a sense of prestige while individuals growing up with fewer advantages preferred jobs that offered low risks and correspondingly low returns and placed more value in jobs that offered cleanliness, job security, and pensions.

Halady (2003) concluded respondents' statuses as teens outweighed adult experiences in and out of the labor market in shaping the value placed on intrinsic or extrinsic job values. Respondents' family background, educational attainment, cognitive ability, and gender affect individuals' definitions of a good job before the transition to adulthood. Thus, human capital shaped by the family of origin influenced lifelong decisions and behaviors regarding employment (Halady 2003). Individuals with advantaged backgrounds were comfortable taking the risk of pursuing an advanced degree for future rewards increasing economic wealth while individuals growing up in disadvantaged families pursued jobs involving lower risk and more security, such as entering a vocational trade. Human capital characteristics present in the family of origin interacted with each other and defined work centrality [i.e., job values] that were still present 35 years later.

Age

Several scholars (Halady 2003; Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001; Johnson and Elder 2002; Smith 2000) have focused more directly on age. Johnson and Elder (2002) found job values changed during the 8 years post high school graduation by becoming increasingly stable as respondents age. The Monitoring the Future Survey was a repeated cross-sectional interview of U.S. high school seniors with a sub-sample of the large survey panel study completed with cohorts from 1976 to 1980 and followed for eight years. Johnson and Elder (2002) found differences between those who received a high school diploma versus those who continued with a post secondary education. At time one, during high school, respondents who eventually completed a college degree were more likely to place a greater importance on internal rewards and were less concerned with external rewards. Respondents who obtained a high school diploma were less concerned with work rewards and more interested in job security. Differences observed during the respondents' senior year were amplified eight years after high school graduation with earlier values that had influenced the pursuit of education being reinforced by continuing education.

Other studies (Halady 2003; Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001; Smith 2000) have found that intrinsic and extrinsic values become increasingly stable as an individual ages (Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001). Based on a panel study of American adults starting in the senior year of high school and following them to 31-32 years of age, the proportion of young adults who reported that each feature of a job, such as intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, and social rewards, was "very important" declined for both women and men. Intrinsic job rewards, such as an interesting job, using one's skills, the ability to see results, learning, and creativity were considered more

important at all time periods than extrinsic rewards, such as advancement, money, respect, and status. The rate of decrease in individuals who reported that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were “very important” shrinks over time suggesting values become increasingly stable as people aged (Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001).

While some scholars studied young adults (Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Johnson 2001), Smith (2000) focused on older adults in eight European countries and found that attitudes shifted towards an emphasis on extrinsic rewards over intrinsic rewards as people aged towards retirement. Individuals were motivated to work for extrinsic rewards even past the age of retirement. Based on a cross national sample of individuals from Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Japan, the United States, and Canada, Smith (2000) found between 62 and 88 percent of individuals who were past the national retirement age preferred to continue some level of employment with 21-57 percent of respondents interested in full-time employment. As people aged, extrinsic work rewards, such as a means to earn money, became more important than intrinsic rewards. An individual’s emphasis on the financial rewards of work rather than on work’s intrinsic value increased as people aged in Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Japan, but varied little by age for the United States and Canada (Smith, 2000).

Marginalized statuses

Previous research (Halady 2003; Leviatan 1985; Mannheim 1994) has frequently reported that white men report more work centrality than women, meaning work plays a more central role in their lives when compared to women; however, research by Ross and Mirowsky (1996) paints a more complex picture. Ross and Mirowsky (1996) found that

the gendered differences in work commitments and work rewards were related to the individual's power on the job. The greater power men typically have in the workplace relative to women translates into greater work centrality. Members of groups with less human capital, such as women and ethnic minorities, receive fewer intrinsic rewards in the workplace compared to groups that were more privileged.

Groups that lack human capital are more interested in external work rewards and value them more explicitly when they are available. Svallfors, Halvorsen, and Andersen (2001) studied individuals in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden and found people with less education and a lower socioeconomic status placed more value in extrinsic rewards than their higher SES counterparts. Furthermore, Shapiro (1977) found that African Americans were likely to value extrinsic job rewards, such as high income and job security, more than intrinsic rewards, such as feelings of accomplishment, even when controlling for social class, education, and income. Overall, studies find that a lack of human capital encourages respondents to value extrinsic over intrinsic rewards, but this research is limited. Further exploration of the relationship between gender and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards is a major contribution of my research.

Integrated Micro/Macro Analyses of Work Centrality and Intrinsic/Extrinsic Rewards

In this section, empirical studies on macro level policies found to shape attitudes toward work are reviewed. A number of scholars from business and sociology (e.g. Gash 2008; Hult and Edlund 2008; Pettit and Hook (2005) Stier, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001; Parboteeah and Cullen 2003; Westwood and Lok 2003) have completed studies that integrated both micro and macro level analyses. Studying European nations, Hult and Edlund (2008) explored retirement age within the context of a country's retirement

policies. Norwegian and Swedish citizens retire at relatively older ages than do citizens of Germany and Denmark. Hult and Edlund (2008) traced variations in these retirement ages to specific economic histories and policies. Germany and Denmark have experienced high rates of unemployment in recent decades. As a result, cultural norms support the idea that older workers needed to leave the labor market relatively early, reducing the need either to fire younger workers or to create government programs supporting the unemployed. The cultural norm of early retirement co-exists with welfare policies that make early retirement financially possible and even attractive. In contrast to Germany's and Denmark's high unemployment, Norway and Sweden have benefitted from 30 years of low unemployment. Norway and Sweden have not needed to create policies encouraging senior workers to retire early and make room for younger workers. Hult and Edlund's study offers insight into how welfare policies are tied to retirement decisions, namely how the motivation to work is shaped by alternatives that make paid work less compelling for certain groups of people.

Public policies beyond retirement also shape individual decisions regarding work. Drawing from the women's employment literature, scholars (Gash 2008; Pettit and Hook 2005; Stier, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001) have found that policies pertaining to parental leave and federally funded childcare have a significant relationship to the probability that married women and men with young children will participate in the paid labor force. The availability of parental leave keeps women with young children connected to the paid labor force by offering financial support for women who temporarily stop working after the birth or adoption of a child and in many cases ensures women can return to their previous jobs when the parental or maternity leave ends. However in Finland, Germany, Hungary, and the Czech Republic where this leave

extends beyond three years, the probability of women with young children participating in employment decreases. In countries with particularly generous maternity leave policies, women may opt to remain in the home when maternity benefits are exhausted. Scholars speculate that longer leaves reinforce the breadwinner homemaker model, thus reducing the motivation to return to paid work.

Likewise, federally supported childcare is positively related to the probability of married women with young children working in the labor force (Pettit and Hook 2005). Pettit and Hook (2005) argued the continuous employment of women with young children influences these women's employment trajectories throughout the life course. Reducing the time women spend out of the labor force reduces the penalties associated with gaps in employment history. When mothers have lower state support for employment, they face a higher chance of not continuing employment (Stier, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001). For example, Gash (2008) found that states that provided childcare enabled more women to work full-time. Gash (2008) compared state investment in childcare as a percent of GDP. Denmark and France were supportive of maternal employment with a higher percent of GDP invested in childcare in contrast with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom, with a private pay system of childcare means childcare is affordable to only the highest wage earners. The result is that women in countries with little or no public childcare are pushed into part-time and low-wage employment.

Taking a more comprehensive look at cross-national trends, Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) presented large-scale multi-level analyses of 30,270 respondents from 26 countries. Building on the international management literature, the authors used multi-level methodology to test how macro-level social phenomena such as socialism, union

strength, educational accessibility, social inequality, and industrialization affected the general importance of work to individuals. The results indicated a connection between national context and individual level attitudes. In socialist countries with more government intervention in individuals' lives, effective redistribution policies, higher rates of participation in labor unions, and less opportunity for advancement within occupations, individuals placed less importance on work. In liberal nations that lack a minimal standard of living guaranteed by the government, have weak unions, and greater reliance on individuals' characteristics for determining career advancement, meant people assigned more importance to work. While documenting the connection between societal level forces and individual attitudes, however, this study looked at only the general importance of work, but did not differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

Westwood and Lok (2003) studied work centrality in two different Chinese cities, Hong Kong and Beijing. Their findings indicated common work attitudes between workers in both cities as well as subtle differences attributed to differing structural conditions. The people of Hong Kong and Beijing have a shared Confucian cultural heritage emphasizing the self in relation to the group (as opposed to the individualism more common in the western hemisphere), but their political and economic histories differ starkly. While Hong Kong was a British colony until 1997 with an open, free market economy, Beijing followed a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist political economy beginning in 1949. Even though Hong Kong was under British rule for 150 years and Beijing under communist control, Hong Kong and Beijing workers both demonstrated high levels of work centrality, although the dimensions stressed by each group of workers differed. Beijing workers emphasized extrinsic rewards by perceiving work as the means to supporting families. Hong Kong's post-industrial capitalism and economic prosperity

enabled Hong Kong workers to focus on the intrinsic rewards, but Beijing workers have had fewer economic resources and thus placed more value on extrinsic rewards.

In addition to political structure, broader economic and social changes resulting in changes in personal fortunes can affect the relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards among workers. In a cross-sectional survey of the American labor force (capturing the years 1982 to 1989), England (1991) found that a decline in intrinsic work rewards and an increased interest in extrinsic work rewards corresponded to changes in American organizations. When workers were in a context of decreasing job security combined with employers' increased emphasis on efficiency and productivity, these workers reported an increased interest in extrinsic work rewards and a decline in emphasis on intrinsic rewards.

The studies reviewed in this section reveal the interplay of structure and individual attitudes and behaviors regarding work. A significant contribution of my study is the inclusion of the concept of human capital and cross-national comparisons that include micro and macro levels of analyses that include gender as a central focus. In addition to reviewing the literature on micro and macro level analyses, one needs to look at literature originating in gender studies.

Negotiation of Gender Roles, Family, Work, and Work Centrality

Within the sociological literature, much research on gender inequality has been framed around the negotiation of gender roles, family, work, and work centrality (Bartkowski 2001; Crompton and Lyonette 2005; Kimmel 2006; Rippeyong, Noonan, and Glass 2006; Semyonov 1980; Walzer 1996). For example, in her study of women executives, Blair-Loy (2003) noted the challenges facing elite women executives who

found work central to their identity. She described how these women negotiated demanding careers and family in the face of restrictive social norms regarding motherhood and a lack of institutional supports for parenting. Blair-Loy's work is an exemplar in many ways, illuminating the work-family balance inequities of elite groups of women, but it does not explain how work rewards came to be so central to these women.

Likewise, other scholars (Crompton and Lyonette 2005; Kimmel 2006; Rippeyong, Noonan, and Glass 2006; Semyonov 1980; Walzer 1996) have given insight into how men and women negotiate roles in various institutions, but these studies failed to examine intrinsic or extrinsic work rewards. In other words, these studies assume work is important to women but do not consider the factors affecting this importance. This oversight is problematic given the rates of women's participation in the labor force in developed nations. Women who are engaging in paid labor are no longer the exception but the rule, thus future research needs to address women's experience of work beyond the difficulties it presents for family life (Bianchi 2000; Blair-Loy 2003; Brines 1994; Cunningham 2001; Hochschild 1997; Walzer 1997).

Psychological Well-Being and Work Centrality

Sociologists and psychologists have frequently studied the relationship between work centrality and personal well-being. When the focus of analyses is on the importance of work in one's life, measures of work centrality are frequently used as an independent variable influencing job satisfaction, with greater work centrality translating into increased job satisfaction and psychological well-being (Mueller and Kim 2008). Factors contributing to increased job satisfaction for U.S. respondents are having control

over the job and access to job rewards (Kalleberg 1977); however, women reported job satisfaction that was equal to or greater than that of men's, even when accounting for differences in material rewards, job characteristics, family responsibilities, and personal expectations (Hobson 1989). Women report that the family is more central in their lives and contributes most to their life satisfaction, while greater work satisfaction is the driving force behind increased life satisfaction for men (Morden and Ostiguy 2005). Studies of job satisfaction, paying particular attention to gender differences and the so-called “paradox of the contented female worker” are highlighted in this section (Mueller and Kim 2008:118).

Scholars have found that women’s reported job satisfaction to be equal to men’s despite the fact that women receive fewer material rewards (Hakim 1991; Hobson 1989; Mueller and Kim 2008). In trying to explain this finding, Mueller and Kim (2008) framed the issues from an organizational behavior perspective and wanted to explain factors related to job satisfaction. The fact that women received fewer material rewards and reported job satisfaction that was equal to men’s was a problematic finding. Mueller and Kim (2008:118) developed the phrase “the paradox of the contented female worker” to describe this discrepancy. Using the 2005 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) data, Mueller and Kim (2008) found the paradox to be consistent across 30 countries and concluded that women were just as satisfied with their jobs as men and that this equitable satisfaction was “essentially a universal, worldwide phenomenon” (Mueller and Kim 2008:117). While this body of literature informs the reader how much and why people like their jobs and the effects of work on overall life satisfaction, the studies did not address how personal resources and national policies intersect with gender in shaping individuals’ work centrality. Although women reported job satisfaction equal to that of

men, the lower personal resources typically found among women vis-à-vis men and the greater importance of state subsidized family leave and childcare for women's labor force participation suggest that these factors affect women and men differently, even when they arrive at the same outcome. Furthermore, work centrality is used as an independent variable in these studies, not as a problem to be explored in its own right.

Work Centrality as a Commodity

Literature emerging from business and economics frames work centrality as a commodity that can be controlled or changed to affect worker productivity and thus benefit corporate interests (Gill 1999). In business and economics research, the complexity of work is reduced to increasing profits (Gill 1999). For example, Mannheim (1984) studied industrial management; comparing labor-owned and privately-owned factories. The goal of the study was to discern employees of managers in labor-owned factories would be more work-centered, more satisfied and committed to their organizations. The findings indicated that employees' view of managers in labor-owned factories did not differ from managers who worked in privately owned factories. Instead, plant size proved to be the critical force driving worker's perceptions of management. Workers in smaller plants felt management focused on the worker and were subsequently happier with their jobs than workers in large factories.

In another study on work centrality emerging from business and economics, Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, and Lord (2002) compared college students' self-reported work centrality to their work supervisors' assessment of the student's performance. A student's reported work centrality was not a useful predictor of supervisors' assessment of an individual's performance. The study represents a line of research that tests the

relationships between job involvement and job performance (Brown 1996; Paullay, Alliger, Stone-Romero 1995). One last example of business and economics research is Benabou and Tirole (2003) who found that extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation by undermining workers confidence. The researchers concluded that “performance incentives offered by informed principal (manager, teacher, parent) can adversely impact an agent’s (worker, child) perception of the task, or of his own abilities. Incentives are then only weak reinforces in the short run, and negative reinforces in the long run (Benabou and Tirole 2003:489). Thus, the emphasis of the business literature is in understanding factors related to increasing workers’ efficiency and productivity. This is analogous to earlier criticisms of the human relations approach to the study of work as “cow sociology” and is clearly applicable today (Bell 1947:88). Absent from the management and economics literatures are studies that explore how individual attributes (i.e. gender, education level, marital status, and parental status) and national policies may shape intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. My current study addresses the weaknesses in the business and economic literature by including factors that are the typical purview of sociologists.

Substantive Gaps in the Literature and Methodological Short Comings

Substantive Gaps

Generally, the current research reviewed above focuses primarily on micro level factors and lacks gendered analyses of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. Specially, micro-level research focuses solely upon individual attributes in explaining work centrality and neglects structural factors (Dubin 1956; England 1991; Halady 2003; Harpaz, Honig, and Coetsier 2001; Herzburg 1959; Johnson 2001; Johnson and Elder

2002; Mannheim 1975; Mannheim 1984; Mannheim 1988; Mannheim 1993; Mannheim, Baruch, and Tal 1997; Mannheim and Cohen 1978; Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero 1994; Ross and Mirowsky 1996; Shapiro 1977, 1982 and 1989; Smith 2000; Svallfors, Halvorsen, and Andersen 2001; Tumin 1955). Other studies rely on limited samples of individuals and/or national contexts (Hult and Edlund 2008; Westwood and Lok 2003) or neglect to fully consider how gender affects work centrality (Parboteeah and Cullen 2003). Still other studies focus primarily on national policy and women's participation in the paid labor force (Gash 2008; Gornick, Meyers, and Ross 1997; Pettit and Hook 2005; Steir, Lewin-Epstein, and Braun 2001) and ignore work rewards. The vast majority of these studies fail to adequately integrate the micro and macro levels of analyses, a critical oversight in the sociological study of work centrality. Furthermore, while the overarching concept of work importance has been studied extensively, the more specific dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards have not, nor have researchers explored how gender affects these dimensions.

Only a few work centrality studies have incorporated country level and institutional factors, including the following three studies: a study on four European nations and the intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards within the context of a country's retirement policies (Hult and Edlund 2008); the meaning of work in two Chinese cities with different political and economic histories (Westwood and Lok 2003); and an analyses of socialism, union strength, educational accessibility, social inequality, and industrialization affected the importance of work in 30 countries (Parboteeah and Cullen 2003). Despite the insights offered by these three studies, scholarship taking such a comprehensive and multi-level approach to understanding work centrality is still the exception in the literature. While an in-depth look at individual level factors is important,

individuals do not exist in a social vacuum and social contexts play a role in shaping how individuals see and experience the world. An over reliance on micro-level variables, a common occurrence in the study of work centrality, ignores the larger social context and fails to recognize the role of political structure in the study of work (Watson 2009). My research furthers sociological understandings of work centrality by incorporating personal resources and national policies in a study of individuals' work centrality, with an explicit focus on gender.

For twenty years, scholars have been calling for the integration of micro and macro level analyses (Abbott 1993; Halford and Strangleman 2009; Simpson 1989; Vallas 1993; Watson 2009). Going back to 1989, Ritzer said combining micro and macro levels has emerged as a central issue "in sociological theory in the 1980s." In 2009, Watson was recommending the integration of the micro and macro levels while keeping aspects of both approaches. Ritzer (1989:600) concludes his metatheoretical analyses of the study of work with the following statement:

"Overall, the theoretical literature on micro-macro integration (or at least some significant components of it) can help meet Simpson's call for sociology of work that deals with the relation between creative actors and constraining structures without sacrificing a sociological approach on the altar of economics."

My research helps to answer the many calls for an exploration of political structure and how macro level measures of inequality shapes individuals' work centrality without an over-reliance on structural economic factors that loses sight of human agency. Studies of work generally, and work centrality specifically, seen through a gendered lens would be an answer to criticisms leveled by previous scholars (Abbott 1993; Halford and Strangleman 2009; Simpson 1989; Vallas 1993; Watson 2009).

Methodological Problems

In addition to substantive gaps, a number of methodological weaknesses exist in the work centrality literature, limiting the scope of sociological understandings of this topic. Overall, the current understanding of work centrality is based on dated analyses of small, non-random, or non-generalizable populations. The present methodological weaknesses suggest the following two limitations with previous research: (1) a lack of generalizability to broader and more current population and (2) inaccurate findings regarding reasons why women and men work.

The first methodological problem is the small, non-random, and non-generalizable specialized populations. For example, studies have included the following samples: 242 respondents from a Canadian university (Morden and Ostiguy 2005); 130 employed American undergraduate students at an urban commuter university (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, and Lord (2002); 313 human services employees and their work supervisors at a state psychiatric site (Paullay, Alliger, Stone-Romero 1994); and a sample of 256 white-collar workers from three universities in Montreal (Kanungo 1987); 209 working men and 136 working women, all of whom were married, had at least two children, and were drawn from four high school districts in a large unnamed city in Israel (Mannheim 1993); 727 respondents from professional, technical, and managerial personnel in Israeli technology organizations (Mannheim, Baruch, and Tal 1997); 319 Israeli high tech works (Snir, Harpaz, Ben-Baruch 2009); 209 students in the 11th grade of 13 high schools in the metro area of Israel (Mannheim 1988). Mannheim (1984) collected data from 57 industrial plants, their production managers, and 847 production workers in Israel. Some studies have included samples consisting of only a few hundred respondents drawn from non-random, highly specific groups. While these studies are

valuable, they are not necessarily generalizable to large segments of the population and their insights are limited to fairly narrow contexts.

Additionally, rapidly changing norms regarding women and work indicate patterns uncovered in more dated studies no longer hold in the contemporary period. A few scholars have more recently contributed greatly to the refinement and understanding of work centrality as a concept, but their research nonetheless consists of specialized populations living in a large unnamed city in Israel (Baruch, and Tal 1997; Leviatan's 1985; Mannheim 1984, 1988, 1993; Snir, Harpaz, Ben-Baruch 2009). My research is based on a survey published in 2005 that includes randomly selected respondents from 12 nations.

The second methodological problem consists of studies that do not adequately consider the gender of workers. The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey conducted 1,496 interviews based on a random sample drawn from the United States population (Kalleberg 1977; Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983). Kalleberg (1977) did not include gender in his analyses. Even more recent studies have left gender completely out of the analyses or used gender simply as a control variable while failing to consider what the significant coefficient for workers' gender might mean (England 1991; Kalleberg 1977; Kanungo 1987; Morden and Ostiguy 2005; Mottaz 1989; Paullay, Alliger, Stone-Romero 1994 Shapiro 1977; Quintanilla and Wilpert 1991).

Even when gender differences are a central research question, methodological shortcomings lead to problematic assumptions and flawed conclusions. Work by Leviatan (1985) and Mannheim (1994) suggests that work plays a more central role in men's lives, suggesting that women are less committed to work. While recognizing the importance of status position, these scholars conclude that reported differences in work

commitment are related to either individual status inconsistency (Mannheim 1994) or socialization (Leviatan 1985). The studies fall short of a more sociological discussion of human capital, which is certainly relevant to the relationship between gender and work centrality.

Specifically, Leviatan (1985) explicitly takes gender inequality into account and actively seeks to explain the relationship, but the conclusion lacks validity. Leviatan (1985) studied the Kibbutz in Israel; a communal settlement traditionally based on agriculture, and sought to explain the recurrent finding that women reported less work centrality than men. He found small gender differences in work centrality overall but greater gender differences among older age groups. The study had the potential to make a significant contribution, because the kibbutz society has attempted to equalize gender roles. Despite the concerted attempt to equalize gender roles, gender differences in work centrality remained; this was true even when controlling for more education, the intensity of the work role, and role conflict. Socialization and social influence were reasons the author gave for the continued differences between women and men in a group that strives for gender equality. The study fails to recognize that men continue to receive advantages over women even in groups that claim to have reduced gender differences resulting in flawed methodology and problematic assumptions. In order to address the weakness of Leviatan (1985), my research builds on the study of Ross and Mirowsky, discussed below, and analyzes intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards through a gendered lens.

While these studies point to social and structural factors influencing reported gender differences in work centrality, all of the studies underestimate the importance of power and neglect to account for the fact that women and men do not have the same access to resources. Left largely unexplored is how the differential access to human

capital for men versus women and how this social fact in turn leads to different commitment to work and work rewards not inherent or socialized differences, with the exception of sociologists Ross and Mirowsky (1996). They are the only scholars who adequately recognize the role of power in their reported findings. Ross and Mirowsky (1996:223) ask, “Why do women take jobs for less pay than do men?” Economists argue that, because women take these jobs, they must get rewards that are not financial. Starting with Adam Smith in the *Wealth of Nations*, economists theorized that workers who engaged in less desirable jobs must receive alternative rewards. Contemporary economists have developed the “theory of compensating differentials” and theorized that women must value interpersonal rewards while men value greater personal control and higher earnings (Ross and Mirowsky 1996). Ross and Mirowsky (1996) conclude that women receive greater interpersonal rewards, such as thanks and recognition, but men received more economic rewards. In contrast to the economists’ claims, however, women’s psychological well-being and feelings of personal control improve with an increase in extrinsic rewards while an increase in intrinsic rewards does not improve women’s well-being. Women simply are more likely to receive fewer economic rewards and more intrinsic rewards. The findings reported by Ross and Mirowsky (1996) emphasize the following points: women are at an economic disadvantage in the workplace relative to men, and this disadvantage shapes their experience of work. They conclude that women and men do not differ in the importance they assign to intrinsic or extrinsic rewards, but they do receive differing amounts of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

With the exception of Ross and Mirowsky (1996), studies trying to explain gender differences assumed these differences were due to benign socialization differences

without considering how human capital, power, and lack of access to resources may impact women and men differently. While Ross and Mirowsky's analyses is limited to the United States, it nonetheless is an important first step in explicating the role of gendered power and gendered access to resources in shaping work centrality. Their work makes a significant contribution, because the scholarship on gender and work wrongly concludes that men are more focused and committed to work and that they are therefore justified when they demand – and receive - greater rewards than women. Erroneous conclusions that men are more committed or report a higher degree of work centrality reinforces women's disadvantage in the work place by perpetuating beliefs that women are less committed to the work. Employers use these erroneous conclusions to their advantage in order to justify taking women workers less seriously in compensating them for work of equal worth. These practices in turn serve to deny women the promotions and access to the jobs that most likely yield the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards linked to greater work centrality and enjoyment of work.

Overall, a review of the work centrality literature suggests a body of literature with significant gaps, including the following: small, non-random, non-generalizable samples, lack of micro/macro integration, problematic, methods and flawed conclusions. The purpose of my research is to address these problems and fill gaps in the literature by exploring how individual characteristics in conjunction with national policies determine the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards and how this differs by gender.

My study improves upon existing studies in a number of ways. First, I seek to understand the forces affecting the importance women and men attach to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards, a very specific part of work centrality. Thus, I avoid the

confusion over the work centrality term inherent in so many other studies. Furthermore, I do not take work centrality as a given by including it as an independent variable, but instead assume it is something sociologically significant that must be explained. I therefore use the relative importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as my outcome variables, coded as index variables, and used to express the salience of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, respectively, as important. To address sampling limitations found among existing studies, I use the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2005 Work Orientation Module data, a recent multi-country survey that represents a large, random sample of individuals within each country's population. I draw my sample from 12 nations from the 2005 wave, yielding a sample of 16,601 and allowing me to examine the most recent wave of data and offering the potential to update existing findings. Furthermore, I combine the ISSP data with policy level data from the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (hereafter OECD) and the International Network on Leave Policy and Research to integrate micro- and macro-level variables to better understand the effects and importance of individual attributes and national policies relative to one another. In order to move beyond using gender as a mere control variable and uncover the effects on gendered resources and constraints on work centrality, I perform gender-integrated and gender-separate analyses to see how the factors affecting work centrality differ for women and men. Using gender-separate samples for these analyses allows me to identify which factors matter for each gender, and whether these factors differ in salience for women vis-à-vis men in shaping work centrality.

Research Questions

This research addresses the following four main questions:

1. How do individual attributes affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards?
2. How do national policies affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards?
3. How do the effects of individual attributes and national policies differ from each other in relative magnitude as predictors of the value individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards?
4. How do the effects of individual attributes and national policies on the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards differ between women and men?

Accordingly, the individual-level variables used in this study include gender, age, income, employment status, and educational attainment. This list includes all of the individual level attributes identified as important to work centrality in the literature. According to the cited literature, national policies shape personal decisions and values regarding work (England 1991; Gash 2008; Hult and Edlund 2008; Pettit and Hook 2005; Steir, Lewin-Epstein and Braun 2001; Parboteeah and Cullen 2003; Westwood and Lok 2003). National level variables measure support for work-family balance and the investment each nation makes in easing the gendered constraints on paid work, proportion of regular salary paid while on paid family leave, and relative levels of public spending on family benefits as a proportion of a country's GDP. I discuss the measurement of all variables in detail in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The methodology I use to investigate how gender, human capital, and national policies shape the importance individuals attach to intrinsic or extrinsic rewards is described in this chapter. The chapter begins with a description of the data and variables used in my study and conclude with a discussion of the analytic strategy.

Data

In order to investigate how gender, human capital, and national policies shape individuals' work centrality, I utilize measures from three different data sets. The measures include individual level data from the International Social Survey Program: Work Orientations III, 2005 (hereafter ISSP: WO); national social policy data from the Social Expenditure Database (hereafter SOCX) drawn from the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (hereafter OECD); and paid family leave data from surveys conducted by the International Network on Leave Policy and Research. The ISSP: WO is a subset of the ISSP, a large, cross-national data set. Since 1984, the ISSP has annually conducted a survey on attitudes toward social issues across a variety of countries. The Work Orientations module is a subset of the larger survey covering the role of work in individuals' lives.

Every year the topic modules in the ISSP vary and have included the legal system, the environment, the economy, the government, religion, and most relevant for my study, family and gender issues and work orientation. Data are gathered by individual

governments of participating nations by The Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences abbreviated as GESIS. The acronym GESIS originates from the institute's original name, the German Social Science Infrastructure Services, that merged with the Social Science Information Centre in Bonn (abbreviated as IZ), Central Archive for Empirical Social Research in Cologne (abbreviated as ZA), and Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (abbreviated as ZUMA) in Mannheim all located in Germany. GESIS is responsible for merging the data from each nation into one data set.

The countries that participate in a given year vary with the 2005 module including the following 30 nations: Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the United States.

The second data set I draw from is the 2005 Social Expenditure Database, a part of the OECD. The OECD was established in 1961 and surveys 34 nations with the current mission of providing data that may lead to analyses promoting "policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world" (OECD 2010). To achieve this mission, the OECD collects data, analyzes the data, discusses the implementation of policies that will enable governments to reduce poverty and create economic growth and financial stability. Extending from the OECD mission, the SOCX database compiles information on 2005 country level family and child policies. The purpose of the SOCX database is to provide comparable, cross national social expenditure data. Covering the years 1980-2007, the database includes information on financial assistance for families through cash benefits or tax transfers, childcare, and

parental leave employment opportunities for families with young children, especially lone parents. For this study, I draw upon the 2005 data of the OECD/SOCX.

To match the 2005 data, paid family leave data are drawn from surveys conducted by the International Network on Leave Policy and Research, which was established in 2005 and consists of 35 scholars and policy makers from 22 countries. The purpose of the International Network on Leave Policy and Research is to bring together information on policies from member countries with a special focus on the welfare of children, parents and other caretakers, such as adult relatives. The International Network on Leave Policy and Research convenes an annual seminar and produces the annual review of leave policies and research in the countries represented in the publication (Moss and O'Brien 2006). For this study, I use the 2005 data gathered by the International Network on Leave Policy and Research.

Methods

I am primarily interested in how human capital and national policies shape individual's work centrality and how the relative importance of these factors varies by gender. Therefore, I draw upon an individual-level sample from the ISSP: WO including 7,190 men and 8,811 women respondents for a total of 16,601 respondents in 12 countries who were 19 years of age or older. Respondents were involved in at least one of the following categories: working full or part time in waged labor; caring for a family member full-time or part-time; attending school or vocational training full-time or part-time; retired; and unemployed (ISSP 2005). I merge these data with country-level policy data from the OECD/SOCX survey from the following nations: Australia, Belgium,

Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, and the United States.

My choice of nations is driven by my desire to explore how the availability of state subsidized resources shapes the value of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. I therefore seek to loosely “control” for cultural variation that would have significant, yet unmeasured effects on work centrality by focusing on a subsample of post-industrial, modernized nations with very high rates of labor force participation by both women and men along with relatively high levels of affluence and educational attainment. I further restrict the sample to democratic nations wherein individuals have a significant degree of autonomy over their personal lives and employment decisions. The original ISSP: WO survey consisted of 43,440 respondents from 31 countries. From the original survey, I omitted 19 countries that did not meet my criteria or were missing key variables thereby eliminating 26,839 respondents.

Several European countries were not included due to missing data or theoretical complexities. Austria, Luxemburg, and Italy were not included in the ISSP: WO survey. The survey on the Netherlands had completed the Work Orientations module, but the work centrality questions were not included, making it necessary to drop the Netherlands from the analyses. Missing macro-level data was a problem for Spain, New Zealand, and Switzerland as the International Network on Leave Policy and Research did not collect family leave information from these nations. The inclusion of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan would introduce significant cultural variations due in part to the cultural influences of Confucianism; while the Eastern European countries of Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Bulgaria, Russia, and Latvia present different structural and political histories emerging from communist party domination after World War II.

Finally, Israel, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and South Africa present considerable differences in industrial development, cultural beliefs, and religious histories (Huntingdon 1993; Inglehart and Baker 2000; Treas and Widmer 2003). After eliminating countries in the ISSP survey that did not share the cultural, religious, historical, structural, and political histories of the desired sample, I was left with 12 nations including Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

In order to accomplish my goal of exploring how human capital and national policies intersect with gender to shape individuals' attitudes toward work centrality, I eliminated the following respondents from the ISSP survey: children under the age of 19; persons permanently disabled and unable to work in the paid labor force; respondents with missing values for the work centrality questions critical to my study; and respondents who did not give a reason for currently not being involved in the labor force. Eliminating these cases resulted in a loss of 932 respondents. Respondents under 19 typically are not working to support a family or to pursue a career; they lack responsibilities for others and view work as temporary with the goal of earning spending money (Ross and Mirowsky 1996). Respondents who were currently unemployed but indicated they were looking for work or intended to return to the paid labor force in the foreseeable future were included.

Smith (2000) found between 62 and 88 percent of individuals who were past the retirement age preferred to continue some level of employment with 21-57 percent of respondents interested in full-time employment. Since many individuals who were past the retirement age preferred to continue some level of employment, indicating a commitment to work centrality, all older individuals remained in the sample.

National policy variables are drawn from two data sets, the OECD/SOCX and International Network on Leave Policy and Research. I use the 2005 data on national public spending on subsidized childcare reported as a percentage of each nation's GDP. A second policy variable, family leave incorporates the Moss and O'Brien (2006) report from The International Network on Leave Policy and Research and includes in months total combined paid leave for maternity, paternity, parental, and sick children some payment is received (SOCX 2005: 1).

Variables

I first discuss the micro level variables from the ISSP: WO, including both the dependent and individual-level independent variables, followed by the macro level variables from the OECD/SOCX and The International Network on Leave Policy and Research.

Dependent variables: work centrality

To explore how personal resources and national policies intersect with gender in shaping individuals' work centrality, two dependent variables capture intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards.

Intrinsic Rewards

The first dependent variable was created from a 7 variable index based on the following questions in the ISSP: WO. The first four index items are as follows:

1. "I would enjoy having a paid job even if I did not need the money;"
2. "I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help the firm or organization I work for succeed;"
3. "I am proud to be working for my firm or organization;" and

4. “I would turn down another job that offered quite a bit more pay in order to stay with this organization.”

Original response options included “strongly agree,” “agree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree,” “strongly disagree,” “can’t choose,” “no answer,” and “refused.” The remaining response categories were recoded into a dichotomous variable with “neither agree nor disagree,” being coded as 0 along with “disagree,” and “strongly disagree.” Responses indicating the respondent strongly agreed or agreed with the questions were coded 1. Respondents who could not choose from among the options or did not answer were omitted from the sample.

The remaining three statements measuring intrinsic work reward included a set of questions that asked respondents “How important is ...”

5. “An interesting job;”
6. “A job that allows someone to help other people;” and
7. “A job that is useful to society.”

Original response options included “very important,” “important,” “neither important nor unimportant,” “not important,” “not important at all,” and “can’t choose.” Respondents that selected one of the following options of “can’t choose” or did not answer were omitted from the sample. The response categories were recoded into a dichotomous variable with “neither important nor unimportant,” “not important,” “not important at all,” being coded as 0. Responses indicating the respondent found these work features to be “very important” or “important,” were coded 1. All of the variables were summed creating an index with values ranging from 0 thru 7 (See Table 1 for frequencies).

Extrinsic Rewards

The second dependent variable was created as an index of 6 variables based on questions in the ISSP: WO. The first question asked respondents if they agreed with the following statement: “A job is just a way of earning money - no more.” Responses to this question capture extrinsic work motivation. Original response options were identical to those for the first four intrinsic rewards statements and recoded into a similar binary variable. Responses indicating agreement or strong agreement with the statement were coded as 1. Responses indicating the respondent disagreed, strongly disagreed, or felt neutral toward the statement were coded 0. Respondents who could not choose from among the options or did not answer were omitted from the sample.

The remaining five components of the extrinsic reward index included a set of questions that asked “How important is ...”

2. “Job security;”
3. “High income;”
4. “Good opportunities for advancement;”
5. “A job that allows someone to work independently;” and
6. “A job that allows someone to decide their times or days of work.”

Original response options included “very important”, “important,” “neither important nor unimportant,” “not important,” “not important at all,” and “can’t choose.” Respondents that selected one of the following options of “can’t choose” and “no answer” or “refused” were omitted from the sample. The response categories were recoded into a dichotomous variable with “neither important nor unimportant,” “not important,” “not important at all,” being coded as 0. Respondents who answered “very

important,” “important,” were coded 1. All of the variables were summed creating an index with values ranging from 0 thru 7 (See Table 1 for frequencies).

Independent variables

In order to understand how human capital and national policies shape the degree to which women and men value intrinsic or extrinsic work rewards, I use the following independent variables: gender, age, educational attainment, income, employment status, family leave policies, and spending on childrearing.

Gender

The question asked in the ISSO: WO is “Firstly, are you male or female?” I use this measure of sex as a proxy for gender. The answers were coded to represent men as a dummy variable with women as the reference category. A total of 7,190 or (46.9 percent) of respondents are men and 8,811 (53.1%) are women.

Age

This variable is coded as the individual’s age expressed in years.

Educational attainment

To address different education systems across multiple countries, I used the ISSP: WO standardized educational categories which translate roughly into the following standard U.S. categories including the: no formal education/no high school diploma, graduated from high school, attended a university but did not complete a bachelors degree, completed bachelor’s degree, attended some graduate school and/or completed a graduate degree. From these categories, I created one dummy variable measuring whether individuals had at least some college education. I combine no formal education

and graduated from high school and coded these educational statuses as 0. Attending a university but not completing a bachelor's degree, completing a bachelor's degree, and some graduate school/graduate degree were coded as 1.

In addition to individual level status variables shaping how women and men value intrinsic and extrinsic work values, people live within specific national context that shapes work centrality via support for family and work roles. To measure the impact of national context, I include two variables that capture the availability and extent of family and child support policies: length of paid family leave and public spending on childcare.

Income

The question asked was "Do you agree or disagree: 'My income is high.'"

Responses included (1) strongly agree, (2) disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) agree, (5) and strongly agree.

Employment

One dummy variable was created measuring employment status. Full-time employment was coded as 1 with employed part-time, unemployed, student in school, or managing the home (e.g., housewife, househusband, caring for family members) coded as 0.

Family and Child Policies

National policy variables include the 2005 OECD/SOCX data for public spending on family benefits and paid family leave. The SOCX database includes 2005 measures on social expenditures for all 12 nations and includes one variable that measures total national expenditures on subsidized childcare as a percentage of GDP. The inclusion of the amount of spending on family and child policies measure the level of investment in

work-family policy made by various nations and should logically affect individuals' resource levels and thus the value attached to intrinsic and extrinsic benefits.

Specifically, social expenditures on pre-primary education include measures of direct public financial support for families with children which include cash, in-kind, or support through the tax system. Childcare support includes spending for families with children between the ages of 3 and 5 and includes subsidies of childcare, such as kindergartens, and day-care centers. The measurement produces a standardized variable and serves as comparable measure of the amount of resources each country is willing to devote to family and child benefits. Variables measuring social expenditures were included to test whether the amount of social expenditures is related to shaping individuals' intrinsic or extrinsic work rewards.

The second policy type measured is paid family leave and includes total family leave available to the nearest month and includes maternity, paternity, and parental leave. This variable was included to test whether the amount of paid family leave is related to shaping individuals' intrinsic or extrinsic work rewards.

Analytic Strategy

I run regression analyses to test how human capital and national policies shape individuals' work centrality and whether the relative importance of these factors varies by gender. Because individuals in this sample are nested within a limited number of countries, the cases are not independent. I use the cluster command in *Stata* with robust standard errors to correct for this non-independence without sacrificing degrees of freedom. Values of the dependent variables are independent between groups of individuals within nations, but within each national grouping these values are non-

independent. The *Stata* cluster command allows me to specify which nation each individual is nested within and corrects for any correlations that result from this non-independence. Following the *Stata Library* (2011), the formula can be written as the following:

$$\bar{n} = \frac{1}{N-1} \left\{ M - \frac{\sum_j n_j^2}{M} \right\} = \bar{n} - \frac{s^2(n_j)}{N\bar{n}} \quad (1)$$

$$s^2(n_j) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^N (n_j - \bar{n})^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{\rho}_I = \frac{F-1}{F + \bar{n} - 1} \quad (3)$$

\bar{n} is the weighted average number of elements (cases) per cluster;

\bar{n} is the mean sample size;

N is the number of clusters;

M is the total sample size; and

S^2 is the variance of the sample sizes.

In order to explore my research questions, I run several models. Turning first to the models using intrinsic rewards as the dependent variable, I run a series of models including all women and men in the sample (Models 1 through 3). The first model includes individual level variables only, the second model includes national level variables only, and the third model includes both individual and national level variables. Models 7 through 9 include only women in the sample and the entry of independent variables into the models parallels the order described for Models 1 through 3. I then run the same series of models using only the men in the sample, Models 10 through 12. I follow an identical strategy for the models examining extrinsic work values: Models 4

through 6 include both women and men, Models 13 through 15 include only women and Models 16 through 18 only men. Models 1 and 4 include only individual levels variables and address the first research question regarding how individual attributes affect intrinsic and extrinsic work values. I test if gender, age, educational attainment, and employment status is significantly related to the salience of intrinsic and/or extrinsic work rewards.

The second research question, how do national policies affect the emphasis on intrinsic and extrinsic work values, will be addressed in models 2 and 5. I test if paid family leave and public expenditures on family benefits shapes an individual's intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. Finally, Models 3 and 6 include both individual and national level policies address the third research question, how the effects of individual attributes and national policies differ from each other in relative magnitude as predictors of the value individuals place upon intrinsic and extrinsic job rewards. I can examine these differences in two ways. First, I compare the change in the adjusted R2 between micro level models and macro level models to gauge which set of variables account the greatest amount of variation in the dependent variables and compare the size and magnitude of the coefficients' impact on the dependent variables.

Finally, the fourth research question will be explored in Models 7 through 18 by testing whether the significance of human capital and national policies differ between women and men in a series of gender-separate models. First, I compare Models 7-9 to 10-12 and Models 13-15 to 16-18 to determine whether individual or policy variables explain more of the variance vis-à-vis each other among women and whether these patterns differ from those affecting men. I then compare the coefficients across models to test for different effects by gender in any of the independent variables. Specifically, I compare each of the independent variable coefficients in the model to its counterpart, and

repeat the process with each model. To do so I apply the z-score test to the beta coefficients in each model.

$$z = \frac{x - \mu}{\delta} \quad (4)$$

This chapter described the methodology I use to investigate how human capital and national policies shape the emphasis individuals place on intrinsic or extrinsic rewards to work, my data set, and the variables used in my study. The dependent variables include intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and independent variables, age, education, income, work status, paid family leave, and spending on childcare. The chapter concluded with a discussion of the analytic strategy.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter consists of a presentation of findings of the analyses described in Chapter Three. Using a representative sample of women and men drawn from 12 post-industrial nations, I analyzed how human capital (i.e. age, education, employment status) and national policy (paid family leave and social expenditures provided by the state on family and child services) intersect with gender to shape the values women and men attach to intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. While not all variables in the models were significant, the following statements may be made:

1. More human capital on the micro and less human capital on the macro level increases an emphasis on intrinsic rewards.
2. Less human capital on both the micro and macro level increases emphasis on extrinsic rewards.
3. Gender mediates the effect of micro and macro variables on the importance an individual assigns to intrinsic rewards.
4. Gender does not mediate the effect of micro and macro variables on the importance an individual assigns to extrinsic rewards.
5. Coefficients tests across the women-only and men-only intrinsic rewards models reveal having some college, having a higher income, and spending more money on childcare increases the importance of intrinsic rewards for both women and men, but each of these variables has a greater effect on men than women.

6. Coefficients tests across the women-only and men-only extrinsic models reveal that high income and full-time employment increase the importance of extrinsic rewards for both women and men, but the effect is greater for men than women. The importance of exploring possible gender differences in the salience of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards builds from a work centrality literature with problematic methods and flawed conclusions. In order to uncover the effects of gendered resources and constraints on work centrality, I perform gender-integrated and gender-separate analyses that test micro and macro variables separately and in tandem to see how the factors affecting work centrality differ. Models 1-6 consider how the salience of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards varies among women and men as a whole, while Models 7-9 and 13-15 examine women-only and Models 10-12 and 16-18 consider men-only (See Tables 2-5).

The Effects of Micro and Macro Level Factors on Intrinsic Rewards

A standard OLS regression confirms that individual attributes (micro level variables) and national policies (macro variables) affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic rewards. Analyses were performed using *Stata* regression with the cluster command with robust standard errors, which controls for the fact that cases are not independent, as individuals are nested within 12 nations. A *p* value of .05 or lower was used to determine statistical significance for all models. Model 1 includes all women and men in the sample to measure the effects of micro level variables upon the salience of intrinsic work rewards (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations and Table 2, Models 1, 2, and 3 for the unstandardized regression coefficients (β) and intercept for each model). This analysis is able to account for 0.02 % of the variance in the dependent

variable, intrinsic work rewards (scale value ranging from 0 to 7). The model includes the following micro level predictor variables: gender, age, education, income, and work status. Specifically, men report intrinsic rewards to be less important relative to women. Furthermore, as individuals' age and income increase so too does the salience of intrinsic work rewards (Table 1, Model 1).

Model 2 consists of macro level variables only and accounts for 9.26% of the variance in the importance people place upon intrinsic rewards. The predictor variables include paid family leave and spending on childcare (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations). Specifically, individuals living in countries with more extensive paid family leave and spending on childcare report less emphasis on intrinsic work rewards (Table 2, Model 2). In other words, the greater the proportion of resources a nation devotes to paid leave and the greater the proportion of expenditures on childcare, the less salient intrinsic rewards become to individuals living in those nations.

The full model includes both micro and macro level variables. The model accounts for 11.29 % of the variation in the importance individuals assign to intrinsic rewards and increases the explained variance compared to the models including only micro-level or macro-level predictors (Table 2, Model 3). Thus, while macro level variables have a far greater impact on the importance individuals assign to intrinsic work rewards, both micro and macro level factors are important for explaining the maximum possible variation. Among the micro level variables, the salience of intrinsic rewards decrease for men. Being older, having some college education, and having a higher income increase the salience of intrinsic rewards. Among macro level predictors, more state spending on paid family leave and childcare had the reverse effect and decreases the emphasis individuals place on intrinsic rewards. Comparing models 1 and 2 to model 3,

the pattern of significant variables did not change with the exception of the income variable. In model 3, a higher income significantly increases the salience of intrinsic rewards but had no effect in the earlier micro level model. Finally, the coefficients for gender in Models 1, 2, and 3, a key variable of interest, indicate men view intrinsic rewards as less important relative to women once other relevant factors are controlled.

Overall, the macro level variables were better predictors, but the strongest models include both the micro and macro level variables. Regarding intrinsic rewards, the variables men, age, and education predict variance in intrinsic rewards, but the model only explained .02% of variance in intrinsic rewards suggesting there may be other factors not measured in the current research influencing variance in intrinsic rewards at the individual level. In contrast, the macro level only model was a stronger model, predicting 9.26% of those who were working for intrinsic rewards. The multi-level model was the strongest of the previous models explaining 11.2% of the variance in the intrinsic rewards. Thus, while greater individual human capital, including age, college education, and higher income, increases the salience of intrinsic work rewards, more state support for work/family balance decreases the salience of intrinsic rewards. Most interesting for the present study is that men consistently value intrinsic rewards less than women.

The Effects of Micro and Macro Level Factors on Extrinsic Rewards

My analyses confirm that micro and macro level factors shape an individual's emphasis on the salience of extrinsic rewards (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations and Table 3, Models 4, 5, and 6 for the unstandardized regression coefficients (β) and intercept for each model). Greater levels of human capital in the form of

education and childcare decrease the importance of extrinsic rewards while higher income and being employed full time increases the emphasis on extrinsic rewards. Gender made no difference in the value assigned to extrinsic rewards. Model 4 consists of micro level variables and accounts for 0.5 % of the variance in the dependent variable. In terms of micro level independent variables and the value of extrinsic work rewards, individuals with at least some college education were less likely to emphasize extrinsic work rewards.

Model 5 consists of macro level variables only and accounts for 2.28% of the variance among individuals in their emphasis on extrinsic rewards. The results indicate that increasing spending on childcare decreases the value individuals place on working for extrinsic rewards (Table 3, Model 5).

Model 6 includes micro and macro level variables and explains 3.35 % of the variance in the salience of extrinsic rewards. Both micro and macro level factors are important for explaining maximum possible variation in the importance individuals assign to extrinsic work rewards. Micro and macro level variables significant in Models 4 and 5 remain significant in Model 6 while higher income and full-time employment status variables became significant. Specifically, among the micro level variables, having some college education and living in a country with higher spending levels on childcare decrease the importance of extrinsic rewards while higher income and full-time employment increase these values. No college education and full-time employment were the two strongest variables that increase the salience of extrinsic rewards. Macro level variables had a similar relationship with less macro level human capital, measured as a decrease in spending on childcare increase the emphasis on extrinsic rewards (Table 3, Model 6). Gender was not a significant variable suggesting that the independent

variables exert similar effects among both women and men. Significantly, this finding contradicts the current literature, which claims women value extrinsic rewards less than men.

As in micro level model for intrinsic rewards, the micro level model for extrinsic rewards was the least effective in explaining variance in extrinsic rewards (0.5%). The macro level model predicts 2.28% of the variation in the dependent variable. However, even the full model predicts only 3.35% of the variation in the salience of extrinsic rewards, suggesting there are unmeasured factors predicting variance in extrinsic rewards.

Gender Differences in the Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards

Gender differences in intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, a key research question, had been previously ignored or poorly researched. To address this disparity, I perform gender-separate analyses in addition to the gender-integrated analyses described above. Although the gender coefficient was not significant in the extrinsic reward models, it is still important to consider whether the relative impact of independent variables differs between women and men.

Intrinsic rewards among women.

Analyses confirm that important differences exist between women and men in the effects independent variables have upon the importance individuals assign to intrinsic rewards. Models 7, 8, and 9 include women respondents only while Models 10, 11, 12 include only men. Model 7 includes only micro level variables and accounts for 1.33 % of the variance in the salience of intrinsic rewards among women (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations and Table 4 Models 7, 8, and 9 for unstandardized regression

coefficients (β) and intercepts for each model). Significant micro level predictor variables of the greater value of intrinsic work rewards for women include being older and having some college education (Table 4, Model 7). Model 8 consists of macro level variables for women-only and explains 10.61% of the variance. Significant predictor variables indicate the more extensive the paid family leave and state spending on childcare decreases the importance women place on intrinsic rewards (Table 4, Model 8).

Model 9 includes micro and macro level variables and accounts for 12.13% of the variance in the emphasis women place on working for intrinsic rewards. Comparing models 7 and 8 to model 9, the pattern of significant variables remain consistent with macro level factors playing the greatest role. Higher levels of individual human capital increase the importance of intrinsic rewards while greater national resources decrease intrinsic rewards (Table 4, Model 9).

Intrinsic rewards among men.

Models 10, 11 and 12 were men-only models. Model 10 includes micro level variables only and explains 2.03 % of the variance in the intrinsic rewards scale among men (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations and Table 4 Models 10, 11, and 12 for the unstandardized regression coefficients (β) and intercept for each model). The significant micro level independent variables predicting higher salience of intrinsic work rewards for men include being older, having some college education, and having a higher income. Model 11 consists of macro level variables for men-only and accounts for 8.40 % of the variance in the salience of intrinsic rewards for men. The significant variables of the salience of men's intrinsic work rewards include more extensive paid family leave, which decreases the salience of intrinsic rewards (Table 4, Model 11).

Model 12 includes micro and macro level variables and accounts for 10.29 % of the variance in salience of working for intrinsic rewards. Overall, both micro and macro level variables are important for explaining the maximum possible variation in men's intrinsic rewards but macro level variables had the greater impact (Table 4, Model 12). Comparing models 10 and 11 to model 12, the pattern of significant variables did not change with the exception of state spending on childcare, which reached significance and decreases values of the dependent variable. This suggests that men with lower levels of individual human capital are more influenced by state work-family programs.

Comparing intrinsic rewards among women and men

In addition to separating analyses by gender, I test coefficients across the women-only and men-only full models. Differences in coefficients reveal that having some college education increases the importance of intrinsic rewards for both women and men. Income, however, has no effect on women but increases the value men place on intrinsic rewards. This difference in the effects of income is also statistically significant. The differences in the coefficient suggest that when men earn a higher income they are free to pursue intrinsic rewards of work.

The analysis of macro level variables reveal that increasing family leave and childcare spending decreases the importance of intrinsic rewards for both women and men and there are no differences in the effects of the policy variables between the genders. My analyses suggest women and men are increasingly similar in terms of how they approach intrinsic rewards. It seems possible that as individual and policy resources go up for women and men, the emphasis on intrinsic rewards may be shrinking as work itself becomes less important. In countries where individuals have access to more human

capital at the macro level, i.e. family supportive policy, work is an extension of one's life and less important. While individuals living in countries with less human capital at the macro level, i.e. little safety net, successful employment is a matter of economic survival. These data; however, do not have measures that would allow me to test for certain patterns.

Extrinsic rewards among women

Analyses indicate gender affects which independent variables shape the importance of extrinsic rewards and the relative magnitude of these effects. Models 13, 14, and 15 include only women (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations and Table 5, Models 13, 14, and 15 for the unstandardized regression coefficients (β) and intercepts for each model). Model 13 includes micro level variables and accounts for 0.35 % of the variance in the importance of extrinsic rewards for women. The significant micro level predictor variables of the value women place on extrinsic rewards include some college education, which decreases the salience of extrinsic rewards. Model 14 consists of macro level variables for women-only and accounts for 2.47 % of women who were working for extrinsic rewards. Significant macro level predictor variables that decrease the salience of extrinsic work rewards for women includes increases in spending on childcare (Table 5, Model 14).

Model 15 includes micro and macro level variables and explains 3.12 % of the value women place on working for extrinsic rewards. Comparing models 13 and 14 to model 15, the pattern of significant variables did not change with the exception of full-time employment and paid family leave. Two variables, full-time employment and more extensive paid family leave, reach significance and increase the salience of women's

extrinsic work rewards in the full model. Among the macro level variables, more extensive family leave increases the importance women place on working for extrinsic work rewards; however, a reverse relationship was evident for an increase in spending on childcare, which decreases the salience of extrinsic rewards. These patterns were consistent both with and without the inclusion of micro level variables in the analyses.

Both micro and macro level factors are important for explaining the maximum possible variation in the importance women assign to extrinsic work rewards (Table 5, Model 15). Thus, micro level human capital factors, such as no college education and full-time employment, increase the value women allocate to extrinsic rewards. A lack of state supports to ease the burdens of work-family balance, such as money spent on childcare, make it imperative women receive enough extrinsic rewards like higher pay to cover the costs of these services themselves. The reverse relationship is true for more paid family leave increasing the salience of extrinsic rewards, suggesting that more generous leave policies are connected to women's commitment to paid work.

Extrinsic rewards among men

Models 16, 17 and 18 are men-only models. Model 16 accounts for 0.88 % variance in extrinsic rewards for men (See Table 5, Models 16, 17, and 18 for the unstandardized regression coefficients (β) and intercepts for each model). Model 16 demonstrates the significance of having some college education, higher income, and full-time employment for the salience of men's extrinsic work rewards, as each of these factors increases the salience of extrinsic rewards among men. Model 17 consists of macro level variables for men-only and explains 2.07 % of the variation among men in the importance they assign to extrinsic rewards. Results indicate that more spending on

child care and pre-primary education decreases the importance of extrinsic rewards among men (Table 5, Model 17).

Model 18 includes micro and macro level variables, accounting for 3.78 % of the variation among men in the salience of extrinsic rewards. In the full model, education reverses direction. In the micro-only model, the relationship was positive, but in the full model the relationship was negative meaning having some college education decreases the importance of extrinsic rewards relative to men with no college education. The significant macro level predictor variable found a decrease in spending on childcare increases the salience of extrinsic rewards. Both micro and macro level variables are important for explaining the maximum possible variation in the importance men assign to extrinsic work rewards (Table 5, Model 18).

Comparing extrinsic rewards among women and men

Comparing the women-only full model to the men-only full model indicates a similar pattern of effects between women and men with the exception of the effects of income and full-time employment. In both cases, these predictors have a greater effect on men than on women. Beyond these differences, longer family leave increased the value of extrinsic rewards for women but had no effect on men, although the difference in the coefficients was not statistically significant. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that in general, women and men are both motivated by extrinsic rewards but women are more responsive to policy variation while individual attributes have a greater impact on men. This pattern of findings is logical in light of the structural discrimination faced by women, whose individual resources are often trumped by sexism in the workplace and a drastically unequal distribution of domestic labor, including the expectation that women

will use family leave to care for children while men remained employed. More encouraging is the fact that higher education levels and greater spending on childcare reduce the value of extrinsic rewards for both women and men, suggesting a greater convergence between the genders in at least some areas of work. It is particularly interesting that greater spending on childcare eases the importance of extrinsic rewards such as pay for women and men, suggesting that it is possible that among some women and men, childcare is becoming a joint concern.

Summary of Results

In conclusion, my analyses present the following findings on intrinsic rewards (models 1-3 and 7-12):

1. Findings indicate men attach less value to intrinsic rewards. In addition, greater micro level human capital predicts an increase in intrinsic rewards for women and men. The significant variables include the following: being older, having more education, and earning more income increases the salience of intrinsic rewards. Surprisingly, less macro level human capital, measured as lower amounts of paid family leave, and less spending on childcare were found to increase the salience of intrinsic rewards.
2. For the multi-level intrinsic women-only model, increasing salience on intrinsic rewards include the following human capital variables: being older and having some college education decreases the importance of intrinsic rewards while more paid family leave, and greater spending on childcare and pre-primary education decreases the value of intrinsic rewards.

3. For the multi-level intrinsic men-only full model, greater age, having some college education, greater income increases the salience of intrinsic rewards while more paid family leave, and more spending on childcare decreases the emphasis on intrinsic rewards.

My analyses present the following findings on extrinsic rewards (models 4-6 and 13 -10):

1. Findings for the extrinsic rewards full model indicate having less education and reducing spending on childcare increases the importance of extrinsic rewards; however, higher income and full-time employment increases the importance of extrinsic rewards. Gender was not a significant predictor variable as it had been for intrinsic rewards.
2. For the multi-level extrinsic women-only model, less human capital increases the salience of extrinsic rewards measured by no college education and a decrease in state spending on childcare. The reverse was true for full-time employment and more paid family leave increasing the importance of extrinsic rewards.
3. For the multi-level extrinsic men-only model, less human capital increases the salience of extrinsic rewards measured by no college and less spending on childcare. The reverse was true for higher income and full-time employment increasing the salience of extrinsic rewards.

My analyses present the following results on gendered intrinsic and extrinsic rewards (models 7-18):

1. A testing of coefficients across women-only and men-only intrinsic rewards models reveal that factors, some college, having a higher income, and spending

more money on childcare increase the importance of intrinsic rewards for women and men, but has a greater effect on men than women.

2. A similar test of coefficients across women-only and men-only extrinsic rewards model, found full-time employment was a significant predictor of extrinsic rewards for women and men, but being employed full-time has a greater effect on men than women.

In terms of the overarching picture, my analyses present the following results for micro and macro levels of measurement (models 1-18):

1. In all models, micro level variables were poor predictors of explained variance for the dependent variables, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, the macro level variables were better predictors of variance in the two dependent variables.
2. The strongest models include both the micro and macro level variables.

A detailed discussion of the implications of the findings as well as limitations and future research directions are covered in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter consists of a discussion of the implications, a consideration of the limitations of the study, and ideas for further research. According to the results of this dissertation, gender, human capital, and national policy do shape the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards for individuals in post-industrial nations. Individual attributes (micro level variables) and national policies (macro variables) affect the importance individuals assign to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and gender affects which variables impact individuals and to what extent. My findings contradict the literature, especially in terms of the findings related to gender and concerns over the validity of the dependent variable extrinsic rewards. The gender findings were not so much a contradiction of prior literature as they were a new application of the gender framework to intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Finally, as a study with a representative sample of 12 nations, a first for the intrinsic and extrinsic portion of work centrality, the results raise concern for the validity of the concepts in prior research due to the lack of explained variance in the dependent variable, extrinsic rewards.

Significant Contributions

Significant contributions to be discussed include the following: a multi-level application of the human capital concept, the addition of the gender framework, and the use of a recent and representative sample.

Multi-Level Analyses of Human Capital

My study is the first to utilize a multi-level approach to human capital and to incorporate the issues of power and access to resources as aspects of the work centrality debate. A significant contribution of the current research builds on findings from several disciplines. The disciplines most relevant to my findings include social psychology, gender studies, and sociology (see Budig et al. 2011; Halady 2002; Hauser, Tasi, and Sewell 1983; Johnson 2002; Kohn and Schooler 1969; Mortimer et al. 1996; Warren, Hauser, and Sheridan 2002). Less central but still important building blocks include research emerging from economics and business (Benabou and Tirole 2003; Brown 1996; Diefendorff et al. 2002; Paullay et al. 1995; Mannheim 1984). My findings indicate individuals who have access to more human capital (resources gained through age, education, and income) placed more importance on intrinsic rewards and individuals with less human capital (education) placed a greater emphasis on working for extrinsic rewards. These results are consistent with prior research on the qualities of a good job (Halady 2003; Hauser, Tasi, and Sewell 1983; Johnson 2002; Kohn and Schooler 1969; Mortimer et al. 1996; Warren, Hauser, and Sheridan 2002) and research on human capital (Becker 1962; Budig et al. 2011; Misra et al. 2010; Misra et al. 2011).

Despite the use of different terminology, my findings and the literature are consistent in many ways: access to human capital is correlated with an individual's emphasis on either intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. The concept of human capital was built on the research of gender scholars, Budig et al. (2011), Misra et al (2010) and Misra et al (2011), who found women with more human capital (measured by fewer children, more education, more job experience, and full-time employment) experienced higher opportunity costs if they leave the labor market while women with less human capital are

more likely to receive a proportionately higher wage penalty for motherhood and are more likely to exit the labor market altogether (Misra et al. 2010 and 2011). In addition to the term human capital (Halady (2003), coming from a social stratification approach, emphasized access to resources and found a similar relationship for individuals with more advantages valued intrinsic rewards while individuals with fewer advantages preferred extrinsic rewards. In addition, another line of research emphasized marginalized groups and individuals with less education and lower socioeconomic status were more likely to emphasize extrinsic work rewards over intrinsic rewards compared to groups with higher SES (Ross and Mirowsky 1996; Svallfors, Halvorsen, and Andersen 2003). Thus, my findings that access to human capital shapes intrinsic and extrinsic rewards is consistent with previous literature.

Unique to only a handful of previous studies, this dissertation extended the concept of human capital to macro level variables (Hult and Edlund 2008; Parboteeah and Cullen 2003) and is another significant contribution to the work centrality literature. The results indicate that both micro level personal human capital factors and macro level political and economic contexts shape the importance of work rewards. By extending prior research that had found institutional factors, such as retirement pensions or family leave, correlate with overall personal attitudes and behaviors regarding work (England 1991; Steir, Lewin-Epstein and Braun 2001), to predictor variables of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, the multi-level analyses contributed to a view of work “as part of the broader ensemble of social relations” (Vallas 1990:358). While separate micro and macro level models did explain variance in both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, the multi-level analyses were the most effective method of understanding predictor variables of work rewards, bringing in the larger social context.

Surprisingly, human capital did not increase a person's emphasis on intrinsic rewards on both the micro and macro levels. The correlation was supported at the micro level: individuals with more personal human capital were more likely to pursue intrinsic rewards. However, on the macro level, individuals with less government capital (countries with less supportive family and child policy) placed a greater emphasis on intrinsic rewards. Results are consistent with the conclusions of Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) and Esping-Andersen (1990).

Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) completed a multi-level analysis of respondents from 26 countries finding individuals who live in socialist countries (measured as more government intervention in citizen's lives with policies that redistributed the wealth, higher density of labor unions, and less opportunity for advancement within occupations), placed less importance on work. In liberal nations that lack a minimal standard of living guaranteed by the government, have weak unions, and greater reliance on individuals' characteristics for determining career advancement, people assigned more importance to work. Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) interpreted their results in two ways: (1) individuals from more socialist nations with greater equality among individuals in the country and family supportive public policies are less committed to work; or (2) for individuals living in countries with more equality and supportive family and child policies, the necessity of work declines and individuals are able to achieve a greater balance between work, family and leisure. While I could not directly test these claims in my own study, my results offer indirect support for the claims.

Esping-Andersen's (1990) typology of welfare states further adds to an understanding of my findings; less supportive family and child policies are related to an increase in the emphasis on intrinsic rewards. Esping-Andersen's framework provides an

understanding for how people experience political structure and how it shapes attitudes and the experience of work. For example, in the United States, people's survival is dependent upon their own successes in the labor market. When people are unable to support their families, the state will provide government assistance, but government programs are means tested, minimal, and stigmatizing. With little safety net people must be able to provide for their own families. Combining the findings of Esping Andersen (1990) with my findings, one may infer that people living in liberal/capitalist nations place a higher priority on work and may 'live to work,' while individuals in social-democratic/socialist nations are 'work to live.'

Gender Framework

The current research applied a gender framework; i.e., adding in a gender variable and creating women-only and men-only models, resulting in findings that both clarified and filled a gap in the previous literature. First, I discuss the interpretation of the greater salience of intrinsic rewards for women compared to men. Superficially, the results appear to support the "theory of compensating differentials" (Ross and Mirowsky 1996:223); however, I agree with Ross and Mirowsky (1996) in how to interpret the findings. Emerging from a tradition of research in economics, the "theory of compensating differentials" (Ross and Mirowsky 1996:223) contends that because women report more intrinsic rewards than men they must value intrinsic rewards more than men do. While my results may seem to support the "theory of compensating differentials," Ross and Mirowsky (1996) offered an alternative interpretation. The authors concluded that women emphasized greater interpersonal rewards due to the disadvantaged position women faced in the workplace and lack of extrinsic rewards. My

results are in line with the research of Ross and Mirowsky (1996) that women value intrinsic rewards more than men; however, like Ross and Mirowsky (1996), I am not content to interpret these findings as support for the “theory of compensating differential.”

While intrinsic rewards are more salient for women, gender separate models show similarities among men and women, offering additional support for Ross and Mirowsky (1996). When the predictor variables of intrinsic rewards are separated into women-only (models 7-9) and men-only models (10-12), the models show little variation. For women, the model that includes micro and macro level variables was able to correctly classify 12.13 % of the variation in the importance women assign to intrinsic rewards. Significant variables include being older, having some college education, less paid family leave, and the lower the percentage of GDP a country spends on childcare predict micro level intrinsic rewards for women. For the micro and macro level men-only model, the predictor variables were able to correctly classify 10.29 % of the variance among men with identical significant variables as to the women only model but with the addition of higher income. The income variable was the only variable that was significant for men and not women. My results support Ross and Mirowsky (1996) in that women and men do not differ in the importance they assign to intrinsic rewards, but they do receive differing amounts of intrinsic rewards.

Regarding extrinsic rewards few differences were found. In the gender-integrated models (4-6) and the gender-separate, women-only models (13-14) and men-only models (16-18), few differences were evident. According to the gender-integrated models (4-6), the gender variable was not significant. In the gender-separate models the explained variances, of the women-only (models 13-14) and men-only (models 16-18) are

essentially the same for the two models. Predictor variables of extrinsic micro and macro level variables were able to correctly classify 3.12 % of the variation in importance among women who were working for extrinsic rewards and include the following significant variables: some college education, full-time employment, and lower percentage of GDP spent on childcare predict extrinsic rewards for women. For the men-only model, micro and macro level variables were able to correctly classify 3.78 % of the variance in importance among men who were working for extrinsic rewards and include the identical variables to the women-only model with the exception of higher income and full-time employment predicting extrinsic rewards for men. As in the intrinsic rewards model, the only difference between the women-only and men-only model was the significance of the income variable for men.

A closer look at the women-only models (13-15) and male only models (16-18) reveal subtle gender differences. The gender coefficients disclose that high income and full-time employment have a greater effect on men than women. The continued salience of extrinsic rewards for men is interesting in light of the significant increases in women's participation in the labor force. The results indicate that women and men value extrinsic rewards the same and want the same returns for their work. Despite the convergence of women's and men's attitudes towards work, a look at the gender coefficients reveal men, more than women, are driven by the need to achieve extrinsic rewards even when they report high levels of human capital. Specifically, even when men report high incomes and full-time employment, extrinsic rewards are still more important for men compared to women.

As evident in labor force participation rates, discussed in the first chapter, women's entrance into the work place has not resulted in men's exit. A historical look at

changes in gender roles since the 1950s shows “asymmetrical” (England and Farkas 1986:194) change. Women’s roles have changed dramatically, but the converse has not been true for men’s roles. While women have moved into more traditional masculine jobs and work patterns, men have not moved in equal measure into women’s jobs nor do they stay out of the labor force in significant numbers. In fact, according to England and Farkas (1986:194), changes in men’s work patterns are a result of economic macro-structural changes such as longer years of schooling, discouraged workers, and earlier retirement, and not more men undertaking women’s roles and exiting the work place to become homemakers. Considering the macro-structural changes in women’s employment history and the lack of change in men’s lives, the results suggest convergence of women’s attitudes/lives towards men’s.

In summary, by applying a gender framework to the study of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, my results clarify and fill a gap in the previous literature. Gender differences were found in that women value intrinsic rewards more than men. In other words, men value work less for its intrinsic rewards suggesting the continued economic pressure for men as the family breadwinners. The purpose of work for men is to provide for the family and only when men feel comfortable that they are fully capable of providing economic stability do they value work as an avenue towards personal fulfillment. The results of the analysis of extrinsic rewards of work support men’s emphasis on their economic role. Even though extrinsic rewards were equally important for women and men, the factors of high income and full-time employment were significant for men and not women suggesting that even when men report more access to human capital men still feel the pressure of the breadwinner role.

My results indicate both differences and similarities between women's and men's attitudes towards the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards of work. My findings are only evident by adequately incorporating a gender framework which leads to a greater understanding of the gendered nature of intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards. The results of my study call into question the conclusions of previous research (such as England 1991; Kalleberg 1977; Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983; Leviatan 1985; Mannheim 1994; Morden and Ostiguy 2005) that men are more committed to work and possess greater work centrality than women.

Random and National Sample

Finally, in contrast to past research (such as that of Diefendorff et al 2002; Morden and Ostiguy 2005), my research includes respondents drawn from random and nationally representative samples. Even though the initial MOW international sample was a random sample of individuals in the labor force in eight countries, the data were collected between 1981 and 1983 (MOW 1987). In addition to an outdated sample, subsequent studies have been based on samples that were small, non-random, and based on non-generalizable specialized populations (such as Diefendorff et al. 2002; Morden and Ostiguy 2005; Mannheim 1993; Snir, Harpaz, Ben-Baruch 2009). My methodology allows an updated understanding of the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards with results that are generalizable to a larger segment of the population plus the addition of macro level data drawn from two data sets.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations of my current research which can be addressed by future researchers. These limitations include the low amount of explained variance for

the extrinsic models, the measurement of the dependent variable and income variable, and the omission of the occupational status variable.

Even though the models were statistically significant and did explain variance in intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, especially in terms of the gendered intrinsic rewards, the low amount of explained variance for the extrinsic models suggests the need for further research. The strongest models predict intrinsic rewards with the full model correctly classifying 11 % of the variance in intrinsic and extrinsic rewards the dependent variable with the gendered models predicting 12 % of the variance in the dependent variables in women and 10 % of men who were working for intrinsic rewards. The extrinsic rewards proved to be a weaker model predicting 3 % of the variance, and 3 % of the women and 3 % of the men who were working for extrinsic rewards. The problems may have grown from a concept that has mostly been tested in small non-random samples.

Future research can address many of the aforementioned limitations by expanding the analyses in a number of ways. Researchers can take advantage of the 30 countries in the 2005 Work Orientation module. By utilizing all the countries and incorporating nations with markedly different structural, cultural, and historical contexts, future researchers can employ hierarchical linear regression (HLM) and test for differences between and within countries (Raudenbush and Bryk 1986). In addition to 2005 Work Orientation module, researchers can utilize the ISSP Work Orientations modules conducted in 1989 and 1997 and take a multi-year approach and investigate political context and individual attitudes across time. Even though all 30 countries were not included in earlier surveys, a multi-level approach across time may offer important insights into structural changes over the last 30 years. In the current study, cluster regression was the best option for statistical analyses due to a small number of countries;

however, more extensive multi-level analyses that include more countries across time would add significantly to our understanding of the link between political context and how people experience work. Using HLM and time series analyses, researchers can explore the link between political differences and the experience of work in a variety of countries, enabling scholars to disentangle country level differences, political structure, and individual effects. Multi-level analyses of former and current communist nations in contrast to western nations on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards using HLM could explore changes within and between nations in different political contexts.

The measurement of the dependent and income variable plus the omission of occupational status variable are limitations of the current methodology and researchers can include these variables in future research. While the creation of an index variable created a stronger measure for the dependent variable, a high number of missing values for extrinsic rewards (n=9,235) in comparison to intrinsic rewards (n=15,017) is problematic. The income variable is also problematic. The variable measured whether a person felt their income was high, medium, or low perceived income not actual income. Perception of one's income was chosen over actual income due to the fact that income was coded in terms of currency of each country. There was no consistency between categories and numbers were not comparable. The occupation variable was defined using the ILO, ISCO 1988 codes. The 460 different occupations were difficult to categorize and the decision was made to omit the variable.

Future researchers can also utilize additional macro level measures. My current research used family and child policies, but Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) showed how additional macro level social phenomena shaped the importance individuals placed on work. The researchers utilized macro level variables such as socialism, union strength,

educational accessibility, and social inequality into predictors of the importance of work. Incorporating the same variables as Parboteeah and Cullen (2003), future researchers can offer additional insight to the link between political context, structure, and personal attitudes toward work.

Finally, future research can narrow the analyses by focusing on select populations by age. Research can explore the importance of family and child policy in shaping the work centrality of women and men of child-bearing age. The current project includes everyone 19 years and older with age recorded as a continuous variable. Since women and men in a certain category would be more influenced by child and family policies, especially in terms of how they negotiate family and work, selecting by age may present more significant results. Likewise, future researchers can also look at older populations and how retirement policies shape attitudes toward work. Hult and Edlund (2008) completed such an analysis of Norway, Sweden, Germany, and Denmark and found variations in retirement were linked to specific economic histories and government policies. A similar approach can be applied to more nations and studied across time with the goal of further exploring the factors that predict work centrality.

Implications

The results of my analyses have the following implications for future researchers, policy makers, women's advocates, and employers: (1) multi-level analyses is vital for a comprehensive understanding of the structural context of work; (2) the gendered nature of work cannot be ignored in future research on work centrality; and (3) policy makers, employers, and women's advocates must consider prior research on work centrality as one part of the multi-faceted aspects of gender inequality.

By integrating both micro and macro level factors, I have been able to fill a gap in the literature with important implications for understanding the structural context of work. The results of my research emphasize that people do not live their lives in isolation from the social contexts in which they live; therefore, future research on work centrality must consider both micro and macro level variables. Today, researchers have the tools to conduct multi-level analyses. Between the availability of large multi-country data sets, such as International Social Survey and World Values Survey, and statistical programs, such as Hierarchical Linear Regression, researchers have the capacity to test the importance of structural factors. A multi-level analysis is vital for a comprehensive understanding of the structural context of work.

The results of my analyses indicate that access to human capital plays an equal role for women and men in predicting a personal emphasis on intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards implying the importance of the gender framework. An adequate analysis of the gendered nature of work using the gender lens is vital for a complete understanding of work centrality, especially when considering changes in women's participation in the work place. Women are continuing to make gains in starting and completing their education at all levels, and women's employment rates continue to converge towards men's. Despite the gains women have made in the work place, women continue to lag behind men in wages and opportunities. The changes in the gendered compensation of work and continued gender inequality makes an understanding of how political and structural context interacts with men's and women's personal experiences of work an essential component of continued scholarship. A better understanding of work centrality, especially research that applies a gendered lens, can help scholars identify the subtle and not so subtle causes of gender inequality. Increased knowledge of these

“complex inequalities and their cumulative and interactive effects on individuals, groups, and social institutions” (Bose 2010:1) can bring an understanding as to why women continue to experience inequality.

Finally, my findings indicate that women and men have similar attitudes toward intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards contrasting with findings from prior research and highlighting methodological problems of previous research. Previous research failed to adequately consider gender resulting in conclusions that support continuing gender inequality. The importance of including a gender framework has implications for policy makers, women’s advocates, and employers. Policy makers, women’s advocates, and employers must consider prior research on work centrality as one part of the multi-faceted aspect of gender inequality. An incorrect belief that women are inherently less committed to work justifies policy makers and employers relegating women to a secondary role in the labor market. Scientific evidence, especially inaccurate findings, lends ideological support to the continuance of capitalism and patriarchy. Employers are justified in continued discrimination against women whether in pay or opportunity, which in turn protects patriarchy, and men’s dominance of the public-work sphere. Scientific findings that justify discriminatory ideologies prevent the development of policy that would address gender inequality while the results of my research give women’s advocates an additional tool to address inequality.

In conclusion, I extended the concept of human capital to macro level variables and added multi-level analyses to a body of research that had primarily focused on micro level variables. I found that both micro and macro level measures of human capital shape intrinsic and extrinsic work values. The intent of studying the relationship between

family and child policies was not to portray policies as inherently good or bad but rather to describe how these policies may shape personal attitudes to work.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, A. (1993). "The Sociology of Work and Occupations." *Annual Review Sociology* 19: 187-209.
- Althausen, R., and Arne L. Kalleberg (1981). *Firms, Occupations, and the Structure of Labor Markets: A Conceptual Analysis. Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets. I.* Berg. New York, Academic Press: 119-149.
- Arvery, R., Itzhak Harpaz, and Hui Liao (2004). "Work Centrality and Post-Award Work Behavior of Lottery Winners." *The Journal of Psychology* 138(5): 404-420.
- Bartkowski, J. (2001). *Remaking the Godly Marriage: Gender Negotiation in Evangelical Families* Rutgers University Press.
- Becker, G. (1962). "Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis." *The Journal of Political Economy* 70(5): 9-49.
- Becker, U. (2000). "Welfare State Development and Employment in the Netherlands in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of European Social Policy* 10(3): 219-239.
- Bell, D. (1947). "Adjusting Men to Machines: Social Scientists Explore the Life of the Factory Worker." *Commentary* 37: 79-88.
- Benabou, R., Jean Tirole (2003). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation." *The Review of Economic Studies* 70(3): 489-520.
- Bernard, J. (1974). *Academic Women*, Plume.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2000). "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?" *Demography* 37(4): 401-414.
- Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing Devotions: Career and Family among Women Executives*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Bose, C. (2010). "The President's Pen." *Eastern Sociological Society* 25(1).
- Braverman, H. (1974 and 1988). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, Monthly Review Press.

Brines, J. (1994). "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(3): 652.

Budig, M., Joya Misra, and Irene Boeckmann "The Cross-National Effects of Work-Family Policies on the Motherhood Wage Penalty: Findings from Multilevel Analyses."

Crompton, R., and Clare Lyonette. (2005). "'The New Gender Essentialism - Domestic and Family 'Choices' and Their Relation to Attitudes.'" *The British Journal of Sociology* 56: 601-620.

Cunningham, M. (2001). "Influences of gender ideology and housework allocation on women's employment over the life course." *Social Science Research* 37: 254-267.

Datamonitor (2009). USA: Country Analysis Report in Depth PESTLE Insights. Datamonitor PLC.

Diefendorf, J., Douglas J. Brown, Allen M. Kamin, Robert G. Lord (2002). "Examining the Roles of Job Involvement and Work Centrality in Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Job Performance." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23: 93-108.

Dubin, R. (1956). "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the "Central Life Interests" of Industrial Workers." *Social Problems* 3(1): 131-142.

England, G. (1991). "The Meaning of Working in the USA: Recent Changes." *European Work and Organizational Psychology* 1(2/3): 111-124.

England, P. and George Farkas (1986) *Households, Employment, and Gender: A Social, Economic and Demographic View*. Aldine de Gruyter: New York.

Epstein, F. C. (1990). *The Cultural Perspective and the Study of Work. The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. K. a. S. V. Erikson. New Haven, American Sociological Association.

Epstein, F. C. (2007). "Great Divides: The Cultural, Cognitive, and Social Bases of the Global Subordination of Women." *American Sociological Review* 72: 1-22.

Erikson, K., and Steven Peter Vallas, Ed. (1990). *The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. Presidential Series. New Haven, American Sociological Association.

Erikson, K. (1990). *On Work and Alienation. The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. K. Erikson, and Steven Peter Vallas. New Haven, American Sociological Association. Presidential Series.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1993). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

- Frase, P., and Janet C. Gornick (2009). *The Time Divide in Cross-National Perspective: The Work Week, Gender, and Education in 17 Countries*. Working Paper 526. L. I. Study.
- Friedan, B. (2001). *The Feminine Mystique*, W.W. Norton and Company.
- Gash, V. (2008). "Preference or Constraint? Part-Time Workers' Transitions in Denmark, France, and the United Kingdom." *Work, Employment, and Society* 2008: 655-674.
- Gill, F. (1999). "The Meaning of Work: Lessons from Sociology, Psychology, and Political Theory." *Journal of Socio-Economics*: 725-743.
- Gornick, J., and Jerry Jacobs (1998). "Gender, the Welfare State, and Public Employment: A Comparative Study of Seven Industrialized Countries." *American Sociological Review* 63(5): 688-710.
- Gornick, J. (1999). *Gender Equality in the Labor Market. Gender and Welfare State Regimes*. D. Sainsbury. Oxford, United Kingdom, Oxford University Press: 210-242.
- Hakim, C. (1991). "Grateful Slaves and Self-Made Women: Fact and Fantasy in Women's Work Orientations." *European Sociological Review* 7: 101-121.
- Hakim, C. (2000). "Developing a Sociology for the Twenty-First Century: Preference Theory." *British Journal of Sociology* 49: 137-153.
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-Lifestyle Choices in the 21st Century: Preference Theory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Halady, C. (2003). "Where Job Values Come From: Family and Schooling Background, Cognitive Ability, and Gender." *American Sociological Review* 68(April): 251-278.
- Halford, S. a. T. S. (2009). "In Search of the Sociology of Work: Past, Present and Future." *Sociology* 43: 811-827.
- Handel, M. J. (2003). "Skills Mismatch in the Labor Market." *Annual Review Sociology* 29: 135-165.
- Harding, S., and Frans J. Hikspoors (1995). "New Work Values: In Theory and in Practice." *International Social Science Journal* 47(3): 441-455.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). "The Importance of Work Goals: An International Perspective." *Journal of International Business Studies* 21: 75-93.
- Harpaz, I., Xuanning Fu (1997). "Work Centrality in Germany, Israel, Japan, and the United States." *Cross-Cultural Research* 31(3): 171.

- Harpaz, I., Benson Honig, and Pol Coetsier (2002). "A Cross-Cultural Longitudinal Analysis of the Meaning of Work and the Socialization Process of Career Starters." *Journal of World Business* 37: 230-244.
- Harpaz, I. a. X. F. (2002). "The Structure of the Meaning of Work: A Relative Stability amidst Change." *Human Relations* 55: 639-668.
- Hattrup, K., Jai Ghorpade, and James R. Lackritz (2007). "Work Group Collectivism and the Centrality of Work A Multinational Investigation." *Cross-Cultural Research* 41: 236-260.
- Hauser, R., Shu-Lino Tsai, and William H. Sewell (1983). "A Model of Stratification with Response Error in Social and Psychological Variables." *Sociology of Education* 56(1): 20-46.
- Hegewisch, A. (2011). "The Impact of Work-Family Policies on Women's Employment: A Review of Research from OECD Countries." *Community, Work and Family* 14(2): 119-138.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*, University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York, Metropolitan Holt.
- Hodson (1989). "Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Dissatisfied?" *Sociological Quarterly* 30: 385-399.
- Hult, C., and Jonas Edlund (2008). "Age and Labour Market Commitment in Germany, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden." *Work Employment Society* 22(1): 109-128.
- Huntington, S. P. (1998). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon and Schuster.
- Inglehart, R., and Wayne Baker (2000). "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review* 25: 19-51.
- ISSP (2005). *International Social Survey Programme: Work Orientation III*. G. L.-I. f. t. S. Sciences.
- Johnson, M. K. (2001). "Change in Job Values during the Transition to Adulthood." *Work and Occupations* 28: 315-345.
- Johnson, M. K. (2001). "Job Values in the Young Adult Transition: Change and Stability with Age." *Social Psychological Quarterly* 64(4): 297-317.

- Johnson, M. K., and Glen H. Elder Jr. (2002). "Educational Pathways and Work Value Trajectories." *Sociological Perspectives* 45(2): 113-138.
- Kalleberg, A. (1977). "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 42(1): 124-143.
- Kalleberg, A., and Karyn A. Loscocco (1983). "Aging, Values, and Rewards: Explaining Age Differences in Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 48: 78-90.
- Kamerman, S. B., and Alfred Kahn (2001). "Child and Family Policies in the United States at the Opening of the Twenty-First Century." *Social Policy and Administration* 35(1): 69-84.
- Kanungo, R. N., Jon Hartwick (1987). "An Alternative to the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Dichotomy of Work Rewards." *Journal of Management* 13(4): 751-766.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1991). "Making Meaning Out of MOW Research: A Discussion." *European Work and Organizational Psychologist* 1(2/3): 161-165.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York, Free Press.
- Knapp, L., Janice E. Kelly-Reid, and Roy W. Whitmore (2005). *Postsecondary Institutions in the United States: Fall 2003 and Degrees and Other Awards Conferred: 2002-03*. U. S. D. O. Education. Washington, DC, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Kohn, M., and Schooler, C (1969). "Class, Occupation, and Orientation." *American Sociological Review* 34(654-678).
- Kohn, M. (1987). "Cross-National Research as an Analytic Strategy." *American Sociological Review* 52: 713-731.
- Kohn, M. (1990). *Unresolved Issues in the Relationship between Work and Personality. The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. K. Erikson, and Steven Peter Vallas. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Leviatan, U. (1985). "Interpretations of Sex Differences in Work Centrality among Kibbutz Members." *Sex Roles* 13(5/6): 287-310.
- Lewis, J., Trudie Knijn, Claude Martin, and Ilona Ostner (2008). "Patterns of Development in Work/Family Reconciliation Policies for Parents in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK in the 200s." *Social Politics* 15(3): 261-286.
- Loscocco, K. A. a. A. L. K. (1988). "Age and the Meaning of Work in the United States and Japan." *Social Forces* (2): 337-356.

- Lundberg, G. (1960). "Quantitative Methods in Sociology: 1920-1960." *Social Forces* 39(1): 19-24.
- Lynd, R. S., Helen Merrell Lynd (1929 and 1937). *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture* [Paperback], Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mannheim, B. (1975). "A Comparative Study of Work Centrality, Job Rewards and Satisfaction: Occupational Group in Israel." *Sociology of Work and Occupations* 2: 79-101.
- Mannheim, B., and Ayala Cohen (1978). "Multivariate Analyses of Factors Affecting Work Role Centrality of Occupational Categories." *Human Relations* 31: 525-553.
- Mannheim, B. (1984). "Managerial Orientations and Workers' Job Responses in Labour-Owned and Private Industrial Plants in Israel." *Organization Studies* 5(1): 23-42.
- Mannheim, B. (1988). "Social Background, Schooling, and Parental Attitudes as Related to Adolescents Work Values." *Youth and Society* 19(3): 269-293.
- Mannheim, B., Yehuda Baruch, and Joseph Tal (1997). "Alternative Models for Antecedents and Outcomes of Work Centrality and Job Satisfaction of High Tech Personnel." *Human Relations* 50(12): 1537-1562.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York, MacMillan.
- Meyers, M., and Janet C. Gornick (2003). "Public or Private Responsibility? Early Childhood Education and Care, Inequality, and the Welfare State." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 34: 379-411.
- Miller, D., and Swanson (1958). *The Changing American Parent: A Study in the Detroit Area*. New York, John Wiley.
- Mills, W. C. (1951). *White Collar: The American Middle Class*, Oxford University Press.
- Misra, J., Michelle Budig, and Irene Boeckmann (2009). *Work-Family Policies and the Effects of Children on Women's Employment Hours and Wages*. American Sociological Association. San Francisco.
- Misra, J., Michelle Budig, and Irene Boeckmann (2011). "Cross-National Patterns in Individual and Household Employment and Work Hours by Gender and Parenthood." *Research in Sociology of Work* 22: 169-207.

- Morden, a. O. (2005). Gender Differences in the Centrality of Work, Leisure, Family, and Community and Models Prediction Life Satisfaction. Canadian Congress on Leisure Research 11: The Two Solitudes: Isolation or Impact. R. T. Delaere, C and D. Robinsons. Nanaimo, British Colombia, Malespina University-College.
- Mortimer, J., and Michael Finch (1996). "The Effects of Work Intensity on Adolescent Mental Health, Achievement, and Behavioral Adjustment: New Evidence from a Prospective Study." *Child Development* 67(3): 1243-1261.
- Mottaz, C. (1989). "An Analysis of the Relationship between Attitudinal Commitment and Behavioral Commitment." *The Sociological Quarterly* 30(1): 143-158.
- MOWIRT, M.O.W.I. R. T. (1987). *Meaning of Work*. Boston, Academic Press.
- Mueller, C. W. a. S.-W. K. (2008). "The Contented Female Worker: Still a Paradox?" *Justice* 25: 117-149.
- O'Connor, O., Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver (1999). *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Osterman, P. (1980). *The Employment of Black Youth: A Review of the Evidence and Some Policy Suggestions*. Expanding Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth, National Commission for Employment Policy. Washington, DC, GPO.
- Parboteeah, P. K., and John Cullen (2003). "Social Institutions and Work Centrality: Explorations beyond National Culture." *Organization Science* 14(3): 137-148.
- Paullay, I., George M. Alliger, and Eugene F. Stone-Romero (1994). "Construct Validation of Two Instruments Designed to Measure Job Involvement and Work Centrality." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79(2): 224-228.
- Percheski, C. (2008). ""Opting Out? Cohort Differences in Professional Women's Employment Rates from 1960 to 2005." *American Sociological Review* 73: 497-517.
- Pettit, B., and Jennifer Hook (2005). "The Structure of Women's Employment in Comparative Perspective" *Social Forces* 84: 779-801.
- Pimentel, E. (2006). "Gender Ideology, Household Behavior; and Backlash in Urban China." *Journal of Family Issues* 27(3): 341-365.
- Quintanilla, A. R. S., and Bernard Wilpert (1991). "Are Work Meanings Changing?" *European Work and Organizational Psychologist* 1(2/3): 91-109.
- Raudenbush, S. a. A. S. B. (1986). "A Hierarchical Model for Studying School Effects." *Sociology of Education* 59: 1-17.

- Rettig, S., Frank Jacobson, and Benjamin Pasamanick (1958). "Status Overestimation, Objective Status, and Job Satisfaction among Professions." *American Sociological Review* 23(1): 75-81.
- Reynolds, L. G. a. J. S. (1949). *Job Horizons: A Study of Job Satisfaction and Labor Mobility*. New York, Harper and Brothers.
- Rippeyoung, P. L., Mary C. Noonan, Jennifer L. Glass (2006). *Does Women's Work Commitment Change After Childbirth?* American Sociological Association. Montreal, Canada: 1-19.
- Ritzer, G. (1989). "Sociology of Work: A Metatheoretical Analysis." *Social Forces* 67(3): 593-604.
- Rosenberg (1957). *Occupation and Values*. New York, Free Press.
- Ross, C., and John Mirowsky (1996). "Economic and Interpersonal Work Rewards: Subjective Utilities of Men's and Women's Compensation." *Social Forces* 75(1): 223-246.
- Rossi, A. S. (1988). "Equality between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal." *Daedalus* 117(3).
- Rowbotham, S. (1969). *Women's Liberation and the New Politics. The Body Politics: Women's Liberation in Britain*. M. Wandor.
- Ruiz-Quintanilla, A. S. a. B. W. (1991). "Are Work Meanings Changing?" *European Work and Organizational Psychologist* (2/3): 91-109.
- Semyonov, M. (1980). "The Social Context of Women's Labor Force Participation: A Comparative Analysis." *The American Journal of Sociology* 86: 534-550.
- Shapiro, G. E. (1977). "Racial Differences in the Value of Job Rewards." *Social Forces* 56(1): 21-30.
- Simpson, I. H. (1989). "The Sociology of Work: Where Have the Workers Gone?" *Social Forces* 67(3): 563-581.
- Skeggs, B. (2008). "The Dirty History of Feminism and Sociology: Or the War of Conceptual Attrition." *The Sociological Review* 56(4): 670-690.
- Smith, A. (1991). *Wealth of Nations*, Prometheus Books.
- Smith, T. W. (2000). *A Cross-National Comparison on Attitudes towards Work by Age and Labor Force Status*, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development: 1-44.

- Snir, R., Itzhak Harpaz, Doris Ben-Baruch (2009). "Centrality of and Investment in Work and Family among Israeli High-Tech Workers: A Bicultural Perspective." *Cross-Cultural Research* 43(4): 366-385.
- Snir, R. a. I. H. (2005). "Test-Retest Reliability of the Relative Work Centrality Measure." *Psychological Reports* 97(2): 559-563.
- Snir, R. a. I. H. (2009). "Cross-Cultural Differences Concerning Heavy Work Investment." *Cross-Cultural Research* 43: 309-319.
- Sorensen, A. B. (1977). "The Structure of Intragenerational Mobility." *American Sociological Review* 40: 456-471.
- Steir, H., Noah Lewin-Epstein, and Michael Braun (2001). "Welfare Regimes, Family-Supportive Policies, and Women's Employment along the Life-Course." *American Journal of Sociology* 106: 1731-1760.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1949). *The American Soldier*, Princeton University Press.
- Sutherland, E. (1937). *The Professional Thief*. Chicago the University of Chicago.
- Svallfors, S., Knut Halvorsen, and Jorgen Goul Andersen (2001). "Work Orientations in Scandinavia: Employment Commitment and Organizational Commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden " *ACTA Sociologica* 44: 139-156.
- Tezli, A., and Anne H. Gauthier (2009). "Balancing Work and Family in Canada: An Empirical Examination of Conceptualizations and Measurements." *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 34(2): 433-462.
- Thevenon, O., and Anne Gauthier (2011). "Family Policies in Developed Countries: A 'Fertility Booster' With Side-Effects." *Community, Work and Family* 14(2): 197-216.
- Treas, J., Eric D. Widmer (2003). "Married Women's Employment over the Life Course: Attitudes in Cross-National Perspective." *Social Forces* 78: 1409-1436.
- Vallas, P., Ed. (1990). *Comments and Observations on the Nature of Work. The Nature of Work: Sociological Perspectives*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Walzer, S. (1996). "Thinking About the Baby: Gender and Division of Infant Care." *Social Problems* 43(2): 219-234.
- Walzer, S. (1997). "Contextualizing the Employment Decisions of New Mothers." *Qualitative Sociology* 20.
- Warr, P., and Peter Lovatt (1977). "Retraining and Other Factors Associated with Job Finding After Redundancy." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 50(2): 67-84.

Warr, P. (1982). "A National Study of Non-Financial Employment Commitment." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 55: 297-312.

Warren, J. R., Jennifer T. Sheridan, Robert M. Hauser (2002). "Occupational Stratification across the Life Course: Evidence from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study." *American Sociological Review* 67(3): 432-455.

Watson, T. (2009). "Work and the Sociological Imagination: The Need for Continuity and Change in the Study of Continuity and Change." *Sociology* 43: 861-877.

Westwood, R. a. P. L. (2003). "The Meaning of Work in Chinese Contexts: A Comparative Study." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 3(2): 139-165.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 1 Data Descriptives

	Frequencies	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Cluster Variables</i>					
Country		16.3500	13	1.00	37.00
Australia	1,988				
Canada	933				
Denmark	1,598				
Finland	1,345				
Belguim	1,338				
France	1,620				
Germany	1,701				
Ireland	1,001				
Norway	1,322				
Sweden	1,371				
United Kingdom	913				
United States	1,518				
Total	16,648				
<i>Dependent Variables</i>					
Intrinsic Work Rewards Scale		4.04	1.21	.00	6.00
0	42				
1	319				
2	1,354				
3	2,874				
4	4,485				
5	4,527				
6	1,416				
Total	15,017				
Extrinsic Work Rewards Scale		4.59	1.59	.00	7.00
0	46				
1	319				
2	640				
3	1,308				
4	1,790				
5	2,099				
6	2,043				
7	991				
Total	9,236				

Table 1 (continued)

<i>Micro Independent Variables</i>						
Gender			.47	.500	0	1
	Man	7,790				
	Women	8,811				
	Total	16,601				
Age (Total)		16,296	47.90	16.130	19	97
Education			3.02	1.47	0	5
	No college	9,516				
	Some College	6,881				
	Total	16,397				
Work Status			.7000	.46	.00	1.00
	Does not work full-time	3,513				
	Works Full-time	8,202				
	Total	11,718				
<i>Macro Independent Variables</i>						
Total expenditure of childcare and pre-primary education as % of GDP			0.68	0.32	0.2	1.2
	0.2	933				
	0.3	2,989				
	0.4	2,632				
	0.6	1,500				
	0.8	2,660				
	0.9	1,345				
	1	2,991				
	1.2	1,598				
	Total	16,648				
Total family leave			17.63	12.31	0	36
	0	1,518				
	4	1,001				
	6	1,500				
	9.5	1,338				
	10.5	1,598				
	11.5	2,255				
	24	3,102				
	32	1,371				
	36	2,965				
	Total	16,648				

Table 2 Regression of Intrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	β	β	β
Men	-0.190*** <i>0.060</i>		-0.213*** <i>0.050</i>
Age	0.013*** <i>0.002</i>		0.010*** <i>0.001</i>
Some College	0.240*** <i>0.080</i>		0.222*** <i>0.061</i>
Higher income	0.040 <i>0.030</i>		0.062* <i>0.028</i>
Full-time employment	-0.023 <i>0.081</i>		-0.005 <i>0.057</i>
Total paid family and child leave		-0.03*** <i>0.005</i>	-0.030*** <i>0.005</i>
Total expenditure of childcare and pre-primary education as % of GDP		-0.666** <i>0.283</i>	-0.679* <i>0.255</i>
Intercept	3.89***	5.553***	4.843***
R ²	0.02%	9.26%	11.29%
n	8,683	9,236	8,683

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; *p < .05

Table 3 Regression of Extrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors

	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	β	β	β
Men	-0.024 <i>0.031</i>		-0.041 <i>0.031</i>
Age	-0.001 <i>0.001</i>		-0.001 <i>0.001</i>
Some college	-0.159** <i>0.066</i>		-0.193*** <i>0.048</i>
Higher income	0.028 <i>0.018</i>		0.046*** <i>0.014</i>
Full-time employment	0.072 <i>0.035</i>		0.109*** <i>0.025</i>
Total paid family and child leave		0.002 <i>0.003</i>	0.004 <i>0.003</i>
Total expenditure of childcare and pre-primary education as % of GDP		-0.6*** <i>0.147</i>	-0.654*** <i>0.124</i>
Intercept	3.987***	4.406***	4.323 ***
R ²	0.54%	2.28%	3.35%
n	9,363	15,017	9,363

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05

Table 4 Regression of Intrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors, Women-Only and Men-Only

	Women-Only Models						Men-Only Models		
	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10	Model 11	Model 12			
	β	β	β	β	β	β			
Age	0.140***		0.013***	0.013***		0.012***			
	0.002		0.002	0.002		0.002			
Some college	0.200*		0.210**	0.290***		0.245***			
	0.090		0.074	0.080		0.070			
Higher income	-0.011		0.017	0.100*		0.118**			
	0.023		0.022	0.050		0.042			
Full-time employment	0.004		0.942	-0.034		-0.003			
	0.090		0.052	0.091		0.080			
Total paid family and child leave		-0.031***			-0.029***		-0.029***		
		0.005			0.007		0.006		
Total expenditure of childcare and pre-primary education as % of GDP		-0.618**			-0.717		-0.727**		
		0.242			0.341		0.288		
Intercept	4.080***	5.647***	5.01***	3.500***	5.470***	4.431***			
R ²	1.33%	10.61%	12.13%	2.03%	8.40%	10.29%			
n	4,285	4,594	4,285	4,398	4,628	4,398			

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05

Coefficients that vary significantly between women and men are bolded.

Table 5 Regression of Extrinsic Rewards Values on Micro and Macro Human Capital Factors, Women-Only and Men-Only

	Women-Only Models						Men-Only Models		
	Model 13	Model 14	Model 15	Model 16	Model 17	Model 18			
	β	β	β	β	β	β			
Age	-0.001		-0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001			
	<i>0.002</i>		<i>0.001</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.002</i>			
Some college	-0.154*		-0.154**	0.168**	0.168**	0.168**			
	<i>0.078</i>		<i>0.053</i>	<i>0.076</i>	<i>0.076</i>	<i>0.076</i>			
Higher income	0.009		0.035	0.049**	0.049**	0.049**			
	<i>0.026</i>		<i>0.019</i>	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.017</i>	<i>0.017</i>			
Full-time employment	0.039		0.080**	0.154**	0.154**	0.154**			
	<i>0.039</i>		<i>0.031</i>	<i>0.057</i>	<i>0.057</i>	<i>0.057</i>			
Total paid family and child leave		0.003	0.006*				0.002		
		<i>0.003</i>	<i>0.003</i>				<i>0.004</i>		
Total expenditure of childcare and pre-primary education as % of GDP		-0.629***	-0.638***				-0.559***		
		<i>0.132</i>	<i>0.110</i>				<i>0.178</i>		
Intercept	4.090***	4.419***	4.390***	3.790***	4.390***	3.790***	4.390***	4.330***	
R ²	0.35%	2.47%	3.12%	0.88%	2.07%	0.88%	2.07%	3.78%	
n	4,642	7,856	4,642	4,721	7,128	4,721	7,128	4,721	

***p < .001; **p < .01; *p < .05

Coefficients that vary significantly between women and men are bolded.