



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

11.13.1994

061

NOV 18 1994

NOV 18 1994

579 9442

A. 44 1999

WHOSE PARADISE?
THE PROBLEM OF REDUCED WORK AND AUTONOMY

By

Cynthia Lee Negrey

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1988

ABSTRACT

WHOSE PARADISE? THE PROBLEM OF REDUCED WORK AND AUTONOMY

By

Cynthia Lee Negrey

Social structural conditions associated with post-industrialism, such as persistently high rates of unemployment, the decline of employment in manufacturing, the increased participation of women in the paid labor force, and the lack of widely available and affordable childcare, have led to calls for work-time reduction and flexible work-time options. Those who advocate such adjustments to working time assume work-time reduction fosters autonomy off the job. This is particularly true of the French social critic, Andre Gorz, who argues for work-time reduction to expand the sphere of autonomy off the job and who claims that those who work less than full time constitute the forefront of a movement toward a post-industrial, more egalitarian, non-market-oriented society.

This study challenges the claim that reduced work by definition fosters autonomy off the job by integrating a feminist analysis and an understanding of labor market segmentation with Gorz's vision of post-industrialism. It takes time off the job as problematic and sheds light on the conditions which enhance or impede autonomy off the job. It asserts that autonomy off the job is influenced by the nature of one's work schedule and one's ability to determine

that schedule; market position associated with the nature of one's job, pay, and benefits; and gender.

In-depth and partially structured interviews were conducted with forty-four individuals who work less than full time. Grounded theoretical analysis compares the experiences of those who work part time with those of temporary employees, job sharers, and work sharers. There are different time regimes associated with these different types of reduced work, and these time regimes coupled with a variety of intervening factors influenced informants' selection of off-the-job activities.

In conclusion, this research identifies five types of autonomy associated with reduced work. Each has ramifications for the quality of life off the job, and each engenders greater or lesser degrees of autonomy off the job. This study also evaluates the claim by Gorz that those who work less than full time are at the forefront of social change.

Copyright by
CYNTHIA LEE NEGREY
1988

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of individuals and organizations to whom I owe a professional debt. First and foremost, I want to thank Rick Hill, my advisor, collaborator, mentor, and friend. His light-handed guidance and constant encouragement gave me a sense of security and direction without undermining my sense of autonomy. I also want to thank Bill Faunce, Ruth Hamilton, Kevin Kelly, and Katie See for helpful comments on this project.

I must also extend my heartfelt appreciation to those persons who gave of their time and volunteered to be interviewed for this study and to those who assisted in the recruitment of volunteers. While they must remain nameless here, without them this project could not have been completed.

The Department of Sociology at Michigan State University and the Sage Foundation of Detroit, Michigan, provided financial support which freed me from financial worries and permitted me to focus my energies on this dissertation.

Several women played critical roles in my intellectual and social experience while working on this project. As sister members of a dissertation support group, they

provided a counterbalance to the isolation associated with dissertation research: Nancy Buffenbarger, Ginger Macheski, Mary McCormack, Ginny Powell, Delores Wunder, Jo Belknap, Mary Roberson, Taffy McCoy, Jo Dohoney, Ruth Harris, Vandana Kohli, and Georgann Lenhart. I will miss the community we created.

Steve Esquith's challenging questions encouraged me to explore uncharted theoretical territory. Carmen Sirianni's work on flexible time options as well as his friendship and encouragement were affirmation that this was a worthwhile project. I am grateful to both.

Too often teachers don't know what becomes of former students or the extent, if any, to which they had any lasting influence on them. I want to mention particularly two of my teachers here. I had developed an interest in sociology in high school when I read Michael Harrington's book, The Other America. Bill Seaton, who taught me introductory sociology in college, kept the fire burning. And Ken Rothrock believed I could accomplish a task such as this long before I believed it myself. This expression of gratitude to them is long overdue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	x
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Theoretical Framework	7
2. Theoretical Issues in Time and Autonomy	24
Toward a Feminist Rethinking of Autonomy	36
3. Review of the Literature	48
Part-Time Employment	49
Temporary Employment	50
Job Sharing	53
Work Sharing	54
4. Research Methodology	62
Research Philosophy	67
Sample Selection	72
Sample Characteristics	76
Analysis of the Interviews	85
5. Michigan's Political Economy in the 1980s	89
Focus: Flint and Lansing	96
Lansing, Michigan	106
Reduced Work in Michigan	111
Part-Time Employment	111
Temporary Employment	121

Job Sharing in State Government	123
Work Sharing	129
6. Terms and Conditions of Reduced Work	133
Job Sharing	133
Work Schedules	143
Power of Supervisors	145
Temporary Employment	149
Placements	155
Part-Time Employment	160
Work Schedules	164
Work Sharing	168
Work Schedules	179
Conclusion	181
7. Children and Autonomy	184
8. Household Work and Autonomy	202
9. Recreation and Autonomy	214
10. Community and Relational Activities	230
11. Education and Alternative Employment	246
12. Conclusion	260
References	287
Scholarly Books and Articles	287
U.S. Government Publications	296
State Government Publications	298
Non-government Publications	298
Popular Press	299
Appendices	
A. Interview Topic Checklist	302

B. Personal and Household Data Sheet	303
C. Recruitment Letter	306
D. Recruitment Memo	307

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age Distribution of Sample	77
2. Sample by Race	78
3. Sample by Education Completed	79
4. Occupational Distribution of Sample	81
5. Income Distribution of Sample	82
6. Union Membership of Sample	84
7. Marital Status of Sample	86
8. Sample by Household Type	87
9. Composition of Manufacturing Employment, U.S. and Michigan, Selected Years, 1972-1980	91
10. Net and Percentage Change in Nonagricultural and Manufacturing Employment, U.S. and Michigan, 1979, 1982, 1985	93
11. Persons at Work Less Than 35 Hours as a Percentage of all Employed Persons, 1980 . . .	112
12. Males and Females as a Percentage of All Persons at Work Less Than 35 Hours, 1980 . . .	112
13. Industry Distribution of Men Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980	114
14. Industry Distribution of Women Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980	116
15. Occupational Distribution of Men Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980	119
16. Occupational Distribution of Women Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980	120

17.	Annual Average Employment in Temporary Help Supply Services (SIC 7362) in the U.S. and Michigan, 1982-1985	122
18.	Wages in the Temporary Help Supply Industry, U.S. and Michigan, 1985	122
19.	Job Sharers in Michigan State Government by Type of Occupation and Sex, September 5, 1986	127
20.	Number of Positions Occupied by Two or More Job Sharers by Department, State of Michigan, July 26, 1986	128
21.	Summary	261

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This is a study of people's experiences of time and autonomy. Its focus is those who work less than full time, particularly part-time workers, temporaries, job sharers, and work sharers. While they all work less than full time or less than year round, their time regimes vary as do their type of occupation, terms and conditions of employment, reasons for working less than full time, control over work schedule, and use of time off the job.

This study takes off from the following premise: people who work less than full time, because they work less than full time, have more time to be autonomous. Few jobs permit self-determination on the job, especially control over one's time. If one has time to do with as one chooses, that time is most likely to occur off the job. Thus, this study explores how people who have a lot of time off the job, by conventional social standards, use their time. But time off the job does not guarantee full autonomy. Spillover effects of the job (Faunce and Dubin 1975, Meissner 1971, Staines 1980, Wilensky 1960), constraints of the work schedule, financial constraints, and off-the-job obligations may limit autonomy. This study takes time off the job as problematic and differentiates between formal and

substantive autonomy. By examining certain features of one's employment and one's life circumstances, it sheds light on the conditions which enhance or impede autonomy off the job.

The problem of reduced work and autonomy is an important one as we move into the closing decade of the twentieth century. Slow economic growth, the availability of cheap labor abroad, and widespread automation at home make it unlikely that the U.S. economy will generate enough jobs in the foreseeable future to absorb all who want permanent, full-time employment. While the official unemployment rate has dropped to below six percent in the nation, some regions and communities, particularly declining manufacturing centers, have unemployment rates near ten percent or higher at the same time that youth continue their entry into the labor market and women's participation in paid employment increases.

Numerous writers recently have called for various types of work-time reduction to decrease joblessness and redistribute the available wage work.¹ Given their

¹ For arguments along these lines, see Roy Bennett and Frank Riessman, "Is It Time for the Four-Day Work Week?", Social Policy 15 (1) Summer, 1984: inside cover; Frithjof Bergmann, "The Future of Work," Praxis International; Fred Best, "Recycling People: Work-sharing Through Flexible Life Scheduling," Futurist 12 (February, 1978): 4-17; Fred Best, Flexible Life Scheduling: Breaking the Education-Work-Retirement Lockstep. New York: Praeger, 1980; Fred Block, "The Myth of Reindustrialization," Socialist Review 73 (January-February, 1984): 59-76; Rolande Cuvillier, The Reduction of Working Time, Geneva: International Labour Office, 1984; Herbert Gans, "Toward the 32-hour Workweek," Social Policy 15 (3) Winter, 1985: 58-61; Bob Kuttner, "Jobs," Dissent Winter, 1984: 30-41; Wassily W. Leontief,

propensity to explain the jobs crisis in structural rather than cyclical terms, most proponents of work-time reduction are pessimistic that the U.S. economy can in the future generate enough secure, well-paying jobs to absorb the unemployed. Increased application of automated methods of production, particularly in manufacturing but also in services, and the availability to mobile capital of ever-larger numbers of low-wage production workers in underdeveloped countries will shrink the supply of jobs relative to anticipated growth in the labor force. Although vociferous debate continues over automation's labor-displacing or labor-generating qualities,² advocates of work-time reduction have generally agreed that whatever productivity gains ensue from the further automation of production could and should be equitably distributed by a reduction of working time.

Future growth in the labor force will also increase competition for jobs. Two categories of entrants to the paid labor force are expected to contribute to the future

"The Distribution of Work and Income," Scientific American 247 (3) September, 1982: 188-204; Sar A. Levitan and Richard S. Belous, Shorter Hours, Shorter Weeks. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977; and William McGaughey, Jr., A Shorter Workweek in the 1980s. White Bear Lake, Minn.: Thistle Rose Publications, 1981.

2 See, for example, Paul Adler, "Technology and Us," Socialist Review 85 (January-February, 1986): 67-96; Chapter 9, "Employment: The Quantity of Work," in Tom Forester, editor, The Information Technology Revolution. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1985; and Barry Jones, Sleepers, Wake! Technology and the Future of Work. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1982.

demand for jobs: women and youth. In particular, women have accounted for three of every five additions to the labor force in the past 25 years (Levitan and Belous 1977, p. 19), and they have taken more than 80 percent of the new jobs created in the U.S. since 1980 (Serrin 1986a).

Increases in women's paid labor force participation may become a factor in hours reduction because women often have sought to work a shorter paid workweek to better juggle home and job responsibilities. In addition, the increases in women's paid labor force participation observed over the past several decades have been associated with an increase in the availability of part-time jobs. The continued participation of women in paid employment may generate greater interest in work-time reduction as a method of equalizing the distribution of wage and household work responsibilities between women and men (Owen 1979).

Work/family conflicts have been the impetus for appeals for a national family policy including provisions for paid parental leave, more widely available and affordable daycare, and flexible work options to remedy such tensions.³

³ For a brief summary of work/family conflicts, see "Conflicts between work and family life," a research summary by Joseph H. Pleck, Graham L. Staines, and Linda Lang in Monthly Labor Review, 103 (3) March, 1980: 29-32. For recent statements on the need for a national family policy and the shape it might take see Sylvia Ann Hewlett, A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation in America. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1986, and Ruth Sidel, Women and Children Last: The Plight of Poor Women in Affluent America. New York: Viking, 1986.

For these reasons as well as others associated with emergent lifestyles in the late twentieth century, several writers (Best 1978; Cuvillier 1984; Levitan and Belous 1977; McGaughey 1981; Owen 1979) have noted widespread preferences for more "leisure" time. Studies of time/income tradeoffs (Best 1978; Cuvillier 1984, pp. 37-38) have shown that in many cases individuals would opt for more time off the job instead of more income if given the choice. This is consistent with findings for Western Europeans reported by Gorz (1982, p. 140).⁴ Time off the job could then be used for meeting household responsibilities, education, community service, athletic and other recreational pursuits.

Aware of these conditions, employers use a rhetoric of autonomy to sell part-time and temporary jobs to potential hires.⁵ Women with young children are an especially vulnerable target audience. Because women's wage work options are circumscribed by their household and childcare responsibilities, managers advertise part-time and temporary jobs as ideal for enhancing "flexibility." Such jobs permit

4 However, about two-thirds of all U.S. workers interviewed in conjunction with the May, 1985 Current Population Survey said they would not want to change the length of their workweek. Of the remainder, most said that, if given a choice, they would opt to work "more hours at the same rate of pay and make more money." A preference for a shorter workweek (accompanied by a reduction in earnings) was expressed by only six percent of the men and nine percent of the women. See U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, News, USDL 86-328, released August 7, 1986.

5 For example, one temporary employment agency advertises "work when you want to work" on the cover of its informational packet. Similarly, a fast food chains frequently advertise flexible hours for part-time employees.

women's labor force participation at times when it is convenient for them to be away from home and children. Students and the elderly are also target audiences. Part-time work is a source of sorely needed financial support for many students. For the elderly, it is a source of financial support as well as continued involvement in the community.

Our increasingly services-oriented economy lends itself well to the creation of part-time and temporary jobs. Employers find that such jobs enhance their flexibility by permitting them to schedule workers at peak demand times during the day, the week, the year, or upturns in the business cycle. Indeed, uncertain economic conditions in the United States have made many employers reluctant to expand their permanent, full-time workforce. They have turned increasingly to part-time workers and temporaries to meet labor demand in good times with the security that these "contingent" (Serrin 1986b) workers are more easily let go when times are bad.

Advocates of work-time reduction, no matter on what side of the capital-labor divide they fall, seem to suggest that work-time reduction by definition fosters autonomy off the job. But reduced work_{may} or may not engender such autonomy, and this study explores that claim. Use of time off the job may be influenced, for example, by the work schedule and one's control over it, market position associated with level of pay and benefits, and gender. Through the voices of the individuals who participated in

this study, it is possible to determine some of the conditions which enhance or impede autonomy off the job.

Theoretical Framework

This study is informed theoretically by debates over the nature of "post-industrial" society, a feminist interpretation of social relations between men and women in the home and place of employment, and an understanding of segmented labor markets which function to divide jobs and workers into particular market sectors.⁶ An exploration of reduced work and autonomy must be located within the context of these larger social relations. The expansion of reduced work, particularly in the forms of part-time and temporary employment, are significant elements in this period of social and economic transition. Because many individuals who work less than full time are women, a feminist orientation is necessary to comprehend the meaning of these time regimes and forms of work. And because reduced work tends to be concentrated in certain types of jobs as they intersect with gender, it is crucial to connect this analysis to the operation of segmented labor markets.

There is considerable debate and uncertainty regarding the nature of the society which will arise, or should arise, from the social and economic changes currently underway.

Two views are focused on here. The first, the conception of

⁶ For further explication of the concept of segmented labor markets, see David M. Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

post-industrialism put forth by Bell (1973), is treated for its value as an early statement on the subject and its location within the mainstream of sociological thought. The second, that of post-industrial socialism as envisioned by Gorz (1982, 1985), is treated for its analysis of the place and promise of work-time reduction in building a non-market, egalitarian society.

Bell's post-industrialism rests on a service economy in which professionals and technicians are preeminent and theoretical knowledge has displaced economic growth as the society's axial principle. The new service economy is composed primarily of human services--principally health, education, and social services--and professional and technical services. The rise of services expands employment opportunities for women, and work increasingly represents relationships between people (e.g. professional-client) rather than relationships between people and machines. This is a society in which the industrial working class erodes as the industrial emphasis on goods production gives way to a society of white-collar service workers. The essential social and political division in industrial society, that between capital and labor, is replaced by the essential division in post-industrial society, that between those with and without authority in bureaucratic organizations. Thus, the haves and have nots are not those with and without property but those with and without decision-making power in organizations.

As Bell (1973, p. xvi) states, however,

The post-industrial society. . . does not displace the industrial society, just as an industrial society has not done away with the agrarian sectors of the economy. Like palimpsests, the new developments overlie the previous layers, erasing some features and thickening the texture of society as a whole.

But because the property relations of industrialism in the U.S. are capitalist and, as Bell notes, industrial society is not displaced by post-industrial society, this post-industrial overlay will reproduce capitalist property relations. They preserve the "axial principle" of industrial society, that of economic growth, and more specifically the accumulation of private profit.

As Braverman (1974) has noted, the service economy has not displaced capitalist relations of production but has arisen within and emerged from those relations. As various market sectors are saturated, capital seeks new markets for investment and accumulation. As the market expands and social relations and communities break down, particularly in their ability to provide non-market-based services to one another, the market expands even further to fill in that void. Thus, it becomes profitable for capital to move from saturated markets in manufacturing, for example, to unsaturated markets in services. The organization of service provision, then, is imprinted with the overriding goal of capital accumulation. Bell has asserted that the primary services of health, education, and social services--those at the center of the post-industrial society--are

largely nonprofit. This is increasingly not true of the health care industry, and those sectors of health care that remain non-profit are intertwined with the insurance industry, which is for profit. Education and social services, provided largely by the public sector, may not be profit-making enterprises but they are affected by the market. Public-sector revenues are determined by the size and health of its tax base which in turn reflects employment and wage conditions and corporate behavior. The public sector, as an employer, exists within a competitive labor market and its ability to hire is influenced by revenues available for hiring as well as attractiveness of positions. The nature and extent of service delivery also depend on revenue availability (and political ideology). The public sector can legislate its own revenue increases by raising taxes, but its power to do so is not unlimited. Ceilings are imposed by popular tax revolt and capital strike. Therefore, while the state can raise taxes at will, it cannot do so without political and economic repercussions. The state must balance its own revenue needs with the political and economic climate. Bell is naive in perceiving the public sector as disconnected from the private sector.

In addition, while we have seen in this century an increase of professionals and technicians in both absolute numbers and relative proportion, it is misleading to characterize post-industrial society by skewed reference to this elite. Professional and technical workers are still

less than one in five members of the labor force (Ritzer and Walczak 1986, p. 21). The concomitant expansion of clerical work, sales work, and low-paying services suggests not an upgrading in the overall skill and education of the labor force but a bifurcation associated with the decline of the manufacturing middle.⁷ In addition, Bell's optimistic scenario overlooks the problem of underemployment among professionally and managerially trained persons. As Levitan and Johnson (1982, p. 128) have reported, over the next decade the number of college graduates is expected to exceed the number of professional and managerial job openings by 2.7 million, and there will be 2.5 college graduates competing for each professional and managerial job. Thus, traditional manifestations of labor-management conflict, such as those associated with getting jobs, keeping jobs, level of pay, benefits, and working conditions, inside or outside the private sector will persist into the post-industrial future.

The computer is the technological centerpiece of Bell's post-industrial service and information society. As noted above, while vociferous debate continues over the long-run labor-displacing capacity of computer-assisted production, there is little question that the productive capacity of computers far exceeds that of more traditional technologies. The distribution of work and the benefits of heightened

⁷ On the decline of the middle class, see Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison, "The Grim Truth About the Job 'Miracle'," The New York Times, February 1, 1987.

productivity are pressing questions for post-industrial society.

Although it is a critique of Marxist orthodoxy in its rejection of the working class as the subject of history, Gorz's work (1982) stems from Marx's critique of political economy, particularly the tendency for mechanization to reduce necessary labor and increase surplus labor. Whereas increases in productivity which result from mechanization could be (and to some degree have been) passed on to all workers in the form of more free time, the tendency under capitalist relations of production is to expand surplus labor time for some workers and to increase unemployment for others.

In Farewell to the Working Class (1982) Gorz delineates the "dual economy" of the future, which consists of an enlarged sphere of autonomy and a reduced, subordinate sphere of necessity. The post-industrial socialist society seeks to increase freedom (the sphere of autonomy) from wage work "while recognizing, trivializing, and limiting the necessity of work" (Cohen 1983, p. 110). Gorz rejects worker self-management as the path to human liberation in favor of liberation from work by work-time reduction.

As specified in Paths to Paradise: On the Liberation from Work (Gorz 1985, p. 63), individuals would have three levels of activity in the dual economy: (1) necessary, macro-social work, organized across society as a whole, enabling it to function and providing for basic needs;

(2) micro-social activity, self-organized on a local level and based on voluntary participation, except where it replaces macro-social work in providing for basic needs; and (3) autonomous activity which corresponds to the particular desires and projects of individuals, families, and small groups.

By limiting the sphere of necessity and expanding the sphere of autonomy, we create a liberated life space--that is, liberation from work. The sphere of necessity can be reduced by applying more energy- and resource-efficient methods of production to the production of socially useful goods and services and eliminating destructive and wasteful production (Gorz 1980, 1982). Socially necessary labor would be distributed such that working time could be reduced and equitably distributed to all those able and willing to work. This makes for more free time--an expanded sphere of autonomy.

Because socially necessary production would require such a small quantity of labor that individuals could not survive if they were paid only for the hours actually worked, Gorz (1985) has argued for a social income. This "income for life" would be paid to citizens, not workers. Social income is the social form income takes when automation has abolished, along with a permanent obligation to work, the law of value and wage labor:

At the strategic level of social struggles, the transition to a post-capitalist economy is more or less anticipated in those union agreements

which ensure that the increase in labour productivity will bring about a corresponding reduction of hours without any reduction in wages. To put it another way, work which is eliminated is paid for in the same way as work which is performed, non-workers paid in the same way as workers. The connection between pay and work performed is broken (Gorz 1985, p. 45).

According to Gorz (1982, pp. 68-69), a "non-class" of "post-industrial proletarians" will lead the way to create the dual economy. This non-class includes all those for whom automation means unemployment or underemployment. Post-industrial proletarians are those with no job security, no class identity, who are employed on some sort of probationary, contracted, casual, temporary, or part-time basis. As I will show in chapter 3, this portion of the labor force is growing.

Unlike the working class, which is a product of capitalism, the non-class is a product of capitalist crisis. It is thrown off as extraneous labor and generally overqualified for the jobs it finds (Gorz 1982, pp. 68-69). But in seeking to appropriate areas of autonomy outside and in opposition to "the logic of society," the non-class expresses its subjectivity in refusing socialized labor. In this way, the non-class is the vanguard of the post-industrial revolution, although it lacks a clear vision of the future society (Gorz 1982, pp. 72-85).

It is here that one must invoke a feminist perspective. This is because (1) women and men experience time off the

job differently and (2) a significant portion of the non-class of post-industrial proletarians is women.

For Gorz, time outside the sphere of necessity is by definition autonomous time, comparable to the notion of formal autonomy mentioned above. But is time in the formal sphere of autonomy substantively autonomous? I would argue that whether one experiences time off the job as free, self-managed time depends on other circumstances of one's life. Individuals with responsibilities at home, particularly mothers with young children, don't necessarily experience their time away from their wage-paying job as "free time."

Because Gorz's definition of autonomy rests on a critique of the capital-labor relation, his model of the dual economy does not give adequate consideration to the expression of necessity and autonomy in the sex/gender system.⁸ Although Gorz recognizes the nonautonomous nature of women's household work in capitalist society, his model of the dual economy perpetuates the work/nonwork dichotomy and the ideological division between public and private. He equates necessity with the public sphere ("complex units of production") and autonomy with the private sphere ("family"). Feminism is the window through which to see the

⁸ Gayle Rubin defines the sex/gender system as the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied. It is rooted in a society's system of kinship and reflected in its division of labor by sex. See her classic statement, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," pp. 157-210 in Rayna R. Reiter, editor, Toward an Anthropology of Women. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.

sphere of necessity as one that extends beyond complex units of production to the "private" realm of reproduction.

Thanks to the feminist movement, intellectuals today can no longer trivialize housework and childcare as nonwork. Noteworthy is the influence of several writers (Gardiner 1979; Hartmann 1981; Seccombe 1973; Vanek 1974; Zaretsky 1976 to name a select few) in the politicization of the household and the elevation of the status of household work. By examining the intersection of capitalist production and the home, they have defined housework and childcare as socially necessary labor which reproduces the labor force on a daily and generational basis. While there is debate over whether housework produces surplus value in addition to use value, and therefore whether housework is productive work in the Marxian sense, there is no question that privatized housework and childcare are integral to the overall operation of the capitalist economy. Thus, the distinction between public and private is blurred, and no longer is the "economy" the exclusive domain of work and "family" the site of "nonwork." Instead, the household does the work and absorbs the costs of maintaining and reproducing the labor force that capital finds unprofitable. Add the fact that housework and childcare are disproportionately the responsibilities of women and we have a critical piece in the puzzle of women's oppression in capitalist society. But the unequal distribution of housework and childcare between women and men is also an expression of male dominance in the

household and in society. Capitalism and patriarchy intersect to produce the present organization of housework and childcare.⁹

The gender division of labor in the household has implications for men's and women's leisure. Deem (1986) has argued that women's leisure is much more constrained than men's and occurs relatively less often in proportion to work. Women's leisure is influenced by the work, leisure, needs, and demands of others, particularly partners and children. Women's leisure may also occur simultaneously with work activities (e.g. folding laundry while watching television) or may be indistinguishable from work (e.g. knitting, sewing, gardening, cooking).

Much of the difficulty in distinguishing women's household work and leisure stems from the fact that for women the home is a workplace in a way that it is not for many men. As Deem notes (1986, pp. 80-81), workplaces do not convert easily into places for leisure; undone domestic chores and other aspects of housework are omnipresent. But

9 A vast literature has grown up around the question of housework and the household division of labor between men and women. In addition to references in the text, see William Beer, Househusbands. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1983; Richard Berk and Sarah Fenstermaker Berk, Labor and Leisure at Home: Content and Organization of the Household Day. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979; Sarah Fenstermaker Berk, The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households. New York: Plenum, 1985; Sarah Fenstermaker Berk, editor, Women and Household Labor. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980; Ruth Schwartz Cowan, More Work for Mother. New York: Basic Books, 1983; and Joseph Pleck, "Men's Family Work: Three Perspectives and Some New Data," The Family Coordinator (October 1979): 481-488.

this may have more to do with the nature of the household tasks women do. The household work done by men, such as painting and repair, may be deferred until such time that they have time for time-consuming projects (e.g. weekends and vacations), and once completed there may not be anything else to do for a period of perhaps a week (as in mowing the lawn), several months (the next time the plumbing is stopped up), or a few years (painting). Thus, men's household work may be less omnipresent and more bounded than women's simply because the nature of the tasks they do differ.¹⁰ Meals are generally prepared daily, which also means daily clean-up, laundry may be done a few times a week, while other tasks like vacuuming and dusting may be weekly activities. Such tasks are usually done by women. In addition, all members of a household are likely to see the home as a place of leisure, but women may have to forfeit their leisure in order to support that of others. Women may have to supervise children's play or prepare the meal for her partner's friends who have come for dinner. As Deem (1986, p. 81) states,

Consequently, women's home-based leisure and enjoyment is often based on or derives from, (sic) the same activities and tasks which form part of their work in the household, or is fitted into those tasks and activities, sometimes simultaneously. . . No wonder then that much of women's household leisure

¹⁰ My research reported below supports this claim as does research reported by Sarah Fenstermaker Berk in The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households. New York: Plenum, 1985.

consists of needlework, knitting, cooking, dreaming and snatching quick naps. All of these activities can be fitted into a fragmented time schedule, don't require large blocks of time, are cheap or free, require little space or equipment and can quickly be disposed of or stopped when work obligations intervene.

Furthermore, the unequal distribution between women and men of housework and childcare creates an unequal distribution of free time which favors men over women--free time which men, in turn, can use to pursue leisure activities and other interests in or outside the home. Thus, the traditional gender division of labor limits women's autonomy.

It is difficult to know whether a reduction in men's paid working time would relieve women of some of their household burden and equalize the distribution of housework and childcare. A study by Walker and Woods (1976) suggests perhaps not. In their study, the men with the shortest workweeks had wives with the longest workweeks, housework and wage work combined. By contrast, DiFazio (1985) reports that many longshoremen on the guaranteed annual income, who report to the hiring hall for about two hours a day and who worked rarely in three years, became "family activists" in their newfound free time.¹¹

¹¹ Family activists were those who became more involved in family relationships and household work. Several questions come to mind, however. Were their wives employed outside the home? If so, was the men's family activism confined to the hours during which the wife was away from the home? What happened during the hours the wife was at home? Did she take over (by choice or fiat) the household responsibilities? If so, what did he do in the hours she

An exploration of the experience of reduced work and autonomy must be located finally within the study of segmented labor markets. There are varied types of reduced work which exist in different labor markets. This, in turn, may affect autonomy off the job. Certain types of reduced work may afford more opportunities for autonomy off the job. Time regimes associated with job sharing may permit scheduling flexibility and control not permitted in other kinds of reduced work. Reduced work in the professions and unionized manufacturing sector may pay more and provide employee benefits not available in other kinds of part-time jobs. Income, in a market economy, influences individuals' options for use of time off the job. To the extent that labor markets intersect with the sex/gender system, the different experiences of time off the job for men and women may be related not only to gender but to the kinds of jobs they have.

Labor markets and the sex/gender system intersect to funnel women into certain kinds of jobs, usually in the secondary labor market. One-fourth of all women in the labor force are in five occupations: secretary, household worker, bookkeeper, elementary school teacher, and waitress. Forty percent are in those five plus four others: typist,

was at home? It seems there may or may not have been an equalization of their work weeks, waged and unwaged work combined. Also, if she took over responsibility for household work during her hours at home, why is it the husband defers to the wife in this arena just because she is there?

cashier, nurse, and seamstress (Fox and Hesse-Biber 1984, p. 34). The crowding of women into this small number of occupations inflates the supply of labor for these jobs and depresses wages. In contrast, the deflated competition for jobs in management and the professions, which results from the relative exclusion of women (and racial minorities) from those jobs, keeps salaries high, to the benefit of men who are represented disproportionately in these occupational categories. In addition, the distribution of men across a much larger number of occupations than women reduces the competition for particular occupations, thereby raising wage levels.

Women are more likely than men to be employed part time. Women's work outside the home is circumscribed by their work in the home. Thus, women often seek jobs, such as part-time, which are more easily integrated with their responsibilities at home. Prevailing gender ideologies justify women's subordinate labor market status by assuming the natural primacy of household and childcare responsibilities for women and by ignoring women's work outside the home as an expression of economic need.

One flaw of theories of labor market segmentation is a tendency to place all part-time work in the secondary labor market. While much part-time work, for example nonunion sales clerks in stores, certainly falls into the secondary labor market as most authors define it, the phenomenon of the part-time professional challenges this view. While

part-time professionals may lack employee benefits and other perquisites of full-time professional employment, they must meet the same formal educational requirements as the full-time professional, and it is this formal education which Edwards (1979) takes as a defining feature of the independent primary labor market. The part-time professional may also have opportunities equivalent to those of the full-time professional for creative expression and self-control on the job.

Much of the foregoing discussion illustrates the conceptual difficulties that ensue when women's experiences are introduced into male-centered discourse. Traditional definitions of work focus on paid work, and leisure is nonwork. Thus, work and leisure are a dichotomy within which it is difficult to force women's tripartite experiences of paid work, housework, and leisure. Even writers on labor market segmentation, who make a genuine effort to deal with the intersection of labor markets and the sex/gender system, fall short when it comes to the part-time professional. It's as if part-time and professional are mutually exclusive categories.¹²

The bias in favor of full-time employment and linear, uninterrupted "male careers" is clearly reflected in the conceptual tools applied to the study of employment,

¹² This bias against part-time employment is built into the conventional sociological definition of professions. Ritzer and Walczak (1986), for example, note the establishment of full-time occupations as part of the process of the professionalization of occupations.

Judgments made about the labor market location of jobs, and off-the-job activities. This study attempts to avoid some of those biases by rejecting the work/leisure or work/nonwork dichotomy. The phrase "time off the job" suggests that work and nonwork activities may occur during that time and that activities need not be paid to be called work. In addition, this study explores the experiences of those employed less than full time or less than year round and it does not assume informants should have been employed full time or should want to be employed full time. Further, it does not assume all less-than-full-time wage work is in the secondary labor market but suggests that reduced work itself may be segmented into primary and secondary labor markets.

The tension produced by dealing with women's reality within a legacy of male-centered concepts is repeated in examining theoretically the relationship between time and autonomy. That is the task to which I now turn.

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Issues in Time and Autonomy

The reader might think it odd that a study that focuses on autonomy off the job would take paid work as its analytic starting point. But there is good reason for this. The obligations associated with paid work are time structures that govern many people's lives. The domination of these time structures is reflected in their typical inflexibility. We must work to ensure our livelihood, we must be at work certain hours of the day and week, and most often those hours are dictated for us by our employer. Most everything else we do in our lives is arranged around our work schedule. When children's or other dependents' schedules take priority, the selection of appropriate employment can be a dilemma. But even this demonstrates the power and inflexibility of paid employment in most people's lives. If work schedules were flexible, finding employment that integrates well with home responsibilities would not be a problem.

Customarily, autonomy is defined as self-determination and is associated with the quality of a person's life or the political life of a society. This understanding suggests autonomy is a matter of decision-making power. Psychologists conceptualize autonomy as the highest stage of ego

development (Helson, Mitchell, and Hart 1985; Loevinger 1966, 1976) and as a central element in mental health (Cassimatis 1979). Political theorists, such as Rousseau in The Social Contract, have discussed the possibilities for collective autonomy. Worker autonomy recently has become a popular topic among sociologists and labor activists who argue that workers in modern industrial society are alienated and would benefit from greater control over their work.

This study follows a second strain in the understanding of autonomy, that of autonomy as unobligated time. Specifically, the ideal explored herein is individuals' self-determined use of time. As noted in chapter 1, Gorz (1982, 1985) has called for the "liberation of time" through work-time reduction and more equitable distribution of free time in the face of productivity increases. To the extent that autonomy is curbed at work, expanded free time increases opportunities for autonomous expression off the job. For Gorz, the heteronomous character of work precludes the achievement of autonomy at work. Heteronomy and autonomy are contradictory in this sense.¹ Further,

1 The concept "heteronomy" as used by Gorz refers to the sphere of socially necessary labor. Heteronomy means necessity and in this context refers to work necessary for the maintenance of the society. These social ends must be fulfilled whether or not the tasks that must be performed to achieve them are personally satisfying. The duality of heteronomy and autonomy is an adaptation of the Kantian duality of heteronomy of ends and autonomy of the will. For Kant, autonomy means the will is its own end and is determined only by its own laws. Heteronomy refers to the will's obeying laws not of its own making but those consistent with external ends. This interpretation of the

according to Gorz, the heteronomous character of work and its attendant division of labor cannot be abolished. As he states,

Without the field of social production and its division of labor, as well as relatively important and complex units of production, we would have to work mainly at producing basic necessities (Gorz 1983, p. 220).

Unless we want to return to a previous state of economic and social development, the complex division of labor characteristic of advanced industrial capitalist societies is a fact of life. However, the sphere of necessity can be reduced by applying more energy- and resource-efficient methods of production to the production of socially useful goods and services and eliminating destructive and wasteful production (Gorz, 1980, 1982). Socially necessary labor would be distributed such that working time could be reduced and equitably distributed to all those able and willing to work. This expands the sphere of autonomy.

Gorz defines autonomous activity as the particular desires and projects of individuals, families, and small groups (1985, p. 63). It is that which we choose to do for ourselves.

Autonomous activity is real only if it is neither an obligation, imposed on us in the name of moral, religious or political principles, nor a vital

Kantian notions of heteronomy and autonomy is borrowed from Dagobert D. Runes, editor, Dictionary of Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1983.

necessity. But for it not to be one or the other, subsistence has to be assured by means of a perfected productive social system that would give us what is essential to live on, and that would only ask of us a small fraction of our time (Gorz 1983, p. 221).

Gorz's vision suggests that free time could be used for autonomous projects. These might include music or film making, educational pursuits, recreation, and the like. Autonomous projects are supported by a cultural infrastructure that provides open space for communication, circulation, and exchange; places to make music and films; "free" radio and television; libraries; and convivial tools. Thus, the post-industrial revolution involves more than simply the reduction of working time. Essential is a cultural revolution in social institutions, the use of space, and the availability of tools to promote creative use of the free time produced by the reduction of working time.

Gorz emphasizes the need for variation even in autonomous activities. As he states (1982, p. 103),

All activities are impoverishing when they cannot be alternated with activities drawing upon other mental and physical energies. Heteronomous activity is impoverishing when it is done full-time to the exclusion of all others, and the same is true of autonomous activity. As Guy Aznar has said, no one can be creative for 12 hours a day, 365 days a year. Regular to-ing and fro-ing between activities requiring intense personal involvement and work divested of mental and emotional effort is a source of balance and fulfilment.

Greater free time could provide opportunities for the realization of species being, to use Marx's language. As Marx argued, capitalism alienates humans from their species being--their creativity and opportunities for self-expression, that which makes us uniquely human. But according to Gorz, because species being may not be realized through work, even socially necessary work, given its heteronomous nature, an expanded sphere of autonomy is required to expand opportunities for self-expression, thus improving the potential for the realization of species being.²

The society Gorz envisions in which the productive system is "perfected" and gives us what is essential without consuming excesses of our time does not exist. Marx's critique of capitalism is instructive in this regard. What I will argue is that in capitalist society humans are literally alienated from some of their time and from control over use of that time. Indeed, the logic of capitalist accumulation demands the alienation of workers from time. While alienation from time is implicit in Marx's analysis of

² Gorz and Marx differ, I think, on strategies to fulfill species being. Marx thought work should be an expression of species being and detested capitalism because work in capitalist society alienated workers from the product of their labor, control of the labor process, and species being. He, like Marxists such as Harry Braverman, can be criticized for romanticizing craftwork and making craft the standard for creative expression of self through work. By contrast, Gorz does not advocate a return to a craft-based economy nor does he believe the division of labor can be transcended. Instead, creative self-expression becomes possible in the sphere of autonomy, separate and distinct in time from the sphere of socially necessary work.

capitalism, it was never discussed by him or other students of Marx as one of the principal forms of alienation in capitalist society.³

How does alienation from time manifest itself under capitalist relations of production? I argue that it takes three principal forms: (1) through the worker's sale of labor power/labor time; (2) through the increase in surplus labor time relative to necessary labor time; and (3) through the unequal distribution of free time.

As a consequence of their proletarianization, the direct producers no longer have access to the means of production because the means of production have come under private ownership and control. At the same time, the goods necessary for subsistence have become commodities that must be purchased with money. To get money to buy the necessary subsistence goods, the proletarians enter into the wage-labor relationship with capitalists. What does the proletarian have that the capitalist wants? An ability to do work--labor power. Once sold, his/her labor belongs to the capitalist employer. But labor and time are a unity which means that when the proletarian sells his/her labor power for a wage, he/she sells it for a specified period of time. As Marx argued, labor can only be measured by its

³ Bertell Ollman's book, Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, is a classic statement. Ollman identifies four principal types of alienation in Marx's writings: alienation from (1) the labor process, (2) the product, (3) other human beings, and (4) species being.

duration. The admonition, "not on company time," reflects clearly the transfer of time that takes place in the wage-labor exchange. It reminds the worker that he/she no longer owns and controls his/her time; it now belongs to the "company."

First, the worker works under the control of the capitalist to whom his labour belongs. . . Suppose that a capitalist pays for a day's worth of labour-power; then the right to use that power for a day belongs to him, just as much as the right to use any other commodity, such as a horse he had hired for the day (Marx, Capital, Volume 1, 1977, pp. 291-292).

The wage-labor exchange is at the root of the capitalists' efforts to ensure that all of the time purchased is filled with productive work. They want "the most" for their money. But because labor is variable and obtaining the average labor is not guaranteed, it is necessary for the capitalist/manager to control the labor process in an effort to ensure maximum output and productivity.⁴ Workers have devised countless strategies of

4 Edwards (1979) identifies three major types of labor control in the history of U.S. capitalism: simple, technical, and bureaucratic. Simple control prevailed in the era of competitive capitalism and persists in small businesses today. It represents a form of labor control characterized by direct, paternalistic, arbitrary control of workers by an owner/manager. Technical control rests in machines, such as the assembly line, which set the pace of work for workers. Bureaucratic control refers to codified rules and regulations which define the nature of the labor process for workers and prevails in large organizations. For a discussion of the role of synchronized clock-time in controlling labor, with illustrations from early factories, see E.P. Thompson's classic essay, "Time, Work Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," Past and Present 38 (1967): 56-97.

resistance to capitalists' efforts to control labor and the use of their time: talking on the phone, extended coffee breaks, reading magazines or newspapers on the job, socializing with other workers, rate setting, stopping the line, and the like. Such "soldiering" is the bane of capitalist existence.

From its inception, workers in capitalist society have fought against work at the same time that they had no choice but to work. While the first class struggles, as documented by Marx (Capital, Volume 1, 1977, Chapter 28), were about whether individuals would spend their time working in factories at all, later struggles developed over the length of the working day. The issue of whether to work in the factories had been resolved--in the capitalists' favor--but subsequently the question became one of how long.⁵

The working day consists of necessary labor time and surplus labor time. Surplus value, the source of profit, derives from the latter. Surplus value derives from surplus labor, the labor expended during the time that a worker works beyond that which is necessary to reproduce him/herself and family.

I call the portion of the working day during which this reproduction takes place necessary labour-time, and the labour expended during that time necessary labour; necessary for the worker, because independent of the particular social form of his labour;

⁵ For this interpretation of the class struggle, see Harry Cleaver, Reading Capital Politically. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1979.

necessary for capital and the capitalist world, because the conditioned existence of the worker is the basis of that world.

During the second period of the labour process, that in which his labour is no longer necessary labour, the worker does indeed expend labour-power, he does work, but his labour is no longer necessary labour, and he creates no value for himself. He creates surplus-value which, for the capitalist, has all the charms of something created out of nothing. This part of the working day I call surplus labour-time, and to the labour expended during that time I give the name of surplus-labour. It is just as important for a correct understanding of surplus-value to conceive it as merely a congealed quantity of surplus labour-time, as nothing but objectified surplus labour, as it is for a proper comprehension of value in general to conceive it as merely a congealed quantity of so many hours of labour, as nothing but objectified labour (Marx, Capital, Volume 1, 1977, p. 325).

The capitalist drive for ever-expanding profit requires the expansion of surplus labor time relative to necessary labor time as productivity increases through changes in the division of labor, the application of mechanized or automated methods of production, greater labor control, and the like. It is this drive to accumulate capital which explains why productivity gains do not result in reductions of working time. Decreasing the length of the working day decreases the rate and mass of surplus value (all other factors remaining equal) or at least holds them constant if the decrease in surplus labor time is proportional to the decrease in necessary labor time--both of which contradict the system's goal of expansion.

What is new in capital is that it also increases the surplus labour time of the masses by all artistic and scientific means possible, since its wealth consists directly in the appropriation of surplus labour time, since its direct aim is value, not use value. Thus, despite itself, it is instrumental in creating the means of social disposable time, and so in reducing working time for the whole society to a minimum and thus making everyone's time free for their own development. But although its tendency is always to create disposable time, it also converts it into surplus labour (Marx, Grundrisse, 1971, p. 144).

Some of the surplus produced by the workers reproduces the capitalists such that capitalists do not have to work, do not have to engage directly in necessary labor for their own upkeep or that of their families. What results is an unequal distribution of free time wherein the capitalist class usurps the free time that the working class would have if workers did not have to labor beyond that which is necessary for their own subsistence.⁶ In addition, producing surplus is a condition of their working to maintain themselves. If they work at all, they work surplus time as well as necessary time (Mandel 1971, pp.106-107). Obviously, if they don't work, they can't maintain

⁶ If one conceives of unproductive labor--that which does not produce directly surplus value although it may aid in its production and realization--as filling "free time," it is possible to see that the surplus labor of productive labor produces and supports unproductive labor. From this vantage point, and depending on one's definition of productive and unproductive labor, it is not only capitalists who usurp workers' free time but also managers, academics, artists, and the like.

themselves; and working only necessary time is not an option in the capitalist system.

This foray into alienation from time in capitalist society yielded these insights: (1) in the wage-labor exchange, capitalists take from workers their time and control over the use of their time, at least for the duration of the working day and to the extent that work schedules dictate the rhythm of life; (2) the drive to accumulate capital, the *raison d'être* of the capitalist system, requires the expansion of surplus labor time relative to necessary labor time, thereby preventing or limiting increases in workers' free time as a result of increases in productivity; and (3) capitalism is characterized by the unequal distribution of free time in that the capitalist class usurps the free time workers would have if they didn't have to labor beyond that which is necessary for their own subsistence.

This understanding of time in capitalist society suggests that the liberation of time à la Gorz cannot be achieved unless capitalism itself is transcended. Indeed, this is Gorz's position. But a difficult problem remains. In a society of unequal gender relations, the liberation of time may benefit men more than women. For women to have the same opportunities as men for autonomous projects and self-development, socially necessary labor outside complex units of production, i.e. in the household, must also be distributed equitably. To the extent that women are the

primary caregivers and tenders of the household, this means an adjustment in the household division of labor so that men do more and women do less. Only then will a more equitable distribution of free time between women and men be achieved, and only then will women have temporal opportunities equal to men for self-development and expression of species being. Mechanization of household work and subcontracting are not wholly satisfactory ways out of this bind. Historically, mechanization has not served to reduce the amount of time devoted to household work because it has had the consequence of raising standards of household cleanliness. The washing machine made it easier to do laundry but it also made it possible to do more laundry in a week's time. Subcontracting, if women are hired disproportionately, would reproduce the sex-segregation of jobs which must be overcome if gender inequality is to be overcome.

But is there a problem with the value of autonomy itself? Usually it is believed that autonomy leads to greater happiness, that self-determination, self-development, and self-expression lead to self-fulfillment.⁷ Yet is this emphasis on self bankrupt? I suggest it is without some appreciation of the relational nature of social

⁷ Following Sartre, however, Fay (1987) has noted the negative consequences of too much freedom and autonomy, particularly jealousy in comparing one's life with that of others, frustration over one's inability to explore all options, instability and impermanence in relationships, and restlessness about the options not chosen. As he states (1987, p. 200), "a free society might sometimes be one in which its members are unsettled, restive, and discontented."

life. A feminist rethinking of autonomy can provide a vision of communitarian autonomy not inconsistent with Gorz's vision of the sphere of autonomy in a post-industrial future.

Toward a Feminist Rethinking of Autonomy

Our ideas about autonomy are intertwined with our ideas about selfhood. The self is fully developed when it is independent and autonomous, separate and inner-directed, no longer attached to parents or other external control agents. Indeed, it seems one can't be autonomous if connected to (read influenced by) others.

In the opening paragraph to her book From a Broken Web, feminist theologian Catherine Keller summarizes the holonic relationship of independence, autonomy, separation, and selfhood in Western society.⁸

To be a self, must I be something separate and apart? How else could I be myself? Myth and religion, philosophy and psychology center our civilization on the assumption that an individual is a discrete being: I am cleanly divided from the surrounding world of persons and places; I remain essentially the same self from moment to moment. Common sense identifies separateness with the freedom we cherish in the name of 'independence' and 'autonomy.' The

⁸ Koestler (1967) coined the term "holonic" from the Greek "holos," meaning whole, and "on," denoting the individual or segment. A segment is at once an individual entity in itself and a part of a larger whole. The holon is at the same time part and whole. I borrow the term here to refer to the meaning relationships of these various concepts. Each has its own meaning yet each is part of the meaning of the others.

assumption that selfhood requires separation is even rooted in language. The Latin for 'self,' *se*, meaning 'on one's own,' yields with *parare* ('to prepare') the verb 'to separate.' For our culture it is separation which prepares the way for selfhood (Keller 1986, p. 1).

As Keller suggests, the focus on individual autonomy has a long philosophical tradition and is deeply rooted in Western culture. Haworth (1986, pp. 11-13) traces the concept to Plato's notion of courage in The Republic and Aristotle's concept of self-sufficiency in the Ethics and the Politics. While neither spoke directly of individual or personal autonomy, the Platonic notion of courage focused on self-control while Aristotelian self-sufficiency connoted independence. However, according to Haworth, it is a mistake to attribute the contemporary concept of personal autonomy to the Greeks. While the word, autonomy, is of Greek derivation and means "self-rule," the Greeks did not apply the term to persons but to city-states. Thus they spoke of political autonomy, as in sovereignty, rather than personal autonomy. This is true despite the prominence of self-control in Plato's thought and self-sufficiency in Aristotle's. Haworth's (1986, p. 13) assessment of the contribution of Greek thought to an understanding of personal autonomy:

The components were largely there, but not the idea itself, with the flavor that it has in its contemporary use. Personal autonomy with us involves an intense individuality of a sort to which the Greeks did not aspire. Our idea of

an autonomous person is of one who has individuated himself vividly.

Rasmussen (1973) traces autonomy and the discovery of the phenomenon of subjectivity to Kant. As he states,

. . .the Kantian man is one who freely constructs his own reality in such a way that he can be said to be the maker of his own destiny. The focus, of course, is internal, upon the achievements of the inner self. . .The Kantian man is on a voyage of internal liberation of self-- his problem is to become what he will begin to recognize as his essential self (Rasmussen 1973, p. 9).

Kant believed autonomy was the foundation of human dignity and the source of all morality. In the Kantian view, autonomy is impartial rationality; it requires temporary detachment from one's loves and hates, desires and aversions, to consider principles from different points of view to make moral decisions. Such abstraction from personal differences takes as its purpose the fair and reasonable adjudication of competing principles and values, with impartial regard for all persons, in the making of universal law. The true self emerges when one is as free as possible from concerns, eccentricities, and attachments one is caused to have by nature and circumstance.⁹

In this conception, one is most fully oneself, expressing one's true nature, when one 'rises above' the particular

⁹ See Immanuel Kant, Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals, translated and analysed by H.J. Paton, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964, especially p. 101. I have borrowed this interpretation of Kant from Thomas E. Hill, Jr., "The Importance of Autonomy," pp. 129-138 in Eva Feder Kittay and Diana T. Meyers, editors, Women and Moral Theory, Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1987.

natural and conditioned desires that distinguish one from others; and one does this by adopting principles from an impartial point of view and acting from respect for these principles. In this way, it is thought, one is self-governing, or autonomous, i.e. governed by one's true (impartial) self (Hill 1987, p. 132).

The existentialists equated autonomy with separation, particularly separation from the domination of society, and is symbolized by Kierkegaard's interpretation of the Abraham myth and by the protagonist in Camus' novel, The Stranger. Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son is a choice made not on the basis of external social codes but on the basis of his own inner courage. And the protagonist in The Stranger realizes his freedom and his true authentic self at the moment of death--the ultimate separation (Rasmussen 1973).

Haworth's definition of autonomy includes elements of self-rule, critical reflection, and procedural independence. It is a decidedly psychological interpretation of the concept with Freudian overtones in understanding the self as mediating between external domination and personal impulse. As he states (1986, p. 14),

An autonomous person rules himself, and this excludes domination by others and by his own impulses. A self is thus effectively interposed and mediates these influences.

Regarding critical reflection, he adds (1986, p. 17),

As a person develops he becomes increasingly autonomous. But in addition, the very sense in which he is

autonomous shifts. . . This is because he develops an ability to reflect critically on his needs, wants, and situation.

An autonomous life is a reflective life, one fostering procedural independence although not necessarily substantive independence.

Behavior is procedurally independent, regardless of how much it may conform to that of others or deliberately follow a pattern laid out by others, to the extent that the decision to initiate it and to continue with it is one's own (Haworth 1986, p. 20).

Yet the substance and outcome of critical reflection have social structural constraints. One may reflect and choose based on that reflection, but what if there are few or no real alternatives? A slave might imagine and prefer freedom, but knowing freedom is not an option, resign him/herself to the oppressed condition. Is this autonomy? Haworth would surely say not. More subtly, individuals may make gender-appropriate choices believing fully that this is what they want and not recognizing that gendered social structures and gender ideologies have guided them to those choices by limiting their options. Critical reflection may be necessary for autonomy, but it is certainly not sufficient. The possibility of social structural constraints forces us to look at personal autonomy within the context of social life. Individuals cannot realistically be taken out of their social context.

Conventional notions of autonomy exaggerate and celebrate the independence, isolation, and separateness of

individuals at the expense of a vision of individuals in relation and connection to others. The Marxian tradition of thought encourages us to examine the institutional context of human life and suggests that humans must reconstruct the social conditions within which they find themselves to realize their true nature. For Marx, the profound isolation and separateness celebrated by liberal notions of autonomy are in fact the substance of human alienation in capitalist society. As values they are bourgeois expressions of that alienation. Marx's pressing concern was to overcome the concrete historical conditions which produce that alienation.

Following Keller and feminist theorists Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow, the concept of autonomy has a decidedly masculine bias. Separation and self-control overshadow relation and connection and as such are expressions of patriarchal culture in which male experience is valued and female experience is devalued, suppressed, ignored, dismissed, silenced, negated, or erased. To understand this argument more completely, it is necessary to delve briefly into Gilligan's work on moral development and Chodorow's theory of masculine and feminine personality development.

Gilligan (1982) has argued that men and women undergo distinct but parallel moral developmental processes. She identifies two types of moral perspectives. One she calls a justice perspective, based on a morality of rights and formal reasoning and long thought, given the influence of

Kohlberg's theories of moral development, to be the only morality. The second moral perspective Gilligan dubs the care perspective. This is a morality of care and responsibility and is centered on responsiveness to others. It is concerned with "providing care, preventing harm, and maintaining relationships" (Meyers and Kittay 1987, p. 3). She describes this perspective:

As a framework for moral decision, care is grounded in the assumption that self and other are interdependent, an assumption reflected in a view of action as responsive and, therefore, as arising in relationship rather than the view of action as emanating from within the self and therefore, 'self-governed.' Seen as responsive, the self is by definition connected to others (Gilligan 1987, p. 24).

Gilligan's discovery and naming of the care perspective were results of a study of moral decision making among a sample of adolescent and adult men and women. In her study, all of the men, with one exception, focused on the justice perspective if they focused on a perspective. By contrast, the women divided, with one-third focused on justice and one-third on care. While the care perspective was clearly not characteristic of all women in the sample, an all-male sample would have shown little or no evidence of the care perspective. This is the substance of Gilligan's critique of Kohlberg. Because his theory of moral development was based on a sample of males only, it could not detect

alternative models of moral development based on female experience, if they exist.¹⁰

Gilligan's research on moral development has fueled speculation that men and women approach moral dilemmas differently and use different standards in making moral decisions. These differences would seem to stem from differences in men's and women's psychological make-up and concrete realities.

Perhaps the best feminist statement on masculine and feminine personality in mid-twentieth century Western society, certainly one that has captured widespread acclaim, is that of Nancy Chodorow (1978). Blending a sociological perspective with object-relations theory, Chodorow has developed a compelling theory to explain men's separateness and women's relatedness. These personality differences have their origins in the child's pre-oedipal period, particularly the relationship with mother. Chodorow notes that universally women mother. Thus, the child's first emotional attachment is to a woman. This is significant in the child's development of gender identity and emergent selfhood.

Because mother and daughter are the same sex, mother identifies with her daughter as does daughter with mother. This "double identification" keeps the daughter attached to the mother for a longer period than sons and discourages the

¹⁰ See Lawrence Kohlberg, The Philosophy of Moral Development. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981.

mother from pushing the daughter away. The daughter's gender identity develops in personal relation to and connection with the mother. By contrast, because mother and son are different sexes, the mother does not identify with her son nor he with her. She pushes him away more easily. Because the father is emotionally absent in that he is not involved directly in childcare, the son's gender identity cannot develop in relation and connection to his father. Therefore, his gender identity develops in opposition to and negation of the mother. Thus, masculinity develops through a process of repressing and negating that which is feminine.¹¹

These pre-oedipal experiences have ramifications for men's and women's sense of self and other in adulthood. As Chodorow states (1978, pp. 169-170),

. . . girls come to define and experience themselves as continuous with others; their experience of self contains more flexible or permeable ego boundaries. Boys come to define themselves as more separate and distinct, with a greater sense of rigid ego boundaries and differentiation. The basic feminine

¹¹ The question might be posed here, does femininity develop by repressing that which is masculine? Following Chodorow, I would argue no. Because the father is emotionally absent and not involved in childcare particularly in the pre-oedipal period, the daughter has not formed a bond with her father from which she must separate. Therefore, there is nothing to repress or negate. In turn, because the mother is emotionally available, the daughter identifies easily with her same-sex parent. The son, by contrast, cannot identify easily with his same-sex parent because the father is unavailable. To develop masculine identity, then, he can only negate that which is not masculine--femininity--as he separates from the parent with whom he has bonded, his mother.

sense of self is connected to the world, the basic masculine sense of self is separate. . . Masculine personality, then, comes to be defined more in terms of denial of relation and connection (and denial of femininity), whereas feminine personality comes to include a fundamental definition of self in relationship. . . This points to boys' preparation for participation in nonrelational spheres and to girls' greater potential for participation in relational spheres. It points also to different relational needs and fears in men and women.

Chodorow here is not trumpeting the Parsonian (Parsons and Bales 1955) complementarity-through-opposition of men's instrumental and women's expressive roles. Instead, the bourgeois patriarchal nuclear family constellation condemns men and women to repeat this asymmetry unless men and women equitably share childcare, particularly in the child's first years. Such a shared childcare arrangement, Chodorow believes, would permit sons to develop gender identity in personal relation and connection to a man. Masculinity, in turn, would be defined in relation and connection to others and would not mean the negation of femininity (defined as relation and connection). Shared childcare would also free women of some of the burden of childcare, permitting them greater opportunities for self-development. Mother's greater sense of separateness could discourage her overinvolvement in her daughter's life, thus girls learn to be more autonomous.

I think Chodorow's theory values autonomy and relation and advocates each in balance as components of human

personality. This I see as potentially consistent with Gorz's ideas regarding an expanded sphere of autonomy from work. Gorz's use of the concept of autonomy is not necessarily an application of the Kantian notion of individual autonomy. Though it can be that, it can also be an opportunity for the reconstruction of community, with an emphasis on relation and care--perhaps not unlike the moral economy of time suggested by Sirianni (1987).¹² For with an expanded sphere of autonomy in Gorz's sense, we could have more time to cultivate nurturing relationships with others and more time to devote to communitarian projects.¹³

12 With regard to political culture, Sirianni argues that time scarcity restricts participation and consensus formation and serves as an excuse at every level of the political system. Urgency takes priority over importance, and small parcels of time do not permit reflection. As he states, "it is this ideological excuse function that a new economy of time calls into question in the most fundamental way by laying claim to time for genuine public activity and political participation" (1987, p. 184). On an interpersonal level, a new economy of time could permit us to "more rightfully demand of each other the time for nurturance, commitment, attention, and civility that we think we deserve" (1987, p. 189).

13 Gorz (1982, p. 85) draws on Marcuse's ideas regarding cultural revolution in developing his vision for a post-industrial revolution. He advocates replacing ethics of performance, accumulation, and competition with reciprocity, tenderness, and spontaneity. While Gorz and some feminists differ in their understanding of the source of the competitive ethic (for Gorz the source is capitalism; for feminists, patriarchy), they are in agreement regarding the desirable values on which to build a future society and the role the feminist movement can play in creating that society. Their differences in defining the source of "wrong" values, however, inevitably lead to differences in political agendas for social change. I see the reduction of working time, with important qualifications, as an area where the two can be made compatible.

It has been noted that industrial capitalism brought with it an unprecedented lengthening of the working day (McGaughey 1980). Simultaneously, it weakened community and has increasingly atomized persons. Despite reduction of working time from 12- and 14-hour days to the 8-hour day, we have seen little reconstruction of community. Perhaps we are too tired, or the time left after work is too harried as we strive to "fit in" personal and familial obligations and leisure activities before we must return to our jobs. The organization of time off the job is an important corollary to questions of work-time reduction.

But the extension of the market into virtually all areas of social life has also diluted community. Thus, work-time reduction provides an opportunity for the restoration of community, but nothing more. Concomitant with that work-time reduction must come a rethinking of basic social values if our goal is a more just and caring society.

CHAPTER 3

Review of the Literature

Gorz's vision of post-industrial society is admittedly utopian--that of a non-market, egalitarian society which many would doubt is attainable. Many other advocates of work-time reduction (Bennett and Reissman 1984; Best 1978, 1980, 1981; Gans 1985; Levitan and Belous 1977; McGaughey 1981 to name a select few) are less romantic and more practical in their vision, perhaps. However, most advocates of work-time reduction overlook the fact that numerous types of reduced work already exist and, therefore, ignore the possibility that a generalized work-time reduction might legitimate and entrench already existing reduced work. While their vision of society-wide work-time reduction has not been instituted, there exist pockets of reduced work in a number of economic sectors and occupational categories. This chapter's objective is to review what is known about four types of already existing reduced work. The four types of reduced work with which I am concerned are part-time employment, temporary employment, job sharing, and work sharing. These four are of interest because they are on the rise, they tap a range of occupational situations and labor market segments as they intersect with the gender division of

labor, and they are suggestive of the non-class as Gorz has defined it.

For purposes of this study, reduced work refers to wage work less than the normative "full time." Because government data are organized according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition of full-time work as 35 hours or more a week, reduced work in this context is work less than 35 hours per week or less than year round.

Part-Time Employment

Part-time employment, defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as employment less than 35 hours per week, has grown appreciably since the mid-1950s. Since that time, the number of part-time employees in nonagricultural industries increased at an average annual rate of nearly four percent, more than double the rate of increase for full-time workers (Deutermann and Brown 1978). Since 1970, the proportion of the labor force voluntarily employed part time has remained between 13 and 14 percent. The proportion employed part time involuntarily, however, has increased from 3.1 percent in 1970 to 5.7 percent in 1984. This suggests that the strongest factor in the growth of part-time employment is not workers' preferences for flexibility but employers' response to economic pressures (U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment 1985, pp. 59-60). Most part-time workers are women, teenagers, and older persons (Nardone 1986). Of this group, women are the largest proportion, constituting two-thirds of all part-time workers in 1985

(Nardone 1986). Part-time jobs comprise 29.4 percent of the jobs in the services industry and 51.5 percent of the jobs in retail trade. More than 25 percent of the nearly 10 million jobs created during the Reagan years have been part time (9 to 5 1986). Nearly half of all part-time workers are in sales and service jobs (Nardone 1986).

Temporary Employment

Within the part-time workforce, temporary help constitutes a significant subgroup. Gannon (1984) defines temporaries as those workers who are employees of temporary help firms, such as Manpower, Inc. and Kelly Services, who are sent out on assignment to various organizations. When the assignment is completed, employees return to the temporary help firm to await another assignment. They do not, however, work for the temporary help firm between work assignments. Technically, temporaries are employees of the temporary help firms and not the companies where they work.

In 1956 there were approximately 20,000 employees in the temporary help industry. More recently it has been estimated that two to three million workers are employed as temporaries at some time--often for only a few hours, but more frequently for several days over a period of three or four months--during each year (Gannon 1984). Temporaries comprised about two percent of the American labor force in the early 1980s, but that number is expected to triple by the early 1990s (Ostrach 1981). In the two-year period between November, 1982, and November, 1984, the number of

employees in the industry grew 70 percent (Carey and Hazelbaker 1986). The temporary help industry is the third fastest growing industry in the United States today, with 90 percent of businesses and practically all of the Fortune 500 companies using temporaries on a regular basis (Ostrach 1981). The industry has grown twice as fast as GNP over the last 14 years, and faster than the computer equipment industry, to a payroll of \$5.5 billion in 1984. This compares to a payroll of \$431 million in 1971 (U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment 1985, p. 61). In the early 1970s, most temporary jobs were in the clerical sector, and most temporary clerical workers were young women (Gannon 1974). More recently, Gannon (1984) has estimated that 65 percent of temporary help employment is in clerical work, 30 percent is in industry, and 5 percent is in professional/technical work. Recently, there has been considerable growth in temporary employment in the health care industry, particularly among registered and licensed practical nurses and other health care professionals and technicians (Howe 1986).

The exercise of management prerogative has led to the expansion of part-time and temporary employment. Managers like to hire "peripheral employees" (Gannon 1975) for a number of reasons. Part-time workers are cheaper to employ because their base pay is often lower than that of full-timers and they often do not receive fringe benefits. Because part-time workers can be scheduled to cover peak

demand periods during the day, they afford managers cost efficiency with greater flexibility than do full-time workers. Temporaries can be hired for special projects or for peak demand periods that occur during an upturn in the business cycle and can be terminated easily when need subsides. The use of part-time workers and temporaries allows managers to trim their permanent, full-time workforce, thereby decreasing the number of workers to whom they are "committed." Politically, it may mean fewer workers to lay off in periods of economic recession. The existence of a part-time and temporary reserve army of labor also enhances management control of labor. According to Appelbaum (1987), this restructuring of work has weakened internal labor markets and is closing off opportunities for job security and advancement for women that have only recently become available.¹

In contrast to part-time and temporary employment, job sharing and work sharing occur when individuals or collective bargaining units negotiate with their employers

¹ The research literature on part-time and temporary employment remains skimpy. In addition to materials cited in this chapter, noteworthy recent titles are: Harvey R. Hamel, "New Data Series on Involuntary Part-Time Work," Monthly Labor Review 108 (3) March, 1985: 42-43; Hilda Kahne, Reconceiving Part-Time Work: New Perspectives for Older Workers and Women. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1985; Vicki Smith, "The Circular Trap: Women and Part-Time Work," Berkeley Journal of Sociology 23 (1983): 1-17; Sylvia Lazos Terry, "Involuntary Part-Time Work: New Information from the CPS," Monthly Labor Review 104 (2) February, 1981: 70-74; and Wendy Weeks, "Part-Time Work: The Business View on Second-Class Jobs for Housewives and Mothers," Atlantis 5 (Spring, 1980): 69-88.

for reduced work schedules. Although there are exceptions, these two types of reduced work tend to exist in the primary labor market while part-time and temporary employment predominate in the secondary labor market. Obvious exceptions are (1) clerical workers who job share and (2) professions, such as university teaching, which are experiencing the encroachment of part-time and temporary employment. The growth in the number of university faculty who are hired on a part-time or temporary basis has led to a concern that university teaching is being deprofessionalized (Van Arsdale 1978) and proletarianized (Abel 1977). The latter trend suggests a blurring of the division between primary and secondary labor markets.

Job Sharing

Sometimes taken on as a temporary arrangement, job sharing can be a form of permanent part-time employment and is usually defined as "two people sharing the responsibility of one full-time position, with salary and fringe benefits prorated" (Olmsted 1979, p. 283). It is designed to increase both the number and quality of part-time jobs (Hedges 1980; Meier 1979). Job sharing is usually voluntary, requested by workers and negotiated with their employers, and is a practice usually associated with professional work although it does occur in clerical settings. Some job sharers work in close partnership; others work more or less independently. In some instances, like academic settings, job sharers are marital partners; in

others, job sharers are unrelated but they work in close partnership; and in still others, they never meet but communicate by phone or note (Hedges 1980; Meier 1979). Meier's (1979) study suggests the overwhelming majority of job sharers are women. Seventy-seven percent of her respondents were members of job sharing teams comprised of two women. Only four percent were members of teams comprised of two men. The remaining 19 percent were members of male-female teams.

As Olmsted (1979, p. 284) notes, job sharing differs from traditional part-time employment in two important ways. First, the purpose of job sharing is to restructure career-oriented, professional positions which cannot be reduced in hours or split between two part-time employees. Second, job sharing often requires a significant degree of cooperation and communication between the sharers.

Work Sharing

Work sharing differs from job sharing in that it is a strategy for rationing the available wage work. Best (1980) has indicated that industrial societies have consistently applied policies to reduce and ration working time as a means of decreasing joblessness. Approaches have varied, ranging from temporary and permanent reductions of the workweek to removing systematically various sections of the working-age population from the labor force through, for example, prolonged schooling in youth or early retirement.

Generally, work sharing takes two basic forms. One type seeks to reduce working time among the employed to create jobs for the unemployed, thus distributing available wage work more evenly among a larger number of persons. Legislated reductions of the workweek are one example here. This type has been used with the intent of reducing unemployment caused by long-term conditions that are likely to persist beyond the periodic downturns of the business cycle. A second type is usually restricted to specific firms and used as a short-term strategy to prevent layoffs and dismissals by temporarily reducing working time. For example, employers and employees in a given firm may decide to reduce the workweek and earnings for a short period by 10 percent as an alternative to laying off one-tenth of existing workers (Best 1980, p. 84; Best 1981, p. 2).

Work-time reductions to decrease unemployment have most commonly occurred in the form of shortened workweeks (Best 1980, p. 85). Over the last 30 years, approximately 30 percent of collective bargaining agreements have had formal provisions for work sharing, although, with the exception of the highly unstable garment industries, these options have rarely been used. More recently, short workweeks were used as an alternative to layoffs by a number of firms in the New York metropolitan area during the dual crises of the 1975 recession and city fiscal crisis (Best 1980, p. 85). Since the late 1970s, eleven states have instituted short-time compensation programs which permit qualifying employers to

cut their workers' hours and the workers in turn can receive prorated unemployment insurance benefits (Business Week, April 14, 1986, p. 77).²

In 1979, less than two percent of the total number of persons at work were work sharers. While male work sharers outnumbered women by five percent and whites far outnumbered racial minorities, women and racial minorities were disproportionately represented relative to their percentage of the working population. Work sharers were concentrated among blue-collar workers, with the largest proportions of work sharers holding jobs as operatives and craft workers.

2 The eleven states are California, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, Florida, Maryland, Illinois, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and New York. The research literature on short-time compensation in particular and work sharing in general has grown along with the number of states that have adopted STC programs. In addition to titles cited herein, the following references are exemplary: Fred Best and James Mattesich, "Short Time Compensation Systems in California and Europe," Monthly Labor Review, 103 (7) July, 1980: 13-22; R.W. Crowley and E. Huth, "An International Comparison of Work Sharing Programs," Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations 38 (3) 1983: 636-647; Stuart Kerachsky et al., "Work Sharing Programs: An Evaluation of Their Use," Monthly Labor Review 109 (5) May, 1986: 31-33; John C. Lammers, "Managing Unemployment: The Role of Union Business Agents and the Use of Work Sharing," Social Problems, 32 (2) December, 1984: 133-143; Sar A. Levitan and Richard S. Belous, "Work-sharing Initiatives At Home and Abroad," Monthly Labor Review, 100 (9) September, 1977: 16-20; Ramelle McCoy and Martin J. Morand, Short-Time Compensation: A Formula for Work Sharing. New York: Pergamon Press, 1984; Maureen McCarthy and Gail S. Rosenberg with Gary Lefkowitz, Work Sharing: Case Studies. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1981; Martin Nemirow, "Work-sharing Approaches: Past and Present," Monthly Labor Review 107 (9) September, 1984: 34-39; Frank W. Schiff, "Short-time Compensation: Assessing the Issues," Monthly Labor Review 109 (5) May, 1986: 28-30; and John Zalusky, "Short Time Compensation: The AFL-CIO Perspective," Monthly Labor Review 109 (5) May, 1986: 33-34.

The incidence of work sharing also varied by industry. The construction, manufacturing, and trade sectors accounted for disproportionate numbers of work sharers (Bednarzik 1980).

No previous research attempts to explore systematically the experiences of part-time workers, temporary workers, job sharers, and work sharers in a comparative framework.

Instead, studies have assumed discrete experiences of workers in those varied types of reduced work. Few studies have explored different types of reduced work as they are related to conditions which may enhance or impede autonomy off the job.

We know relatively little about the terms and conditions of reduced work. While a few studies evaluate the job attitudes of part-time workers (Eberhardt and Shanl 1984; Miller and Terborg 1979), part-time workers generally have been ignored in organizational research (Rotchford and Roberts 1982). This is the logical outcome of an ideology that delegitimizes work when it is not full time.

Nonprofessional part-time jobs tend to be low-paying jobs (Owen 1978; Plewes 1984) with few fringe benefits (Plewes 1984). Part-time workers who are covered by a collective bargaining agreement tend to have higher base pay and some benefits by comparison to nonunion part-time workers (Zalusky 1984). Generally, temporary help agencies provide their employees with legally required benefits (social security, workers' compensation, and unemployment insurance) but not sick or holiday pay or other benefits common in

industry. The actual rate of pay for temporary workers is sometimes higher than that of regular employees; at other times, the same or slightly lower (Gannon 1974).

Job sharers generally receive prorated salaries and fringe benefits (Olmstead 1979). Marital partners who job share have indicated difficulty living on the equivalent of one full-time salary (Arkin and Dobrofsky 1978; Winkler 1979). Work sharers may suffer a loss of wages associated with their hours reduction, although those who are eligible for short-time compensation make up some of that wage loss in prorated unemployment insurance benefits. Because they remain attached to their job instead of being laid off, work sharers can retain their fringe benefits (Best 1981; McCoy and Morand 1984; McCarthy and Rosenberg 1981).

We know even less about the extent to which those who work less than full time have an influence on their work schedules. Can they choose their hours? The available research does not provide a complete answer to this question. Temporaries may refuse a job assignment altogether, although they must weigh carefully the consequences of such refusal and don't always have complete information (e.g. the range of assignments available and the merits of each) to make such decisions (Olesen and Katsuranis 1978). Twelve percent of the respondents to a temporary help agency survey indicated that the most attractive feature of temporary employment was the ability to choose one's hours (Gannon 1974).

Although few studies have explored directly how those who work less than full time use their time off the job, the fact that some choose reduced work to better integrate wage work with childcare and household responsibilities suggests that many use their time off the job for those purposes. Numerous studies of women who work part time have examined the factors that influence their decisions to seek part-time employment, and the primacy of childcare and household responsibilities is an overriding concern (Long and Jones 1980; Long and Jones 1981; Morgenstern and Hamovitch 1976; Yeandle 1982).

Gronseth (1975) reported that part-time employment is a viable strategy for coping with home responsibilities and fostering role sharing relationships in the household. However, his conclusions were drawn with some important qualifications.

It seems safe to say, that at least for families with small children, with an average working man's income or higher, where both parents have above average education, and the wife has a firm and personal occupational commitment, where both are committed to the welfare of each other and of their children, and are strongly motivated for a work-sharing pattern, the adoption of the pattern generally results in the expected positive kinds of adaptations (Gronseth 1975, p. 219).

Olesen and Katsuranis (1978) distinguished between "transitional" and "permanent" temporaries. The former use temporary work as a stepping stone to other occupational or personal pursuits, and the latter use temporary work to

support other aspects of their lives, such as artistic pursuits. This is consistent with findings reported by Moore (1963). Meier's (1982) study of job sharers showed that job sharing is preferred by women who have children, older persons, and those seeking flexibility to pursue further education and training. A couple profiled in the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that job sharing facilitates shared parenting and permits off-the-job professional pursuits, such as consulting work (Winkler 1979). McCarthy and Rosenberg (1981, pp. 29, 35) reported that work sharers use their extra time off the job for such activities as farming, hunting, fishing, and family.

Olesen and Katsuranis (1978), in their study of women who were temporary clerical workers, concluded that temporary employment affords a certain autonomy because the women were able to exercise some control over their work lives and their time off the job. Arkin and Dobrofsky (1978), while they sought to explore the relationship of job sharing and the personal autonomy of each partner in a marital relationship, tended to emphasize circumstances associated with the job itself. Several problems associated with job sharing were reported, such as problems of sexism, stigma associated with part-time employment, and perceptions of exploitation as each partner finds him/herself giving more than 50 percent to a job that pays just one full-time salary.

This chapter has documented the existence of pockets of reduced work in various sectors of the economy and occupational classifications. Part-time employment is concentrated in retail trade and services, and about two-thirds of all part-time workers are women. Women are also a large proportion of temporary employees. Most temporaries are clerical workers, although many are laborers in industry and there has been considerable growth in temporary employment among professional and technical workers particularly in the health care industry. Job sharing occurs predominantly among clerical workers and professionals, and, while extensive survey data on job sharing do not exist, it appears that it is a work-time option selected by women far more frequently than it is chosen by men. Work sharing is concentrated among blue-collar workers in construction and manufacturing, and male work sharers outnumber female work sharers by a slight margin.

The terms and conditions of reduced work vary by type of reduced work, but generally the literature suggests that terms and conditions improve if one's reduced work is in the primary labor market and if one is represented by a labor union. The literature provides a cursory analysis of workers' use of time off the job and autonomy off the job and does not compare systematically different types of reduced work. It is a goal of this study to improve on that weakness in the literature.

CHAPTER 4

Research Methodology

As discussed in the previous chapters, reduced work is on the rise in the United States. Employers favor the use of part-time and temporary employees to maximize flexibility in staffing and to minimize labor costs. In turn, they use a rhetoric of autonomy to sell part-time and temporary jobs to potential hires. Women with dependent children, students, and the aging are especially vulnerable target audiences. Women with children require flexible work schedules to balance wage work and household responsibilities, students need them to integrate wage work and the classroom, and the aging prefer less-than-full-time employment as an adjunct to retirement. Additionally, the sheer desire to have more time off may motivate individuals to want to work less than full time. Job sharing is a form of part-time employment that permits individuals to negotiate for more time off. Work sharing is a form of work-time reduction that permits the redistribution of available wage work and is an alternative to layoff. It is also on the rise, especially in states that have legislated short-time compensation programs. Whether individuals work voluntarily or involuntarily at less-than-full-time wage-paying jobs, the phenomenon of reduced work is a fact of

life. It is legitimated on grounds of greater personal autonomy particularly regarding the use of time off the job, but the relationship between reduced work and autonomy must be scrutinized empirically. In addition, Gorz has argued that individuals unemployed or underemployed are a post-industrial non-class who refuse socialized labor in an effort to appropriate a sphere of autonomy outside work. The existence of this non-class is also an empirical question.

This research project explores people's experiences of reduced work and autonomy off the job. It focuses on individuals employed part-time and as temporaries and on those who job share and work share. My goal is to learn about the relationship between different types of reduced work and autonomy as people experience them in their daily lives. Specifically, the study seeks to identify conditions that enhance or impede autonomy off the job.

Given the project's focus on people's lived experience --as they would define and tell it--I deliberately avoid imposing on them my own values regarding time, work, and autonomy. This study does not force informants' responses into a preordained autonomy scale. Instead, it examines their impressions about their jobs and their time off the job to discern what they define as conditions that enhance or impede their autonomy off the job. Thus, I use a broad definition of autonomy to begin the research: the ability to decide how to use one's time off the job. To capture

this, informants were asked how they used their time off the job, if there were things they wanted to do with their time that they didn't do, and why they couldn't do those things. I wanted to give voice to people who too infrequently have it, therefore, the research method I used followed from my philosophy of sociological research.

My first concern was to diminish the power of the researcher, which is why participants in this study are called "informants" instead of interviewees or subjects. Rather than define participants passively, as people who had something done to them by a knowledgeable expert, I chose the term informant to signify their knowledge of their experiences of reduced work and autonomy. After all, if I am an all-knowing expert, what point is there in doing the research? Granted, I bring a "sociological imagination" (Mills 1959) to the endeavor that my informants may lack, but their intimate knowledge of reduced work and autonomy is what I lack. Thus, this study is best seen as a cooperative venture, a meeting of the minds, in which my sociological imagination complements the experiences of my informants, yielding new insight into the sociological meaning of people's varied experiences of reduced work and autonomy off the job.

My second concern was to structure an interview that would provide informants with the opportunity to discuss their experiences freely and openly. The interviews were open-ended and largely unstructured. I followed an

interview guide (see Appendix A) which functioned in part to sequence the interview but primarily as a checklist to ensure that I had covered all of the topics I wanted to cover. Each interview began with my asking informants to tell me about their current job. This portion of the interview inevitably led to discussion of the informants' actual work tasks and job responsibilities. It was here that we also discussed work schedules and work histories. About mid-way through the interview we shifted to questions about their use of time off the job. Each interview was concluded by completing the Personal and Household Data Sheet (see Appendix B) and my asking two summary questions: (1) Is there anything about your job, the hours, your work schedule that you'd like to say that you haven't already said?, and (2) Is there anything about your time off the job that you'd like to say that you haven't already said? The Personal and Household Data Sheet, which included potentially sensitive questions about personal and household income, for example, was saved until near the end of the interview to ensure the establishment of sufficient trust between informant and interviewer. Often, however, the information asked for on the Personal and Household Data Sheet had been discussed earlier in the interview, as it had come up in the flow of conversation, and the Data Sheet became an opportunity to verify information and sometimes triggered additional comment on a topic. The summary questions ensured that nothing important to the informant

had been excluded by the interviewer's oversight or lack of intimate knowledge of the informant's experience. Barring this cadence which was virtually uniform across all interviews, topic sequence varied somewhat depending on the particular nuances of individual experiences. Thus, while the interview topic checklist ensured that the same topics were covered in each interview, ensuring comparability across interviews, each interview was also tailored to the unique experiences of each informant.

Interviews generally lasted one to one and one-half hours. Most took place in a small meeting room on the Michigan State University campus. In some cases they took place in a private meeting room at the informant's place of employment. A few interviews took place at the informant's home, and a couple were done over the phone. The effort to diminish the researcher's power was admittedly compromised in the cases where the interview was done on campus. But having informants come to campus ensured privacy that may have been compromised in their homes. Given that a substantial portion of the interview covered time off the job, relationships with other household members were inevitable topics of discussion. I believe that informants could discuss these relationships more honestly and openly in the privacy of a room on campus than at their homes where other members of the household might overhear or appear unexpectedly. However, this location was not imposed on the informants. In each phone call I made to volunteers to

schedule an interview time, I indicated that I was willing to negotiate a convenient meeting place, but that a private room on campus was always available to us. My sense was that some did not want the interviewer to come to their homes, that the interviewer's presence there might be an excessive invasion of their privacy. In cases where it was not convenient for the informant to come to campus, alternatives were discussed and the most frequent choice was for me to go to their place of employment. In these cases, interviews were conducted during the informant's lunch break, during an hour of personal time taken during the working day, or immediately after the informant's work-day ended. It was my understanding that in all of these cases the informant's employer knew that the informant was participating in an interview and had given permission for the informant to use space at the worksite without interruption during the interview.

Research Philosophy

My research philosophy and the nature of the interviews are consistent with principles of research associated with critical social science (Fay 1987) and "grounded theory" (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Critical social science seeks to explain a social order or social phenomena such that social science becomes a catalyst for social change. Practically, it seeks to become an enabling, motivating resource for its audience. Thus, critical social science is concerned with enlightening, empowering, and emancipating a group or groups

in a society. One of critical social science's central values is that of collective autonomy. It promotes self-determination and the removal of barriers which prevent people from living in accordance with their will. As Fay (1987, p. 75) puts it,

. . .its aim is to help people. . .to
cease being mere objects in the world,
passive victims dominated by forces
external to them.

This, however, is not a recipe for anarchy. Instead, critical social science promotes transformation of social institutions and relations such that they permit greater self-determination. Specific to this project, work schedules are conceptualized as dominating forces that may inhibit people's autonomy off the job. Control of working time, then, is an important dimension of autonomy. Because this project focuses on reduced work, and because reduced work is gendered as is use of time off the job, gender arrangements must also be examined as dominating forces that may inhibit autonomy off the job.

Grounded theory is theory generated from data obtained systematically from social research (Glaser and Strauss 1967, p. 2). It differs from theory generated by logical deduction from a priori assumptions. Research with the goal of generating grounded theory differs from empirical research whose purpose it is to verify (or falsify) or modify already existing theory by testing hypotheses generated from the theory. The advantage of grounded theory is that conceptual categories are developed from the data,

not imposed on the data. Thus, the researcher may "see" phenomena he or she may not have looked for or chose to ignore if he/she had been limited by the principles of an already existing theory. As Glaser and Strauss (1967, p. 46) state,

Potential theoretical sensitivity is lost when the sociologist commits himself exclusively to one specific preconceived theory (e.g., formal organization) for then he becomes doctrinaire and can no longer 'see around' either his pet theory or any other. He becomes insensitive, or even, defensive, toward the kinds of questions that cast doubt on his theory; he is preoccupied with testing, modifying and seeing everything from this one angle. For this person, theory will seldom truly emerge from data.

Furthermore, the researcher may find him/herself "hemmed in" by preconceived notions of theory and research design.

. . . data collected according to a preplanned routine are more likely to force the analyst into irrelevant directions and harmful pitfalls. He may discern unanticipated contingencies in his respondents, in the library and in the field, but is unable to adjust his collection procedures or even redesign his whole project. In accordance with conventional practice, the researcher is admonished to stick to his prescribed research design, no matter how poor the data. If he varies his task to meet these unanticipated contingencies, readers may judge that his facts have been contaminated by his personal violation of the preconceived impersonal rules. Thus he is controlled by his impersonal rules and has no control over the relevancy of his data, even as he

sees it go astray (Glaser and Strauss 1967, p. 49).

Finally, the researcher whose concern is verification is not free to "play" with his/her data. Data that do not fit preordained conceptual categories will usually be dismissed from theoretical analysis.

While grounded theory and quantitative data collection need not be mutually exclusive, the generation of theory from data usually follows from qualitative data. This permits the theoretical analysis of social phenomena that are not quantifiable or analysis of quantifiable social phenomena from a different angle. Unfortunately, this line of reasoning has led many social researchers to call research in the tradition of grounded theory "exploratory," suggesting that qualitative research is a precursor to quantitative research and not legitimate in its own right.

According to Glaser and Strauss, the generation of grounded theory permits the generation of theory that fits its data well. It is theory of the "middle range" that seeks to illuminate a limited range of phenomena represented by and related to the data, but it is not an effort to generate grand theory, theory so broad and abstract that it seeks to encompass a wide variety of social phenomena.

Because grounded theory's concern is the generation of theory and not its verification, the researcher need not pursue full coverage of evidence, as with statistical sampling. Instead, the researcher's goal is theoretical saturation. One achieves theoretical saturation when

no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category. As he sees similar instances over and over again, the researcher becomes empirically confident that a category is saturated (Glaser and Strauss 1967, p. 61).

This differs from statistical sampling whose goal is the fullest possible coverage and not theoretical saturation.

. . .in statistical sampling, the sociologist must continue data collection no matter how much saturation he perceives. In his case, the notion of saturation is irrelevant to the study. Even though he becomes aware of what his findings will be, and knows he is collecting the same thing over and over to the point of boredom, he must continue because the rules of accurate evidence require the fullest coverage to achieve this most accurate count (Glaser and Strauss 1967, pp. 64-65).

The method of sampling followed to generate theory is called theoretical sampling. It is done to discover categories and their properties and to suggest the interrelationships into a theory. It requires only collecting data on categories for the generation of properties, not the fullest statistical coverage of a group (Glaser and Strauss 1967, pp. 62, 69). This research project followed the method of theoretical sampling and was concerned primarily with properties of time regimes, control of work schedules, and use of time off the job associated with four categories of reduced work.

Sample Selection

The sample was composed through a theoretical sampling procedure. It is not a scientific sample in that it is not representative of all part-time workers, temporary employees, job sharers, and work sharers. Given its nonrepresentativeness, findings from this study are not intended to be generalizable to the population of workers in those four categories. Additionally, this study does not assert and test hypotheses about the relationship between reduced work and autonomy. Instead, my goal was to understand the experience of reduced work and autonomy to determine conditions which enhance or impede autonomy off the job. While the sample may not be representative of all part-time workers, temporaries, job sharers, and work sharers, I believe it is typical of those four categories of workers. For example, women predominated among the part-time workers, temporary employees, and job sharers in my sample and men predominated among the work sharers. This is consistent with the distribution of women and men across categories of reduced work reported in chapter 3. As will be shown below, the types of occupations held by my informants were also typical of those who work less than full time as reported in chapter 3. Finally, given the paucity of data on workers in those four categories, it would be difficult to construct an absolutely representative sample.¹

¹ The U.S. Census does include data on part-time employees, as do Bureau of Labor Statistics data sets, but they are

All interviews were conducted in the Lansing-East Lansing, Michigan and Flint, Michigan areas, with the exception of one done in a small town about 30 miles east of Lansing. Interviews were done between September, 1986 and October, 1987. Part-time workers were recruited from private- and public-sector establishments in the Lansing-East Lansing area. Temporary employees were recruited through two temporary employment agencies in the Lansing-East Lansing area. Job sharers were recruited through the State of Michigan Department of Civil Service. This concentration of job sharers attached to a single employer is problematic in that in this case the nature of job sharing reflects the nature of civil service employment, but it solved the dilemma of locating 10 to 15 job sharers to interview. As noted in chapter 3, job sharing tends to be an individually negotiated employment arrangement, and it can be difficult to identify job sharers and organizations that permit job sharing. One job sharer in the sample, however, was not a state employee. She was a private hospital employee recruited originally as a part-time worker. It was during her interview that I discovered she was a job sharer. This "accident" reveals the lack of distinction between part-time employment and job sharing.

only differentiated by voluntary and involuntary part-time employment. The BLS began collecting data on temporary employment in 1982. The categorization used by federal government agencies, however, is inadequate for my purposes. For example, federal data do not distinguish between part-time employment and job sharing.

As this study shows, however, job sharing is part-time employment, but it is a distinctive form of part-time employment which may afford job sharers a measure of control over their work schedules not permitted most part-time employees and which may require coordination between job sharing partners not required of most part-time workers. Despite these analytic differences, job sharers as well as their employers apparently think of themselves as part-time workers. While this singular case of a job sharer in the private sector provides a contrast to those in the public sector, it shows the uniformity of job sharing across sectors. The work sharers were recruited through a UAW local in Flint, Michigan, from an auto plant that had recently laid off a large number of workers. While there are many types of work sharing, as discussed in chapter 3, in this study work sharing took the form of an inverse seniority layoff plan in which high seniority workers volunteered to be laid off for periods of four months, seven months, or one year. Like job sharing, work sharing is not a common or easily identified phenomenon. It occurs on a plant-by-plant basis and may go by names other than work sharing, in this case "inverse seniority layoff."²

² The inverse layoff plan permitted high seniority workers to volunteer to take time off with the consequence that less senior workers, who otherwise would have been laid off, stayed on the job. In this way, inverse seniority layoff can be seen as a form of work sharing. Those whose seniority rights protected their jobs exchanged their jobs with those with insufficient seniority. This differs from the conventional understanding of work sharing discussed in chapter 3 in which all workers in a plant have shortened workweeks and no one is laid off.

The principal recruitment strategy followed in this study was to send letters (see Appendix C) to potential informants telling them about the research project, asking them to volunteer to be interviewed, and providing them with a pre-addressed and stamped postcard with which to respond if they wanted to volunteer or wanted more information about the project. Because the state civil service and the temporary employment agencies would not/could not provide me with names of employees, a staff member selected randomly names and sent the letters I provided. Work sharers who received letters were selected at random from a list of persons on the inverse layoff.

A less formal, less systematic recruitment procedure was followed in the case of the part-time workers. Because I went to several establishments and only sought two or three volunteers at each, it seemed impractical to send letters to a large number of employees. At one hospital, the personnel director from whom I gained permission to recruit located volunteers for me. At one retail establishment, the manager from whom I sought assistance in recruiting told me to walk around the store and ask any employees on the floor. At another retail outlet, I posted on the employees' bulletin board a memo (see Appendix D) describing the project and asking for volunteers. Attached at the bottom of this memo was an envelope filled with response postcards pre-addressed to me.

Sample Characteristics

Interviews were obtained from 44 informants--27 women and 17 men. Eleven job sharers (nine women and two men) were interviewed, and they ranged in age from 27 to 53 years. Their median age was 33. Twelve temporaries (nine women and three men) were interviewed, and they ranged in age from 18 to 59 years. As a group the temporaries were the youngest by comparison to the other categories of reduced work, with a median age of 24 years. Part-time workers had a median age of 27 years, ranging from 20 to 46. Nine part-time workers (seven women and two men) were interviewed. Finally, the work sharers were the oldest group, ranging in age from 33 to 55 years. Their median age was 42. Twelve work sharers (two women and ten men) were interviewed. Table 1 provides the age distribution of the sample by type of reduced work and gender. Women ranged in age from 18 to 46, men from 24 to 59. Their median ages were 28 and 41 respectively.

The vast majority of my informants were white. Twenty-six white women and 13 white men were interviewed. One woman and two men were black; two men were hispanic. Table 2 gives the racial characteristics of the sample by type of reduced work and gender.

Table 3 gives the level of education completed by my informants by type of reduced work and gender. All of the job sharers, temporaries, and part-time workers had completed high school at least, while five of the work

Table 1. Age Distribution of Sample.

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
18-25	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	0	9
26-30	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7
31-40	1	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	6	9
41-50	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	4	2
51-60	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{0}{7}$	$\frac{4}{10}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{6}{17}$	$\frac{0}{27}$

Table 2. Sample by Race.

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
White	1	9	2	8	2	7	8	2	13	26
Black	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1
Hispanic	$0 \frac{0}{2}$	$0 \frac{0}{9}$	$1 \frac{1}{3}$	$0 \frac{0}{9}$	$0 \frac{0}{2}$	$0 \frac{0}{7}$	$1 \frac{1}{10}$	$0 \frac{0}{2}$	$2 \frac{2}{17}$	$0 \frac{0}{27}$

Table 3. Sample by Education Completed.

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Less than high school	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	0
High school	0	1	2	2	0	4	3	2	5	9
1-3 years college	0	7	1	5	2	1	2	0	5	13
Bachelor's degree	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Some graduate training	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2
Master's degree	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{0}{3}$	$\frac{1}{9}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{0}{7}$	$\frac{0}{10}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{0}{17}$	$\frac{1}{27}$

sharers had not. Most job sharers had completed one to three years of college and three had completed college or gone on for some graduate training. Half of the temporaries had completed a few years of college. Three of the part-time workers had completed a few years of college and two had completed some graduate training. Only two work sharers had formal education beyond high school.

Table 4 shows the occupational distribution of the sample by type of reduced work and gender. The job sharers were professionals and clerical workers and the temporaries were all clerical workers with the exception of one laborer. Three temporaries had no placement at the time they were interviewed. One part-time worker was a professional and a couple were skilled workers, but the majority were clerical and sales workers. The work sharers were all operatives or laborers. Over half of the women in the sample were clerical workers and over half of the men were operatives and laborers.

Table 5 shows the income distribution of the sample by type of reduced work and gender. Most of the job sharers had annual incomes between \$10,000 and \$14,999, but four had incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999. All of the part-time workers had annual incomes less than \$20,000 with the modal category \$15,000 to \$19,999. One had an income of less than \$5,000. By contrast, all of the work sharers had annual incomes of more than \$25,000. Most had incomes between

Table 4. Occupational Distribution of Sample.¹

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Professional	2 ²	2 ³	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Technical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clerical	0	7	0	8 ⁴	0	3 ⁵	0	0	0	18
Sales	0	0	0	0	1	2 ⁶	0	0	1	2
Skilled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Operatives	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 ⁷	0	5	0
Laborers	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	6	2
Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No placement	$\frac{-}{2}$	$\frac{-}{9}$	$\frac{2^8}{3}$	$\frac{1^9}{9}$	$\frac{-}{2}$	$\frac{-}{7}$	$\frac{-}{10}$	$\frac{-}{2}$	$\frac{2}{17}$	$\frac{1}{27}$

Footnotes:

1. Occupation(s) held at time of interview.
2. One of these men was also a self-employed accountant.
3. This includes one paraprofessional.
4. One of these women was also employed part time as a service worker.
5. One of these women was also employed full time as a clerical worker.
6. One of these women was also a full-time school teacher.
7. One of these men was also a self-employed tax consultant.
8. One of these men usually took clerical placements while the other took labor or service placements.
9. This woman usually took clerical placements.

Table 5. Income Distribution of Sample.¹

	Job Sharers		Temporaries ²		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Less than \$5,000	0	0	-	-	0	1	0	0	0	1
\$5,000-\$9,999	0	0	-	-	0	2	0	0	0	2
\$10,000-\$14,999	1	6	-	-	2	2	0	0	3	8
\$15,000-\$19,999	1	2	-	-	0	2	0	0	1	4
\$20,000-\$24,999	0	1	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	1
\$25,000-\$29,999	0	0	-	-	0	0	2	1	2	1
\$30,000-\$34,999	0	0	-	-	0	0	5	1	5	1
\$35,000-\$39,999	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	1	0
\$40,000-\$44,999	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	1	0
\$45,000-\$49,999	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	1	0
	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	1	0
	2	9			2	7	10	2	14	18

Footnotes:

1. Individual annual income.
2. Annual income was difficult to determine for temporaries because their work was so unpredictable. Overall, they reported earning from \$3.25 to \$5.00 an hour depending on the nature of the placement. Two women who had worked 40-hour weeks for some time estimated their annual earnings would be around \$12,000.

\$25,000 and \$34,999, but a few had incomes ranging from \$35,000 to \$49,999.

Annual income was difficult to determine for temporaries because their work was so unpredictable. Overall, they reported earning from \$3.25 to \$5.00 an hour depending on the nature of the placement. Those who worked 40-hour weeks reported weekly incomes of \$210 to \$250. Two women who had worked 40-hour weeks for some time estimated their annual income would be between \$10,000 and \$14,999.

About half of the job sharers were union members. Those who were not who were state employees were excluded from representation because their work was considered confidential. The one job sharer who was not a state employee was not a union member. The clerical workers at the hospital where she worked had not been organized. As would be expected, none of the temporaries was represented by a labor union although one, a former autoworker, maintained her membership in the UAW. As a temporary, however, she received none of the benefits of membership. About half of the part-time workers were union members. They were municipal and retail workers. Those who were not union members were health care and retail workers. All of the work sharers were members of the UAW. Table 6 shows union membership by type of reduced work and gender.

Most (26/44) of my informants were married. Seven were divorced and an equal number had never been married. Four were cohabiting. They represented a variety of household

Table 6. Union Membership of Sample.

	Job Sharers ¹		Temporaries ²		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Yes	1	4	0	0	2	2	10	2	13	8
No	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{5}{9}$	$\frac{3}{3}$	$\frac{9}{9}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{5^3}{7}$	$\frac{0}{10}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{4}{17}$	$\frac{19}{27}$

Footnotes:

1. Job sharers who worked for state government who were not union members were excluded from representation because of the confidential nature of their work. One job sharer, who was not a state employee, was not a union member. There was no union for clerical workers at the hospital where she worked.
2. One temporary, a former autoworker, remained a member of the UAW although she did not receive benefits of membership.
3. One part-time sales worker was a union member through her full-time teaching job but not her part-time job.

types. Most of those who were married lived in dual-earner households, however, four male work sharers were the sole earners in their households and one temporary was the sole earner in her household.

Only one informant was the female head of household. Four informants lived alone. The remainder shared a household with parents or other unrelated adults. Tables 7 and 8 show informants' marital status and household type by type of reduced work and gender.

Analysis of the Interviews

Each interview was tape recorded with the exception of a couple that were conducted over the phone and a couple in which recording equipment failed. These few were reconstructed from notes taken by the interviewer and recorded on paper. Those that had been tape recorded were transcribed. The 44 interviews yielded approximately 500 pages of single-spaced, typed dialogue and notes. After they were reproduced in written form, each interview was coded following a line-by-line coding procedure. This I called first-level coding and it was at this point that I categorized demographic data, type of employment, work schedules, work history, time off the job, household characteristics, autonomy issues, and the like. Second-level coding was done within large first-level categories. For example, time off the job had to be categorized according to themes of time use. Because the interviews had also been recorded on computer diskettes, I used my word

Table 7. Marital Status of Sample.

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Married	1	9	1	3	0	4	6	2	8	18
Divorced	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	0	5	2
Never married	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	1	6
Cohabiting	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{7}$	$\frac{0}{10}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{3}{17}$	$\frac{1}{27}$

Table 8. Sample by Household Type.

	Job Sharers		Temporaries		Part-Time Workers		Work Sharers		Total	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Husband-wife households										
Husband sole earner	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	-	4	-
Dual-earner	1	9	1	2	0	4	2	2	4	17
Wife sole earner	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	1
Female-headed, no husband present	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	1
Single	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	1
Shares household ¹ with parents or other unrelated adult(s)	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{0}{9}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{5}{9}$	$\frac{2}{2}$	$\frac{2}{7}$	$\frac{2}{10}$	$\frac{0}{2}$	$\frac{6}{17}$	$\frac{7}{27}$

Footnotes:

1. In all cases except the male temporary and the work sharers, other household members were earners. The two work sharers shared households with retired parents. The male temporary was the sole earner in his household.

processing program to create files of excerpts from each interview pertinent to each code. Separate files were kept for each of the four categories of reduced work. The write-up of the data analysis was organized to follow a "comfortable" and logical sequence for the various codes. The data analysis begins with an examination of the terms and conditions of employment associated with each of the four types of reduced work, including some explication of the various time regimes associated with reduced work and informants' ability to control their work schedules. This appears in chapter 6. Chapters 7 through 11 are organized according to the major themes of use of time off the job. Each of those chapters explores the conditions which enhance and impede autonomy off the job relative to each theme of use of time off the job.

My informants' experiences of reduced work and autonomy off the job cannot be comprehended fully, however, without some understanding of the political economy of the geographic area in which they worked and lived. I turn next to an examination of the political economies of Michigan, Flint, and Lansing in the 1980s.

CHAPTER 5

Michigan's Political Economy in the 1980s

Michigan began the decade of the 1980s in the depths of recession--the worst since the Great Depression of the 1930s--and today is hailed by state administrators as "the comeback state." That comeback, however, is an uneven one as some communities in the state suffer more than others from the effects of structural crisis in certain of the nation's manufacturing industries. Michigan is at the center of a badly shaken production system--the nation's industrial heartland. Michigan became the center of the U.S. automobile industry, and the state prospered as the industry grew. Today the domestic automakers are reorganizing in the face of unprecedented foreign competition, and Michigan workers and citizens are feeling the jolt of that reorganization. While the state is most affected, and disproportionately so, by changes in the auto industry, the decline of steel and machine tools, the rise of high technology, and the expansion of services also have repercussions in Michigan.

This chapter begins with an exploration of the nature of the state's economy. Then it focuses on the Flint and Lansing-East Lansing areas, as cities linked to one another in a production system and as the areas in which the persons

whose voices follow in chapters 6 through 11 work and live. Finally, this chapter examines reduced work in Michigan: part-time employment in the state, Flint, and Lansing; temporary employment in the state; job sharing among state government employees; and work sharing.

Michigan's centrality in the nation's industrial production system and the extent of the state's employment concentrated in durable goods manufacturing make the state economy hypersensitive to fluctuations in the business cycle.¹ Table 9 shows that 80 percent of Michigan's manufacturing activity, 20 percentage points more than the national average, is in the production of durable goods; and Michigan's durable goods manufacturing is eight times more concentrated in auto production than is the rest of the nation (State of Michigan 1984, p. 19).

Not all firms affiliated directly with the automotive industry are classified under motor vehicle assembly (SIC 371), however. Automotive stampings and the manufacture of wheels fall under fabricated metals (SIC 34), pistons and valves are nonelectrical machinery (SIC 35), and automotive

¹ This focus on manufacturing employment is not to deny the importance of nonmanufacturing employment in the state. In 1984 nonmanufacturing employment constituted 75 percent of all employment in the state, but the 25 percent share that was manufacturing employment was higher than the national average of 21 percent (State of Michigan 1984; Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 1985, p. 61). While nonmanufacturing employment predominates in Michigan as it does elsewhere in the nation, manufacturing plays a particularly crucial role in the state's economy. As in the title of a recent book by Cohen and Zysman (1987), "manufacturing matters" in Michigan.

**Table 9. Composition of Manufacturing Employment,
U.S. and Michigan, Selected Years, 1972-1980.**

		Fraction of Manufacturing Employment				
	Sector	1972	1974	1976	1978	1980
U.S.	Durable	.57	.59	.58	.60	.60
	(Vehicles)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.05)	(.04)
	Nondurable	.42	.41	.42	.40	.40
Michigan	Durable	.80	.81	.80	.81	.80
	(Vehicles)	(.34)	(.33)	(.34)	(.35)	(.33)
	Nondurable	.20	.19	.20	.19	.20

Source: Brazer, Harvey E. and Deborah S. Laren. Michigan's Fiscal and Economic Structure. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1982, p. 67.

foundries are classified under primary metals (SIC 33). At the four-digit SIC code level, the Michigan Employment Security Commission recently classified 34 industries as "motor vehicle related," although only four were included under SIC 371. Using this scheme, the MESC found that in March 1979 fully 55 percent of Michigan's manufacturing employment was motor vehicle related, compared to only 11 percent for the U.S. In addition, 62 percent of durable goods manufacturing employment in Michigan was motor vehicle related, and more than 21 percent of employment in nondurable goods was motor vehicle related (Brazer and Laren 1982, p. 68).

The cyclical sensitivity of Michigan's economy is a function of the concentration of durable goods manufacturing and related employment in the state. When incomes fall or interest rates are high, people defer purchases of durable goods because they are expensive and last a long time. During such times, Michigan's economy takes a nosedive. However, when the national economy picks up and pent-up demand is released, the state economy tends to bounce back quickly (State of Michigan 1984, p. 19).

In the current national recovery, however, Michigan has not recovered all of the jobs lost during the recessionary period, 1979-1982. Table 10 shows that nonagricultural employment declined by 439,000 jobs between 1979 and 1982, 277,000 of which were manufacturing jobs. Between 1982 and 1985, 316,000 nonagricultural jobs were generated in

Table 10. Net and Percentage Change in Nonagricultural and Manufacturing Employment,
U.S. and Michigan, 1979, 1982, 1985.

		Nonagricultural Employment (in thousands)			
		1979	1982	1985	1979-1985
U.S.		89,823	89,596	97,692 ¹	
				-227	7,869
				-0.3%	8.8%
Michigan		3,628	3,189	3,505	
				-439	-123
				-12.1%	-3.4%
		Manufacturing Employment (in thousands)			
		1979	1982	1985	1979-1985
U.S.		21,040	18,853	19,424 ¹	
				-2,187	-1,616
				-10.4%	-7.7%
Michigan		1,151	874	984	
				-277	-167
				-24.1%	-14.5%

Footnotes:

1. Preliminary annual average.

Sources: U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Supplement to Employment and Earnings, States and Areas, Data for 1977-79; Employment, Hours, and Earnings, States and Areas, 1939-82; Employment and Earnings, volume 33, numbers 1, 5 (January, May), 1986.

Michigan, a little over one-third of which were manufacturing jobs. Thus, between 1979 and 1985 Michigan suffered net losses in both manufacturing and nonagricultural employment. While Michigan gained 44,000 nonmanufacturing jobs between 1979 and 1985, that gain was not sufficient to compensate for losses in manufacturing employment. Today unemployment in Michigan remains near 10 percent, down from a recessionary high of 17.3 percent in December, 1982, but 4 percentage points above the national average.

Despite national economic recovery and a nonagricultural employment growth rate of 9 percent between 1982 and 1985 in the nation, Michigan still faces a jobs crisis. Because the U.S. automakers have adopted strategies to recover profitability focused on automation, global sourcing, plant relocation, and extensive use of overtime, they have improved productivity with fewer workers, particularly fewer Michigan workers. Renewed profitability is not guaranteed to persist, however, as the domestic automakers continue to feel the pressure of foreign competition and as certain companies, General Motors in particular, currently suffer lagging sales and profits.² The difficulties experienced by General Motors are

² General Motors now finds itself involved in the biggest non-recession cutbacks in its 78-year history in its effort to recover the 46 percent share of the U.S. car market it enjoyed as recently as 1984 (Miller 1986).

especially pertinent to the Lansing-East Lansing and Flint areas, to be taken up in detail below.

The decline of manufacturing employment in Michigan is the product of the expansion of services relative to manufacturing, the increased productivity in manufacturing resulting from changes in the methods and organization of production, and the relocation of manufacturing employment to other parts of the U.S. and the globe. Manufacturing has declined in both absolute and relative terms in Michigan. To the extent that post-industrialism describes the social structure of the advanced industrial nations, Michigan, as a manufacturing center, is affected by that shift. Global economic change portends a recentering of capital, threatening U.S. global hegemony and the economic might of the nation's industrial heartland. Michigan's political economy in the 1980s must be understood in this context. Michigan, of course, is not first or unique in its experience of "deindustrialization." The British economy has declined more than has the U.S. economy at this point, and within the U.S. New England experienced the effects of structural shifts in nondurable goods manufacturing a few years before the crisis was felt in the automobile industry. As the effects of global economic change ripple across the face of the earth, it was guaranteed that the auto industry, and Michigan in particular, would be caught in the waves of change. Flint and Lansing, both auto manufacturing cities, have different experiences of economic change. Flint is far

more dependent on the auto industry than Lansing and, therefore, is more vulnerable. Lansing appears to be benefiting from the post-industrial shift to services (and high technology) in a way that Flint has not.

Focus: Flint and Lansing

Flint, Michigan, nicknamed the "Vehicle City" when it was still a wagon- and carriage-making center, is the city that gave birth to General Motors and the United Auto Workers. It is a city whose fortunes rise and fall with the automobile industry. Eighty years ago Flint was among the most attractive cities to live in the United States. As Edsforth (1987, p. 49) notes,

Drawn together by the promise of high wages and steady employment in the automobile industry, working people literally swamped Flint's existing housing facilities, splitting shifts in rooming houses and hotels, and even setting up tent colonies that provided homes for more than a thousand families in 1910.

Between 1900 and 1910, Flint's population almost tripled, from 13,000 to 38,000 inhabitants, and in that ten-year period the town grew into a bustling industrial city (Edsforth 1987, p. 48).

Flint's entry into the automobile business came in 1903 when five directors of the Flint Wagon Works purchased the financially troubled Buick Motor Company of Detroit. With the added backing of William C. "Billy" Durant, Flint's millionaire road-cart entrepreneur and leading businessman, Buick's financial difficulties were reversed and the company

expanded. That expansion contributed to Flint's growth. In 1905, Buick began construction of a huge, 14-acre manufacturing complex in the city's north end, the Oak Park subdivision, several miles from the original Buick engine factory. Oak Park, formerly a 220-acre family farm, became the new industrial and residential heart of Flint, as smaller supplier firms and thousands of working people were attracted to the rapidly growing Buick Motor Company (Edsforth 1987, pp. 39-43).

In 1908, Buick was absorbed into the General Motors Corporation, founded by Durant. Along with Buick, the Olds Motor Works of Lansing, Michigan, and the Cadillac Motor Company became the core of GM. By 1910, a total of 27 separate firms scattered across Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Ontario, Canada, had been brought under General Motors' control (Edsforth 1987, pp. 45, 47-48).

Barring the Depression era of the 1930s, Flint prospered and grew until the 1970s. By early 1930, nearly 156,000 people had settled in Flint, and as many as 24,000 others resided in four surrounding suburban townships (Edsforth 1987, p. 79). Due to some loss during the Depression, Flint's population was just over 150,000 in 1940. In the next twenty years, that 150,000 expanded to 200,000. In the suburbs, population growth was even more impressive. In 1940, the entire Flint metropolitan area contained about 185,000 persons; by 1960 more than 265,000 lived there. During the 1960s, with continued in-migration

and some white flight to the suburbs, the central city's population did not grow but with suburban growth the metropolitan area's population went over 330,000, almost twice what it had been in 1929-1930 (Edsforth 1987, p. 217).

Flint's economic boom was reflected not only in population growth but in the high wages paid to workers there. By 1957, weekly wages in the Vehicle City were 37 percent higher than the national average (Edsforth 1987, p. 217). Even in the midst of recession in 1980, Flint's average pay was the second highest of any city in the U.S., behind Anchorage, Alaska (Buss 1982). Today the specter of that achievement haunts Flint's working population as General Motors shifts production to lower-wage, less-unionized sites.

The Great Depression has particular historical significance in Flint since that is when the U.S. labor movement came of age and the United Auto Workers achieved formal recognition through the militant efforts of Flint automobile workers. On the morning of December 30, 1936, a group of workers shut down Fisher Body 2 to protest the firing of three union inspectors in the sit-down strike that would 44 days later win recognition and bargaining rights for the UAW. Later in the day the striking workers were joined by workers at Fisher Body 1. Most autoworkers in Flint remained on the sidelines, fearful of retaliation if they openly expressed commitment to the union. But after the violent confrontation between strikers and police that

took place on January 11, 1937, known as the Battle of the Running Bulls, many of those bystanders saw fit to lend support by signing up as union members. By late January General Motors was backed against the wall as production was virtually halted by the Flint sit-down and strikes in nine other cities. GM sought and won an evacuation order (the second of the confrontation) in Flint courts, but workers responded by seizing the Chevrolet No. 4 engine plant on February 1.

Then Michigan Governor Frank Murphy had played a crucial role in the Flint sit-down, giving strength to the striking workers. After the Battle of the Running Bulls, he called in the National Guard but refused to use the troops to break the strike. Instead, they were used as buffers to prevent further violence. Later on, he refused to enforce the court injunction to evacuate workers. With assistance from President Franklin Roosevelt, Murphy pressured General Motors' Vice President William Knudsen into bargaining with CIO President John L. Lewis and UAW Vice President Wyndham Mortimer. Thus, on February 11, 1937, Knudsen signed a six-month contract with the UAW that called for the evacuation of the occupied plants and workers' return to work without discrimination, and granted the union the right to be the sole bargaining agent for its members (Edsforth 1987, pp. 170-175).³

³ For detailed accounts of the Flint sit-down strike, see Sidney Fine, Sit Down: The General Motors Strike of 1936-37. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969; Roger Keeran, The Communist Party and the Auto Workers Union.

The sit-down is noteworthy for its longevity and victory for the UAW; but it was not an isolated incident. At various points between 1930 and 1936 Flint workers joined hunger marches and struck to demand (unsuccessfully) higher wages and better working conditions. Virtually all of Flint's industrial workers suffered periods of prolonged unemployment and declines in standard of living during the Depression. General Motors' retrenchment policies at the time have an eerie ring of familiarity in the 1980s.

Declining sales of Buicks and Chevrolets created an economic disaster in Flint. To maintain profitable operations, General Motors' management pursued rigorous retrenchment policies designed to cut costs faster than revenues were falling. In Flint, the company reduced its production schedules and workforce while simultaneously raising the speed of production and the output expected from each worker. Throughout the early years of the Great Depression, wage cuts and speed-ups like those that had prompted the Fisher Body 1 strike (this was a strike that took place in July, 1930--author's note) were pressed upon all of the company's remaining production workers. Salaried workers also faced layoffs and pay reductions. In addition, some fringe benefits, including the savings and

Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1980; and Henry Kraus, The Many and The Few: A Chronicle of the Dynamic Auto Workers. Los Angeles: The Plantin Press, 1947. For specific accounts of the activities of women in support of the sit-down strikers, see Mary Heaton Vorse, Labor's New Millions. New York: Modern Age Books, 1938, and her article, "Wives of Flint's Strikers Form Emergency Brigade," The New York Times, January 21, 1937. See also Patricia Yeghissian, "Emergence of the Red Berets," Michigan Occasional Papers in Women's Studies, Number X, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1980. An excellent film about the Women's Emergency Brigade is "With Babies and Banners" from New Day Films.

investment plan for blue-collar workers, were terminated. Together, these cost-cutting measures kept General Motors out of the red during the Great Depression. The company even managed to show a small profit in 1932, a year of drastically reduced revenues. Beginning in 1933, General Motors' production, sales, and profits rose steadily, approaching record levels as early as 1936 (Edsforth 1987, p. 137).

These conditions, among others, no doubt fueled the 1936-37 sit-down strike.

Time has yet to reveal what will happen in Flint from the aftershocks of General Motors' present reorganization. Flint remains a company town and its fate continues to rest in the hands of GM executives. General Motors' activities in Flint peaked in 1978, when the company employed about 77,000 people in the Flint area. Ninety percent of all manufacturing jobs and 39 percent of all jobs in the area in 1978 were provided by GM. By 1982, GM employment in Flint had declined to about 60,000, yet the company still provided almost 32 percent of all jobs in the area (Buss 1982; Jones et al. 1986, p. 23). It has been estimated that by the end of 1987 the number of GM employees in Flint will drop to 48,000 (Moore 1987, p. 753).⁴

General Motors is pulling out of Flint. The Flint Body/Pontiac Assembly plant is slated for closure, and one

⁴ Between 1978 and 1985 Genesee County lost 24.8 percent of its manufacturing jobs and 7.8 percent of its nonagricultural jobs. In 1978 there were 80,098 manufacturing jobs in the county; in 1985 there were 60,251. There were 157,139 nonagricultural jobs in the county in 1978 and 144,924 in 1985 (U.S. Department of Commerce 1978, 1985).

line at GM Truck and Bus in Flint has already been shutdown, idling 3,400 workers (Sorge 1986; Higgins 1987). The company has also consolidated two Buick assembly plants into the new Buick City Complex, a \$200 million retooling effort that reduced the number of hourly workers from 16,000 to 4,800 (Grenier et al. 1983). In late 1986 it was also expected that Flint would lose 1,300 jobs from the Buick City Complex as GM laid off workers due to slow sales (Sedgwick and Faust 1986).

Moore (1987, p. 753) has commented critically on General Motors' reorganization strategy:

In 1982, G.M. claimed it was going broke, so the U.A.W. agreed to slash workers' wages and benefits, saving management more than \$2.1 billion. But G.M. wasn't broke, and the money it saved from those concessions helped it buy Hughes Aircraft, Electronic Data Systems and several high-tech firms. Close to 250,000 G.M. employees had permanently lost their jobs by 1984, the year G.M. posted a record profit of \$4.5 billion. By the end of last year (1986 --author's note) G.M. had made another \$6.8 billion, and had announced that, over a three-year period, it would cut 25 percent of its white-collar work force and close at least eleven plants in the United States. Before the year was out it would also open twelve factories in Mexico.

Unemployment in Flint was the worst among industrial cities in the U.S. during the recession in the early 1980s. Officially, the unemployment rate reached as high as 26.5 percent (Grenier et al. 1983) and unofficially was estimated to be around 40 percent (Detroit News, August 10, 1980). Recently there has been some improvement, although

unemployment remains high compared to Michigan and the nation. In August, 1987, for example, the official unemployment rate in Flint hovered near 14 percent compared to 8.3 percent in Michigan and 6 percent in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Labor 1987), and has been estimated to be as high as 30 percent unofficially (Erickson 1986).

Joblessness is guaranteed to rise with GM's plans to retrench and it has been projected that the official unemployment rate may reach 17 percent or higher by 1989 (Faust 1987).⁵ The reduction of GM's workforce in Flint is expected to have dire consequences for other businesses and tax revenues. It is estimated that about half of the earnings of Flint businesses are linked to the manufacture of durable goods (Sedgwick and Faust 1986), and the city will lose \$335,000 in income taxes over three years and \$2.4 million in property taxes.

To date, the most expensive strategy to revitalize Flint's troubled economy has been a largely failed effort to turn the city into a tourist mecca. The Mott Foundation, originally established in the 1920s by GM's largest stockholder and three-time Flint mayor, Charles Stewart Mott, has been the prime mover in this effort. It centered in 1981 on the construction of a luxury Hyatt Regency Hotel in downtown Flint, supported by \$13 million in federal funds

⁵ From 1956 to 1982, GM's auto production in Flint and the area's unemployment rate correlate $-.80$. This shows rather starkly Flint's dependence on General Motors (Jones et al. 1986, p. 179).

and no private support from the Hyatt Corporation. In 1986, the hotel went into foreclosure (Moore 1987, p. 754). In 1982 the Mott Foundation convinced federal, state, and local governments to contribute \$25 million to build an indoor theme park called AutoWorld (Moore 1987, p. 754). The \$10-million amusement park, a celebration through rides, shows, and exhibits of the automobile and Flint's long history with the industry, opened on the Fourth of July, 1984, but was closed in 1985 at the end of its second season because of poor revenues (Risen 1984; Cain and Freedman 1987; Cantor 1986).⁶ It had been hoped that AutoWorld would generate an estimated 400 full-time and 2,000 seasonal jobs (Pollack 1984) to serve the 900,000 people a year who it was expected would come to downtown Flint to see AutoWorld (Risen 1984). In 1986 the facility's giant-screen IMAX Theatre was the only part of AutoWorld open to the public (Cantor 1986), and in 1987 it was announced that a California firm, Wrather Port Properties, would take over management of the theme park from Six Flags Corporation, with hopes of reopening in April 1988 with new amusements and a new name (Cain and Freedman 1987).

Amidst other cultural and tourist attractions such as the Alfred P. Sloan Museum and Crossroads Village (Cantor

⁶ Moore (1987, p. 754) described AutoWorld as an all-enclosed amusement center, "the largest of its kind in the world," which offered two rides through the "humorous history of automobility, a movie about car commercials, a giant car engine, and an assembly line complete with robots and an 'auto worker' singing a tender ode to them called, 'Me and My Buddy'."

1986) and plans for a new horse racing track (Pollack 1984) is the new Water Street Pavilion, another Mott Foundation-promoted project. It is a downtown shopping and eating place by developer James Rouse, who built New York City's South Street Seaport and Boston's Faneuil Hall. Water Street Pavilion is having its own difficulties; more than a half dozen stores have already closed (Moore 1987, p. 754).

A less well known response to Flint's economic difficulties was the creation in 1984 of the Center for New Work by two university professors with the assistance of two UAW members, representatives of General Motors, and religious leaders. The Center was established in downtown Flint with money raised from the University of Michigan, the UAW, the Michigan Department of Commerce, and other organizations. It promotes work-time reduction as a strategy to cope with automation and unemployment. Despite the Center's existence, however, no UAW local has yet volunteered to experiment with a six months on/six months off pilot program advocated by the Center (Erickson 1986).

Workers in Flint are organizing to fight General Motors, and a National Coalition to Stop Plant Closings has been formed in the city. The Coalition is organizing other communities to press for passage of a law that would halt factory closures across the country (Moore 1987, p. 755). Otherwise, the only game in town appears to be the placement and training service offered to displaced workers by the UAW-GM Human Resource Center and provisions for job security

for employed workers won in the 1987 contract between GM and the UAW.

All this, however, leaves the reader with a rather gloomy impression of Flint. Despite the city's tough times, or perhaps because of them, an estimated 10,000 persons turned out in a demonstration of support and solidarity to watch the 300-unit parade on Labor Day weekend, 1987, celebrating the UAW's fiftieth anniversary.

Lansing, Michigan

While Lansing, Michigan is tied to the General Motors empire through its Oldsmobile division, the area is in no way as dependent as Flint on GM for its economic stability. That's not to say GM is not a strong force in the area's economy, because economic fluctuations do result from forces that impinge on the automaker and its actions. But Lansing is the state capital and nearby East Lansing is the site of a major state university. Thus, the Lansing area's employment base is much broader than Flint's and extends into sectors currently advantageous to the area.

Near the end of the nineteenth century, Lansing was a well-established farm machinery manufacturing center. By the turn of the century it was fast becoming the center of gasoline engine production. The latter resulted from local businessman Ransom E. Olds' work on the internal combustion engine.⁷ Olds had organized the Olds Motor Vehicle Company

⁷ While Olds was not first to produce an automobile (he was preceded by six years by Charles and Franklin Duryea of Springfield, Mass.), he revolutionized automobile manufacturing through his subcontracting and merchandising

in 1897, which became the Olds Motor Works in 1899. Olds' curved dash Oldsmobile was the best-selling car of its day with sales increasing from 400 in 1901 to 4,000 in 1903 (Manassah et al. 1986). At this time, Oldsmobiles were produced in both Detroit and Lansing, but by 1905 all production had shifted to Lansing.⁸ In 1904 Olds resigned from the Olds Motor Works, which became part of General Motors four years later, and formed a competitor, REO Motor Car Company, which remained involved in the production of automobiles until 1936 and the production of trucks into the 1970s.⁹

One of the first auto supplier firms was also formed in Lansing around this time. W.K. Prudden and Company, the first company to produce "just wheels", was organized in 1903. In 1909 Gier Pressed Steel Company was organized; it specialized in the manufacture of brake drums and hubs. Also in 1909, Auto Wheel Company, a Prudden competitor, was organized. These were three of four companies that were

practices. He subcontracted for parts from suppliers, and he required dealers to pay for cars as they ordered them rather than taking them on consignment. This merchandising practice solved Olds' cash flow problems (Crane 1984).

8 After the Olds Motor Works was formed, a new factory was built in Detroit--the first ever exclusively for the manufacture of autos in the U.S. A fire in March, 1901 destroyed the factory after which all Olds auto production took place in Lansing.

9 REO Motor Car Company had gone through several name changes. Originally, in 1904, the company was called the R.E. Olds Company, but after legal action from the Olds Motor Works the company became the Reo Car Company. Later it was renamed REO Motor Car Company.

later joined together in the Motor Wheel Corporation in 1920. By 1924 Motor Wheel was a world leader in the manufacture of wooden and steel wheels (Manassah et al. 1986).

Like Flint, although on a somewhat smaller scale, the automobile boom in the early part of the twentieth century brought a population boom to Lansing. In 1900, Lansing's population was 16,485. It almost doubled, to 31,738, by 1910. By 1920 it reached 57,327 and 1930, 78,425 (Oldsmobile News, July 17, 1935, p. 2, on display at the R.E. Olds Transportation Museum, Lansing, Michigan). Thus, in 30 years Lansing's population grew 375 percent! (In Flint, note, population grew 1100 percent in the same 30-year period.)

Lansing was not quite the center of labor strife that Flint was in this early period of auto production. In fact, in the 1920s the Lansing Chamber of Commerce boasted that less than one-half of one percent of Lansing's workers were union members (Manassah et al. 1986). After the UAW gained formal recognition, however, there was a month-long strike of REO employees in March-April 1937 and in May that same year workers at Capital City Wrecking Company went on strike for several weeks (Manassah et al. 1986). Thus, it was not long before union influence was felt in Lansing.¹⁰

¹⁰ Unless otherwise noted, information in the foregoing discussion of Lansing's history of auto manufacturing was gleaned from exhibits at the R.E. Olds Transportation Museum, Lansing, Michigan.

Today, the presence of state government and a major university in the area will help Lansing weather the transition in the auto industry. The state suffered a fiscal crisis during the recession of the early 1980s, which Governor James Blanchard responded to upon taking office in 1983 by raising the personal income tax.¹¹ There was a budget surplus in 1984, and taxes are being "rolled back" to earlier levels. Public-sector employment dropped from approximately 63,700 employees in 1980 to 61,000 in 1982, but seems to have stabilized near that figure more recently.¹² In addition, while the Michigan economy is clearly dependent on the automobile, the public economy's dependence on the automobile is not so clear. Automobile production in the state was quite variable between the late 1950s and the early 1980s, yet state and local government employment grew steadily until 1979. This suggests that continued variability in the automobile industry may not have irreversible negative consequences for the public sector. The automobile industry may constrain the size of the public sector, but it does not determine it (Jones et al. 1986, pp. 16-21).

Michigan State University in East Lansing is providing a resource base upon which the local economy can build for

11 Unlike the state's fiscal crisis, Lansing had a budget surplus in 1980. See "3 Million Surplus in City Budget," Detroit News, November 22, 1980.

12 According to the Capital Area United Way (1986), public sector employees numbered 60,800 in 1983; 60,400 in 1984; and 60,900 in 1985.

entry into high technology industries. According to a survey done by Michigan Business magazine, Arthur Young and Company, an accounting firm, and Durocher and Company, a public relations firm, the Lansing area claims ten percent of the state's fastest growing private firms (Manassah et al. 1986). Some of those are high technology enterprises apparently attracted to the University and the new Michigan Biotechnology Institute. MBI scientists are engaged in the manipulation of plant and animal genes to develop commercial products. State economic development experts hope the work done at MBI will generate new companies in the area to commercially produce laboratory-developed products, expanding the market for Michigan-grown crops, hardwoods, and softwoods (Mallory 1985).

The city of Lansing has itself recently had a "facelift" with the construction of a new downtown hotel and convention center complex. With the Capitol within a block's walk of the hotel, city and state government leaders are hoping the complex will become a bustling center of state and economic deal making.

The scenario for Lansing certainly appears optimistic by comparison to Flint. Yet many unanswered questions remain. How many new jobs will be created? High technology industries have been projected to create relatively small numbers of jobs. What will be the quality of the jobs created? Again, high technology has been characterized as bottom heavy; and service jobs of the sort generated by

tourism are notoriously low-paying and part time.

Unemployment in Lansing-East Lansing was 8.4 percent in July 1987, up 1.3 percentage points from the previous month and 1.2 percentage points from the previous July (Lansing State Journal, September 2, 1987). Eight percent unemployment is considerably better than 13 percent in Flint, but it is still above state and national averages. Thus, I think the question, what is to be done?, persists for displaced autoworkers in Lansing.¹³

Reduced Work in Michigan

In this section I will explore in some detail part-time employment, temporary employment, job sharing, and work sharing in Michigan. This is to further provide a context within which to place my sample of informants.

Part-Time Employment

In 1980 there were 826,723 persons employed part time in Michigan, or 22 percent of all employed persons in the state. Almost two-thirds of these were women.

Proportionately, there were slightly more part-time employees in Michigan than in the U.S., and the proportion of part-time employees who were women was also slightly

13 It seems; however, Lansing's auto industry is today placing its hopes on the success of GM's "Quad 4" engine. The new engine debuts on a 1988 Oldsmobile. A GM official has stated that the Quad 4 engine "will set the standard for future engine technology" not unlike the 1932 Ford V-8 and the high compression Olds Rocket engine introduced in 1949. Initial planned output of the Quad 4 is 1,600 per day. The engine will be an Oldsmobile exclusive for a short period of time, according to Oldsmobile's chief engineer (Higgins 1986). Obviously, it's far too soon to predict the engine's success or its effect on auto employment.

**Table 11. Persons at Work Less Than 35 Hours
as a Percentage of All Employed Persons, 1980.**

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
All Persons	20.3	22.0	24.8	20.8
Males, 16+	7.6	7.8	9.6	7.4
Females, 16+	12.7	14.2	15.2	13.4

Based on data published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population
Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

**Table 12. Males and Females as a Percentage
of All Persons at Work Less Than 35 Hours, 1980.**

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
Males	37.4	35.4	38.5	35.6
Females	62.6	64.6	61.5	64.4

Based on data published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population
Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

higher in Michigan than the nation. The highest proportion of part-time employees was in the Lansing-East Lansing area, almost 25 percent of all employed persons. This reflects the service nature and student composition of the labor market in the Lansing area. In Flint, the proportion of part-time employees was closer to the national average, although the proportion of part-time employees who were women was closer to the Michigan figure.¹⁴

Differences in the Flint and Lansing area labor markets are apparent in the data in Tables 13 and 14. Almost 30 percent of the men employed less than 35 hours in Flint are in manufacturing, compared to 11 percent of the men in Lansing. While the proportion of men employed in retail trade is comparable in the two areas--differing by just 1.4 percentage points--the proportion of all men employed part time in professional and related services and public administration in Lansing is two to two-and-a-half times that in Flint.

There is also a greater proportion of women employed part time in manufacturing in Flint than in Lansing. Almost

14 The Census is the only data base which provides comprehensive information on part-time employment for local areas, thus it is my principal source in this section. While the Current Population Survey provides annual data, it does not include information by occupation and industry. Because of differences in sample size and timing of data collection, the Census and CPS are not strictly comparable. The CPS shows an absolute increase between 1980 and 1986 in the number of persons employed part time in Michigan, from 3.25 million to 3.77 million. In 1980 part-time workers were 26.4 percent of total employment in the state. In 1986 they were 25.9 percent of total employment in Michigan (Personal Correspondence from Michigan Employment Security Commission, July 7, 1987).

Table 13. Industry Distribution of Men Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980.

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
Agriculture	6.2%	3.8%	4.9%	2.4%
Forestry and Fisheries	0.3	0.1	---	---
Mining	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.1
Construction	12.0	9.3	8.2	9.9
Manufacturing	13.4	18.9	11.1	27.7
Transportation, Communications, and Other Public Utilities	5.6	4.1	2.8	3.5
Wholesale Trade	3.4	2.8	1.9	2.4
Retail Trade	26.4	29.0	27.3	28.7
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	3.5	2.7	2.3	2.5
Business and Repair Services	5.4	5.1	3.7 ¹	4.4 ¹
Personal Services	2.7	2.3	2.0 ²	1.6 ²
Entertainment and Recreation Services	2.7	2.7	1.7	2.2
Professional and Related Services	15.1	16.8	29.6	12.5
Public Administration	2.6	2.3	4.2	2.1

Footnotes:

1. Automotive repair and services; other business and repair services (excludes advertising; commercial research, management, and data processing services).

Table 13 cont'd.

2. Private households; other personal services (excludes hotel and lodging places; laundry, cleaning, and garment services; barber and beauty shops).

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

Table 14. Industry Distribution of Women Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980.

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
Agriculture	1.5%	1.1%	1.3%	0.7%
Forestry and Fisheries	0.1	----	----	----
Mining	0.1	----	----	----
Construction	1.1	0.7	0.8	0.7
Manufacturing	8.1	7.0	4.2	8.1
Transportation, Communications, and Other Public Utilities	2.4	1.7	1.8	1.5
Wholesale Trade	1.9	1.5	1.3	1.4
Retail Trade	30.7	32.6	29.3	33.5
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	5.1	4.5	4.8	4.2
Business and Repair Services	3.5	3.1	2.8 ¹	3.2 ¹
Personal Services	8.0	6.8	6.0 ²	6.1 ²
Entertainment and Recreation Services	1.6	1.6	1.1	1.9
Professional and Related Services	33.3	36.9	42.3	36.9
Public Administration	2.8	2.4	4.2	2.1

Footnotes:

1. Automotive repair and services; other business and repair services (excludes advertising; commercial research, management, and data processing services).

Table 14 cont'd.

2. Private households; other personal services (excludes hotel and lodging places; laundry, cleaning, and garment services; barber and beauty shops).

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

twice the proportion of women part-time employees in manufacturing in Lansing are employed in manufacturing in Flint. The differences in the proportion of part-time employed women in professional and related services in Flint and Lansing is not so great as it is for men, but a larger proportion of part-time employed women in Lansing are in professional and related services than in Flint (42.3 percent and 36.9 percent respectively). Finally, more than twice the proportion of part-time employed women in public administration in Flint are employed in public administration in Lansing. So the greater diversity of the employment base in Lansing compared to Flint is reflected in the data on the distribution of part-time employees across industries.

This argument is further supported by data in Tables 15 and 16. In Flint, part-time employed men are more likely to be employed in occupations as operators, fabricators, and laborers while in Lansing they are equally likely to be employed in this occupational category or as technical, sales, and administrative workers. Among women there does not appear to be great variation between part-time employees in the various occupational categories in Flint and Lansing, with one notable exception. A greater proportion of part-time employed women in Flint are operators, fabricators, and laborers than in Lansing (9.7 percent and 5.7 percent respectively).

Table 15. Occupational Distribution of Men Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980.

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
Managerial and Professional	13.7%	12.4%	15.3%	10.6%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	19.0	17.3	20.6	14.7
Service Occupations	19.5	23.4	26.7	21.8
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing	6.9	4.2	5.2	2.3
Precision Production, Craft, and Repair	15.4	14.6	11.6	16.8
Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers	25.4	28.0	20.6	33.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

Table 16. Occupational Distribution of Women Employed Less Than 35 Hours, 1980.

	U.S.	Michigan	Lansing- East Lansing	Flint
Managerial and Professional	16.5%	15.5%	16.0%	15.4%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	44.0	43.0	44.9	42.4
Service Occupations	28.6	31.8	31.0	30.9
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing	1.2	0.9	1.1	0.6
Precision Production, Craft, and Repair	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2
Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers	8.2	7.6	5.7	9.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population, 1980. Chapter D: Detailed Population Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan.

Temporary Employment

At this time there is little aggregate data on temporary employment in Michigan. As noted above, the Bureau of Labor Statistics just began compiling data on the industry in 1982. An examination of the available data, however, shows that temporary employment has soared in Michigan relative to the nation where it has also grown rapidly.

Table 17 shows the annual average employment in temporary help supply services in the United States and Michigan, 1982-1985. In that three-year period, temporary employment in the nation grew 72 percent, from over 411,000 employees to almost 708,000. In Michigan, temporary employment grew 209.5 percent, from almost 9,000 employees in 1982 to almost 28,000 in 1985. These data confirm that Michigan employers have adopted with a vengeance the use of temporaries in their post-recession recovery strategies.

Wages in the temporary help industry in Michigan were slightly less than those in the nation overall in 1985. Table 18 shows that temporary employees in Michigan earned annual wages of \$8,897 or \$171 per week. In the nation overall, they earned \$9,174 in a year or \$176 per week. These figures do not fulfill expectations that strong labor unions in Michigan have driven up the wage rate for all workers in the state. If that were true, wages for Michigan's temporary employees should be higher than the national average.

**Table 17. Annual Average Employment
in Temporary Help Supply Services (SIC 7362)
in the U.S. and Michigan, 1982-1985.**

	1982	1985	Percentage Change 1982-1985
U.S.	411,364	707,715	72.0
Michigan	8,993	27,833	209.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and Wages, Annual Averages, 1982, 1986. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

**Table 18. Wages in the Temporary Help Supply Industry,
U.S. and Michigan, 1985.**

	Annual Wages Per Employee	Average Weekly Wage
U.S.	\$9,174	\$176
Michigan	\$8,897	\$171

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and Wages, Annual Averages, 1985. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

State government is one of Michigan's major employers of temporaries. Between 1980 and 1985 state government outlays for temporary hiring almost doubled, from \$133 million to \$257 million, at the same time that the number of full-time state workers fell from a peak of 72,000 in 1980 to 58,283 in 1985. For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, state civil service entered into 4,200 contracts for temporary help. In the fiscal year that ended September 30, 1985, the state entered into 5,000 contracts for temporary help. Administration-imposed hiring curbs were the main impetus behind increased temporary hiring (Detroit News, December 26, 1985).

Job Sharing in State Government

In his 1984 State of the State Message, Governor Blanchard directed "all state departments to develop plans to increase shared job arrangements" to expand employment options and generate employment opportunities in state government for persons who cannot work on a full-time schedule (Memo to Department Directors from Robert H. Naftaly, Director, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, and John F. Hueni, Jr., Director, Michigan Department of Civil Service, December 26, 1985).

The State of Michigan defines job sharing as "the utilization of two or more positions on a part-time basis to perform the job duties which typically would be assigned to a single position" (Memo to Department Directors from Robert H. Naftaly, Director, Michigan Department of Management and

Budget, and John F. Huenf, Jr., Director, Michigan Department of Civil Service, December 26, 1985). Job sharing may be employee or management initiated (Michigan Department of Social Services internal memo, March 14, 1986) but is limited to positions that are identical in class and level or those that are similar in nature. It can be arranged only between positions that are in the same department and share common agency number codes, time keeping units, payroll/personnel systems, and county/city location codes (Memo to Department Directors from Robert H. Naftaly, Director, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, and John F. Huenf, Jr., Director, Michigan Department of Civil Service, December 26, 1985). Employees sharing a job may be assigned individual caseloads, individual portions of a job, or may literally share the same job at different scheduled times (Michigan Department of Social Services internal memo, March 14, 1986). Therefore, in practice, job sharing in Michigan's public sector may take the form of "job splitting" as in the first two cases just cited or "classic" job sharing in which sharers must coordinate their duties and responsibilities on a regular basis.

Job sharers' work schedules vary, but the total number of hours worked by all employees involved in a particular shared job situation cannot exceed 80 hours in a two-week pay period. Employees sharing a job earn annual and sick hours each time they complete 80 hours in pay status. These

and other benefits are subject to policy for other part-time employees in the public sector (Michigan Department of Social Services internal memo, March 14, 1986).

Job sharing is also subject to existing civil service procedures or collective bargaining provisions as they apply to part-time employment (Memo to Department Directors from Robert H. Naftaly, Director, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, and John F. Hueni, Jr., Director, Michigan Department of Civil Service, December 26, 1985). However, the concept of job sharing and affected employees' rights or obligations are not well defined in collective bargaining agreements (Michigan Department of Social Services internal memo, March 14, 1986). Thus, job sharers may be vulnerable in areas not governed by civil service rules or protected by collectively bargained contracts.

Controversy has stirred in the public sector regarding employee headcounts in relationship to job-share arrangements and part-time employment. To support job sharing and to ensure that employment count policies do not adversely affect job-share arrangements, job sharers are counted as one-half position in employee counts. However, a non-job-sharing part-time employee is not counted as a portion of a position but instead as one employee (Memo to Department Directors from Robert H. Naftaly, Director, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, and John F. Hueni, Jr., Director, Michigan Department of Civil Service, December 26, 1985). Thus, part-time employees have been

discriminated against in efforts to limit the size of the state workforce. Some departments, responding to recent limitations imposed by the Governor, gave notice to part-time employees that they would be laid off unless they started working full time (WSG Wire, March, 1986, p. 1).

In September 1986 there were 400 individuals employed by Michigan state government who were job sharing; 355 were women and 45 were men. Combined they accounted for 178.5 positions, or 0.3 percent of all state government positions. Almost 50 percent of job sharers are in clerical occupations and about one-fourth are professionals. Another 20 percent are paraprofessionals. Table 19 compares the distribution of men and women in job-share positions across types of occupations.

The majority of job-share positions are in the Department of Social Services (37.5 percent). Nineteen percent are in the Department of Mental Health. Another 29 percent are distributed across four departments: Attorney General, Education, Natural Resources, and Transportation. The remaining nine departments in Table 20 account for 14 percent of all job-share positions. Eight state departments report having no job-share positions.

Whether job sharing has increased in popularity over time among state government employees is impossible to discern at this time. Job-share positions were not coded distinctly in state government employment data sets prior to

Table 19. Job Sharers in Michigan State Government
by Type of Occupation and Sex, September 5, 1986.

Job Category Code	Occupation	Women	Men	Total
1	Officials and Administrators	0	0	0
2	Professional	81	16	97
3	Technicians	5	1	6
4	Office and Clerical	183	3	186
5	Skilled Craft	0	1	1
6	Service-Maintenance	18	12	30
7	Paraprofessional	66	12	78
8	Protective Service Workers	<u>0</u> 353 ¹	<u>0</u> 45	<u>0</u> 398

Footnotes:

1. There are 355 job-share positions held by women. Two are in job classifications not found in the Michigan Department of Civil Service Compensation Manual. Rather than guess their job category code, I have excluded them here.

Table 20. Number of Positions Occupied by Two or More Job Sharers
by Department, State of Michigan, July 26, 1986.

Department ¹	Positions	Department	Positions	Department	Positions
Attorney General	10.5	Labor	4.0	Public Health	7.0
Civil Service	2.0	Lottery	5.0	Social Services	67.0
Commerce	1.0	Management and Budget	0.5	State	1.0
Corrections	4.0	Mental Health	34.0	Transportation	13.0
Education	14.5	Natural Resources	14.0	Treasury	1.0
		Total	178.5		

Footnotes:

1. Eight departments reported no job-share positions. They are excluded here.

Source: State of Michigan. Department of Civil Service. Classified Employees by Department on Active Payroll Status (computer printout), July 26, 1986.

January 15, 1986. Thus, limited longitudinal data are available.

Work Sharing

Work sharing does not appear to have widespread appeal in Michigan, although it does occur as this study reveals. The fact that the Detroit News called the inverse seniority layoff plan from which a portion of my sample was drawn "unusual" (Higgins 1987) conveys the relative obscurity of work sharing in Michigan.

A few efforts to promote work sharing in recent years in Michigan have failed. For example, in 1983 state Senator Jerome A. Hart (D-Saginaw) and 24 colleagues introduced Senate Bill 200 in the Michigan Legislature--a bill to establish a "shared-work program" in Michigan along the lines of short-time compensation plans in California and other states (Gribbin 1983). The bill never made it through committee and hearings were never held.

Timing may well have worked against this legislation. In 1983 there was some optimism that Michigan's economy would turn around with national recovery, and some laid-off workers, particularly in the automobile industry, were being called back. At the time, additional layoffs seemed unlikely, and the state had its own agenda for revitalizing Michigan's economy which focused on improving the state's business climate, targeting industries for retention and growth, and creating state-supported investment capital funds to encourage business expansion.. It appears that

short-time compensation in Michigan will have to wait at least until the next recession.

Work sharing schemes proposed by Buick and the UAW in Flint also failed. Early in 1984 Buick proposed scheduling a third, swing shift at two GM plants in Flint--which would have created 1,700 jobs--if all three shifts would give up overtime pay on hours worked over eight and for work on Saturday and Sunday. The plan would have required current and recalled employees to work four 10-hour days at straight pay. A UAW counterproposal allowed the waiving of Saturday and Sunday premiums but retained overtime pay for work over eight hours. The two proposals also differed in the days chosen for the swing shift. The company wanted the extra shift to work days on Friday and Saturday and nights on Monday and Tuesday. The UAW wanted it to work days Friday and Saturday and nights on Sunday and Monday, so workers could have three consecutive days off. Workers on the other shifts would have worked days Monday through Thursday and nights Wednesday through Saturday. At the time, the two shifts at the two plants were working six days a week, nine-and-a-half hours a day (Job 1984; Nehman 1984). At the time, there were also 9,000 laid off autoworkers, or 15 percent of GM's workforce, in the Flint area (Brown 1984).

Both proposals were turned down by workers. In a straw vote by one UAW local that was involved, 576 workers voted for the status quo (two shifts plus overtime) and 440 workers favored the union plan. The company's proposal

received 28 votes (Job and Roach 1984). Regional UAW officials attributed worker opposition, especially to the company plan, to worker morale and fear of layoff. With overtime pay averaging at least \$200 a week, workers wanted overtime for fear they might not have jobs a year later. The two plants involved were slated to be closed and merged into the new Buick City Complex, which would operate with a smaller workforce than the two plants combined. Workers were also hostile because concessions agreed to in the 1982 contract had not resulted in the recall of laid-off U.S. workers but instead in further foreign investment by the company (Job and Roach 1984; Nehman 1984).

Overtime has developed as a hot political issue in the automobile industry. By conservative estimates, up to a million, or 15 percent, of 1983's passenger cars were built on overtime. Industry executives claimed overtime production then was the highest since the mid-1940s and perhaps the highest in the industry's history. UAW President Owen Bieber has been critical of the companies for "abuses" of overtime, but internally the union is split on the issue (Grenier 1983).

Overtime has been an important component of company strategies to recover profitability. That strategy, however, was undermined somewhat in the 1987 contracts between Ford, General Motors and the UAW. Under those agreements, temporary layoffs are permitted only in the event of a sales slump, and laid-off workers must be

recalled when demand increases. In other words, a company could not put those workers on indefinite layoff and use overtime to accommodate increased demand (Fogel, Lupo, and Spelich 1987). Such a plan ensures the spreading around of available work.

In sum, Michigan's economy was thrown into turmoil during the recession in the early 1980s and the major players--state government, companies, unions, unemployed workers, and unrepresented workers--are scrambling to gain some measure of control over it. Reduced work strategies, some more widespread than others, have figured prominently in that effort. To what extent reduced work enhances or limits people's autonomy off the job is the question to which I now turn. In chapter 6 I examine the terms and conditions of reduced work and my informants' reasons for working less than full time. Chapters 7 through 11 explore their use of time off the job and conditions which enhance or impede autonomy off the job.

CHAPTER 6

Terms and Conditions of Reduced Work

This chapter introduces the informants in this study by examining their reasons for being employed less than full time and the terms and conditions of their reduced work. By terms and conditions of reduced work, I mean in particular the type of job, employee benefits, work schedules and control of those schedules. It will be shown that different types of reduced work permit varying employee benefits and varying degrees of control of time.

Job Sharing

With one exception, all of the job sharers in this study were state government employees. Thus, they were subject to the employment regulations established by state civil service in Michigan. Most state government offices operate on an 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. schedule, Monday through Friday. However, the state adopted flexitime some time ago, which means state employees may alter somewhat their starting and leaving times from the standard 8 to 5 and lunch hours may also be reduced to one-half hour at the employee's discretion. In addition, civil service grades and pay levels organize state employment, and several labor unions are involved in negotiating contracts and determining terms and conditions of employment for employees in various

occupational classifications. Some employees, such as those whose work is considered confidential, are excluded from labor union representation. It is within this bureaucratic system of state employment that job sharing occurs.

Job sharers are paid the same hourly rate as full-time employees in the same occupational classification and grade. They are eligible for most of the employee benefits of full-time employees. Sick leave, vacation time, and retirement benefits accrue according to hours worked, thus at any given time a job sharer will accumulate proportionally less than a full-time worker. Holiday pay is prorated. Job sharers are eligible for the same health insurance coverage as full-time employees. Like other part-time state employees, job sharers are not eligible for long-term disability, the only significant area of difference between employee benefits for job sharers and full-time employees.

The vast majority of job sharers who work for the State of Michigan are clerical workers. This reflects the state's reluctance to permit job sharing in high-level positions and the concentration of women in clerical positions. Given that job sharing is practiced far more by women than men, it would be expected that job sharing would occur most frequently in occupations where women are concentrated. As noted in chapter 5, almost 50 percent of the job sharers who work for the State of Michigan are clerical workers. About 25 percent are professionals and 20 percent are paraprofessionals.

Six of the state job sharers in this study were clerical workers, two were accountants, and two were social services caseworkers. The one job sharer in the study who was not a state employee was a clerical worker at a local private hospital. The job sharers in this study had combined experience of almost 23 years with job sharing. Length of experience ranged from six months to seven and one-half years, with an average of about two years.

Eight of the eleven job sharers were motivated to try job sharing because they had young children to care for at home. All eight were married women, and, with the exception of one whose husband was laid off at the time she began job sharing (he was employed when I interviewed her, however), had a second earner in the home to cushion the blow of lost income from the reduction of working time. All eight had been employed full time before they began job sharing, and while a few would have continued working full time had they not gained the opportunity to job share, most would have quit their jobs under the demands of caring for young children.

Martha's (008) case is especially poignant in this regard. She considered quitting her full-time job as a secretary under the pressure of caring for a newborn and two toddlers. Instead, a sympathetic supervisor created a job-share position in the office, but taking the position constituted the equivalent of two demotions for Martha. Her superiors were unwilling to consider job sharing for her

secretarial position, so she moved into a position in the same department as a receptionist. Her situation was complicated by the fact that her employment provided her family's insurances. Her husband is self-employed and without her employment, they would have to purchase their own insurances.

Martha characterized her decision to job share as a difficult one to make because she believed her position as a secretary was much more interesting than the receptionist position she would have to take to job share. She was also attending school part time and "working her way up the ladder." But she believed someone at home had to make the commitment to raising the children. Although she believed her husband would have been better at it, her husband could not give up his work.

"One of us had to slow down a little bit and make our presence in the home, for the children's sake. So it was me. I couldn't ask him to give up his business customers because that would have meant asking him to give up his business."

Carol (001) was motivated to job share when she heard from other state employees that job sharing was available in other departments. At the time, she had an 18-month-old and a four-year-old and "really wanted to have some more time at home with them." She called Civil Service and had her name put on a job-share or part-time list. Within three months she was called for an interview and within an additional two months she was hired for her job-share position. If she had

not been able to job share or work part time, she would have quit her full-time job.

Similarly, Kathy (002) sought to work part time because her six-month-old son was "a terrible sleeper" and working full time "was rough." She thought of quitting if she couldn't find a part-time job. There were no part-time jobs available in the unit she was working in at the time, so she called Civil Service and they referred her to a full-time employee who was looking for someone with whom to job share. That woman had the approval to job share from her immediate supervisor but could find no one who was interested or qualified to share her position. Kathy and she spoke on the telephone several times and managed to negotiate an agreeable job-share arrangement that also met the needs of the department.

The position attainment process was not so smooth for Elaine (003) and Linda (009). Elaine's homelife was stressful with a one-year-old and a six-month-old and a husband who worked second shift. A caseworker, she requested part-time employment when it was virtually unheard of in her office. There was just one part-time position allocated to her office and that one was filled. She was planning to quit when it looked like she couldn't go on a part-time schedule. Two days before her last day of work, the office learned that allocations had changed and they couldn't replace her. She was permitted to begin working part time with the proviso that if and when she could be

replaced full time, she would have to quit or agree to work full time. At first, Elaine's part-time position was not half of a job-share position. She worked half days, five days a week, rotating jobs. She replaced employees who were absent. She did this for about a year. She described the job as "okay," but complained that she never had any responsibilities of her own. Her opportunity to job share occurred when the organization of work in her office became "generalized." Previously, job sharing was not feasible because caseworkers specialized in various aspects of the processing of clients, such as intake or follow-up, and had to be at the office all day for client contact. Once the office generalized, however, and caseworkers no longer specialized in one step in the processing of clients but became responsible for entire cases, it became possible for two caseworkers to share one caseload. It was at this time that Elaine and the other part-time employee in her office began to job share.

Linda, an accountant, planned to begin working part time when she returned to her job from maternity leave. Her request to shift from full time to part time was approved by her supervisor while she was on leave, but when she returned he asked her to work full time for six weeks because work was backlogged in the office. During this six-week period, however, he was promoted and because his position was vacant, he asked Linda to postpone her shift to part time and to continue working full time beyond the originally-

agreed-to six weeks. After some time, because of her childcare responsibilities and because her mother had become ill, Linda told her boss, "I gotta work part time or else I'm going to have to quit." He asked her if she would job share and she agreed to "whatever you want to do." Her supervisors converted her full-time position to a job-share position and interviewed candidates for the half position that would remain when Linda would begin working part time. Linda recounted her efforts to be involved in the hiring process. She asked her supervisors,

"'Don't you think it would be a good idea for me to be in the interviews to make sure this is someone I'm going to be able to get along with because we're going to have to communicate well?' They said 'no.' (She laughed.)"

Fortunately for Linda, the woman hired for the job had several years of experience as an accountant and they were compatible. They had been job sharing for almost a year at the time of the interview.

Not everyone who was motivated to job share by childcare concerns actively sought to job share, however. Barbara (005), the informant with the longest job sharing experience--seven and one-half years--had worked full time for 15 years and had, with her husband, raised two children, 11 and 12 years old. After giving birth to their third child, Barbara decided, "that was it." She was going to quit her job and stay home with her third and last child, partly because she had not done so with the other two and partly because she was "older." She was in her mid-thirties

when the third child was born. Another secretary in the office had become pregnant and sought and gained approval to job share from her supervisor. She talked to Barbara about job sharing and convinced her to try it. The position was converted from full time to job share and Barbara moved into it. They were among the first in their office to job share and in fact had been called a "pilot."

Sylvia (007) had also been courted by her job share partner. Originally Sylvia had no interest in job sharing. She had one child, had worked full time for six months after her return from maternity leave, had a "good sitter," was "making good money," and thought she'd "let things stand." Another secretary in the office was pregnant with her second child and approached Sylvia, the only other secretary at the same grade in the office, and asked her to job share. Sylvia recalled,

"I joked with her and said, 'If I get pregnant again, I'll think about it.' Well, I did (get pregnant), and she didn't let off."

In the meantime, a few others in the department had begun to job share and became valuable sources of information about job sharing. After some conversations with them, Sylvia agreed to consider job sharing. She recounted her reasoning:

"I talked with my husband. . . I hated the thought of a reduced income. That scared me because it is good money for doing what we do. But I started weighing the pros and cons. I thought, I want to have more kids. This was gonna be my second and I thought I had

already missed so much with my first. So I thought this would be a good opportunity. We went through all the paperwork. . . Our boss was very supportive.

They agreed to share Sylvia's position. They had been job sharing for six months at the time of the interview, and what was Sylvia's assessment of the experience? "It's great. I love it."

The remaining three job sharers in the sample were not motivated to job share by childcare responsibilities. Tina (004), an accountant, had worked full time for ten years. During her last year of full-time employment, she was pursuing a second career in music. She played in a band in a bar a few nights at the end of the week and thought it would be ideal to work only the first part of the week in her accounting job. She requested job sharing and found someone else in her department who wanted to job share. They began job sharing in May, 1985, and had done so for more than a year at the time of the interview.

Bill (024) and Jim (029) were the only male job sharers who volunteered to be interviewed. Bill had been a self-employed accountant for twenty years and sought to work for someone else to have firmer boundaries on his working time and to obtain employee benefits. He wanted full-time employment but took a part-time job-share position that was offered to him in the hope that this might be an avenue to full-time employment. He had been job sharing a little more than six months with a woman who had planned to quit her

full-time job. Supervisors in her office converted her full-time position to a job share position to keep her. The week before I interviewed Bill, however, she quit to take a job in another city. Bill was uncertain what would happen next, but he expected the position to be converted back to full time and that he would be offered the full-time job.

While job sharing was an avenue of entry to full-time state employment for Bill, it was a mode of exit for Jim (029). Jim had been a full-time caseworker for about five years, but his off-the-job religious activities motivated him to inquire into part-time employment. He believed he was permitted to job share because he had the highest seniority of those in his office who wanted to job share. Once his position was converted to job share, it was advertised to locate a partner for him. His partner was a man trying to establish his own business. Jim had been job sharing almost two years at the time of the interview. While he had no plans to quit his job with the state at that time, he did entertain the thought of doing his ministerial work full time. If he does at some future time make this change, job sharing will have permitted a gradual rather than sudden transition.

The circumstances and interests that motivated informants in this study to try job sharing reveal a clear gender difference. The vast majority of women decided to job share because they wanted or needed to be more involved in the lives and care of their young children. For the men,

on the other hand, job sharing provided an opportunity to make a transition from one type of employment to another or to balance employment with other interests and commitments.

Work Schedules

Generally, job sharers who work for the State of Michigan work 40 hours in a two-week pay period and negotiate their own schedules. Their schedules are subject to supervisory approval, but sometimes supervisors create the task division between job sharers as well as their work schedules. In one case in the sample, the work schedule was inherited from the person who was being replaced.

Because job sharers tend to negotiate their schedules to accommodate off-the-job demands as well as demands of the organization in which they are employed, schedules vary considerably reflecting the individual needs of the workers. Most of the job sharers in this study worked two or three days each week. Bill (024), whose schedule was not self-determined, worked 8 to 5 Monday and Thursday. Kathy (002), Elaine (003), and Barbara (005) worked the same two days each week and alternated a third with their partners. Others alternated weeks. Carol (001) and Jim (029) worked Monday through Friday while Sylvia (007) worked Wednesday through Tuesday and Linda (009) worked Thursday through Wednesday. Sylvia noted that she and her partner "always have a weekend to break up the week."

Given that the state uses flexitime, daily work schedules also varied considerably. Some job sharers worked

8 to 5, others 8:30 to 5 or 7:30 to 4 or 7 to 3:30. Several commented that they preferred working full days to half days for various reasons having to do with commuting, children, and the nature of the job. Sylvia (007), for example, said,

"I love the schedule. I wouldn't change that for anything. It's better than half days. Especially when we both have to drive quite a distance. If we had to work half days, we didn't want it (job sharing). You know, you're putting the miles on."

Similarly, commuting was a concern for Elaine (003).

"Might as well work all day once here . . . That's nicer than coming in every day a half a day especially since I live 25 miles away."

Linda (009) noted that working every day half days meant taking the children out every day and getting dressed for work every day. And Barbara (005) commented that four hour shifts "go by so fast that you can't get your teeth into it."

Carol (001) preferred her alternating week schedule because she felt she was under a lot of time pressure when she works. On the weeks she was off, she tried to slow down, enjoy time, and enjoy her children. She believed working half weeks would not relieve the time pressure because it took time to unwind. She also believed she accomplished more at home by having full weeks off. Barbara (005), however, found alternating weeks to be confusing to other workers in her office when she and her partner tried that type of schedule. They decided to try to keep confusion to a minimum by working the same two or three days

every week. That arrangement "keeps things more structured at work and at home." Jim (029) preferred his early starting (7 a.m.) and leaving (3:30 p.m.) times because it gave him time at the end of his work day to go to a nearby gym to workout, freshen up, and rest before going to religious meetings in the evening.

Power of Supervisors

Supervisors have considerable discretionary power over job sharers because they must approve the job-share arrangement and work schedules. Whether they exercise that power for or against the desires of workers may also be affected by their attitudes toward individual workers. Some job sharers saw the opportunity to job share as a reward given to valued workers. Linda (009) put it well:

"It's the employer's option. They don't have to make it available to you unless you fight for it. Which is what I had to do. . . It's not like they're saying, 'Here's all these part-time jobs. Do you want them?' They're just not there. . . I felt like I was in a good position because of the fact that I had worked in my job for a couple of years and created some value for myself. Had I been not a very good employee, they would have probably told me to take a hike."

Martha (008), who took two demotions so she could work part time by job sharing, expressed similar sentiments. She thought job sharing in higher job classifications was "still a fringe" and workers must establish themselves in a high position before they can ask to job share in that position.

Those elements of simple or personal labor control within the larger system of bureaucratic labor control

generate feelings of insecurity for workers who do get the opportunity to job share. Sylvia (007) reported that she and her partner felt like they were "walking on ice" because they didn't want to lose their job-share arrangement.

Because they feel insecure, job sharers may go out of their way to please supervisors and avoid imposing on co-workers to prove the arrangement works. Sylvia and her partner documented their work and coordinated carefully to ensure a smooth transition when one left at the end of her week and the other came in. Sometimes they stayed late on Tuesdays to ensure work was caught up for the partner who came in on Wednesdays. They also sought to keep each other well informed so they did not have to "bother" other workers in the office to get information.

Susan (018), who shared a clerical job at a local hospital, noted similar insecurity at first.

"When we first started, we wanted this to work so bad. It used to be our boss was kicking us out at night because it was like, 'I gotta finish,' but now we've settled into, I leave a note . . . and we're both really comfortable with it. . . It was a little hectic at first because for one thing, I was training. Neither one of us wanted this to fail; it was like we had to make this work. It's ideal for both of us. So then we started the notes. We may leave each other a letter at night but we know exactly where we're at and what has to be done so if she gets a call at 8:00 the next morning right when she walks in the door, all she has to do is read the note and vice versa, and whoever's on the phone knows."

In Susan's office, however, this meticulous documentation and coordination benefited others.

"Our department manager claims the only reason she knows what's going on with (financial) statements is because of the notes we (the job share partners) leave each other. She reads them (laughs)."

Job sharers in state employment may be vulnerable in other ways. While Michigan Civil Service permits job sharing, departments don't necessarily have formal policies on job sharing to deal with all contingencies. Sylvia (007) explained that her and her partner's job sharing agreement specifies that job sharing could be terminated if their supervisor no longer wanted it or if one of the job sharers didn't want it. But she didn't know what would happen if one of the partners wanted to go back to full time or if there were layoffs or someone was bumped. She confessed that the lack of written policy in these areas frightened her and acknowledged that she could be the one to lose a job since she had less seniority than her partner. But she also doubted that she would "end up on the street" because she felt there were always possibilities to bump down. This may well be one of the advantages of civil service employment. Once in the system it is not difficult to transfer from one job to another within the system if the moves are lateral or downward. Such shifts, however, could mean the loss of desirable working conditions.

Sylvia also noted that she didn't know what would happen to her job-share arrangement if her supervisor were

replaced by someone not in favor of job sharing. She believed that many supervisors don't like job sharing and added that the personnel director of her own office didn't support it and "had to be fought all the way" despite her immediate supervisor's approval.

Elaine (003) also commented on supervisors' negative attitudes toward job sharing. She claimed that job sharing increases the amount of supervisory recordkeeping. Supervisors are allocated to cover positions, not people. Therefore, a supervisor responsible for ten positions actually supervises 20 people if all of those positions are job shared. Scheduling training sessions can also be a problem if sessions are scheduled on a day a job sharer is off and an extra session must be scheduled to accommodate him/her.

Kathy (002) had experienced a change in immediate supervisors. She reported during the interview that her new supervisor reorganized task divisions in the unit and gave Kathy and her partner "the crud jobs." The job classifications of similarly classified clerks were upgraded, giving those workers higher pay and more opportunities to advance, but Kathy's job-share position was not upgraded. The supervisor had also questioned Kathy's career commitment. Kathy interpreted these actions as affronts directed at part-time employees by a supervisor prejudiced against part-time workers.

In spite of the insecurities and vulnerabilities of job sharing, virtually all of the job sharers in this study reported positive attitudes about their experience. Several of them said it was "the best of both worlds." To what extent it is the best of both worlds warrants further empirical investigation. There is no doubt that many of the job sharers in this study, particularly the women who were caring for young children, found themselves with few other alternatives, as expressed in their thoughts about quitting their jobs if they hadn't been able to work part time by job sharing. Job sharing's gray areas--those matters not formally taken up in departmental policies--are rife with promise for labor union intervention to protect workers.

Temporary Employment

The temporary employees in this study differed from the job sharers in several important ways. As a group the temporaries were younger, with a median age of 24 compared to 33 for the job sharers, with less stable employment experience. They earned less and received no employee benefits. Their reasons for seeking temporary employment also differed from those given by job sharers, particularly with regard to childcare. And most important for this study, the temporaries have less control over working time than did the job sharers.

The twelve temporaries interviewed for this study had combined experience of about five years as temporary employees. Their experience ranged from less than two

months to about nine months, with average experience of about five months. A few of the informants had done more than one stint as temporaries. Ten of the twelve did clerical work while two were laborers, although three were without placements at the time the interviews were conducted.

The informants were recruited from two temporary employment companies. Each company made benefits available to employees who became eligible after they had worked a certain number of hours and maintained eligibility by working a certain number of hours each month. For example, Company A provided benefits for paid holidays and paid vacations if an employee had worked more than a specified minimum of hours (1,200-1,500) in the previous year. Employees could also receive referral bonuses, life and health insurance, and workers' compensation if they met certain eligibility requirements.

None of the temporaries in this study received employee benefits. Few were eligible given their short length of service at the time they were interviewed. Some were not concerned by their lack of benefits because they were covered by a husband's or parent's insurance policies. Others indicated their interest in the benefits packages available to them and thought they would look more deeply into the matter once they became eligible. One woman maintained coverage on insurances she purchased while previously self-employed; and two men, one the sole support

of his family and the other who was single, looked to state social services for assistance.

Why did the informants in this study seek temporary employment? Three of the informants were students who found temporary employment preferable in pay or a desirable adjunct to part-time employment. Another had recently finished school and temporary employment was a means by which to gain experience in her field to better qualify for desired full-time employment. Most, however, chose temporary employment as transitional employment or because they had had difficulty finding other steady work. Meg (010), for example, had been a self-employed economic policy consultant and found herself spending her time attending meetings and making sales calls rather than doing research and writing which she preferred. She decided to try to find other employment that would permit her to do the sorts of tasks she wanted to without having to manage her own company. With a master's degree in economics, she expected the search for suitable employment to take some time. She chose temporary employment as a clerical worker in the interim.

Harold (015) had a custodial job before he signed with a temporary employment company. He had been hired as a part-time employee, but because his employer knew he preferred full-time work, Harold was able to work 40 hours a week much of the time. The job paid about \$4.75 an hour and required that Harold travel to different sites. The father

of four children, Harold complained that he "wasn't making enough." He received no employee benefits and disliked traveling so much.

"Just to get 40 hours I kinda had to bounce all over town. . . It was costing me more to drive around, and we didn't get paid for mileage."

He signed up for temporary employment and planned to use his time between placements to search for a more suitable job.

Jean (027) had worked at an automobile assembly plant for about a year when she was laid off. She had hoped to be called back, but when her unemployment benefits expired and the prospects for callback were dismal, she tried to find other work. An ad in the newspaper led her to a temporary employment company.

Ed (013) had an unstable employment history following what he believed was an unjust termination from a job more than ten years ago. His tarnished work record made it difficult to find steady, full-time employment. He chose temporary employment in the hope that he could find a full-time job through temporary jobs.

Tom (021), in his fifties with a slight handicap, had worked as a mechanic for 20 years. In his most recent full-time job, one he had for two years, he worked in the garage's office doing paperwork and computer work because he could no longer do any lifting or work on his feet. He was fired from this job, in what Tom believed was a clear case of discrimination, and replaced by a young woman who was paid a little more than one-fourth of what he had been paid.

Divorced and self-supporting, he had been without a job for six months when he signed up with a temporary employment company. He had distributed resumes "all over town. . .you know, the surrounding area. . .there's nothing. . .so I just signed up for temporary. I had to have something." Tom, like Ed, hoped to find a full-time job through temporary work. Given his age, Tom might have opted for early retirement, however his previous employers provided no retirement or pension plan.

Only one informant in this study fit the stereotype of the married woman who works as a temporary to give her something to do. Karen (026), a minister's wife, had no desire for permanent or full-time employment when she signed with a temporary employment company.

"At the time, I was just doing it for something extra to do and to fill in some of my hours. I didn't really care (about permanent employment). It was just something to fill in my days. It didn't really matter to me if I got a permanent job or not."

There was a chance that her placement at the time the interview was conducted could become a permanent, part-time job. I asked her if her attitude about a permanent job had changed, given this opportunity.

"It'd be nice. . .but I'm married and we hope to have children. And so it's just kind of something that I'm doing for now until we have children. I'm not really sure about it yet. . .I don't want to start working for them and then get pregnant and have to leave."

Peggy (014) sought temporary employment when she left an unsatisfactory full-time job that she had had for six months. She had worked as a temporary prior to this full-time employment and had had a good experience with temporary employment. Because her full-time job was located in an office near the temporary employment company for whom she had previously worked, she continued to have contact with the staff of the temporary employment company. Members of the staff often asked her when she was going to come back and told her there were placements for her. When she left her full-time job and went back to that temporary employment company, they "weren't there" for her. She waited two weeks and they never called her. When she called them, they couldn't come up with a satisfactory placement for her. Demoralized and betrayed by a company she had trusted, she signed with a different temporary employment company on her brother's recommendation. Her experience with this company was quite favorable.

"My confidence had been really shot down in this last job. . .I walked in there and my confidence went straight up . . .They were just thrilled to have me and recognized my talents right off . . .I appreciate that. . .and they were ready to put me right on the job. I think they're a little bit more professional, better training. I like the way I was treated, and I like the way I'm still treated and kept up with. When I call anybody there. . .they know me."

Peggy had interviewed for a couple of full-time jobs before resigning from the one she had but felt temporary

employment was best for the foreseeable future. She needed steady work because she was supporting her husband through graduate school, but he would finish in a few months and she expected that they would relocate after that.

"I don't know where we'll be. . .It's hard for me. . .It's hard on employers, too, to hire me not knowing if I'll be around after June. (Company A) is secure; I get benefits within a month. I plan on staying with them. I do have another option which would be temporary also, but I think temporary is the best thing for right now. . .They (Company A) pay better than a lot of them do."

In summary, unlike most of the job sharers, none of the temporary employees in this study were motivated by childcare responsibilities to seek temporary employment. Instead, with a few exceptions, the temporaries were (1) students who needed money to pay for college and found temporary employment preferable to or a convenient adjunct to part-time employment, (2) persons making a transition from previous unsatisfactory employment, and (3) individuals who had had difficulty finding suitable, steady employment.

It is not surprising that childcare did not emerge as a factor that motivated individuals to seek temporary employment. As will be seen below, there is enough unpredictability associated with temporary employment that it would be difficult to coordinate temporary employment and the care of young children.

Placements

Most of the temporaries interviewed for this study reported that they had had fairly steady employment as

temporaries. A significant few, however, reported intermittent placements. This was especially problematic for Tom (021) who, apparently for reasons of age and handicap, had had difficulty finding a job and desperately needed employment to support himself.

Tom had signed up for temporary employment about a month and a half before the interview. He was between placements at the time, and his last placement had been ten days earlier. He worked for six hours at a job that involved folding letters and statements and stuffing envelopes. Company B had called him on a Friday to inform him of the placement that would begin the following Monday at 8 a.m. Tom knew when he accepted the placement that it was for just one day. "Work is work," he commented. Previously, he had had three placements of two or three days each.

When Tom signed with Company B, he hoped he would find full-time work through temporary employment.

"They ask you on the form that you sign, they asked me if I wanted temporary work or if I wanted full-time work, morning work, or afternoon or evening. . . I wrote down anytime, part time or full time, preferably full time. . . When they were interviewing me afterwards, they asked me if I'd settle for (less than full time) and I said, 'Oh yeah,' I'd take anything I could get. Because I'm by myself. I have nothing to hold me back. So I can go anytime, day or night."

Tom's willingness to work anytime and do almost anything within his physical capabilities might have permitted him to work steadily with numerous placements.

Instead, he had had few placements--all of short duration--and remained largely unemployed despite his willingness to work.

Vicki (023) had had two placements in the three and a half months she had been with Company B. Her first placement lasted two and a half weeks. It was supposed to last three weeks, "but they got done early." This was a full-time placement, 8:30 to 4:30 five days a week. Her second placement, which had ended a month and a half before the interview, lasted a couple days. A month lapsed between these two placements.

Vicki wasn't at all disturbed by the few jobs she had had as a temporary. She babysat a lot, thus she had another fairly regular source of income. She was also selective about placements and exercised freely her right to turn them down. While a month and a half had lapsed between her last placement and the interview, she had been offered placements during that period but turned them down.

"There are some places I've heard that are really bad places to work. And I just don't want to get into something like that."

She explained that some other temporaries she met through her placements had taken three-week placements at one place in particular and quit after one week because they felt they were treated badly.

Harold (015) had had two placements in the month and a half since he signed with Company A. His first placement was of two-week duration and his second lasted one week.

The first could have lasted longer because it was an indefinite placement, but Harold was dissatisfied with the job. "That was just janitorial," he commented. His second placement was at a radiator shop doing auto repair. At the time of the interview, it had been a week since his last placement. He had done stints as a temporary twice before, about ten years ago. His longest placement was one through another temporary employment company that lasted about six months.

In contrast to these few cases of intermittent temporary employment, many in this study reported fairly steady employment as temporaries, and some achieved Tom's and Ed's dreams--to locate regular, full-time employment through temporary placements.

Meg (010), Terri (011), Chris (012), Ed (013), Peggy (014), Ann (025), Karen (026), and Jean (027) had all worked fairly steadily as temporaries, with placements of two to nine months duration at the time they were interviewed. Most expected their steady, temporary employment to continue for the foreseeable future. Meg's temporary job had just become a regular, full-time job and she hoped to upgrade and expand her responsibilities within the next year. Karen and Jean had been asked to become regular part-time (Karen) and full-time (Jean) employees where they were placed and were mulling it over. Ann worked steadily as a temporary for three and a half months until she found a regular part-time job. She worked intermittently as a temporary while

employed part time. Her part-time job had recently become a full-time job, so she was easing out of temporary employment.

There is considerable variation in temporary employment, particularly in the factors that motivate people to seek temporary employment and in the experiences individuals have as temporaries. While temporary employment was designed to meet employers' needs for flexibility, it is clearly adaptable to the varied needs of some workers, particularly those for whom temporary employment is transitional, those who have other sources of financial support, and those who want temporary employment. The lack of employer commitment to temporaries, however, may in turn be met with little employee commitment to employers. Thus, Harold (015) could choose to leave a placement of indefinite duration because he was not satisfied with the job, and Vicki turned down placements that had a reputation among temporaries as bad placements. Yet there are limits to workers' freedom to leave or turn down placements, and these are the limits faced by all workers--those imposed by one's pocketbook.

While temporary employees have a certain amount of freedom to accept/reject offers and to leave placements prematurely, they have little control over their work schedules.

Unlike job sharers who generally negotiate their work schedules and therefore have considerable control over them

subject to supervisory approval, temporaries are generally told when and where to report for placements. Temporaries' control over their work schedules comes in their ability to specify desirable working times on their temporary employment application. Thus temporaries can indicate whether they prefer full-time or part-time temporary employment and whether they prefer to work in the morning, afternoon, or evening. It can therefore be said that temporaries have some choice over their placements, but the difficulty arises in not knowing when placement offers will come and the variability of placement duration. These issues will be taken up more concretely in chapters 7 through 11 on autonomy off the job.

Part-Time Employment

The part-time employees interviewed for this study worked in a variety of occupations in state government, municipal government, the health care industry, and the retail sector. They were clerical workers, sales clerks, skilled workers (e.g. tailor and gardener) and professional (e.g. nurse clinician). Two were employed full time in addition to their part-time employment, one as a clerical worker, the other as a teacher. They had worked in their part-time jobs for a combined 33 years, ranging from less than one year to nine years. They had an average 3.7 years in their current part-time jobs. Some were union members and others were not. Those who were union members received employee benefits, as did a couple of others who were not

union members. Those who did not receive benefits (except for merchandise discounts) were not represented by a labor union.

The variation in occupation and economic sector was related to further variation in work schedules, number of hours worked each week, and the regularity of hours over periods of several weeks. Few of the part-time workers had control over their work schedules, although many could request preferred working hours and days. Those outside the retail sector had regular hours and work schedules, but those in retail, particularly the sales workers, had experienced considerable variability related to seasonal fluctuations and fluctuations in demand in both their work schedules and number of hours worked each week. Those in retail, therefore, experienced unpredictability in employment not unlike that experienced by temporaries. They differed from temporaries, though, in that the part-time workers expected to work a minimum of hours each week and their work schedules for each week were posted several days in advance.

As a group, the part-time workers in this study worked from as few as 15 hours to as many as 48 hours in a week. They averaged about 22 1/2 hours a week.

About half of the part-time workers had actively sought to work part time, and most of them were motivated to do so by childcare concerns. Elizabeth (006), for example, had worked full time as a state clerical worker for about five

years before she started working part time. She began working part time after her first child was born and after the federal monies that paid her wages and funded the project on which she worked were reduced. She spent a year, the period of her pregnancy and the first few months of her child's life, "constantly pleading" to work part time. She was given the opportunity when the grant monies were cut.

Lisa (016), a nurse clinician and the only salaried worker in the sample, also began working part time after the birth of her first child. She had worked full time for several years and part time for seven. She planned to continue working part time for at least another year, until her youngest child would go to school. Sarah (017), a clerical worker in the same hospital, continued to work full time for a few months after her daughter was born until she was given the opportunity to job share. She job shared for about a year and a half, but an office reorganization ended that arrangement. She returned to full-time employment, but sought a transfer to another office so she could work part time.

Diane (030), by contrast, had not been employed outside the home. She did alterations at home but decided to seek employment outside the home because her "homework" was too irregular. The mother of two, she said "a full-time job didn't seem possible at the time." Besides her childcare responsibilities, she and her husband only had one car and had to commute long distances to their jobs. Their

dependence on one car also limited her options, and she didn't think they could afford to purchase a second car.

A couple of part-time workers preferred full-time employment but settled for part time. Helen (031) had worked full time for ten years as a clerical worker. She had also worked part time for five years at a retail store. She picked up the part-time job after she was divorced from her husband. "I was left with a lot of bills and. . . (I) just needed more money," she commented. The mother of one teenage son, she looked for a full-time job with better benefits to replace the full-time job she had, but that job search was unsuccessful. She settled for a second, part-time job to increase her income.

Joanne (020) sought full-time employment after her graduation from high school but couldn't find it. She was offered a number of part-time jobs and chose her position as a sales clerk because she could also get benefits, something the other part-time jobs she was offered lacked. At the time of the interview, after about nine months of employment, she was considering going to college to improve her chances of finding a full-time job.

Mark (028) and Joe (019) sought employment in a particular kind of job and industry and were not especially disturbed that their jobs were part time. Mark worked seasonally as a gardener for a municipality. He actively sought work as a gardener; what came his way was a seasonal job. Joe, a sales clerk whose parents had worked for the

retailing company that employed him, hoped to move into management in that company. He accepted part-time employment because today the company hires few full-time employees, and they hire no one full time "off the street" unless it is for a management position. Too inexperienced to be hired directly into management, Joe was gaining experience in the store and going to college majoring in business management. He hoped that the combination of in-store experience and a college degree in business management would give him access to a full-time management position at some time in the future.

In sum, the part-time workers in this study worked part time for different reasons. Generally, they can be categorized according to those who actively sought part time employment and those who preferred full time but settled for part time. The exceptions were the two men in the sample who worked part time because the job was desirable or because it was a hoped-for step on the career path toward management. Among those who actively sought part-time work (all women), the principal motivator was to integrate employment and childcare.

Work Schedules

About half of the part-time workers had little control over their work schedules while the others had considerable control. Interestingly, those who had control over their work schedules generally did not work in the retail sector. They worked for the state and for a hospital. The one

person in retail who did have control over her schedule did so because she had moved into a sales supervisory position and was responsible for making the schedule in her department. Thus, not only did she control her schedule but she controlled those of the other employees in her department.

Elizabeth (006), for example, who was a clerical worker in state government, worked 7:30-4:00 Tuesday, Wednesday, and every other Thursday. Subject to state civil service employment regulations, she could not work more than 44 hours in a two-week pay period. She also had to be at work certain hours of the day, although starting and quitting times were flexible, consistent with state government's policy of flexitime. Elizabeth determined her own schedule but sought the approval of her immediate supervisor. When she began working part time, she worked Tuesday, Thursday, and every other Wednesday, but recently she had changed her schedule to better coordinate with her babysitter.

Similarly, Sarah (017) negotiated her work schedule. She worked six hours a day, four days a week. She experimented with different schedules, for example 12:00-4:00 and 8:00-1:00, five days a week, but had settled on 8:30-2:30, Monday through Thursday to coordinate with her child's daycare.

Lisa (016), a salaried nurse clinician, had the most schedule control of all the part-time workers interviewed for this study. She worked 7:00-3:30, sometimes 7:00-5:00,

three days a week. Her schedule varied depending on patient appointments, but she scheduled her patients. She noted that often she took work home, something few of the others in this study (part-time workers or otherwise) did. Her work also involved occasional public speaking engagements, but she decided whether and when to speak.

All but one of those who had little schedule control worked in the retail sector. Mark (028), the gardener, worked a shift set by the city: 40 hours a week, April 1-October 30. He had no choice over his hours, although he noted that overtime was optional. Mark was rarely offered overtime; "the more senior workers get it first." But he said he had little desire for overtime.

Generally, those who worked in retail experienced considerable variation in work schedules and had little control over their schedules because a supervisor made them. Joe (019) was usually scheduled 27 hours a week, but he could pick up extra hours if the demand in his own department was sufficient or if he could be used in another department. Because he had the highest seniority of the part-time employees in his department, Joe had to be given the most hours. If he obtained extra hours inside or outside his department, it was because he asked for them.

Joanne (020) had little influence on her schedule because she had very low seniority in her department. She could request days off if she needed them, and she was guaranteed a minimum of 15 hours a week. Her supervisor

made her schedule, and Joanne thought she could alter that schedule if her preference were for an unpopular time. She usually worked afternoons and/or evenings and said it would be difficult to get daytime hours because those were popular hours and workers with higher seniority would get them first. She said it wasn't "impossible" to change her schedule and accepted that she would have to wait her turn until she accumulated more seniority.

Joanne's hours, however, had varied extremely during the period she had been employed. She worked in the toy department, and during the pre-holiday and holiday season she worked 48 hours a week. Two months later, when she was interviewed, she worked the minimum 15 hours a week.

Diane (030) was working 40 hours a week when she was interviewed, because of the heavy work load in the tailor shop. Usually, however, she worked not more than 30 hours a week. She was satisfied with her schedule. She usually worked during the daytime (the tailor shop was not open in the evenings even though the store was), and she knew she could take time off when necessary.

Helen (031) worked anywhere between eight and 20 hours a week in her part-time job. She estimated that her hours averaged 15 a week over the six months before she was interviewed. Because she had a full-time, 8:00-5:00 job, her part-time hours were limited to evenings and weekends. Her supervisor made her schedule, but employees could request days off if they did so before the supervisor made

the schedule for the upcoming week. Employees could also switch hours with one another, subject to supervisory approval.

In conclusion, those who worked part time outside the retail sector were blessed with regular hours and, for some, control over their schedules. Those in retail experienced variation in both their schedules and the number of hours worked each week. They had little control over their schedules. Sometimes part-time workers in retail worked full-time hours, for example 40 hours or more a week, when the workload demanded it. However, these workers were only guaranteed part-time hours and did not receive the benefits full-time workers received and perhaps received no benefits at all. Such variability of hours would make it difficult for workers to plan the rest of their lives and would also make financial planning difficult. One would have to live with the uncertainty of not knowing how many hours one would work from week to week. Additionally, this variability benefits employers. The knowledge that many part-time workers want and need more hours justifies employers' working them full time when the workload demands it. The desperate workers are grateful for the extra hours, yet they can't get benefits because they remain officially part-time workers.

Work Sharing

The work sharers differed from all others in this study in that the work sharers usually worked full time but were

off work voluntarily for a period of several months to one year under an inverse seniority layoff plan. Because they did not have a work schedule to attend to until they were called back to work, they had considerable control over their time. In addition, because they were UAW members with considerable seniority, they had extensive benefits despite layoff.

Twelve work sharers were interviewed for this study. Their combined seniority was 243 years with average seniority of 20 1/4 years. Their seniority ranged from 14 to 30 years. At the time they were laid off, they worked as machine operators (e.g. forklift and sweeper drivers) and laborers (e.g. assemblers, inspectors, repairmen, metal finishers, and trim finishers). They had been laid off about four months at the time they were interviewed.

The inverse seniority layoff plan was developed in tandem with a system of indefinite layoffs according to seniority, low to high; the latter is the layoff procedure typically followed in automobile plants. While the plant in this study was not being shut down, one of two lines was eliminated, displacing 3,400 workers. A little more than one thousand volunteered to be laid off under the inverse seniority plan. Without this plan, these high-seniority workers would have been required to stay on the job while an equivalent number of low-seniority workers would have lost their jobs, some permanently perhaps.

Workers volunteered for the inverse layoff by completing forms provided by union committeemen. They could take the layoff for four months (June layoff with October callback), seven months (June layoff with January callback), or one year (June layoff with May callback). Six of the informants for this study took the layoff for one year, five for seven months, and one for four months. They indicated their preferences on the form with no guarantee they would get the layoff or their first choice because layoffs were contingent on job classification and seniority. Workers in some job classifications were not at all eligible for the inverse layoff. Sharon (044), who took the layoff for a year, recounted her surprise when she learned she was eligible for the layoff. She had doubted her eligibility not because of her job classification but because of her seniority. With 15 years, she didn't think she had enough to qualify.

"When I first learned of it, I had no idea that I could get it. I thought we were talking people with 25 or more years. I was under the understanding, I didn't even think of it. The only thing I thought is wow, maybe this will help save my job. That's what I thought. And I was so scared to go on nights because of the kids that I was gonna have to go nights in order to keep my job. And I thought maybe that would save my job."

The UAW is widely recognized as a trendsetter of benefits for workers. Under the inverse seniority plan, workers lost some benefits. Although they lost dental insurance, vision, and educational tuition assistance, they

kept their health insurance. Paid sick leave, holidays, and vacations, of course, did not pertain under the layoff. But with state unemployment insurance and supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB), they continued to receive 90 to 95 percent of straight time pay while on layoff. Thus, despite their not working, the work sharers had an income for the period of time they were laid off. They also had the security of knowing they had a job to return to.¹

This might lead some to believe that anyone and everyone would volunteer to get money for nothing. That was not the case, however, and, while this study did not take up the question of why eligible workers did not volunteer to be laid off, it's clear that those who did had weighed the pros and cons and given the matter serious thought.²

Why did the work sharers in this study volunteer to be laid off? For all but a couple, there was no single reason but a combination of reasons that motivated them to take the layoff. Most said it was an opportunity to take some time off, and many said they wanted to give someone else a chance to keep his/her job. Those who were near retirement said that figured prominently into their decision, while others

1 There was doubt expressed by some informants about whether they would return to the same job classification or the same work schedule. The 1987 contract negotiations took place while the informants were laid off and they had heard that some job classifications were eliminated under the new local agreement. Some had also heard schedule changes had been made. They were unsure what these changes meant for them personally.

2 Although they didn't have a lot of time to mull it over. They had just a few days to complete and return their preference forms.

mentioned family relationships, employment change, contract negotiations and the possibility of strike, and job-related stress as factors that motivated them to volunteer for the layoff.

Tim (041), John (042), and Larry (043) were typical of those who took the layoff because they wanted time off. Tim said it was "the chance of a lifetime."

"You go out there with 95 percent of your pay knowing that you have a job when you come back. Working there now with 15 years, I've never had that opportunity. And there's a lot of things I wanted to do."

The possibility of a strike in the fall also influenced Tim in his thinking about the layoff, particularly his decision to take it for seven months instead of four.

"I wanted at least January because the contract year is here. . . If you're out on layoff and they don't call you back for the strike, if they go out on strike I still get 95 percent of my pay. If I was at work, I would only get strike benefits. So if they do go out, I will really benefit from this layoff if they don't call me back to work. So there were several factors why I wanted it. One, I wanted it anyway, and it just made it nicer to know that I might be able to get away from a strike."

However, Tim feared he would become bored if he took the layoff for a year.

"I don't know what I'd do after January. January, February, March. . . you can't do much work on a house in those months and there's not much to do."

John (042) also took the layoff for seven months. He, too, feared becoming bored but didn't want to pass up what might have been a one-time opportunity.

"I wasn't interested at first. I had to do a lot of thinking about it. First of all, it's not because I don't like my job. . . I enjoy my job. I have good relationships at work. I just thought it would give me an opportunity to spend more time with my family. Do more rebuilding at our church and give me time to spend there. Just opportunity to do some things I wanted to do. I didn't figure this opportunity would come up again. . . I didn't think I could stand being off a year and I didn't think I had enough time to get it for four months, which I found out later I didn't. So I put in for the seven months figuring that if worse got to worse I could always sign up to go back early. . . I didn't do this because I just don't like work. . . or I wanted to lay around and be lazy. I had to have something to keep me busy. Something that would be constructive. So that's why I took it. . . I didn't want to be the type that just drew a check for doing nothing. . . If it gets to where I'm sitting around with nothing to do . . . I'd have to go back to work. That way I can keep my conscience happy . . . Our plant's never been known for inverse layoff. There's a lot of other plants in the area that guys do this every summer. But I think this is a one-time deal for us. . . And so that was another thing I had to consider, do it now or never."

Larry (043) took the layoff for a year.

"I've been in the plant for a little over 30 years. . . and never had too much time off. I always wanted to do some stuff of my own, so I thought the opportunity was good. Not only that, I think that today, the young people, that would give another worker, probably, the way I see it, another year of seniority that would maybe balance his future of

maybe staying in the plant. I think anybody that stays in the plant an extra year is fortunate the way things are going now. But I always wanted some time off to do things I wanted to do. It was a good opportunity so I took it. I hadn't had too much time off in the last ten years, so I decided it was a good opportunity. I had kind of a question whether to take it for six months or a year or three months. . . I discussed it with the wife and she said, 'Do the best you can,' so I took the whole year. And I'm enjoying the time . . . I felt that anytime you get a chance to take some time off after 30 years in the plant is pretty good."

While the opportunity to have time off was a major consideration for Larry, he was also concerned about younger, less-senior workers. Such altruistic sentiments were also expressed by Al (033), Bob (034), Mike (036), and Dave (040).

Al, who said he would have retired if he hadn't been laid off under the inverse plan, thought 30 years in the plant was long enough.

"Once you spend 30 years in the shop, it's time to get out, you know. Let somebody else have a chance. Because I was probably as far as I was gonna go anyway. And I wasn't really thinking about any promotions or anything like that."

Bob, with 27 years and near retirement, said that giving someone else a chance to work and his own imminent retirement figured prominently in his decision to take the inverse layoff.

"My main reason for taking it was to give somebody else the chance to stay working. Myself, I'm single. I feel why stay there when somebody else can be

staying working. That is one of my main reasons but not all of it. . .It gives me leisure time to be able to understand, maybe, when I retire what it's going to feel like and what I'm gonna do."

Mike, too, was concerned about less-senior workers. Numerous workers in his shop had nine and a half years seniority and they were going to be laid off. They needed 10 years seniority to be eligible for income beyond state unemployment benefits (specifically SUB and Guaranteed Income Stream) during layoff. But Mike also wanted relief from the stress of his job.

". . .being a truck driver, I'm subject to a lot of stress because I'm moving enormous weights around a lot of people walking. You actually like burn out. So I wanted a break from that. That's one of the reasons I took into consideration when I signed up. Just to get away for a while."

But Mike also worried about a strike.

"Another thing that entered in, too, when I was thinking about it. I was thinking, well, if the contract comes up and there's a three-month strike at General Motors and I'm working, I'm gonna get a hundred dollars a week. And if I'm out here laid off I'm gonna get three hundred some dollars. I was going either way but if I'd have been thinking about staying I'd have been scared to stay on account of the strike possibility. That's one thing that kind of, it didn't really sway me either way, but if I'd have been swayable, that's one thing that would have done it."

Dave (040) volunteered to be laid off for four months. He was fearful about his financial security, which is why he didn't take the layoff for a longer period of time, but he

wanted to find out what it would be like to have a large amount of time off.

"I just wanted to find out what it's like to be off that long. . . See what I could find to do to occupy my time. . . Just to really get prepared for retirement."

He elaborated,

"I think the only time that I've had off like this was when we had a strike or something like that. Then when we had the cars in the plant, that was back in the sixties. This is the longest I've had off since that time. It's not bad. It's something that, it makes you think. It makes you wonder about what's gonna happen when you don't go back to work. When this is it. There's got to be something to keep you going. To keep you active. You have to get into something. Time can really get up on you before you know it."

While altruistic sentiments toward less-senior co-workers figured in Dave's decision to take the inverse layoff, he expressed hope that those who benefited by his sacrifice were grateful for it.

"I just hope the guys that we took the layoff and the guys that we gave a chance to stay in the plant learn something about it. I figure that by being in the union we have, we're called brother and sister, I think we gave a lot. A lot of these guys, they leave the plant and go out to give these guys a chance to build up their benefits. I think they ought to appreciate it. Cuz we really didn't have to do it. By them having low seniority, they would have been out there on the street."

The two women in the sample of work sharers saw the inverse layoff as an opportunity to try to solve some family and personal problems. Sharon (044) was reluctant to reveal

details but noted that problems at home and some encouragement from others entered into her decision to take the layoff.

"At first I wasn't going to take it. I had some personal problems at home so everybody thought, well, time off will clear your head."

Mary's (038) situation was interesting because both she and her husband took the layoff for seven months (unfortunately, he was unwilling to be interviewed). They were separated and on the verge of divorce when the inverse layoff plan was designed.

". . .my family life was falling apart and I figured if we both had the time off . . .we could make a new start. And that's why I did it. Plus the simple fact that it's that much time off. I was just glad to take it because I haven't had that much time off in a long time."

Mary's fears about bill payments and family finances prevented her and her husband from taking the layoff for a year--a decision she regretted.

"I regret not taking it til May. [Why is that?] Because I'm really enjoying myself. And we're getting our family life back together and every day is great. It's like every day is Saturday. I've been married fourteen years and I didn't want to lose that. I wish that we could extend it longer, as of now. The bills are fine and we're making it just fine."

For Carl (035) and Ted (039), both single and both at mid-career, conditions in the plant led them to take the layoff to consider employment alternatives. Their experiences as autoworkers had made them somewhat bitter and

cynical. Carl was quite honest in recounting his reasons for taking the layoff.

"Well, there's a lot of factors, reasons why I chose it. One of the basic ones was that I got paid for doing nothing. I wanted out. I was really debating at the time when they came up with this whether to take a complete buyout . . . One of the reasons I didn't take it (the buyout) was because I have 15 years in next month and by about six months I was going to lose \$10,000 in the buyout, from 35 gross to 45 gross. . . Actually, it (the layoff) was a chance to get out of there. Get out of there for a year and check out other things. See what else is going on. After 14 1/2 years, I've had just about enough. To tell you the truth, I don't want to go back. But basically, like I said, it was a chance to get out. I really had enough of that place for a while. Plus I could still collect benefits. My benefits are still in full except for dental. I'm protected under everything else. Why not? Paid vacation for the year. It's kind of the answer to your prayers."

Carl's discontent stemmed largely from the repetitiveness of his job and his feeling that he didn't fit into the shop subculture. Ted's dissatisfaction, on the other hand, stemmed from supervisor-worker relations. He had had some problems that affected his work and had been suspended for five months several years ago. His blemished work record still haunted him. He wanted to consider other employment when he took the layoff.

In summary, the work sharers had a variety of reasons for volunteering for layoff under the inverse seniority plan. Most wanted time off; many wanted to give others an opportunity to keep their jobs. Those near retirement

thought of their layoff as a kind of temporary retirement, a chance to try retirement before committing themselves to the real thing. Family relationships, the possibility of strike, consideration of employment alternatives, and job-related stress were also elements in their decisions to volunteer for layoff. While the two women in the sample tended to give greater priority to family concerns than did the men, there was considerable overlap in other reasons given by the women and men interviewed. Perhaps what variation there was in reasons for taking the layoff differed more by seniority and individual experience.

Work Schedules

The work sharers had almost complete control of their time on the layoff because they had no work schedule to attend to until callback. Picking up checks every two weeks was the main work-related limit on their time, but even this didn't affect those who had arranged for their checks to be mailed to them.

On the job, the work sharers had little control over their work schedules. The plant was organized into three shifts, and starting and quitting times varied somewhat by job classification. Generally, first shift started at 6:00 a.m., when the line started, and ended at 2:30 p.m. Second shift started at 3:30 p.m. and ended at midnight, and the only member of the sample who worked third shift had a work schedule of 3:30 a.m. to noon. Some informants who didn't work on the line and did work in preparation for the line

had starting times earlier than the line's start time, e.g. 5:30 a.m. or 2:30 p.m. Eight informants worked first shift at the time they were laid off, three worked second shift, and one worked third. As a group they weren't working much overtime, perhaps half an hour to an hour each day with few Saturdays.

When these workers began working in the plant, they were generally assigned a shift. Once in the plant, however, it was possible to request a shift change, but one's ability to obtain a shift change depended on one's job classification, seniority, and which shift was desired. Second and third were generally less difficult to get than first because first is generally more desirable and the competition for it is greater. Workers, however, can also be bumped from a shift, e.g. from first to second. Therefore, the work sharers' ability to control their work schedules on the job came in their ability to request alternative shifts. They could also request transfers to other departments and/or job classifications, which could or could not mean a shift change. Such transfers also took place on a seniority basis.

In conclusion, the work sharers had considerable control of their time on the layoff but had relatively little control of their time on the job. This might explain why they embraced the opportunity for time off with such enthusiasm. The layoff permitted a temporary respite from the rigidity of work schedules and the repetition of work in

the auto plant, and it was something many of the work sharers believed they deserved given the number of years they had worked in the plant and the time that had passed since they had "much time off."

Conclusion

What should be concluded from the foregoing comparison of the terms and conditions of job sharing, temporary employment, part-time employment, and work sharing? The job sharers received prorated benefits with full health insurance coverage. They had considerable control over their work schedules, negotiating them with their partners, subject to supervisory approval. There were important exceptions, however, in cases where supervisors created the task division between job-share partners as well as their work schedules. Thus, schedule control is not a component of job sharing by definition. While job sharing can permit greater control for workers, management can also take control of job sharing to use it for its own purposes. Thus, job sharing remains an object of labor-management struggle.

The temporaries in this study were eligible for some benefits after so many hours of work. They had little control over their work schedules beyond specifying preferences for full-time or part-time temporary employment and days of the week and periods of time during the day during which they would like to work. Temporaries' control over their schedules really rests in deciding whether to

work, whether to accept or reject placements. However, they cannot assert this control unless they are offered placements, but they cannot control when placements will be offered or their duration. Thus, temporaries must live with considerable uncertainty regarding whether and how much they will work.

Some part-time workers must live with similar uncertainty. In this study it was those who worked in the retail sector who experienced the most uncertainty in terms of work schedules and number of hours of work each week. Those in government and health care had regular hours, regular schedules, and most had some control over their schedules. Not all part-time workers received employee benefits, but many did. Some who received benefits were union members, others were not. Those who did not receive any benefits, however, were not represented by a labor union. In the retail sector especially, part-time employment benefits employers by permitting flexibility in staffing responsive to market demand.

Finally, the work sharers had considerable control of their time on layoff and substantial incomes and benefits during the period of layoff. They were the beneficiaries of an historical benefit structure established to accommodate cyclical fluctuations inherent in the automobile industry. They had very little control of their work schedules, however, when they were on the job. Their work schedules existed within a rigid shift system organized around the

operation of the assembly line. Not only does the line set the pace of work under a system of technical labor control, it also establishes work schedules in the plant and, indirectly, controls the scheduling of workers' lives.

CHAPTER 7

Children and Autonomy

To assess autonomy off the job, one must first know what those who work less than full time do with their time off the job and what they would like to do with it. Only then is it possible to begin to determine the extent to which what they do is an expression of autonomy or self-determination. What conditions enhance their ability to do what they want to do and what conditions inhibit this ability? Chapters 7 through 11 attempt to answer this question by examining in turn the different ways informants in this study used their time off the job and autonomy issues related to each.

Informants' use of time off the job has been sorted into five broad categories: Childcare, Household Work, Recreation, Community and Relational Activities, and Education and Other Employment. No one pursued activities in all of these categories, but few reported pursuing activities in just one area. While one or two areas may have predominated, most everyone had a number of interests and commitments that consumed their time off the job.¹

¹ Informants were asked how they spent most of their time off and then were asked what other things they did in their time off the job. I realize that informants may well have felt compelled to put their best foot forward. Few, for example, mentioned that they watched television. It's entirely possible that this was a sample that represented

This chapter focuses on the first of the five categories, childcare, and examines informants' perceptions of autonomy related to the care of children. The relationship between children and autonomy is important to examine because so many women who work less than full time do so to accommodate childcare. Those writers who assume greater autonomy off the job under conditions of reduced work should consider carefully the relationship between children and autonomy. It is hoped this chapter will point the way.

It is obvious from reasons given for working less than full time discussed in chapter 6 that many informants used much of their time off the job caring for young children. This was particularly true for most of the job sharers and about half of the part-time workers. Only one of the work sharers spent much of her time caring for a young child and none of the temporaries did. Notably, all of those for whom childcare was uppermost in their use of time off the job were women.

disproportionately non-TV viewers, but I doubt that given national statistics on TV viewing. Instead, I am inclined to think that television was insignificant in their use of time off the job. The way the questions were posed in the interview, and the fact that a checklist of items was not used, meant that informants had considerable discretion in deciding how to respond. My goal was not to determine everything the informants did in their time off or exactly how much time they devoted to various activities (thus time budgets were not used) but only that which was most significant to them. In addition, time spent on very private and personal matters was generally not disclosed, nor was it asked for.

Few of those who spent most of their time off caring for children did it because they felt they had to or because there was no one else to do it. Instead, they wanted to be involved in their children's lives. Even Martha (008), who was on a career path when she took two demotions so she could job share and spend more time at home with her children, accepted that having children when she did was her choice. She recognized the limits placed by contemporary society on young mothers, accepted them as limits imposed on her, but hoped someday they could be removed. She commented that having children

"did interrupt my job, but with society being the way it is nowadays, I knew it would. . .I didn't want it to. . .I don't think it necessarily has to . . .but it did. . .It was a welcome interruption. . .I don't have negative feelings. My feelings are more like, it's too bad and let's try and change it."

Martha also believed if she hadn't been laid off from the management-level civil service job she had held some years previously, she might have been able to incorporate into that job the flexibility she needed for childcare. Therefore, she would have had a stimulating job and time for her children.

Susan (018), Sarah (017), and Mary (038) hadn't experienced the employment problems that Martha had. The acquisition of job flexibility to accommodate childcare had not come at great cost to them. Each spoke rather extensively about the importance of being involved in their

children's lives. Susan's children were two and four years old.

"I try and plan things. Tuesday and Thursday my son goes to preschool, so we get up and have breakfast and take him to preschool. Then my daughter and I come back and we do Jane Fonda's Workout. She loves that. Then we kind of pick up and do stuff. Quite often we pick up (my son) at 11:30, we either come home and do crafts or something at home, finger painting, baking. My mother-in-law thinks I'm crazy. She can't understand where I get all my patience. But my mother was like that. We had five kids in my family. She let us do everything because you could always clean up. Sometimes I plan things with other friends that have kids. My kids go to a sitter when I work and she has two girls and a newborn. But other than that, my daughter doesn't really get out with other kids. Her brother gets to go to preschool. They both take gymnastics . . . so Tuesday we take (my son) and Thursday we take (my daughter). I guess basically my days off I spend time making sure they get to the places they're supposed to go and getting involved in their lives. That's really important to both my husband and I that they spend a lot of time with us."

Sarah said she spends most of her time off with her three-year-old daughter.

"When I used to work from 8 to 1, I wouldn't pick her up until 1:30 and at that point in the day she wouldn't have had her nap. She'd be pretty wound up when I'd get her home and I'd struggle with her to get her down for her nap. Before you'd know it, it'd be four o'clock. So now (that I have changed my schedule to 8:30 to 2:30) she pretty much gets her nap out of the way by the time I pick her up. So we do things together. (We go) shopping. We've been working with her alphabet, reading, drawing, you know, trying to teach her

how to write her letters, things like that."

Mary, who had worked first shift (6:00-2:30) since her daughter's birth, had missed many of her daughter's waking hours. Her time off on the inverse layoff became an opportunity to spend those hours with her.

"I have a four-year-old daughter. It's her last year before she goes to school, and she is so precious that we're enjoying every minute with her. Really get to know her."

Later in the interview, Mary picked up this line of thought.

"Once they go to school, it's like they lose that super innocence that she has now. . . She's so precious in the morning . . . just eating her breakfast and things like that. And she's got something to say every second, and I missed all that."

She talked about a nature walk they had taken the day before to illustrate her newfound bond with her daughter.

"We were in the thumb of Michigan yesterday just walking around on paths . . . we went for a nature walk and ended up right on the beach of the bay, and she collected shells. . . We'll be able to see fall and winter. She's learning how the seasons change; kids even have to learn that. 'Why are the leaves falling?' So you can be there and teach her all these things instead of some daycare lady telling her."

Elizabeth (006) enjoyed working part time and felt sorry for mothers who have to work full time.

"You got the best of both worlds, I guess I've always thought, because you've got extra money by working but yet you've got days with your kids at home. I think you have a lot better attitude. . . I feel

sorry for mothers who have to work full time because you miss a lot with your kids by not being there, especially when they're younger."

A few men also commented on spending their time off with children. The three discussed here were all on inverse layoff and hadn't typically had large periods of time to spend with their children. These men differ from the women discussed previously in that their children were adolescents and adults. Adolescents, of course, require a different kind of care and supervision than do young children, and grown children have left the nest. Despite these important differences, these men valued their time with their children.

Paul's (037) son was 12. He spent considerable time, even before he was laid off, with his son's Cub Scout troop and softball team. He accompanied the troop on nature hikes and was in a five-man rotation serving as coaches and umpires for softball games. His son had joined his school's wrestling team and Paul planned to attend his son's matches. During the summer when his son was on summer vacation and Paul was laid off, the family travelled within the state of Michigan. Paul described a playful relationship with his son and contrasted it with his son's friends' relationships with their fathers and stepfathers as well as his own relationship with his father.

"I think basically what it is is just that I have to be home because I see so much. He's got friends that, they'll come over and we'll be wrestling or something like that and they just

can't understand how I'll be off the couch and wrestle with him or kid him or aggravate him and they just can't understand because their dads or stepdads just don't do that. They think that's really something. And I've always said that because my dad was never a giving person. He'd come in from work and he'd set in his chair and he'd go to sleep and get up and eat supper and then he'd go back and set in his chair and watch TV and go to sleep again. And I've never been that way. . . Dad was always work, work, work, and I can't understand that. . ."

John (042), the father of a 16-year-old son and a 14-year-old daughter, had worked first shift since his son was five. He had transferred at that time from second to first shift to spend his evenings at home with his family. Some other work sharers in the sample had made such shift changes for similar reasons. But by working first shift, John had missed mornings with his children. When I asked him to describe a typical day on the layoff, his description of the day before included reference to newfound time with his children.

"Yesterday, got up about 7:00. Hung around until the kids go off to school. They're both in high school. That's something I've really enjoyed. I've never been able to do that before."

Ted (039) was divorced and had become estranged from his children over the years. He had begun making some changes in his life before he was laid off, and the layoff gave him an opportunity to continue to make those changes. He rekindled relationships with a brother, his mother, and a grown son.

"I've got into the (Detroit) Tigers for the first time in years. I've been to the ballpark eleven times this year since June. . .And that's something that's allowed me to spend some more time with my older brother. . .Kind of a closeness that I kind of like. Get along a little better with my mother. . .and my son and his wife. I've been able to spend some time with them. Took (my son and his wife) to a couple ballgames. Took them down to Detroit one weekend and kept them there for the whole weekend. Went to two ballgames. . .I was pretty well estranged from them. . .I didn't spend much time with kids from my marriage. It's kind of. . .It's nice having the time to reestablish those lines of communication. . ."

Clearly, many informants with children reported that they enjoyed the time with their children gained by being laid off or working less than full time. It's noteworthy, however, that those most directly involved in the care of young children were women. The type of care required by young children and the fact that it is women principally responsible for it raises important questions about the relationship between children and autonomy. How does the presence of children limit autonomy? What autonomy is gained by children's absence or their developing independence? Might the care of children contribute to a parent's autonomy if that care contributes to a parent's self-development?

Several women deferred autonomy because they had young children. Carol (001) had attended a community college but quit when her first child was about a year old. She wanted to go back to complete her degree but couldn't see doing it

until both of her children go to school full time. She commented that it would be hard to return to school with a preschooler at home. An added difficulty, however, was the fact that her husband worked second shift at an auto plant.

"My husband sleeps late and he's with the kids in the afternoon for four hours before he goes to work. He helps out as much as he can on weekends but then there have been weekends where he has to work Saturdays, too. I think that when they're on an afternoon shift like that, . . . the mother has quite a bit of responsibility with the kids. It's very hard for me to get out in the evenings and do things because I have to find a babysitter."

Carol noted that her husband had worked an 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. shift a couple years ago.

"That was beautiful. He was home every evening to help out. We shared the responsibility of childcare and I was able to get out in the evenings a little bit. That worked out beautiful, but he got bumped off there. . . You have to go where you can. Days does not work out well for him at all. He's not a person to get up real early. They start at 6:30, I think. We tried it for a few months, and he's not a day person."

In Carol's case, then, her children imposed something of a limitation on her autonomy, but this limitation was added to by her husband's work schedule. While it appears her husband could work first shift if he wanted to, which would make him available for childcare in the evenings, Carol's autonomy was sacrificed to her husband's need not to work days.

Martha (008) missed not being in school as well. She had completed the equivalent of two years of college before her children were born and was considering returning to school. While she did not perceive her marriage and children as having interrupted her schooling because she was "just taking classes" and not working toward a degree, she did perceive her children as a interruption in recreational activities she previously enjoyed.

"I used to play volleyball once a week. I miss that. And believe it or not, with four children, I have always enjoyed my private times. Maybe a walk down the road by myself. Maybe just going to the library and reading for a little while. These are things I would enjoy doing if I had the time. And I will again someday. But right now with trying to work and the little ones and providing for them first of all, those things have gone by the wayside. And they will for a little while longer."

Martha's autonomy was limited by what she perceived as her own unique life circumstance. She had four children, all age five and under, and her husband was self-employed with an irregular, "crazy" schedule.

"I wouldn't change it for the world, but that's the reason for the job share. I guess sometimes I feel, oh, maybe I feel I was penalized for having the children and needing to have that flexibility in my life."

She noted that not only was it difficult to get time to herself, but it had also become difficult for her and her husband to find time alone. They wanted a family, were thrilled to have one, but free time had come to be devoted

to the children. Their relationship became secondary in importance to the children. She thought about weekend trips to northern Michigan that she and her husband might make, but felt "four little ones" was a "tremendous responsibility" to leave with someone, even family. Then she joked,

"Unless I was absolutely, positively filthy rich. Then I would hire me a nanny. . .and a housekeeper."

Here again the demands of childcare coupled with the social constraints of gender have led to a sacrifice of autonomy for Martha.

Some women manage to steal some private time after their children go to bed at night. Kathy (002), however, couldn't do that because her son, who she described as a "terrible sleeper," wouldn't go to bed until she and her husband went to bed. She could only fantasize about what she would do with that time if she had it. She imagined reading, crocheting, "taking a nice leisurely bath." Instead, she summarized her situation by stating, "I don't have free time."

Tina (004) and her husband, both of whom took music lessons and played in a band in their time off the job, were contemplating having children but had concerns about the effect children would have on their artistic pursuits.

"That's one of our most talked about topics. I suppose you can plan and talk but you never really know. I suppose it would put a big crunch on it at least for a few months. I really want to have children and I

think it's time. I think we both would continue playing. We'd probably stop somewhat at first. . . Maybe the kid could grow up to be a drummer. . . We'd have a trio."

The limits imposed on personal autonomy by children were revealed further by informants' comments about freedom gained in the absence of children or as children become increasingly independent. Jean's (027) son was 12, old enough that she could leave him without a sitter.

"If I want to get in the truck and run to (the store) or something, if I don't feel like taking him with me, I don't have to go get a sitter, or I don't have to put up with a screaming, yelling kid in (the store) because I've been in there two hours."

Larry (043) noted the financial constraints associated with raising children. His children were grown and had left home, but he reflected on their effect on his time off the job.

"I never took vacation time off until the last maybe seven, eight years. It seemed to me like you never had the money to go. Of course, when you're raising a family. . ."

He added,

"I went through some layoffs when I was bringing my family up. I raised three children, and it's hard. . . you couldn't do nothing. You couldn't enjoy yourself because you couldn't even go someplace, because you was afraid. How about if they call me back and I'm not there?. . . Sometimes you can't even go fishing for a couple, two, three days because you're afraid they're gonna call you back."

On the inverse layoff, Larry had the security of knowing he had a job to return to at the end of his year's layoff, and he could request an early return if he wanted to.

"When I was laid off before, I didn't know if I'd go back in the plant. I didn't know if I was gonna have a job. Here it's kind of more safe. So you're a lot more relaxed, more at ease in the idea that you can go back to work anytime. I can go back to work anytime I want. And I have the seniority and that's important."

Because Larry's children were grown and his wife was not employed, they were free to travel.

"A lot of people don't take time off because they think they don't have enough money. But by being just you and your wife, like me and my wife, we're doing well. . . I've been off four, five months and I'm doing fine. And I'm willing to stay (off) til next year. . . See, if I had some children I couldn't go anywhere unless I went by myself because the children have to go to school. Since I don't have that, like I said, I go up north quite often. In fact, I had the idea of going up there for the whole year (but decided against it). I can leave here in the middle of the week. I don't like to travel up north and come back on the weekends because, you know, the traffic. But I can go on say Tuesday or Wednesday and come back on Tuesday or Wednesday."

Larry's sense of autonomy came from the security of knowing he had a job to return to, financial security because his unemployment benefits and SUB were sufficient for him and his wife, and their freedom to travel because

they didn't have dependent children. Larry also liked being able to choose his travel time, rather than having to travel on weekends when he worked full time.

Helen (031), the single mother of a 16-year-old son, anticipated her son's leaving the nest.

"He's looking forward to going into the service. He's wanted to do that for the last five years. I don't know. It's hard to imagine that if you come home, if you don't want to eat that night you don't have to fix anything. If you want to just sit there and sew until bedtime, you can. More freedom. Possibly go back to school."

The limits imposed by children on personal autonomy were addressed realistically by these informants. As a culture we recognize the financial and time constraints associated with childrearing, but we leave it to individuals to solve pressures and conflicts associated with such constraints. Recent advocates of family policy in the United States, such as U.S. Representative Patricia Schroeder (D-Colorado) and authors Sylvia Ann Hewlett and Ruth Sidel, have called for more generous federal government support for "working families" through the provision of children's allowances and more widely available and affordable daycare. They have also called for employers to build flexible work schedules into their organizations. Such changes, they believe, would support parents who work outside the home in their efforts to raise the next generation.

But I think it is one-sided to look only at the limitations on autonomy imposed by children. Childrearing also provides opportunities for personal development, a growth that occurs only through intimate involvement in another, unfolding life. Childrearing and the time gained through job sharing opened such opportunities for growth and self-fulfillment for Barbara (005).

"My goal was always, well I'm going to work a few years then stay home with the children. That's really what I wanted to do. But financially and with just the way things went. . . so I worked full time with them (her two oldest children) and always felt like I did as much as I physically and mentally could do, but it wasn't what I really wanted to give them. I wanted to give them more of my time. So when this last one came along unexpectedly, the other children were 11 and 12 years old. So my husband and I said, 'okay, if we're ever gonna do it, this would be the time.'"

Barbara's husband owned his own business at the time she became pregnant with their third child and she considered quitting her full-time job. But six months after her daughter was born, her husband's business failed. Her job-share partner had been courting her to this time but Barbara kept insisting that she wanted to stay home full time. But once the business failed, she needed a job, although she still didn't want to work outside the home full time. Job sharing was the compromise she needed.

In her time off the job, Barbara had become very actively involved in her youngest child's school and school-

related activities. For example, when her daughter was still preschool age, Barbara worked at and attended board meetings of her daughter's cooperative nursery school. Once her daughter began school, Barbara became an officer in the home-school organization and a troop leader for her daughter's Brownie troop. She described this as "doing things I always wanted to do with the other kids but just couldn't." I asked her how she decided to get involved in her daughter's school activities.

"I think that's a decision you make even before your children are born. You have a predetermined idea in your mind what you want. I'm a firm believer that the more you give your children. . .the more they get out of the educational process. I always wanted to give more to the other kids. I don't know if it's guilt or what. I never really delved into it. I don't consciously feel guilty. . .and maybe it's for my own gratification. But when I had the extra time available to me I thought, oh great, I'm going to do certain things with her that I always wished I could do."

Barbara's sentiments reflect what I call the self-other nexus. She is not so absorbed in her daughter's life that she has no sense of herself as a separate being. She is not other-directed. She noted, for example, that she tries to reserve some time off the job for herself. Yet as a separate being she grows from her involvement in her daughter's education and school-related activities and is fulfilled by them. After all, these are things Barbara "always wished" she could do. Therefore, if she had continued to be prevented from doing them by full-time

employment, something in herself would have been denied. This is an unconventional approach to the idea of autonomy because it suggests that separation and connection exist in a kind of yin/yang relationship. Self-development occurs through self-determined activities and relations with others. Self and other are a unity. This is consistent with the feminine sense of self-in-relation expounded by Chodorow and Gilligan.

It should be noted that Barbara's autonomy, her freedom to work less than full time in particular, was facilitated by the fact that there was a second earner in the household. This is true for virtually all of the women in this study who worked less than full time, cared for young children, and believed they had "the best of both worlds." Few of them addressed the fact that they could have the best of both worlds because there was a second earner in the home. When pressed for what might force them to work full time, many mentioned financial problems and some mentioned divorce. But the ones who mentioned divorce tended to dismiss it as a possibility, feeling secure in the stability of their marriages.

Traditional definitions of gender prevailed in this sample of individuals working less than full time. Childcare tended to be the responsibility of women primarily, although men "helped" when they could. To the extent that reduced work facilitates time for childcare, it reinforces patriarchal gender relations.

The argument that childrearing may be a source of personal fulfillment and development is not meant to be an argument for the status quo in gender relations and the childcare division of labor. It is instead meant to be an argument that men miss opportunities for personal development when they are not very involved in their children's lives. Expanded work-time reduction for men, under conditions of adequate pay and employment security with greater control of work schedules, could facilitate greater involvement in their children's lives. Their children could benefit from closer relations with their father as could they benefit from closer relations with their children. It could also benefit women with wage-paying jobs and children to care for if it frees some of their time to pursue education, recreational activities, or other activities they enjoy. The sheer manipulation of time, however, would not guarantee such benefits. Patriarchal gender ideologies that discourage men from developing their capacity for nurturance and social structures that maintain women's economic dependence on men must also be transcended. As long as patriarchal gender ideologies prevail, few men will risk being nurturant, and as long as women remain economically dependent on men, they will not have the power to challenge patriarchy in their own homes.

CHAPTER 8

Household Work and Autonomy

Everyone in the sample had household work of some kind to do in his/her time off the job. This is no surprise, of course, since houses must be cleaned and maintained, meals prepared, clothing laundered, lawns mowed, groceries purchased, bills paid, and the like. Because they are necessary elements of living, everyone does these things unless they hire someone to do them. Many informants talked about household work as something they did in their time off the job. They discussed how much they did, the quality of what they did, the pace at which they did it, and its organization in time.

There were important differences among the informants regarding household work. Those who had children and owned homes tended to have more household work than those who did not, at least to the extent that their conversations reflected this. Single persons who lived alone had less to do than those with children, but they had more to do than singles who shared a household with other singles or with parents.

Gender differences were also apparent in the kinds of household tasks my informants did. With some important exceptions, such as single men who lived alone and one man

who was a partner in a particularly egalitarian relationship, women tended to be responsible for cooking, cleaning, laundry, and shopping while men were responsible for such tasks as maintenance of the dwelling's physical structure, mowing the lawn, automobile repair, and the like. These tasks the men called "projects," "jobs," or "work around the house" as distinct from housework, the latter conventionally thought of as "women's work." I use the term household work here to refer to "women's work" and to men's "projects." Therefore, the term, broad enough to encompass gender differences in household work done by my informants, includes a wide array of activities done in and around the living quarters to maintain them, the yard, household members, and items owned and used by them, for example, automobiles.

The objective of this chapter, however, is not to document the household tasks performed by my informants or how much they did relative to others. Such information is incidental to the relationship between household work and autonomy. The chapter takes as given the household tasks performed by the informants and inquires into the relationship between those tasks and the time available to do them under conditions of reduced work. For many, but not all by any means, reduced work provided opportunities to catch up on household work and to gain greater control over household work by having more time within which to select

time to do it, slowing down the pace at which it could be done, and/or having larger blocks of time in which to do it.

The theme of catching up appeared in interviews in which the informants had previously worked full-time weeks, such as part-time workers who had worked 40-hour weeks for some time and autoworkers who had taken the inverse seniority layoff. Joanne (020), for example, had worked 48-hour weeks in her part-time job during the holiday season but had been cut back to 15 after the holiday rush.

"When you work seasonal, like when I was working 48 hours, I didn't have time to do anything. Now it's like I'm catching up. I took everything in my room apart. It was a mess."

Paul (037), who had done some traveling with his family during the summer months while he was laid off, spent the fall catching up on household work.

"Now I've mostly spent my time catching up all the little jobs that I was too tired to do whenever I was working before. Painting the house and so on and so forth."

Mike (036) described at some length his backlog of household work.

"Well, you know how you always got these projects you want to do when you're working you can't do them? I made a list when I got laid off. I took about a week off and I put on my coveralls and I took care of a bunch of stuff I wanted to do for myself, my own stuff. And I got that done. Like I had three off-road machines that I had financed and I wasn't really using them. I got a bad back. So I cleaned 'em up, fixed 'em up, shined 'em up, and set 'em out and sold 'em. Paid all the loans off. I got rid of three loans that I had and

three machines that I was paying on and really wasn't using. I got rid of those. I got a real nice Cadillac that had a bunch of rust. . . So I sanded them all out, took and had it painted, had a nice tune up on it. I just took care of all that stuff that piles up when you're working."

The household work that Paul and Mike did was typical of that done by most of the men interviewed for this study. Bill (024), a job sharer who worked two days a week, liked to work on and around the old farmhouse he owned. He described himself as a "do-it-yourselfer" and enjoyed doing his own auto repair. He also refinished antiques. Ed (013), one of the temporaries, "puttered" around the house, and Harold (015), another temporary, "worked around the house" and "on the car." Mark (028), who worked seasonally, painted the kitchen as his first major off-the-job project and took over from his partner all the "household duties" other than shopping, specifically cleaning, laundry, and daily meal preparation. Tim (041) used his summer months on the layoff to remodel an old house he and his wife had purchased. This was a project expected to take quite some time since their goal was to restore the house to its original condition as much as possible. He had started the remodelling before he was laid off, working "some evenings, not every one, depending how tired you were." The layoff gave him the opportunity to enjoy the work of remodelling and still have free time. He described what it was like to do the remodelling in addition to working full time.

"Well, you would do it but you wouldn't have any free time. It'd be work work. Now I have the pleasure of working."

For Mike, working full time had been a disincentive to doing household projects because his work schedule interrupted his time to do household work.

"When you're working, like I work second shift. When I get up in the morning, it's hard to start a project because you're not gonna get it done, you have to drop your tools and leave things setting around and go to work. So you don't start those projects. Now that I got all day every day. . . it's easy to start something and get it done. Because you can stick to it."

Paul's autonomy was in his ability to decide when to work on household "jobs" and to spread them over time.

"I think the biggest difference (between being laid off and working full time) is I feel better because I know that Saturday rolls around I don't have to put everything in two days. I can spread it out. I used to, if I get up on Saturday morning, have to do something. And I'd work myself to a frazzle to try to get it done. And Saturday night would roll around I was on the couch sleeping. Since I've been laid off, I do just as much but I can spread it out over whenever I want to do it. My brother, his wife bakes cakes. She needed a kitchen put down in the basement. Her business is skyrocketing. . . And so I went over and helped him put that in. Before I would never even think about helping him. Now that I got the time. . . I think basically the whole thing of it is that General Motors don't govern my time. I'm my own governor. That's what the difference is. Not that I have that much more time. Because I don't because I usually, even now I

usually don't get started until two o'clock in the afternoon, but it is still my time. I don't have to worry about getting up and going in to work. It makes a difference."

Many of the women expressed similar sentiments about household work under conditions of reduced work. While women and men in the sample tended to do different household tasks--women did the housecleaning, meal preparation, laundry, and shopping--the women's attitudes about being able to spread their household work over time and to choose when to do it were similar to those of the men.

Elaine (003), one of the job sharers, married and the mother of two children, said she spent most of her time off the job doing what she would "otherwise" do, but she wasn't rushed.

"My house is cleaner, my laundry doesn't have to be done all day Saturday. I can do it throughout the week. I don't have to do my grocery shopping on Saturday or my banking on Saturday. I can do it slowly throughout the week."

For Elaine, then, working less than full time meant she could achieve a higher standard of cleanliness in her house and she could do household work at a slower pace and spread over several days. Her comments, like Paul's, provide some insight into the relationship between household work and autonomy. Most everyone in the sample perceived household work as work that had to be done, although some tasks may be more or less enjoyable. In this sense, there is little autonomy in household work. The autonomy comes, however, in

the household worker's ability to decide what to do (to select from an array of tasks that must be done--although even this can be influenced by the needs of other household members) and when to do it. By working less than full time, informants did not have to try to complete household work in a small, perhaps fixed amount of time, for example, weekends. Barbara's (005) remarks were instructive here. She noted that she stopped grocery shopping on weekends once she began to job share. She added,

"When I worked full time I did everything on weekends, absolutely everything. And I still don't know how it was done."

And what she couldn't accomplish on weekends overflowed into her evenings during the week.

"(I had) strong resentments about working full time. . . I felt I was being forced to do certain things at a certain time, basically at night. . . (I) felt forced to grocery shop, do laundry at night, because there weren't enough hours on the weekend."

Kathy (002) had also benefited by getting out from under the tyranny of the 40-hour workweek. She preferred her job-share arrangement because she felt less pressure. She could use her days off during the week to clean house and grocery shop, household work she had to do on the weekend when she worked full time. Such temporal shifting of household work freed up her weekends.

"When you work full time, and even when you have children, you think you should be able to keep up with everything. And it bothers me a lot

when I can't. Meaning, you know, ornery. You know, ornery because it's pressure. A lot of pressure on me. I know I take it out on my husband, everybody. Short temper with the kids. . . (Working part time) is a lot less pressure on me. . . I don't have time for everything even now. But I can do my grocery shopping on my day off and try to get the house clean so I can have the weekends more free."

Once Tina (004) began job sharing, the temporal shift of household work from weekends to weekdays made weekends quality time for her and her husband.

"I plan to get all my household duties and the cooking and stuff done while (my husband) works full time, say on Thursday or Friday. Then I can have my weekends with him."

Job sharing and some forms of part-time employment permitted such temporal shifts of household work when the work schedule associated with one's job was regular and permitted time off during the week. Part-time workers and temporaries who worked full-time weeks were still subject to the tyranny of the 40-hour workweek, however, despite reduced work. Diane (030), for example, was a part-time worker who worked 40-hour weeks when the work load required it. She still tried to "do everything" on weekends. She characterized weekends as time "for the kids," and for doing laundry, housecleaning, "catching up," and "sleeping in if I can."

Peggy (014) had worked full-time weeks as a temporary. She complained that most of her time off the job was spent doing household work.

"I'd rather be doing something other than having to clean house. I don't mind doing it but it seems like that's all I do. This is my first time, really, this last year, working full time. We've been in smaller towns. . . part time's been available. . . I enjoy the work but when I get home I'm just struggling. I'd rather do fun things. I'd rather have the time. . . A lot of times I skip (my husband's) concerts because of trying to get caught up from the week before. I'd rather really have the freedom to go and do some things. . . I think people are important and relationships are important and I'd like to be able to spend more time on them."

Part-time and temporary workers such as Diane and Peggy have to wait until work is slack or there is a break in placements to catch up on household work. Temporaries, of course, can create such a break for themselves by refusing placements for a period of time after a placement ends. This opportunity to catch up on household work, however, comes at the expense of lost income--an expense few temporaries in my sample could afford. Therefore, temporaries like Peggy must live with feeling like they are behind in their household work and sacrificing relationships in their struggle to keep up.

It was noted in chapter 6 that work schedules for part-time workers and temporaries can be unpredictable and irregular. Such irregularity, however, did not necessarily inhibit informants' ability to complete their household

work. Most household tasks, particularly laundry, housecleaning, and shopping, can be adjusted to small nooks and crannies of time even if they are scheduled irregularly or arise unexpectedly. One might be prevented from doing more time-consuming household work, however, if one is inhibited by one's work schedule from getting blocks of time large enough to complete them.

Because household work is elastic, it can be made to fit almost any time available to the household worker. The minimum can be done (perhaps with maximum guilt) when the worker doesn't have a lot of time to do household work. But household work can also expand, perhaps infinitely, particularly if one reclaims from the market production of many household goods.

Tom (021), one of the temporaries who had had few placements (each of short duration), an unsuccessful job search, and a mobility-limiting handicap, had "extra time" on his hands. He spent much of his time doing housework and working in his yard, particularly in warm weather. He tended his flower and vegetable gardens, his fruit trees, grapevines, and berry bushes. His household work included canning produce from his gardens, trees, and bushes.

"I do my own canning. I'm divorced now six years so I kind of look after myself. My mother made all of us kids learn how to cook and bake and keep house and can and everything. Now it's come in awful handy. Because I put up all kinds of vegetables. Put stuff in the freezer, can stuff, make pickles."

In Tom's case, household work shaded into the realm of recreation. He had so much time and engaged in sufficiently creative household work that he gained pleasure from doing it, although he still preferred to have a wage-paying job. His situation is reminiscent of the romanticized image of the nineteenth-century housewife. But he suffered, like her, from the pitfalls of social isolation associated with privatized household work.

In summary, reduced work permitted some informants to catch up on undone household work when they experienced a significant reduction in working time. Those who had regular days off during the week could shift household work from weekends to weekdays, freeing weekend time for other activities. Those who gained large blocks of time in their time off the job were able to accomplish time-consuming tasks that might have remained undone or certainly would have been less pleasurable if such blocks of time had not become available. Reduced work in some forms also permitted informants to do household work at a slower pace and in some cases to raise their standards of quality.

Some forms of reduced work, however, were formally reduced work but substantively full time. Part-time workers and temporaries who worked full-time workweeks remained subject to the tyranny of the 40-hour workweek. They did not have the freedom that others had to choose when to do household work. Their household work had to be done on weekends and in the evenings during the week, and it imposed

on time that might have been used for recreational or relational purposes.

Household work's malleability permits it to be molded to nooks and crannies of time that become available when work schedules are unpredictable and irregular. It's elasticity permits it to expand to consume large amounts of time if one's reduced work is minimal in number of hours. Household work's expansibility, however, may be limited by other off-the job activities such as recreation, community activities, and education, topics to which I now turn.

CHAPTER 9

Recreation and Autonomy

Almost everyone (32/44 or 3/4 of the sample) reported that they spent some of their time off the job engaged in recreational activities. For many, these activities included other family members or friends. But for some, recreation was an opportunity for solitude.

Recreation includes a broad array of activities pursued by my informants: individual and team sports; outdoor activities such as gardening, camping, hunting, fishing, and boating; "indoor" activities such as sewing, crafts, knitting, reading, and computers; spectator activities such as sports, movies, and television viewing; and artistic pursuits such as music, painting, and photography. What all of these activities have in common is that they were pursued for their own sake (they were ends in themselves even though they produced a product in some cases), they were pleasurable for the individuals who did them, and they were sources of escape, relaxation, or rejuvenation.

The difficulties associated with separating recreation from household work and childcare should be noted. A family camping trip, for example, involves food preparation, clean up, and supervision of children. Sewing often produces clothing for oneself and other household members. Garden

produce is often cooked before it is consumed and large yields may be canned or frozen for future use. Deem (1986) has noted that housework and leisure frequently overlap, particularly for women. This occurs because women often pursue recreational activities that can be performed easily in and around the house in the presence of others and, like some household work, are readily adaptable to small quantities of time. However, it was clear in the interviews conducted for this study that the informants--both women and men--had separate conceptions of household work and recreation. Many implied that some activities had to be done whether they were enjoyable or not. This attitude colored their discussions of what I categorized previously as household work. The pleasurability, or lack thereof, however, was not necessarily an inherent quality of the task. An ordinarily unpleasant task could become enjoyable if one was not rushed in accomplishing it or if one could do it in the company of others. Recreational activities by contrast to household work were unequivocally pleasurable. The attitude that colored my informants' discussions of what I have here categorized as recreational activities conveyed a sense of enjoyment and choice.

There were some gender differences in the recreational activities preferred by my informants. Women tended to enjoy sewing, knitting, crafts, and gardening while men enjoyed camping, hunting, and fishing. There were several exceptions to these generalities, however. Some women

enjoyed camping and some men enjoyed gardening and knitting. Like the analysis of household work in chapter 8, my purpose in this chapter is not to document gender differences in recreational pursuits so much as it is to examine the ability to engage in recreational activities and the limits on such engagement relative to time regimes associated with reduced work.

Theoretically at least, because they worked less than full time or less than year round, my informants had more time than the average full-time worker to pursue recreational activities. While 3/4 of the sample did engage in some kind of recreational activity at least occasionally, as noted above, many still had unfulfilled interests. To what extent reduced work fostered my informants' ability to pursue recreational activities or prevented them from fulfilling their recreational interests is the objective of this chapter.

Reduced work freed up time for recreational pursuits for many of my informants. Job sharers Barbara (005) and Sylvia (007) both set aside some of their time off the job for such activities. Barbara took dance classes.

"I'm still a little bit selfish.
I like to have one of those days
for me. I try to keep a portion
of the day for me."

Sylvia liked to golf.

"The job sharing isn't just for the
kids. That is my prime reason for
being on it, but it gives me a
little time to. . .I'll golf now

and then. . .it gives me time for myself."

Other job sharers and part-time workers with children had difficulty finding time for recreation. This was especially true for Kathy (002) and Elizabeth (006). Kathy complained that she felt a lot of pressure from working outside the home, caring for two children, and trying to keep up with her household responsibilities, although she felt less pressure once she began job sharing. She complained, "I'm always doing laundry."

Kathy had recently begun to attend a jazzercise class for one hour once a week. She described it as her "hour out."

"Being so tied down to the house and kids was really getting to me this summer. I needed just something by myself, to get away. You know, it's not getting away taking the kids to the store. My husband said, 'You go out all the time.' Taking the kids shopping with me is not a release."

She recounted her decision to take jazzercise.

"My husband gets his times out, and I was resenting it."

Her husband went out two or three times a week and tended to make plans spontaneously. That made it difficult for Kathy to commit herself to a regular recreational activity. Finally, she settled on one night a week when his parents could care for the children if he couldn't.

Elizabeth (006) also yearned for time for herself but had had difficulty getting it.

"I think I should get away more and do more. . .Probably a few days I'd like to get a sitter and just go and have time by myself. I mean I know I have time by myself when I work but it'd be nice to take a day every once in a while. . .and just go shopping and not have to worry about it. But yet I don't because I'm working part time and I think I should be home with my children and things like that. My husband has told me I should do that more at night because he thinks I should take at least one night of the week and just go out and have time by myself. I'm going through this big thing where I feel like if I'm not working I have no time by myself. . . because my husband's not one of these men who's a real big help around the house or with the children. When I'm home, the responsibility's all put on me. He's aware of it but it just doesn't change and he doesn't think it'll get better unless I just leave the house and he's stuck with the responsibility. . .I feel our financial status doesn't really allow me to do that. Everything I enjoy doing costs money. . .I gotta change because my husband has a lot of extra activities that take the money too, but yet if we're both doing that then where's the money gonna come (from) to meet the bills?. . .I feel like one of us has to give so I guess right now it's me. . .I enjoy being home a lot with my kids, too. . .but I want him to be the same way. . .I do think about things I could do for time for myself which are not costly, but I haven't been successful yet. . . I enjoy needlecraft. . .but I can only do that after my kids get to bed and so in order for me to be able to do those things I'm staying up late lacking sleep. . .I don't want to make it sound like I don't get any time to do the things I enjoy doing but it seems to occur only when my other responsibilities are over. Where I feel for men they have it whenever they want. . .they get it periodically throughout the

day. . .where a woman has to schedule the time."

In these two cases, it was not the work schedule that was an obstacle to participation in recreational activities. An argument might be made that the children were the obstacle, but closer examination reveals that the husbands' lack of participation in childcare, deference to their wives in this area, and the women's own conception of their duties as mothers combined to prevent Kathy and Elizabeth from pursuing a self-determined recreational goal. These two cases point to the stranglehold of gender despite reduced work schedules (although in these cases only the women had such schedules; the husbands were employed full time). It is circumstances such as these which raise doubts about the potential for greater autonomy for women under conditions of reduced work.

Not all women with young children in the sample who wanted time for themselves had such difficulty finding it. Susan (018), for example, bowled once a week while her husband watched the children. This was a respite from her childcare and household responsibilities, but it was also time to spend with other family members and friends.

"I bowl on Tuesday nights. That's kind of my time alone. . .I require time just to myself. Bowling is that. Or quite often on a weekend when the kids are napping I'll go for a drive or go shopping, walk around the mall, because I require that time alone."

Susan had taken up bowling before she was married, as had her husband. They met when they bowled in the same

league. For several years they bowled together in a mixed doubles league, but her husband had given it up temporarily to have time to work on their house. Susan continued to bowl.

"This year my mother-in-law's team needed another person and so I bowl with my mother and my mother-in-law and one of my best friends. Which is nice because then (my friend) and I have time just to talk."

While Susan had this time for recreational activities, she wanted to have had more.

"I would like to (go to the spa and) work out more and get back into shape. That's important to me. I would like to either take a sewing or a craft class. I could do it. I could work my time into it, but I feel I brought these two children into the world and I can't be gone from them all the time. I'm gone Monday, Wednesday, and every other Friday, and I don't feel that it's right to leave them on Tuesday and Thursday. . . I figure a lot of things I want to do are put on hold temporarily and I guess in the back of my mind I know if I want to do it bad enough I'll do it later. Right now, that's not the most important thing."

Would Susan be as reluctant to take a couple hours on Tuesday or Thursday to go to the spa or to a craft class if her husband were able to be home with the children at that time? One can only speculate here, but it's entirely possible that she would be less reluctant to leave the children with her husband than she would be to leave them with a sitter.

The few job sharers without children did not have these dilemmas and were free to pursue most recreational activities they enjoyed in their time off the job. And in most cases work schedules were not an inhibiting factor. Carol (001), however, worked alternating weeks and noted that there was little time with which to recreate during the weeks she worked.

"We don't do a lot in the evenings. Til you get home, fix dinner, there's just not time. We go for walks. We just don't have a lot of time to do much."

Similarly, part-time workers and temporaries who worked 40-hour weeks had little time for recreation. Terri (011) and Chris (012) both worked 40-hour weeks as temporaries. They had little time for recreational activities. Terri said she was usually too tired.

"Well, I don't really do much. I get up pretty early. . .so I come home, watch TV a little bit. I'm in bed usually by 8 o'clock."

Chris echoed Carol's sentiments.

"There's not really a lot of time to do anything."

Diane (030) liked to garden but had little time for it. She had been working 40-hour weeks in her part-time job, so by the time she got home from work during the week it was almost dark. Her recreational autonomy was also limited, however, by the fact that she and her husband had only one car. Both commuted long distances to two different towns to work. They usually left home around 5:30 in the morning and

her husband dropped Diane off at her sister-in-law's whose van Diane drove to work. At the end of her working day, Diane returned to her sister-in-law's to wait for her husband to pick her up after he got off work. They rode home together to arrive there around 6 or 6:30 in the evening. Diane calculated that if they had a second car and she could get to and from work independent of her husband, she could gain four hours each day. But they couldn't afford a second car.

Although Jean had been working 40-hour weeks as a temporary, she thought one advantage of temporary employment was the ability to take time off at will. She had recently been given the opportunity to keep her temporary placement as a permanent full-time job, and this figured into her thinking on the matter.

"Summer's coming up. My husband and I, we have a temporary campsite up north . . . Every weekend that he doesn't have to work, we go up there. And if he works Saturday, we go up on Sunday. Because of that reason, I would want to stay there as a temporary. When (my husband's place of employment goes) for changeover in July, they get four weeks off. . . If I'm still here as a temporary, then I'll just take that four weeks off. And just come back when I'm ready. . . And if I'm working full time, I won't have my six months in yet to take even one week. . . Even though I don't get any benefits and the pay isn't as good. . . I like that advantage of being able to take off. . . I did that last summer. . . (My husband) works nights. So he didn't have to be to work until Monday at 5:00. . . I'd call them and tell them I'm taking Monday off and we'd get back in time for him (to go

to work). . . So he'd take maybe a vacation day here or a vacation day there, sometimes a week. . . and I could just up and take off with him, which I really liked."

Jean's recreational autonomy was fostered by her husband's secure employment and her attitude that temporary employment required less commitment than permanent, full-time employment. Ann (025) didn't have a husband as a source of financial support and was much more dependent on her temporary employment and consequently much more limited in her recreational autonomy.

". . . it depended how my financial situation was. If I thought I would be fine for the next month, then I wouldn't worry about it. I'd take a long weekend or whatever. But right when I graduated I needed a lot of money to move out and get a place to live, down payments and everything, so I really had to push for money. That's exactly what it felt like. I had to be home, I'd probably be home cleaning or doing something anyway, but I felt kind of bad if I wasn't there to get a phone call from (the temporary employment company) because I would miss out. . . Yeah, it was kind of stressful having to worry about whether you'd be working next week or not, even though I did."

Ann had taken a part-time job that had just become full time. The insecurity and unpredictability of temporary employment had motivated her to make that employment change.

"An ex-roommate. . . told me about (the part-time job). And I kept telling her I'm getting tired of temporary work because I never know when I'm going to work. I hate to wait for these phone calls and feel that I can't take a long weekend and

find that on Monday I missed a call and therefore missed a week's worth of work."

With no work schedule to attend to until callback, the laid-off autoworkers were free to pursue a variety of recreational activities, particularly travel. This was especially true of the men who were single or married to women who were not employed outside the home and without dependent children. Larry (043) was a good example. His children were grown and his wife was not employed outside the home, so he and his wife were free to travel at will. He had purchased a place in northern Michigan, and the layoff gave him an opportunity to spend more time there as well as control over his choice of travel times--he didn't have to travel on weekends, when traffic is heavy. His freedom to travel was only limited by household finances and the fact that he had to pick up unemployment and SUB checks every two weeks. Similarly, Bob (034), divorced with grown children, spent much of his time off at his campsite.

"I got a nice camp. I've been out there all summer since I've been off. I kind of enjoy it. The only time I come back (to town) is to take care of business, get my unemployment check and my SUB check, and go back."

For Ted (039), one advantage of the layoff was that it gave him large blocks of time to work on his computer.

"The thing I like the most about it is that I can get into some projects with my computer that may project themselves into six, eight, ten hours in order to accomplish the result I'm looking for. When I'm working

I don't have that bulk of time, unless it's on a weekend. So that's allowed me to actually learn some concepts about the computers themselves that would (still be) eluding me because I wouldn't have had the time to apply til I came to the results that was necessary. It's like any learning process. If you ain't got the time to spend, you ain't gonna learn."

With regard to recreational activities, being laid off was not fundamentally different from working full time for Dave (040). He had taken up golf as a new activity, although he didn't comment on how much time he devoted to it. He liked to jog and work out at the local YMCA.

"I go do some jogging. Go down to the Y. Work out a couple hours, set around and shoot the breeze. . . I always participated in trying to keep a little fit. So when I'd get off work, I'd go down to the Y and do maybe a mile, mile and a half, maybe two, according to how I feel when I get off. Then take a nice steam shower. And then I feel a lot better. Come on home. That's about it. I always did that. Now I just do more of it."

For Dave, as well as several of the other work sharers, the financial constraints associated with layoff were most distressing.

"I would like to did a little more traveling while I was off. The way the unemployment and SUB pay's divided, you really can't do too much on that because you still have your home bills and different things that you have to pay. . . So now I just have to be careful where I spend, what I spend, how I spend."

Bob (034) had plans to go to Florida in the winter but still dreamed of trips to Hawaii and the Caribbean.

"I'd like to go to Hawaii. I'd like to take a Caribbean cruise. I could go on all day. I'm a man with rich tastes when it comes right down to it."

I asked Bob what prevented him from taking these trips.

"It takes a lot of bucks. If you want to have something come to a flying stop, that'll do it. . . And I got responsibilities here, too, that I've got to take care of. You can't have your cake and eat it too. It'd be nice to travel all the way around the world, but you gotta take it one step at a time."

Mary (038) wanted to travel, too.

"I really like to travel, but I have to win the Lotto first. . . If we had worked our bill situation out different. . . I would like to save my money enough to take trips and to explore things and to see different parts of the world. . . We travel, but it's just in Michigan."

Financial constraints were not the concern of the laid-off autoworkers only. In fact, such concerns cut across all categories of reduced work and a wide range of incomes.¹

When I asked Elaine (003) if there were things she'd like to do with her time that she wasn't doing, she responded,

¹ I'll take them up only as they pertain to recreation here. The effects of financial limitations on educational aspirations will be discussed in chapter 11.

"Yeah, if I had more money. You know, when your income gets cut like that, there are definitely things that I can't do as much. . ."

Meg (010) had to decrease her attendance at theatre productions when she terminated her consulting business and began working as a temporary and experienced the concomitant loss of income. And Jean (027) commented that her desires were costly.

". . .the things I like to do are kind of extravagant. You know, they take time and they take money. I'd like to travel. If I could just get in a mobile home. I wouldn't want to fly anywhere or take a cruise. I'd want to be able to drive and take my time and just go here and there and everywhere in the whole United States, because there's a lot of places in the United States I've never been that I'd like to see. And then think about going to other countries."

Like some household work, some recreational activities are readily adaptable to small amounts of time. Thus, time availability influences the selection of recreational pursuits. Time-consuming activities will be forgone if work schedules and/or other commitments limit the availability of time. By the same token, some recreational activities can be pursued in and around the house while others cannot. Thus, recreational activities for which one must leave home will be forgone if one must remain at or near home.

Many of the job sharers were limited in their recreational autonomy, but this had little to do with their work schedules. Instead, the demands of childcare and the

strength of gender ideologies which define childcare as the primary responsibility of women limited their recreational autonomy.

Temporary employment also constrained recreational autonomy, particularly when individuals were also financially insecure and couldn't afford to miss a placement opportunity or when they were working 40-hour weeks. In cases where there was some degree of financial security, however, temporary employment enhanced recreational autonomy to the extent that an individual may feel less attachment to a temporary job than a permanent job and therefore feel freer to take time off.

Irregular part-time schedules limited recreational autonomy to the extent that recreation had to be planned around those schedules. Part-time employment also placed financial constraints on recreation.

The laid-off autoworkers in this study had the greatest recreational autonomy, unless family ties or other responsibilities were inhibiting factors. Otherwise, they had large expanses of free time and some degree of financial security. However, even they complained, as did many others, about financial constraints on their ability to participate in certain kinds of recreational activities, particularly travel. In the course of the interviews for this study, it was a common occurrence to hear informants talk about how they wished they had more time and money to travel. One can only speculate on the insatiability of

human desires and the symbolic meaning of travel. More important, perhaps, is the extent to which recreation has been commodified such that individuals' financial status must influence their ability to recreate. Where the cultural infrastructure is underdeveloped, or where access depends on market position, there are limits on individuals' selection of recreational activities. Reduced work may provide the time for recreational pursuits, but if reduced work restricts one's market position, recreational choices will be limited. Also, if the private sector controls the availability of recreational activities, those that are unprofitable will not be offered or they will be offered by the public sector but limited by the availability of tax-generated revenues. Gorz has argued for "free" recreation. This may be a desirable goal, but its achievement doesn't seem likely in the foreseeable future. As capital expands into services in search of new markets, the commodification of recreation will grow. Those who work less than full time and who have limited incomes may in the future find that more and more recreational activities are out of their reach despite the fact that they have time to pursue them. The creation of "free" recreation may become more urgent as a larger proportion of the population has time on its hands.

CHAPTER 10

Community and Relational Activities

Several informants discussed voluntary associations in which they were active participants and time they devoted to volunteer work. A few others wished they could engage in such activities and discussed circumstances that prevented them from doing so. This chapter explores the nature of my informants' actual and desired participation in the community and how their reduced work facilitated or limited their participation.

But this chapter's focus is not confined to voluntary associations. It also examines what I call relational activities. Relational activities refers to primary relationships (Cooley 1962, pp. 23-31) with partners, relatives, and friends. Many more informants were involved in these sorts of activities than the more formally organized community activities. I exclude childcare from this category of relational activities not to deny the relational character of childcare but because interaction with children differs fundamentally from interaction with adults. Children need supervision not usually required by adults.

Community activities and relational activities are brought together in this chapter because they are of a

piece, although analytically distinct. Community activities are by definition relational even if formally organized, and relational activities maintain the human community outside the bounds of formal organization. Certainly, however, community and relational activities may overlap, for example, when relatives and friends belong to the same voluntary association.

There is some difficulty in separating community and relational activities from recreation. Community and relational activities can be coterminous with recreation, and, like recreation, can be means of escape, relaxation, and rejuvenation. This occurs, for example, when members of a church group join together to play volleyball or have a potluck dinner or when partners go out to dinner and a movie. But recreational activities embody a strong orientation to self-pleasure, as suggested in chapter 9, whereas community and relational activities embody a strong orientation to helping and supporting others and reaffirming ties as members of a group. However, as Cooley (1962) argued, the separation of self and other, or self and society as he put it, is a false dichotomy. Community and relational engagements are sources of self-fulfillment to the extent that we derive pleasure and satisfaction from them, and they are products of self-expression in that our participation in them is an expression of our needs and desires. Therefore, connection to others is an element of self.

The central question of this chapter is the relationship between reduced work and community and relational activities. It will be argued that certain types of reduced work fostered greater social participation, but other types, particularly those associated with unpredictable work schedules and financial insecurity, were barriers to social participation.

As will become apparent, community and relational activities were not the exclusive province of female informants. Many men spoke just as forthrightly as women about the important community and relational activities in their lives. Jim (029) was a case in point. He was a lay minister in an evangelical religious organization. Before he began to job share, he devoted 60 hours a month to his religious activities.

"At times I did find myself using a lot of annual leave around like holidays in order to get more days off and spend more time (on my religious activities). . ."

After he began job sharing, Jim was able to devote 90 hours a month to his ministerial activities. He valued his religious work so much that he thought he might try to find other employment if he lost his job-share position and had to return to working full time.

A number of other job sharers were involved in a variety of community activities. Carol (001) was a room mother at her oldest child's school and also accompanied the class on field trips. Because these are daytime activities,

full-time 8-5 employment would have barred her from such participation. Elaine's (003) work schedule prevented her from being a room mother, but she did accompany children on field trips. She also hosted her daughter's class picnic in the spring.

Elaine had become involved in so many community activities that she had to withdraw from some. A Sunday school teacher, she had also been active in CROP walks and other church-related activities. For a period of time, she had meetings to attend every night of the week. She gave up some activities so she could spend more time at home with her husband and children.¹

There were no job sharers who said they wanted to be more involved in community activities but could not. This suggests that those who wanted to be involved were involved and that work schedules associated with job sharing were not major obstacles to such participation. Job sharing facilitated community involvement to the extent that individuals could devote more time or could be involved in activities, such as those that occur during the daytime, that otherwise would not have been options. It appears that those inclined to be active participants in voluntary associations found whatever time they could to participate

¹ Barbara's (005) community activities were discussed in chapter 7 in conjunction with children and opportunities for self-development associated with childrearing. I will not repeat that case here, although it does pertain. Suffice it to say that Barbara's case was another example of community activism fostered by job sharing.

even when employed full time. Their participation was facilitated by combining childcare and community activity or by the availability of substitute childcare.

Similarly, there were few temporary employees in my sample who yearned to participate in community activities but felt they could not. Many did not express interest in community activities. One of those who did, Vicki (023), wanted to get involved in community theatre, hadn't done so, but didn't think her temporary employment prevented her from doing so. (But babysitting was her other source of employment and this may have been an obstacle, although she didn't address it.) She did note, however, that she used to be more active in her church.

"I used to do a lot of church things
. . . I'm in the church choir, but
that's about it. I never know when
(the temporary employment company)
is going to call so I can't really
do something during the day."

Here again, the unpredictability of temporary employment put limits on Vicki's autonomy off the job.

Temporary employment, however, facilitated Karen's (026) autonomy. She requested part-time temporary employment to accommodate her commitments as a youth pastor's wife. One-half of a two-person career, she accompanied her husband on weekend trips with the youth.²

² The two-person single career occurs when a combination of formal and informal institutional demands is placed on both members of a married couple of whom only the man is employed by the institution. Usually, the wife is inducted into the orbit of her husband's employing institution not because of her own, or the institution's, specific choice but because she is related to her husband through sexual, economic, and

" . . . a lot of weekends we have to leave on Fridays or there's a lot of preparation on Fridays that I need to do to leave for a weekend with the teens. So that's the main reason why I asked for Fridays off."

Karen estimated that she spent between 25 and 30 hours a week on church activities. In addition to frequent weekend trips with the youth group, she also participated in other groups and served on committees. This amounted to a part-time job in itself, although Karen was not paid for her church commitments. She differentiated, however, between activities that she perceived to be her duty as a pastor's wife and those that she participated in autonomously.

" . . . all of my time is volunteer time, besides being the support for my husband. When they hired him, they hired him personally. But I feel it's my responsibility as his wife to help him. 'Calling' I consider to be part of our duties, but as far as (the children's group) and the committees that I'm on, that's just my own personal choice to do those types of things."

Temporary employment provided the flexibility Karen needed to be an active participant in her church. But it would not have been so satisfying if she hadn't had some

emotional bonds. It is an extension of her role as wife. The typical, although by no means unique, two-person career is that of the corporate executive and his wife. Her participation is his career, usually not acknowledged or remunerated directly, furthers his career by maintaining and perhaps, over the long run, improving his status. See Hanna Papanek's article, "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career," American Journal of Sociology 78 (4) 1973: 852-872.

semblance of financial security. Her husband's employment provided that financial security.

Few part-time workers were involved in community activities or expressed an interest in getting involved. Joanne (020) expressed an interest in assisting the United Way, "but I can't tell for sure what day I'd be able to help them because of my schedule." She worked an irregular schedule at a retail store and had little control over her schedule. She could request days off but was reluctant to do so, particularly because she had low seniority.

" . . . I don't like to do that because sometimes they get kind of an attitude about it and the other employees might, too. So I just like to be free whenever I can, especially now."

Mark's (028) seasonal employment provided him opportunities to work with a political group and assist in the city's beautification project during the off season.

Her newfound time gave Sharon (044), one of the laid-off autoworkers, an opportunity to help a terminally ill friend. She had found this experience so gratifying that she wanted to be a hospice volunteer. She was reluctant, however, because she thought her full-time job, which she had to return to, would interfere with the commitment she thought was necessary to provide such care.

"If I didn't have to go back to work ever I would like to be a volunteer that goes to homes where people are terminally ill. Like someone's got to be there to take care of them. I would like to do that. To help take care of terminally ill people

and give the other person that's living in the home a break. . . . I'm reluctant because I don't want to get into something like that and all of a sudden get called back to work. If I say I'm going to do something, I do it. I don't like to back out. So I hate to start it because I know I can't keep at it."

I asked Sharon if she could imagine a way of changing her work schedule so she could work and do the volunteer care she wanted to do. She replied emphatically, "No. Absolutely not."

Two of the other laid-off autoworkers were active participants in the church. Their involvement was not new--they had been active members when they worked full time--but it extended in time and substance while they were laid off. Paul (037) taught Bible study on Wednesday nights. When he worked full time he could only devote a few hours to preparation for the class. On layoff, his preparation began a few days in advance.

"I'd get out of work Wednesday night and I'd go home and take a short nap. And then I would study for an hour or two, eat supper, and then go to church. And now I'll start Monday night, start reading and researching and everything."

The church was at the center of Paul's family life.

"I'm the song leader and the head trustee. My wife is the treasurer and Sunday school teacher. And I teach Sunday school. She was involved in the church whenever I met her. We grew up in the church and we got married in the church. Just a big part of our

lives. And most of the activities
are planned around the church. . ."

John (042) was also actively involved in his church. He attended several meetings in the evening during the week, which he had done when he worked full time. But on the layoff he could also spend some time during the day at the church.

"I helped a guy put on a new roof,
cut a tree down, stuff like that."

John had also become the person who regularly mowed the lawn since the church was without a custodian.

Ted (043) worked with a substance abuse program. He had become involved a few years before he was laid off and had served as the financial secretary for a period of time. In fact, he became such an enthusiastic volunteer that at one point he was suspended from his job.

"I went overboard, excessive in
spending the time. I equate it
with giving something to myself
that I'd never been able to do
before. I went nuts with it.
Missed work. Got confronted
with it."

The layoff gave him time to devote to this program without concern for a work schedule.

". . .a lot of times I stay up
til six, seven o'clock in the
morning. I get down to the (center)
and somebody's in anguish or having
difficulties. I enjoy the conversa-
tion part. I never had time for
that before. I did, but it was
always at the expense of something
else. Today it's at the expense
of nothing."

In conclusion, participation in community activities was to some extent facilitated by reduced work, particularly when work schedules were regular or nonexistent. In such cases, work schedules did not interfere with commitments to community activities and sometimes permitted greater participation because more time could be devoted to such activities or because more options became available. Irregular work schedules interfered with participation in community activities in some cases because planning ahead was difficult. The anticipated return to a rigid full-time schedule in the case of one laid-off autoworker was an obstacle to a long-term commitment to voluntary care of terminally ill persons.

Relational Activities

Most of my informants mentioned spending some of their time off the job with partners, relatives, and friends. They went out to dinner with partners, visited parents or other relatives if they lived in the area, and socialized with friends. These are relational activities we engage in under most any circumstances, employed full time as well as less than full time or not at all. The extent to which we are attentive to others is influenced by our work schedules to the extent that our work schedules determine how much time we have off the job and when we have it. But our attentiveness to others may also be affected by our needs for sociability, and some individuals may thrive on more

social contact than others. In turn, difficult relationships may be avoided.

This section, however, is not intended to be a psychoanalytic treatise on variability in needs for affiliation or the origins and management of conflictual relationships. It is intended to explore the relationship between reduced work and relational opportunities. I'll begin with the assumption that everyone participates in relational activities to one degree or another for this is the stuff of human existence. But I will also assume that reduced work may permit greater opportunities for relational activities because a smaller portion of one's time is obligated to wage work. In this section I will not examine the full array of relational activities engaged in by my informants. Instead, I will focus on the relational activities that became possible under conditions of reduced work.

Ted (039), one of the laid-off autoworkers, made one of the most eloquent statements on relational possibilities associated with reduced work.

"I never had time before. It used to be you'd run into an old friend or something, you get a few minutes to talk with him, you're on your way to work or you're on your way (somewhere). . . Now I can say, well, I'm on my way to nowhere and there ain't nothing that's so important happening to me today that I can't postpone it and sit down and talk to an old friend. Or even a new friend. That, I really really enjoy that. That alone could be more than adequate to offset any

economic loss that I gave up when I took this inverse."

Other work sharers discovered newfound time with partners. Paul (037) and John (042), who had both worked days, enjoyed going out for breakfast or lunch with their wives. Paul suggested that his job had interfered with his and his wife's ability to communicate with one another.

"We'll go out for breakfast or we'll go out for lunch once or twice a week. It's very hard to communicate. . . . Like me, you get off work, you don't feel like doing nothing. You go home and set down and have supper, you don't feel like going anywhere. . . . But now that you have time and the patience. . . ."

He also noted,

"My wife enjoys me being home. Well, most of the time. Whenever I get lazy and set there and watch 'The Waltons' instead of doing something, she gets up in arms. But I enjoy being home and she enjoys having me home."

Tim's (041) experience wasn't quite as positive, however.

"Being at home with my wife more, it seems like we don't get along as good as we used to, but then, I don't know, that could be caused by a lot of different things. We're not used to seeing each other that much. Our differences are showing up more."

Mary (038) and her husband were using their time on the layoff to repair a failing marriage. They had worked split shifts since their four-year-old daughter was born to share her care, which meant they didn't see very much of each

other and didn't have much time to deal with problems. Recently, however, they had gone out for breakfast while their daughter was at preschool.

"...and that was time well spent. Just the other morning we had breakfast together at Bob Evans. That was really nice. We haven't done that together in at least four years. . .It's just like every day is Saturday while we're laid off, so we can just enjoy it to the fullest. We haven't had a fight about anything. . .because there just isn't that tension. See, when we were separated by our shifts, there wasn't time to have that kind of time because we would just have to tell our troubles and go on our way. There was just no enjoyable time. So it drove us farther and farther apart."

To avoid such difficulties in the future, Mary and her husband both intended to work first shift when they are called back to the plant.

In some cases at least, a reduction in working time permitted partners to devote time and energy to somewhat neglected relationships with positive results. Such relational outcomes of reduced work cannot be assumed, however, as Tim's case illustrates. More time together may accentuate differences and tensions as much as it may alleviate them.

Other laid-off autoworkers found time to help relatives and friends. Dave (040) ran errands for his mother. Mike (036) helped a friend's father build an addition on his house. Carl (035) helped friends remodel their house,

repaired his niece's car, and regularly helped a friend with some repair work at his store.

Linda (009), one of the job sharers, also found having more time off meant she had more time for friends. She and her husband planned to visit friends the weekend after the interview. They were going to help them insulate their cottage. Linda thought if she were working full time she probably would not make the trip and her husband would go alone. They were planning to leave their daughter with a sitter, and Linda would have been reluctant to do this if her daughter had been with a sitter all week. Her time off also permitted Linda to accompany her husband on a business trip. Because Linda worked alternating weeks, she was off when her brother-in-law and sister-in-law came to visit for a week, and she had more time to enjoy their visit.

Some of the temporaries who worked 40-hour weeks were frustrated by the little time off the job they had. Chris (012) had complained that she didn't have much time to do anything and had "cut friends out."

Peggy (014) helped her husband with school-related or household projects but had difficulty finding time to help other people. The only time she had available was in the evening, a time when other's didn't necessarily need her help.

"A friend of mine had a baby in the spring and she was in bed for seven weeks before the baby (was born) and I couldn't do anything until night and when her husband was home, too. I told (my husband). . .I wish I

had enough time so I could take off and help them. I guess that's one thing that really bothers me. I don't have time to take out for other people."

Peggy might have viewed her temporary employment as Jean did--employment not requiring complete commitment and employment from which she could readily take time off. If she had worked enough hours as a temporary, she might also have been able to take some vacation time. But, unlike Jean, Peggy was the sole breadwinner in her household. Without financial security she could not use temporary employment to create flexibility and autonomy for herself.

In conclusion, reduced work--when it actually meant a reduction of working time--permitted my informants who were so inclined to devote more time and energy to relational activities. This, coupled with possibilities for greater participation in voluntary associations, suggests that certain types of reduced work can foster greater social involvement. This can occur when reduced work is stable, permitting commitments to others, and when financial insecurity does not hinder such involvement. When reduced work is unpredictable, however, it interrupts individuals' ability to plan ahead, and financial insecurity, such as that associated with temporary employment, has the consequence of isolating people in their homes waiting for employment opportunities or, as will be shown in chapter 11, forces individuals to seek other sources of employment. Therefore, reduced work does not automatically mean greater

community and relational participation, but certain types of reduced work can create the structural conditions within which such participation could occur if individuals are so inclined.

CHAPTER 11

Education and Alternative Employment

Several informants spent some of their time off the job engaged in educational pursuits. These were principally temporary and part-time workers. Many informants wanted to go to school but couldn't for one reason or another. The desire to go to school transcended all four categories of reduced work. For some, education's value was in its potential for self-enrichment. This was especially true of those who took adult education classes on an occasional or regular basis. For others, education was a means to an end, that of better-paying and more secure employment or career advancement.

Some informants (about 1/4) had secondary sources of income from a small self-owned business or work in the informal economy. A few informants dreamed of self-employment.

This chapter examines the last of five categories of use of time off the job, education and alternative employment, in relationship to reduced work. In what ways did reduced work enhance or limit my informants' educational opportunities? Did reduced work enhance or limit their opportunities for alternative employment? Why did they have or need alternative employment? How did their need for

alternative employment relate to reduced work? Finally, what was attractive about self-employment for those who dreamed of it?

The fact that so many of my informants who were students worked part time or as temporaries indicates that part-time and temporary employment are readily adaptable to student life. This, of course, was reflected in data presented in chapter 3 that noted the predominance of students among part-time and temporary workers. While few part-time and temporary workers had control over their work schedules, they could specify times when they could not work, for example, because they were taking classes. Most felt supervisors were understanding of the needs of students, and supervisors scheduled their work hours around their classes. Temporary employment was especially suitable for students on recess who wanted employment for only a few months.

It's noteworthy that most of the students in my sample were unmarried and childless, with few responsibilities for anyone other than themselves. The one exception was Lisa (016) who was married with two children. She was working on a master's degree in nursing. She attended classes on weekends as part of an outreach program offered by one of the state universities. She spent much of her time studying when she was not on the job. Had the weekend classes not been available to Lisa, she probably would not have gone back to school because she would have had to give up her job

during the week to attend classes, something she didn't want nor could afford to do. In Lisa's case, although she was employed part time and had considerable control over her work schedule, her schedule could not be made flexible enough to provide time to attend classes during the week. The availability of a specially designed weekend graduate program made it possible for her to keep her job and go to school. Part-time employment meant she remained attached to her profession, she maintained an income, and she had time to attend classes, study, and spend time with her husband and children. While she was in school, she had given up some recreational activities she enjoyed but was confident she could resume them once she finished her degree. She made some trade-offs, but part-time employment permitted her to do the things that were most important to her: go to school and have a family life.

Other informants wanted to go to school, but couldn't at least until some future date. Carol (001) hoped to return to school to finish her degree once both of her children were in elementary school, but Kathy (002) was far less optimistic. "I always thought I could go back . . . that's a big joke," she commented rather cynically. She wasn't sure if she would return to school at some future time because it was becoming less and less important to her.

Both Carol and Kathy were job sharers with secure incomes and financial security provided by a second earner. Childrearing seemed to be the main obstacle to their

autonomy in this case, but the anticipated removal of this obstacle restored education as an option only for Carol. Kathy's lost autonomy seemed to have resulted not in a temporary deferral of autonomy but a permanent sacrifice--at least regarding her educational interests. She had become discouraged and lost the motivation to pursue those interests under the pressure and demands of her household and childcare responsibilities.

A couple of other job sharers, Sylvia (007) and Martha (008), wanted to return to school. Sylvia believed she could do so; it was just a matter of scheduling. Martha had gone so far to make an appointment with a former professor to inquire about returning to school.

There is nothing in these four cases to suggest that job sharing creates any obstacle to educational pursuits. Childrearing, however, did create at least a temporary obstacle for these women. This is yet another area in which gender relations and the division of labor regarding childcare operate to limit women's autonomy despite temporal autonomy associated with reduced work and control over work schedules.

For the part-time workers and temporaries who wanted to go to school, money was the primary obstacle. Harold (015) was not satisfied working at low-status and low-paying temporary jobs and wanted to go back to school to "make something better," but he couldn't afford to go to school.

He needed a better-paying job to provide for his four children before he could afford to go to school.

"What I was trying to do was go back to school, but I haven't got the money either. People always talk about that they got grants, but the thing is having the money to start with. . . I wish I would have went earlier when I first got out (of the service). Then I could have used the VA benefits, but it expired. . . If I worked for a company that paid reasonably well, or for the state. . . that would give me the opportunity to go back to school because I'd be making fairly good money with benefits. . . that's kind of what I wanted but that's kind of hard to do. You can't get a minimum-wage janitor job and then go out and try to be something if you haven't got the money to feed your kids let alone to buy books."

Harold's was a sad case. He attended a local community college with financial assistance from the VA, but his children were born and their needs were more urgent than his to go to school. Harold sacrificed what turned out to be a one-time opportunity to finish school to try to better provide for his family. His sacrifice became a costly one, through no fault of his own. He had been employed at a number of companies that shut down. Since that time he has had difficulty finding other secure, well-paying employment. He complained, "There isn't no work," and lamented the days when Oldsmobile would hire workers off the street. Harold is a victim of the economic transition occurring in the "rustbelt" without a social safety net to help him and his family make the transition.

"If there was work, I think that would solve the whole situation. There are minimum-wage jobs, but I worked for that in high school. You can't raise a family on that. . . That's the reason I went back to school. . . Everybody said first you need a high school diploma. Then I got a high school diploma and still didn't find nothing. Then I went to school. . . Hell, you gotta have a damn master's degree now just to be a janitor, you know, just to sweep the floor."

Some of the autoworkers on inverse seniority layoff will probably have to face economic crisis head-on in the not-too-distant future. Aware of this likelihood, some considered additional education as a bridge to alternative employment. While none of the laid-off autoworkers in my sample was in school during the period of layoff, a few considered it. Those who talked most about going back to school were those at mid-career. They had about 15 years' seniority and their plant's future was uncertain. (One informant told me the plant has no production schedule after 1990.)

Their's was a decidedly different experience than an older generation of autoworkers also represented in my sample. The latter, with 25 to 30 years' seniority, entered the plants when the U.S. auto industry was prosperous. It sustained prosperity for most of their careers. They also entered when the demand for unskilled labor was high. Many had not completed high school (they didn't need to) and landed well-paying and largely secure employment in the plants. Some of their children had benefited in that they

were able to pay for their children's college education. The younger generation represented in this sample, by contrast, had completed high school, had traveled a much rockier road in their careers as autoworkers, and faced uncertainty in the future. The futures their children will have are also uncertain.

Carl (035) considered going to school but hadn't settled on a program to pursue.

"Right now I guess I'm kind of at a standstill what to decide about going back to school. I'm just trying to figure out what area that it would be beneficial to go back to school in. Like I said, I do have background in computers and background in photography. . .but outside of going back in computers for my own personal standpoint, I don't really see taking courses and seeking employment in the computer field. At 35, I don't know if that would be something I'd want to do or not. I'm really kind of indecisive about it right now."

Ted (039) had been enrolled at a nearby college, but because he lost the tuition assistance benefit by taking the inverse layoff (something he hadn't realized would happen when he volunteered for it), he dropped out for the period of the layoff. "The benefits of the courses did not outweigh the costs of tuition." But he also had a small tax preparation business that he wanted to try to build up during the layoff. If he could make a go of it, he thought he'd opt for self-employment instead of returning to General Motors.

"I (will) be off during tax season and have a chance to really search

out to see if this would be a better profession for me. I've never really enjoyed working for GM. . .I'll be able to really research the thing and experience whether or not I would like to do that, (with the) option of going back to work. And if there was another cutback or layoff or something, I might consider selling my seniority and establishing my own business. . .I don't think GM is that dependable today. . .It's like bureaucracies in any area. . . the guy at the bottom, he's the one that always pays the prices. I'd like to be in a position where I don't have to live with that. . . I'm not married today. My kids are grown and married. I don't have the financial dependency on me. All I got's me. My child support's all paid up. I don't have any bills other than my house. Why shouldn't I consider it?"

Ted was the only autoworker with a realistic option of self-employment, but he was not alone among my informants in his dream of autonomy through self-employment. Mark (028), the gardener, did consulting work during the off-season. He showed me the layout of a flower bed he was designing for a local business.

"It's a house with a bed that surrounds the house completely. . . there's a great big bed that sticks out to the east which is about 40' by 20', so I had to go out and measure the whole thing and plan the whole thing and find out where to get the stuff and then plan a watering system. . . I'm also doing (landscape renovation plans for several people). There's a lot of people out there who like and really want that connection with the grounds but they don't know quite enough about how to do it, so that's where I step in and either act as sort

of a consultant or a facilitator maybe. At this point I'm not set up to actually do the work. I'm not sure I'd want to. But I do like the planning end of it, so far."

Mark expressed a strong need for balance between manual and mental labor.

"Sometimes at the end of the winter when I've done this (design) for a while, the amount of detail, the sheer amount of detail, makes me want to go out and work. Then after I do that for a while I want to come in and do the detail. The only job I've ever had that met both of those sets of requirements was the job I had in Spokane at the arboretum. When I felt like going out and working, I went out and worked. And I felt like going out, looking at trees, I went out and looked at the trees. And when I felt like studying, I studied. I seem to be the kind of person who needs a rough 50/50 mix between intellectual and physical stuff. And I don't know of any job that would allow me that. There's just no such thing. It's either one or the other. Either you're beating your brains out physically or else you're beating your brains out with this stuff (planning). . . . I get confused sometimes, you know. I tend to forget things. My head gets very noisy. When I'm out there, I get bored. I feel like I'm not being creative."

While self-employment could provide a better balance of mental and manual labor, Mark was fearful that it could limit his temporal autonomy. I asked him if he thought going into business for himself would give him an opportunity to blend the two.

"I don't know any other way to do it. I just don't. Around here. Although, it's frightening because, you know, at that point in your, I don't want to get sucked into getting married to a business. I'm hoping there's just a process of experimentation that I can go through to find things that are, several things that are relatively mindless to do that are physical and find some other things that are stimulating to do that are mental. Neither of which will take so much time and be under the level at which I can sustain body and soul. But that I think is going to take some time to figure out exactly, you know, what those things are. I know one guy who goes around rototilling in the spring. He makes the equivalent of about 20 dollars an hour. His investment is about four thousand dollars for the truck and then a good tiller. That's a good example of the kind of thing I might choose to do as a supplemental part of a whole long thing. Now I'd be happy as a clam running around in the spring for six or eight weeks tilling people's gardens. . . But, and then I would switch at some point, if I was self-employed. I'd like to have a couple of (consultations) a year, a couple, maybe two or three. I'd like to have some pruning work to do in the winter and maybe some snow removal. So I think, hopefully, I would end up working maybe half time in the winter and just go like hell from April to October. Which is what I tend to do anyway. And I think I would do that no matter what because I cannot resist going and planting flowers. I mean I would rather do that than be not tired. So, I think I would just probably do that one way or the other."

Diane (030) also thought about self-employment. She imagined running her own tailoring business out of her home. She wanted to set up a shop in her yard with a commercial

sewing machine and press, rather than the home sewing machine and ironing board she ordinarily used for alterations. She also wanted a dressing room in the shop so customers wouldn't have to change clothes in the bathroom in her home. But the investment she would have to make in equipment and construction of the shop was prohibitive. Diane and her husband just couldn't afford it, although she had not inquired about small business loans. The advantages to self-employment for Diane were that she could work her own hours and she wouldn't have to pay someone to care for her children.

Working one's own hours certainly sounds attractive. Bill (024), however, wanted to terminate his self-owned accounting business because his work schedule was irregular, unbounded, and only provided him small blocks of free time which were inadequate to do some of the things he enjoyed, such as refinishing antiques. He complained that he had to schedule appointments with clients far enough apart to ensure adequate time to meet individual client's needs, but client business didn't always require all the time he allotted to the appointment. For example, Bill might schedule a client for a two-hour appointment and then find they could complete the transaction in one hour. Bill would then have an hour to wait until his next appointment--an hour in which he could do little but wait. Bill had come to prefer his free time in 8-hour blocks so he could use the time more productively.

Bill continued to see some clients in his time off from his two-day-a-week job-share position. But if that position became full time, which he hoped, he planned to discontinue his accounting business.

This brief foray into my informants' dreams and experiences of self-employment may lead one to conclude that the grass is always greener on the other side. However, I think what it reveals is that people often dream that self-employment is the road to autonomy but that may not be the case. In today's competitive environment, where small businesses have a high mortality rate, it is often difficult to make a secure living operating a business. One may need to actively recruit clients and make oneself available to them on demand. One's own financial security requires that as do the debts incurred in getting the business off the ground. Such dependency on client needs can wreak havoc on the service provider's time and create a situation in which one becomes married to a business, as Mark put it. While on the face of it, one is autonomous because one doesn't have to adhere to the rules and regulations of an employer, there is little autonomy in being at the beck and call of clients on whom one must depend for financial security.

How does reduced work relate to this? In Mark's and Ted's cases, it provided the opportunity to experiment. In the off-season Mark received unemployment benefits as did Ted during the layoff. Each had some degree of financial security that they didn't have to find a second job per se.

They also had the security of returning to their regular job. In the interim, Mark could "toy" with self-employment and Ted could consider risking commitment to self-employment.

For others in my sample who had alternative employment, whether it was a second job in the formal economy or activity in the informal economy, alternative employment was an effort to improve one's financial situation. This was especially true of temporaries and part-time workers. Harold (015) did "odd jobs" for people, particularly former landlords. He cleaned, repaired, and painted dwellings vacated by tenants before new tenants moved in. Vicki (023) babysat in addition to and between temporary placements while she waited to find steady employment commensurate with her training in data entry. Laura (022) worked at two jobs, one temporary and one part-time, because she couldn't support herself and pay her school expenses on the income from one job.¹ And Diane (030) continued to do some alterations at home in addition to her part-time tailoring job to try to increase her income so she could pay for childcare in particular.

¹ An interesting footnote to this case, especially for those concerned with the future of higher education. Laura had been a full-time student working toward a degree. She cut back to part time concerned with taking classes specific to her interest in dance. There were courses she was required to take in her degree program that did not interest her at all. She couldn't justify paying for such courses when her income was so limited and difficult to come by. I wonder how many other students who must work their way through school have made or will make similar choices. And who will suffer in the long run, the student or the university or both?

What may be concluded from this discussion of education and alternative employment in relationship to reduced work? First, reduced work did provide the temporal autonomy for my informants who wanted to go to school to actually do so. Where there were limits, they were limits imposed not by time per se but by other responsibilities, such as childcare, or finances. To the extent that the financial limits were bound up with the low level of pay associated with certain types of reduced work, i.e. temporary and part-time, then reduced work did limit my informants' ability to pursue their educational goals. Regarding alternative employment, again reduced work provided the time but in some cases it created the need for more income. Some types of reduced work, particularly part-time and temporary, were inadequate for those supporting a family or supporting themselves without other financial assistance, whether that assistance came from parents, a second earner, or the state.

CHAPTER 12

Conclusion

I began this study by examining four different types of reduced work: job sharing, temporary employment, part-time employment, and work sharing (in this case, inverse seniority layoff). I explored my informants' reasons for working less than full time and their use of time off the job. What this study suggests is that there are different time regimes associated with reduced work, and these time regimes coupled with a variety of intervening factors influenced my informants' selection of off-the-job activities. In this concluding chapter, I will review these interrelationships to suggest that there are different types of autonomy associated with reduced work. Table 21 provides a summary of the important components in my argument.

There were four identifiable time regimes associated with reduced work. Most of the job sharers and some of the part-time workers had stable work schedules and substantial control over the determination of those schedules. A few job sharers, some part-time workers, and some temporaries also had stable schedules but minimal control over them. Other part-time workers and temporaries had irregular schedules and minimal control over them such that working time became unpredictable. Finally, the work sharers on

Table 21. Summary.

<u>Types of Reduced Work</u>	<u>Time Regimes</u>	<u>Intervening Factors</u>	<u>Menu of Off-the-Job Activities</u>	<u>Types of Autonomy</u>
Job sharing	Stable schedule, substantial schedule control	Presence/absence of dependent children (degree of dependency)	Childcare and child-related activities	Stable
Temporary employment	Stable schedule, minimal schedule control			Temporary
Part-time employment	Irregular schedule, minimal schedule control	Financial security/vulnerability	Household work	Fragmented
Work sharing (inverse seniority layoff)	No work schedule to attend to	Organization of time off the job (large/small blocks)	Recreation	Deferred
		Personal preferences	Community activities	Contingent
		Social supports	Relational activities	
			Education	
			Other employment	

inverse seniority layoff had no work schedule to attend to for the period of the layoff and maximal control of their time.

One of the work sharers, Paul (037) summarized well the influence of work schedules on time off the job.

"...the whole idea of it is not so much how much time you put in there but how much you have to dedicate yourself to put the time in. Whenever you get out, instead of going home and saying, 'I'm done for another day,' I know that I would say, 'I have to plan for tomorrow'... And even though you're not in the plant, you're still having to regulate yourself to it, to the fact that you're gonna have to get up and go in again. It's really amazing. My job was a very easy job. I could finish up in four hours eight hours' production... But even then, you just, you still have to regulate yourself. And even when your time was your own, you're still regulating your mind to the fact that you have to go in the next day."

The necessity to attend to a work schedule has a psychological effect, as described by Paul, such that the work schedule is at the center of one's temporal life. But work schedules also have a concrete effect on time off the job. To the extent that schedules are stable and of one's own making, work schedules can be made to accommodate off-the-job activities and perhaps lose some of their power in the process. Stable schedules, whether determined by the worker or not, create stable time off the job such that one can plan off-the-job activities. When work schedules are irregular and not subject to the worker's control, they limit selection of off-the-job activities and are a

hindrance to regular, planned activities. Thus, the activities selected tend to be those that can be taken up rather spontaneously and without commitment for relatively long periods of time.

The quantity and organization of time off the job also influenced my informants' selection of off-the-job activities. Large blocks of time, for example, provided the temporal opportunity to pursue time-consuming projects that would not be an option if only small blocks of time were available.

The organization of time off the job was one of several important intervening factors in my informants' selection of off-the-job activities. The presence (or absence) and relative ages of dependent children were major influences on off-the-job activities, although their influence differed for men and women. Women talked almost exclusively about children's need for care and time, while men often equated children and financial responsibility. Thus, to the extent that children were viewed as inhibitors of autonomy off the job, they placed limits on women's time and men's money. However, children enhanced autonomy off the job to the extent that their presence provided options for self-development through child-related community and recreational activities. My sample exhibited considerable gender asymmetry with regard to childcare. With few exceptions, women were the primary caretakers of children. If Chodorow's theory is correct, we continue to reproduce

mothering such that feminine personality is defined in terms of relation and connection and masculine personality negates that which is feminine. Reduced work as it is organized currently buttresses asymmetrical gender relations more than it challenges them.

Informants' financial status influenced their selection of off-the-job activities. Some activities simply are not options if one doesn't have the money to pursue them. This is especially true of expensive commodities like education and travel. Those who were most limited financially were informants who worked few hours at low-paying jobs, many of whom worked irregularly as temporaries or part time, the latter particularly in retail trade. Financial insecurity in these cases led some informants to consider using their time off the job to work at a second job. For some of my informants, autonomy off the job was enhanced by the presence of a second earner in the home. This created a degree of financial security that the informant otherwise may not have had. All informants, though, even those who reported earning as much as \$40,000 a year, were concerned about financial limitations. In a market economy such as ours, money is the ticket to paradise. And in a society that values consumption as much as we do, for many there's just never enough money.

Finally, the selection of off-the-job activities was influenced by intervening factors such as personal preferences and the presence (or absence) of social

supports. Both of these, however, were gender-loaded. Personal preferences varied for men and women. In areas related to childcare, household work, and recreation, social definitions of gender-appropriateness influenced their preferences. The presence of social supports, for example in the form of substitute childcare, the availability of friends or family with whom to pursue various activities, and the existence of social institutions such as a weekend graduate degree program, also shaped my informants' off-the-job options.

The varied time regimes associated with reduced work coupled with the influence of an array of intervening factors produced several different types of autonomy off the job. Thus, it is inaccurate to argue that reduced work does or does not foster autonomy off the job. Instead, autonomy off the job is problematic and the relationship between reduced work and autonomy is complex.

I have identified five different types of autonomy associated with reduced work. These are ideal types constructed on the basis of data provided by my informants. I treat them here as distinct categories, however, in reality they may intersect one another and may be further influenced by the sorts of intervening factors I discussed above.

The identification of these theoretical categories is an indication of the success of grounded theory as a method of qualitative research. Their identification provides

insight into the varied off-the-job experiences of those who work less than full time, but they should be understood as a first step in the theoretical understanding of reduced work and autonomy, not the final product. Grounded theory is open-ended and responsive to insights gained from data. In its ideal form, grounded theoretical research is an ongoing process in which core variables are identified and shift as the researcher gains more insight into his/her problem. The present study should be understood within the limitations of dissertation research, research bounded by categories and variables specified in the research proposal and bounded by time. A dissertation rooted in the tradition of grounded theory must be understood as a report on research in progress. For example, if this study were carried forward the researcher's focus might shift from the four types of reduced work with which I began to the different time regimes I identified. The researcher might also seek to broaden the study to include less-than-full-time employment in more diverse settings as well as full-time work and individuals without wage-paying jobs. The researcher might also want to shift his/her focus to the household to articulate a better understanding of the spheres of necessity and autonomy there.

The five types of autonomy associated with reduced work are: stable, temporary, fragmented, deferred, and contingent. Stable autonomy is associated with stable work schedules and lends itself to regular and planned off-the-

Job activities. When that stable schedule is a less-than-full-time schedule and subject to the worker's determination, it maximizes the worker's opportunities for off-the-job activities over long periods of time. This is an important contrast with temporary autonomy. Temporary autonomy is associated with the experiences of the laid-off autoworkers in my study. On the surface they appear maximally autonomous because they have no work schedules to attend to, but that autonomy will contract as soon as they must return to work. And their ordinarily rigid full-time work schedules will limit their autonomy off the job.

Fragmented autonomy is associated with unpredictable and irregular work schedules. Such time regimes create sometimes large, sometimes small, but difficult to anticipate amounts of time off the job. The fragmented and unpredictable nature of time off the job in this case limits the selection of off-the-job activities to those that can be taken up spontaneously and molded to the available time.

Deferred autonomy characterizes the experiences of those who, because the needs of young children take priority and/or because of financial limitations, must put off until tomorrow something they would like to do today. If this were a question only of self-determined priorities, I would not see it as a problem. But to the extent that deferred autonomy is the product of socially determined ideas and relations of gender, it is a problem. It is also a problem when that which is deferred is sacrificed as an option for

self-fulfillment. Granted, no one can have it all in this life, but to the extent that social structures curb options unnecessarily, those social constraints should be removed.

Finally, there is the type of autonomy that I call contingent autonomy. This type of autonomy accurately characterizes the experiences of those informants in my study whose autonomy off the job was fostered by financial security provided by a second earner or the discretionary approval of supervisors. It is a type of autonomy that could too easily be lost if the supports that permit it were suddenly removed. Because those whose autonomy is contingent must be concerned with the approval of others, their autonomy isn't really autonomy at all.

What should one conclude from this definition of different types of autonomy associated with reduced work? Of the five, stable autonomy is probably the most desirable, and stable autonomy free of the gender and hierarchical relations that give rise to deferred and contingent autonomy. Such autonomy can be fostered by the more equitable distribution of childcare responsibilities, household work, and money income between men and women; more equitable power relations on the job (in this case, especially regarding the determination of work schedules), and more secure employment and pay for those currently employed as contingent or marginal workers.

What does this discussion of types of autonomy imply for our understanding of Gorz's vision of the dual society

and particularly his conceptualization of the sphere of autonomy? He understands autonomy in a formal sense suggesting that control of time and use of time for creative expression and self-development only begin to be possible outside the sphere of heteronomous work. The types of autonomy discussed above suggest that the so-called sphere of autonomy is actually a sphere of greater and lesser degrees of substantive autonomy influenced by factors like the nature of one's work schedule and the extent to which one determines that schedule, organization of time off the job, the presence of dependent children, finances, and the availability of social supports. To the extent that these intersect with the sex/gender system and segmented labor markets, these macrostructural social relations affect autonomy off the job. Gorz recognizes that a cultural infrastructure must exist to foster creative use of time, which might include the availability of libraries; places for artistic expression; and open spaces for communication, circulation, and exchange. While an infrastructure of the sort he describes would certainly enhance the opportunities for creative expression, he underemphasizes elements of the cultural infrastructure that could inhibit individuals' ability to use the facilities and social space he wants to provide. My research shows clear evidence that some time regimes associated with reduced work permitted more enriching time off the job than others. Irregular and unpredictable schedules detracted from autonomy off the job

by fragmenting free time and, therefore, circumscribing its use. The types of reduced work most associated with irregular and unpredictable schedules were precisely those that are increasing most rapidly today, part-time employment, particularly in retail trade, and temporary employment. Unless individuals control their work schedules, one's job will continue to dominate time off the job even if the amount of working time is substantially less than the amount of time off the job.¹

The existence of deferred and contingent autonomy also reflects weaknesses in the cultural infrastructure that curb autonomy despite reduced working time. In my sample, these types of autonomy were associated largely although not exclusively with the experiences of women. Some women with dependent children deferred recreational and educational pursuits while their children were young and their care required considerable time. Other women, desperate to blend wage work and family life, experimented with job sharing even if this introduced an element of vulnerability to their security as workers and added to their supervisor's power.

And their ability to trade-off income for time was fostered

¹ In all fairness to Gorz, he does address this issue when he cites the authors of La Revolution du Temps Choisi stating that it is necessary to abolish compulsory working hours 'so that each individual has real freedom to choose when he or she wants to work.' 'We need to 'get away from the universal productivist injunction', 'the system of prefabricated timetables'. 'Every wage earner must be given the possibility of reducing his or her own worktime (and pay); the employers should have the right to reject this only in a limited number of specifically defined and controlled circumstances'" (Gorz 1982, p. 139).

by the presence of a second earner in the home. If it is the case that women shoulder disproportionately the burdens of deferral and contingency, then a cultural infrastructure must be created to redistribute that burden. Gorz advocates the development of neighborhood services as an alternative to currently institutionalized services that he believes destroy the fabric of interpersonal relations, and such neighborhood services could be the source of substitute dependent care which could free women's time for educational, recreational, and artistic pursuits. While this might begin to interrupt patriarchal gender relations, it doesn't go far enough if all of the neighborhood caregivers are women. As Chodorow's theory implies, as long as caregiving remains women's responsibility, the cultural infrastructure will discourage men from developing capacities for nurturance and gender asymmetries will persist. In addition, without some redistribution of power between supervisors and workers and redistribution of income between men and women, women's autonomy will be inauthentic.

Gorz sees women as the vanguard of the post-industrial revolution, rejecting the productivist ethic for time spent in nurturing relations with others. My female job sharers and some part-time workers certainly made this choice, but are they pioneers forging the way to a new society or are they trapped by contradictions in the present? As much as I would like to believe the former, it is difficult not to be cynical. With prevailing definitions of gender giving

primary responsibility for childcare to women, are women who choose to work less than full time at a wage-paying job actively rejecting a productivist ethic or are they simply doing what they are supposed to do as women? Feminist values have certainly gained a foothold in the society, but they remain politically contested and they are far from hegemonic. Given this political culture, are women who work less than full time a revolutionary vanguard or misfits in a culture that values full-time wage work? As some of the job sharers in my sample noted, they had to struggle to obtain their job-share arrangements but may be stigmatized or demoted for winning this privilege. This doesn't strike me as a group around which others are likely to rally. Their relative powerlessness and lack of organization render them ineffectual as leaders despite the apparent progressivism of their job-sharing experiments.

But the job sharers, despite areas of vulnerability, are protected somewhat from supervisory caprice by civil service employment regulations and labor union representation. This accords them relatively more power than many of the part-time and temporary workers in my sample. The part-time workers and temporaries remain most vulnerable to the vicissitudes of the market and without union protection have little power to guard their positions as workers. The laid-off autoworkers in my sample are perhaps the most powerful of the four groups studied here. Despite the vulnerability of those at mid-career who may

face job loss in the not-too-distant future, for now their jobs are protected as are their incomes and benefits. True, the UAW has lost membership and strength coincident with the auto companies' efforts to reorganize, but the UAW remains one of the most powerful unions in the nation and rests on a foundation of hard-won rights for workers. There is a safety net in place for the autoworkers that simply does not exist for most part-time and temporary workers. Perhaps the autoworkers are the vanguard for they have refused socialized labor--at least for the period of time they volunteered to be laid off--and they represent a legacy of union struggle that has gained benefits approximating a social income of the sort Gorz envisions. Yet they are far from a feminist vanguard and, therefore, unlikely to lead us to Gorz's post-industrial future.

Another important question for purposes of evaluating Gorz's theory is, does the non-class exist? My sample was not selected to assess the concept of the non-class per se, but it may provide an answer to the question just the same. To reiterate, Gorz (1982, pp. 68-69) defines the non-class as encompassing those expelled from production by the abolition of work and those whose capacities are underemployed. It includes all those potentially and actually unemployed, permanently or temporarily, partially or completely. They lack job security and a class identity, and this "neo-proletariat" is generally overqualified for the jobs it finds. While the issue of class identity is one

I cannot address because my data are inadequate for that purpose, Gorz's definition certainly pertains to most of the part-time and temporary workers in my sample. But the job sharers and work sharers do not fit so neatly his definition. Their job security is relatively greater than that of the part-time workers and temporaries for reasons of labor market segment and seniority rights.

Gorz (1982, p. 72) asserts that the neo-proletariat defines its own subjectivity through the refusal of socialized labor and implies that this refusal is motivated by work-based alienation. He states (Gorz 1982, p. 71), ". . . neo-proletarians are basically non-workers temporarily doing something that means nothing to them." In turn, this post-industrial proletariat seeks to appropriate areas of autonomy outside and in opposition to the logic of society for purposes of individual development (Gorz 1982, p. 73).

The work sharers in my sample expressed evidence of worker alienation and their volunteering for the inverse layoff was an act of refusal of socialized labor. While a few part-time workers and temporaries preferred reduced work because they valued their time off the job, many wanted regular, steady, full-time employment because they needed the income. In those cases, reduced work did not represent a refusal of socialized labor so much as making do with what came one's way. And in cases where informants worked 40-hour weeks as part-time and temporary workers, their work schedules inhibited their ability to appropriate areas of

autonomy, even if they were so inclined. The female job sharers' refusal of socialized labor was not the product of worker alienation but gender-related responsibilities rooted in their definition of the meaning of motherhood. Yet they valued their wage-paying jobs. Employment was a source of identity because it gave them a public role in a society that values wage-paying work more than privatized unpaid work.

My sample shows some evidence that a non-class exists, but its subjectivity is underdeveloped and what desires for autonomy exist stem from both work-related alienation and gender-related responsibilities. The most marginally employed among the part-time and temporary workers, even if they desired greater autonomy, could not afford it. Their employment was sufficiently insecure and their pay inadequate that they sought second jobs and hoped to one day find secure, full-time employment.

The differences in pay, benefits, and employment security experienced by my informants reflect differences in reduced work in various labor market segments. Those employed in manufacturing are the beneficiaries of what remains of the postwar capital-labor accord when increases in productivity were passed on to workers in the form of higher wages and benefits. Those employed in the public sector are the beneficiaries of wage determination practices that linked the public sector to wage levels in the unionized private sector. But part-time workers,

particularly those without union representation, and temporary employees make a precarious living at best.

The state could certainly establish policy to minimize the effects of labor market segmentation by mandating an increase in the minimum wage and requiring employers to provide benefits to their part-time and temporary workers. The former is on the horizon, but the latter seems unlikely given that employers use part-time and temporary workers in part to avoid paying benefits. Such a public policy, however, would be consistent with Gorz's vision of the administrative state in the post-industrial future. Following Marx, Gorz (1982, pp. 114-115) sees the role of the state apparatus to ensure that everyone has the necessities of life and to define the amount of socially necessary labor required from each individual. Yet these coordinating activities of the state must be preserved at the same time that its powers of domination are abolished and it checks the power of classes or groups in society to dominate other groups. In executing its responsibility to define and allocate socially necessary labor time but doing so with restricted power, the state avoids imposing work-time reduction and more free time on individuals. Instead, people are empowered to take more free time if they want it (Gorz 1982, p. 137). But to ensure that gender asymmetries in free time do not persist, thereby checking the power of men to dominate women, Gorz's administrative state would have to incorporate nurturing work, like child and dependent

care, into its definition of socially necessary labor and monitor the distribution of this work across men and women.

Today the state has not taken an active role in promoting the redistribution of wage work through work-time reduction, except with regard to short-time compensation. On both the federal and state levels there persists faith in the ability of the economy to grow and generate jobs, although strategies for stimulating economic growth vary from state to state and between state and federal government. The track record of the 1980s, however, with considerable growth in part-time and temporary employment and unemployment rates that remain unacceptably high to all but those who are prepared to revise upward the rate of unemployment associated with full employment, suggests such thinking is naive.

The last time the U.S. federal government wrestled with the issue of generalized work-time reduction was in the late 1970s after U.S. Representative John Conyers (D-Michigan) introduced legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.² Conyers' bill proposed (1) reduction of the standard

² Signed into law on June 25, 1938, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to become effective October 24, 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) has been called the "cornerstone" of federal labor legislation (McGaughey 1981, p. 252) and has been assessed as "second only to the Social Security Act in significance" (Elder and Miller 1979, p. 11). The FLSA established the minimum wage, maximum hours, and premium pay for overtime. For accounts of the politics surrounding the formulation and passage of the act, see Orme Wheelock Phelps, The Legislative Background of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939; Jonathan Grossman, "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938: Maximum Struggle for a Minimum Wage," Monthly Labor Review, 101 (6) June, 1978: 22-30; and Ronnie Steinberg, Wages and

workweek to 37 1/2 hours, effective January 1, 1981, and 35 hours, effective January 1, 1983; (2) increase in premium pay for overtime from time-and-one-half to double-time; and (3) prohibition of mandatory overtime. Proponents argued that a generalized reduction of the workweek would decrease unemployment and offset the social costs of unemployment; combat technological unemployment; relieve stress on the job, thereby improving morale and productivity; decrease absenteeism; and improve the quality of life off the job. They believed it could also help conserve energy if work-time reduction decreased commuting and permitted buildings to be closed part of each week. By employing more people, income tax revenues would increase as would net consumption demand. Opponents, however, believed generalized work-time reduction would increase labor costs and bring about a decline in productivity if unqualified persons were employed. It would be inflationary because increased labor costs would lead to an increase in prices which, paradoxically, might exacerbate unemployment in the long run

Hours: Labor Reform in Twentieth-Century America, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1982. For discussions of the history of the FLSA, particularly its enforcement record and amendments, see Peyton K. Elder and Heidi D. Miller, "The Fair Labor Standards Act: Changes of Four Decades," Monthly Labor Review 102 (7) July, 1979: 10-16; and William McGaughey, Jr., A Shorter Workweek in the 1980s, White Bear Lake, Minn.: Thistlerose Publications, 1981, pp. 252-256. For a discussion of the effect of state maximum hours laws and the overtime provisions of the FLSA on women, see Ronnie Steinberg Ratner, "The Paradox of Protection: Maximum Hours Legislation in the United States," International Labour Review 119 (2) March-April, 1980: 185-198.

if employers tried to offset higher labor costs with increased mechanization. Further, a reduction of the workweek would increase multiple job holding. A legislated reduction, they believed, interferes with the operation of the collective bargaining system (U.S. Congress, House of Representatives 1979). Economists generally criticize efforts to reduce the workweek because such efforts assume the amount of work in a society is fixed. They argue that the amount of work to be done can be increased if the economy expands (McGaughey 1981, p. 109). The political contest over reduction of the workweek reached a stalemate; the bill never progressed beyond committee hearings (McGaughey 1981, p. 256).³

The strategy to promote economic growth adopted by the Reagan administration has been to reduce taxes and economic regulation to stimulate investment. In Michigan such "supply-side" efforts have been coupled with an increasingly acclaimed corporatist strategy, including development of a targeted industries program and creation of a public-private investment fund, to generate economic growth.⁴ Legislation

3 For further discussion of the pros and cons of work-time reduction see Rolande Cuvillier, The Reduction of Working Time. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1984; Ronald G. Ehrenberg and Paul L. Schumann, Longer Hours or More Jobs? An Investigation of Amending Hours Legislation to Create Employment. Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1982; and William McGaughey, Jr., A Shorter Workweek in the 1980s. White Bear Lake, Minn.: Thistlerose Publications, 1981.

4 For overviews and evaluations of Michigan's economic development policy see Charles Bartsch, Reaching for Recovery, Washington, D.C.: Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1985, and Richard Child Hill and Cynthia Negrey, "The

introduced in 1983 to create a short-time compensation plan in Michigan, the only work-time reduction issue state legislators have dealt with recently, died in committee. What support for work-time reduction exists in Michigan or at the federal level encourages experimentation with flexible time options among public sector employees. Such policy seems particularly responsive to the needs of female employees, but it also has the consequence of marginalizing them. Clearly, government lacks any comprehensive time policy in its efforts to manage economic transition.

But issues and conflicts around time will persist if not because of unemployment and slow economic growth then because women will continue to be active participants in the paid labor force. We as a society must face the fact that the 1950s "cult of domesticity" no longer exists, and our social institutions must be altered to reflect that fact. Employers must become more responsive to the needs of "working parents." This might include a redefinition of the full-time workweek to 9:00 to 3:00 Monday through Friday to coincide with the hours children are in school.⁵ Flexible

Politics of Industrial Policy in Michigan," pp. 119-138 in Industrial Policy: Business and Politics in the United States and France, edited by Sharon Zukin. New York: Praeger, 1985. Favorable appraisals of Michigan's strategy appeared in Inc. Magazine in October, 1987, and March, 1988.

5 The power of capital to resist reductions in working time, however, is reflected in the trend today to extend the hours during which children are at school. I am referring especially to the growth of before- and after-school care provided by some school systems (at cost to parents) particularly in affluent areas. There has also been some discussion of extending the school year through the summer.

hours should be available to the parents of pre-school-age children and those who don't want to work full time. Work on weekends and at night should be optional. Employer-provided benefits might include on-site childcare and/or childcare allowances to pay part of the cost of childcare as well as paid parental leaves for parents of new infants and ill children. Dependent care coverage might be an option available to employees caring for aging and ailing parents. These benefits could be supplements to or substitutes for publicly provided child and dependent care. Such work schedules and benefits would recognize that the sphere of necessity extends beyond the place of employment to the household and that time off the job includes obligated as well as unobligated time. While a feminist conception of full-time employment and employer-provided benefits doesn't address the problem of gender asymmetries in household work and caregiving, they may be a step in the right direction if they apply equally to women and men.

The final theoretical issue that this study deals with is the relationship between reduced work and community. Could reduced work foster reconstruction and renewal of community? While my study provides an inconclusive answer to this question, I think it could. With a few exceptions, reduced work for my informants generally enhanced relational activities. They had more time to spend with partners,

These trends suggest it is the public schools that will be the providers of substitute childcare for working parents.

other family members, and friends and, although not true across the board, believed relationships benefited from informants' ability to devote more time and energy to them.

For those interested in community activities, reduced work facilitated that involvement when work schedules were stable and predictable. It inhibited such participation if it prevented informants from making commitments. Because voluntary associations can be spheres of democratic participation, reduced work should be organized to encourage such participation.⁶

Currently, two models of relation and community seem to be on the rise, neither of which fulfills the vision of communitarian autonomy suggested in chapter 2. The first, which I call the corporate model, places the corporation at the center of community and equates the corporation with community. The corporation is the community. This is advocated by writers such as Robert B. Reich (1983) who want to borrow Japanese corporate practices and apply them in the U.S. This includes making the corporation a social service deliverer. Reich promotes a dismantling of the welfare state and transfer of its responsibilities to corporations. This model extends the power and domination of capital even

⁶ Voluntary associations may be conservative forces in society, reinforcing the status quo, or they may be the organizational base from which grow movements for democratic social change. In either case, they can provide opportunities for autonomous citizen participation. Regarding voluntary associations as sources of democratic social change, see Sara M. Evans and Harry C. Boyte, Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1986.

further into the sphere of community, thus threatening community autonomy. Reich has an answer to this: workers control corporate welfare programs. But this is insufficient given that even worker-controlled corporate welfare programs would remain hostage to the vicissitudes of the profit motive and hierarchical corporate relations. Corporate control of workers could increase under this model if workers' social safety net is attached to their performance as workers.

Another manifestation of the corporate model of community comes in the guise of corporate health and recreation programs for workers. This is exemplified by those companies that provide such perquisites as tennis courts and aerobics classes for their employees. Although I do not mean to dismiss any humanitarian motives on the part of companies in providing such programs, the primary rationale behind them is cost efficiency. Corporations today bear a major burden in health care costs for their insured employees and promoting healthy lifestyles might be a strategy to reduce the costs of health care for employees.

I have no objections to healthy living, but I do object to corporate-dominated models of community. As stated previously, employees who use these services remain subordinate to the interests of the corporation. Further, not all workers in the society are or will be attached to corporate employers and they would be excluded from the corporate community. Few small businesses can afford to

develop recreation programs of the sort just described or provide social welfare programs to their employees.

The second model of relation and community which is on the rise today is the therapeutic model. Therapy is part and parcel of the quest for relation and community in an increasingly individualistic society. The therapist may be a substitute for significant others missing in one's life or may (it is hoped) provide assistance in finding relation and community. Adelman (1987) recently has documented the increase in the percentage of Americans who sought mental health care between 1957 and 1976, from 4 to 13 percent. Still a minority of the population, the rate of increase (more than 200 percent in a 20-year period) reflects, she argues, the greater availability of mental health services; changes in the way Americans think about their own well being; and cultural changes, especially greater affluence, rootlessness and isolation from one's extended family, and the decline of church and community as social influences.

Therapy, however, may not be an adequate substitute for significant social bonds. First, the relationship is contractual; and second, it is asymmetrical, focused on the client. Further, it is an unequal relationship circumscribed in time and space by the therapist. In the language of social psychologist Charles Horton Cooley, the therapeutic relationship is a secondary relationship--an inadequate substitute for the primary relationship for which the client may be searching.

The therapeutic model is also an extension of the value of bourgeois individualism in advanced capitalist society. As such, it tends to focus on individuals as the cause of their own problems and cannot entertain social solutions to personal problems. Indeed, therapy itself is a product of advanced capitalism, yet further extension of the market into profitable areas of service delivery.⁷

In Civilization and its Discontents, Freud argued that humans require a balance of work and love. Psychologists today continue to trumpet balanced lives for individual well being. Yet it takes time to pursue the varied activities that constitute a balanced life. When we spend most of our waking hours at work, even if it is a job we enjoy, and the rest of our hours recovering and preparing for the next day, or catching up at a feverish pace on household activities, our lives are necessarily one-sided. The experiences of the informants in this study suggest that reduced work can provide the increased time necessary to build balanced lives. But reduced work doesn't do this by definition. Social practices and institutions must change to provide

⁷ For a critical discussion of therapy in modern American society, see Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton, Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. New York: Perennial Library (Harper and Row), 1986. They argue that therapy takes for granted the institutions and organizations of advanced industrial society and "helps" individuals maneuver within those institutions. Despite its orientation to encouraging the development of autonomous persons, it is blind to the ways in which social institutions circumscribe autonomy. Because of this myopia, therapy rarely encourages individuals to join together to change social institutions.

greater financial security to those who don't have it and greater personal autonomy to those whose autonomy is limited by social convention.

I have strayed a long way from the central question of this study, the relationship between reduced work and autonomy. I have argued that their relationship is complex, that the varied time regimes associated with reduced work and a number of intervening factors influence autonomy off the job. I have also suggested that greater autonomy off the job may be a vehicle for the reconstruction of community. Reconstructing community at the local level and building community at the international level may be our most urgent enterprise today. In the nuclear age, our survival as a species depends on it.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Scholarly Books and Articles

- Abel, Emily. 1977. "The Professional Proletariat: Teachers in California Colleges." Radical Teacher (July): 1-13.
- Adler, Paul. 1986. "Technology and Us." Socialist Review (January-February): 67-96.
- Appelbaum, Eileen. 1987. "Restructuring Work: Temporary, Part-Time, and At-Home Employment." Pp. 268-310 in Computer Chips and Paper Clips: Technology and Women's Employment, edited by Heidi I. Hartmann. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Arkin, William and Lynne Dobrofsky. 1978. "Job Sharing." Pp. 122-137 in Working Couples, edited by Rhona N. Rapoport and Robert Rapoport. New York: Harper and Row/Rutledge.
- Beer, William. 1983. Househusbands. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey.
- Bell, Daniel. 1973. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. New York: Perennial Library (Harper and Row).
- Bennett, Roy and Frank Riessman. 1984. "Is It Time for the Four-Day Work Week?" Social Policy 15 (Summer): inside cover.
- Bergmann, Frithjof. "The Future of Work." Praxis International. (personal copy)
- Berk, Richard and Sarah Fenstermaker Berk. 1979. Labor and Leisure at Home: Content and Organization of the Household Day. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker, editor. 1980. Women and Household Labor. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker. 1985. The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households. New York: Plenum.
- Best, Fred. 1978. "Recycling People: Work-sharing Through Flexible Life Scheduling." Futurist 12 (February): 4-17.
- Best, Fred. 1980. Flexible Life Scheduling: Breaking the Education-Work-Retirement Lockstep. New York: Praeger.
- Best, Fred. 1981. Work Sharing: Issues, Policy Options, and Prospects. Kalamazoo, Mich.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Block, Fred. 1984. "The Myth of Reindustrialization." Socialist Review (January-February): 59-76.
- Braverman, Harry. 1974. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brazer, Harvey E. and Deborah S. Laren. 1982. Michigan's Fiscal and Economic Structure. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Cassimatis, Emmanuel. 1979. "Mental Health Viewed as an Ideal." Psychiatry 42 (August): 241-254.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1979. Reading Capital Politically. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Cohen, Mitchell. 1983. "Farewell to the Working Class (Book Review)." New Political Science 12 (Summer): 107-115.
- Cohen, Stephen S. and John Zysman. 1987. Manufacturing Matters: The Myth of Post-Industrialism. New York: Basic Books.
- Cooley, Charles Horton. 1962. Social Organization. New York: Schocken.
- Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. 1983. More Work for Mother. New York: Basic Books.
- Crowley, R.W. and E. Huth. 1983. "An International Comparison of Work Sharing Programs." Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations 38 (3): 636-647.

- Cuvillier, Rolande. 1984. The Reduction of Working Time. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Deem, Rosemary. 1986. All Work and No Play? A Study of Women and Leisure. Milton Keynes, England and Philadelphia, Pa.: Open University Press.
- DiFazio, William. 1985. Longshoremen: Community and Resistance on the Brooklyn Waterfront. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Eberhardt, B.J. and A.B. Shani. 1984. "The Effects of Full-Time Versus Part-Time Employment Status on Attitudes Toward Specific Organizational Characteristics and Overall Job Satisfaction." Academy of Management Journal 27 (4): 893-900.
- Edsforth, Ronald. 1987. Class Conflict and Cultural Consensus: The Making of a Mass Consumer Society in Flint, Michigan. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Edwards, Richard. 1979. Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century. New York: Basic Books.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Paul L. Schumann. 1982. Longer Hours or More Jobs? An Investigation of Amending Hours Legislation to Create Employment. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press.
- Evans, Sara M. and Harry C. Boyte. 1986. Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Faunce, William A. and Robert Dubin. 1975. "Individual Investment in Working and Living." Pp. 299-316 in The Quality of Working Life, edited by Louis E. Davis and Albert B. Cherns. New York: Free Press.
- Fay, Brian. 1987. Critical Social Science. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Fine, Sidney. 1969. Sit Down: The General Motors Strike of 1936-37. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Forester, Tom, ed. 1985. The Information Technology Revolution. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Fox, Mary Frank and Sharlene Hesse-Biber. 1984. Women At Work. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co.

- Freud, Sigmund. 1961. Civilization and its Discontents. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc.
- Gannon, Martin J. 1975. "Management of Peripheral Employees." Personnel Journal 54 (September): 482-486.
- Gans, Herbert. 1985. "Toward the 32-hour Workweek." Social Policy 15 (Winter): 58-61.
- Gardiner, Jean. 1979. "Women's Domestic Labor." Pp. 173-189 in Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism, edited by Zillah R. Eisenstein. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. In A Different Voice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1987. "Moral Orientation and Moral Development." Pp. 19-33 in Women and Moral Theory, edited by Eva Feder Kittay and Diana T. Meyers. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine.
- Gordon, David M., Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich. 1982. Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the U.S. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorz, Andre. 1980. Ecology as Politics. Boston: South End Press.
- Gorz, Andre. 1982. Farewell to the Working Class. Boston: South End Press.
- Gorz, Andre. 1985. Paths to Paradise: On the Liberation from Work. Boston: South End Press.
- Gronseth, Eric. 1975. "Work Sharing Families: Adaptations of Pioneering Families with Husband and Wife in Part-Time Employment." Acta Sociologica 18 (2-3): 202-221.
- Hartmann, Heidi I. 1981. "The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class, and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework." Signs 6 (3): 366-394.
- Haworth, Lawrence. 1986. Autonomy: An Essay in Philosophical Psychology and Ethics. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

- Helson, Ravenna, Valory Mitchell, and Barbara Hart. 1985. "Lives of Women Who Became Autonomous." Journal of Personality 53 (2): 257-285.
- Hewlett, Sylvia Ann. 1986. A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation in America. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc.
- Hill, Richard Child and Cynthia Negrey. 1985. "The Politics of Industrial Policy in Michigan." Pp. 119-138 in Industrial Policy: Business and Politics in the United States and France, edited by Sharon Zukin. New York: Praeger.
- Hill, Thomas E., Jr. 1987. "The Importance of Autonomy." Pp. 129-138 in Women and Moral Theory, edited by Eva Feder Kittay and Diana T. Meyers. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jones, Barry. 1982. Sleepers, Wake! Technology and the Future of Work. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Bryan D. and Lynn W. Bachelor with Carter Wilson. 1986. The Sustaining Hand: Community Leadership and Corporate Power. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Kahne, Hilda. 1985. Reconceiving Part-Time Work: New Perspectives for Older Workers and Women. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1964. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Translated and analysed by H.J. Paton. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Keeran, Roger. 1980. The Communist Party and the Auto Workers Union. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.
- Keller, Catherine. 1986. From A Broken Web: Separation, Sexism, and Self. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kittay, Eva Feder and Diana T. Meyers, eds. 1987. Women and Moral Theory. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Koestler, Arthur. 1967. The Ghost in the Machine. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1981. The Philosophy of Moral Development. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

- Kraus, Henry. 1947. The Many and the Few: A Chronicle of the Dynamic Auto Workers. Los Angeles: The Plantin Press.
- Kuttner, Bob. 1984. "Jobs." Dissent (Winter): 30-41.
- Lammers, John C. 1984. "Managing Unemployment: The Role of Union Business Agents and the Use of Work Sharing." Social Problems 32 (December): 133-143.
- Leontief, Wassily W. 1982. "The Distribution of Work and Income." Scientific American 247 (September): 188-204.
- Levitan, Sar. A. and Richard S. Belous. 1977. Shorter Hours, Shorter Weeks. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Levitan, Sar A. and Clifford M. Johnson. 1982. Second Thoughts on Work. Kalamazoo, Mich.: W.E. Upjohn Intitute for Employment Research.
- Loevinger, Jane. 1966. "The Meaning and Measurement of Ego Development." American Psychologist 22: 195-206.
- Loevinger, Jane. 1976. Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Long, J.E. and E.B. Jones. 1980. "Part-Week Work by Married Women." Southern Economic Journal 46 (January): 716-725.
- Long, J.E. and E.B. Jones. 1981. "Married Women in Part-Time Employment." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 34 (April): 413-425.
- MacCoy, Ramelle and Martin J. Morand. 1984. Short-Time Compensation: A Formula for Work Sharing. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mandel, Ernest. 1971. The Formation of the Economic Thought of Karl Marx. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1971. The Grundrisse. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Marx, Karl. 1977. Capital. Volume 1. New York: Vintage Books.
- McCarthy, Maureen and Gail S. Rosenberg with Gary Lefkowitz. 1981. Work Sharing: Case Studies. Kalamazoo, Mich.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

- McGaughey, William, Jr. 1981. A Shorter Workweek in the 1980s. White Bear Lake, Minn.: Thistlerose Publications.
- Meier, Gretl S. 1979. Job Sharing: A New Pattern for Quality of Work and Life. Kalamazoo, Mich.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Meier, Gretl S. 1982. "Family and Life-Cycle Changes Due to Job Sharing." Pp. 152-158 in New Work Schedules in Practice: Managing Time in a Changing Society, edited by Stanley D. Nollen. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company/Work in America Institute Series.
- Meissner, Martin. 1971. "The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure." Industrial Relations 10: 239-260.
- Miller, H.E. and J.R. Terborg. 1979. "Job Attitudes of Part-Time and Full-Time Employees." Journal of Applied Psychology 64 (August): 380-386.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, Mack. 1963. "The Role of Temporary Help Services in the Clerical Labor Market." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin- Madison, 1963.
- Morgenstern, R.D. and W. Hamovitch. 1976. "Labor Supply of Married Women in Part-Time and Full-Time Occupations." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 30 (October): 59-67.
- Olesen, Virginia L. and Frances Katsuranis. 1978. "Urban Nomads: Women in Temporary Clerical Services." Pp. 316-338 in Women Working, edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Ollman, Bertell. 1976. Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society, 2nd edition. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Olmsted, Barney. 1979. "Job Sharing: An Emerging Work-style." International Labour Review 118 (May-June): 283-297.
- Ostrach, T.R. 1981. "Second Look at Temporaries." Personnel Journal 60 (June): 440.
- Owen, John D. 1979. Working Hours: An Economic Analysis. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books (D.C. Heath and Co.).

- Papanek, Hanna. 1973. "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career." American Journal of Sociology 78 (4): 852-872.
- Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales, eds. 1955. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Phelps, Orme Wheelock. 1939. The Legislative Background of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pleck, Joseph. 1979. "Men's Family Work: Three Perspectives and Some New Data." The Family Coordinator (October): 481-488.
- Rasmussen, David M. 1973. "Between Autonomy and Sociality." Cultural Hermeneutics 1 (April): 3-45.
- Ratner, Ronnie Steinberg. 1980. "The Paradox of Protection: Maximum Hours Legislation in the United States." International Labor Review 119 (March-April): 185-198.
- Reich, Robert B. 1983. The Next American Frontier. New York: Times Books.
- Ritzer, George and David Walczak. 1986. Working: Conflict and Change, 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Rotchford, N.L. and K.H. Roberts. 1982. "Part-Time Workers as Missing Persons in Organizational Research." Academy of Management Review 7 (April): 228-234.
- Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex." Pp. 157-210 in Toward an Anthropology of Women, edited by Rayna R. Reiter. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Runes, Dagobert D., editor. 1983. Dictionary of Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Secombe, Wally. 1973. "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism." New Left Review 83 (January-February): 3-24.
- Sidel, Ruth. 1986. Women and Children Last: The Plight of Poor Women in Affluent America. New York: Viking.
- Sirianni, Carmen. 1987. "Economies of Time in Social Theory: Three Approaches Compared." Current Perspectives in Social Theory 8: 161-195.

- Smith, Vicki. 1983. "The Circular Trap: Women and Part-Time Work." Berkeley Journal of Sociology 23: 1-17.
- Staines, Graham. 1980. "Spillover Versus Compensation: A Review of the Literature on the Relationship Between Work and Nonwork." Human Relations 33 (2): 111-129.
- Steinberg, Ronnie. 1982. Wages and Hours: Labor and Reform in Twentieth Century America. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Thompson, E.P. 1967. "Time, Work Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." Past and Present 38: 56-97.
- Van Arsdale, George. 1978. "Deprofessionalizing a Part-Time Teaching Faculty: How Many, Feeling Small, Seeming Few, Getting Less, Dream of More." The American Sociologist 13 (November): 195-201.
- Vanek, Joann. 1974. "Time Spent in Housework." Scientific American (November): 116-120.
- Vorse, Mary Heaton. 1938. Labor's New Millions. New York: Modern Age Books.
- Walker, Kathryn E. and Margaret E. Woods. 1976. Time Use: A Measure of Household Production of Family Goods and Services. American Home Economics Association.
- Weeks, Wendy. 1980. "Part-Time Work: The Business View on Second-Class Jobs for Housewives and Mothers." Atlantis 5 (Spring): 69-88.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1960. "Work, Careers, and Social Integration." International Social Science Journal 12: 543-560.
- Winkler, Karen. 1979. "Two Who Share One Academic Job Say the Pros Outnumber the Cons." Chronicle of Higher Education (December 3): 3.
- Yeandle, S. 1982. "Variation and Flexibility: Key Characteristics of Female Labor." Sociology 16 (August): 422-430.
- Yeghissian, Patricia. 1980. "Emergence of the Red Berets." Michigan Occasional Papers in Women's Studies, Number X, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Zaretsky, Eli. 1976. Capitalism, The Family, and Personal Life. New York: Harper Colophon.

U.S. Government Publications

- Bednarzik, Robert W. 1980. "Worksharing in the U.S.: Its Prevalence and Duration." Monthly Labor Review 103 (July): 3-12.
- Best, Fred and James Mattesich. 1980. "Short-Time Compensation Systems in California and Europe." Monthly Labor Review 103 (July): 13-22.
- Carey, Max L. and Kim L. Hazelbaker. 1986. "Employment Growth in the Temporary Help Industry." Monthly Labor Review 109 (April): 37-44.
- Deutermann, William V., Jr. and Scott Campbell Brown. 1978. "Voluntary Part-Time Workers: A Growing Part of the Labor Force." Monthly Labor Review 101 (June): 3-10.
- Elder, P.K. and H.D. Miller. 1979. "The Fair Labor Standards Act: Changes of Four Decades." Monthly Labor Review 102 (July): 10-16.
- Gannon, Martin. 1974. "A Profile of the Temporary Help Industry and its Workers." Monthly Labor Review 97 (May): 44-49.
- Gannon, Martin. 1984. "Preferences of Temporary Workers: Time, Variety, Flexibility." Monthly Labor Review 107 (August): 26-28.
- Grossman, Jonathan. 1978. "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938: Maximum Struggle for a Minimum Wage." Monthly Labor Review 101 (June): 22-30.
- Hamel, Harvey R. 1985. "New Data Series on Involuntary Part-Time Work." Monthly Labor Review 108 (March): 42-43.
- Hedges, Janice Neipert. 1980. "Working Less and Enjoying It More." Monthly Labor Review 103 (May): 59-60.
- Howe, Wayne J. 1986. "The Business Services Industry Sets Pace in Employment Growth." Monthly Labor Review 109 (April): 29-36.
- Kerachsky, Stuart, Walter Nicholson, Edward Cavin, and Alan Hershey. 1986. "Work Sharing Programs: An Evaluation of Their Use." Monthly Labor Review 109 (May): 31-33.
- Levitan, Sar A. and R.S. Belous. 1977. "Work-Sharing Initiatives at Home and Abroad." Monthly Labor Review 100 (September): 16-20.

- Nardone, Thomas. 1986. "Part-Time Workers: Who Are They?" Monthly Labor Review 109 (February): 13-19.
- Nemirow, Martin. 1984. "Work-Sharing Approaches: Past and Present." Monthly Labor Review 107 (September): 34-39.
- Owen, John D. 1978. "Why Part-Time Workers Tend to be in Low-Wage Jobs." Monthly Labor Review 101 (June): 11-14.
- Pleck, Joseph H., Graham L. Staines, and Linda Lang. 1980. "Conflicts Between Work and Family Life." Monthly Labor Review 103 (March): 29-32.
- Schiff, Frank. 1986. "Short-Time Compensation: Assessing the Issues." Monthly Labor Review 109 (May): 28-30.
- Terry, Sylvia Lazos. 1981. "Involuntary Part-Time Work: New Information from the CPS." Monthly Labor Review 104 (February): 70-74.
- U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. 1979. To Revise the Overtime Compensation Requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, 96th Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 1784, October 23-25.
- U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment. 1985. Automation of America's Offices. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1978. County Business Patterns. Michigan. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1980. Census of Population. Chapter D: Detailed Population Characteristics, U.S. and Michigan. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1985. County Business Patterns. Michigan. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1980. Supplement to Employment and Earnings, States and Areas, Data for 1977-79. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1982. Employment and Wages, Annual Averages. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1983. Employment, Hours, and Earnings, States and Areas, 1939-82. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1985. Employment and Earnings 32 (June).
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1986. Employment and Earnings 33 (January, May).
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1986. Employment and Wages, Annual Averages.
Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
1987. Employment and Earnings 34 (November).
- U.S. Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
News. USDL 86-328, released August 7, 1986.
- Zalusky, John. 1986. "Short-Time Compensation: The AFL-CIO Perspective." Monthly Labor Review 109 (May): 33-34.

State Government Publications

1986. "Headcount Concept Affects Women Workers." WSG (Women in State Government) Wire 3 (March).
1986. Michigan Department of Social Services Internal Memo, March 14.
- Naftaly, Robert H. and John R. Hueni. 1985. Inter-departmental Memo to Department Directors, December 26.
- State of Michigan. Department of Civil Service. 1986. Classified Employees by Department on Active Payroll Status (Printout), July 26.

Non-government Publications

- Bartsch, Charles. 1985. Reaching for Recovery.
Washington, D.C.: Northeast-Midwest Institute.

Capital Area United Way. Long Range Planning Committee.
1986. Retrospect and Prospect: A Portrait of the Tri-
County Area. Lansing, Mich.: Capital Area United Way.

Manassah, Sallie M., David A. Thomas, and James F.
Wallington. 1986. Lansing: Capital, Campus, and Cars.
East Lansing, Mich.: Contemporary Image Adv., Ltd.

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women. 1986.
Working at the Margins: Part-Time and Temporary Workers
in the U.S. Cleveland, Ohio: 9 to 5, National
Association of Working Women.

Plewes, Thomas. 1984. "Profile of the Part-Time Worker."
Pp. 1-20 in Part-Time Employment in America: Highlights
of the First National Conference on Part-Time Employment,
edited by the Association of Part-Time Professionals.
McLean, Va.: Association of Part-Time Professionals.

Zalusky, John. 1984. "Presentation by John Zalusky." Pp.
32-34 in Part-Time Employment in America: Highlights of
the First National Conference on Part-Time Employment,
edited by the Association of Part-Time Professionals.
McLean, Va.: Association of Part-Time Professionals.

Popular Press

Adelmann, Pamela. 1987. "Freshening Freud For Us All."
Detroit Free Press (September 13).

Bluestone, Barry and Bennett Harrison. 1987. "The Grim
Truth about the Job 'Miracle'." The New York Times
(February 1).

Brown, Peter. 1984. "Fate of 1,700 Jobless in Hands of UAW
Local." Detroit Free Press (January 15).

Buss, Dale D. 1982. "Of All Places Hurt By The Slump,
Flint, Mich., Seems Hurt The Most." Wall Street Journal
(April 30).

Cain, Charlie and Eric Freedman. 1987. "Autoworld Revived
by \$6-Million Deal." Detroit News (February 26).

Cantor, George. 1986. "Flint: Its New Spark Will Surprise
You." Michigan Living (AAA) (August).

Crane, Maurice. 1984. "R.E. Olds Saw Car's Great Future."
Lansing State Journal (May 20).

- Erickson, Lorf. 1986. "Working Out the Kinks in Flint." In These Times (August 6-19).
- Faust, Scott. 1987. "City Braces for Bleak Days Ahead." Detroit News (April 26).
1980. "Flint Reels With Jobless Rate That's Worst in the Nation." Detroit News (August 10).
- Fogel, Helen, Nunzio Lupo, and John Spelich. 1987. "How UAW Opened Path to GM Pact." Detroit Free Press (October 11).
- Grenier, Melinda. 1983. "Overtime Car Output Highest Since 1940s." Detroit News (December 18).
- Grenier, Melinda, John Broder, and Ann Cohen. 1983. "Flint to Lose 3,600 Jobs." Detroit News (January 20).
- Gribbin, August. 1983. "State Studies Work Sharing to Curb Layoffs." Detroit News (September 4).
- Higgins, James V. 1986. "GM Unveils All-New Engine: 'Quad-4' Called One Step Closer to Maintenance-Free Motor." Detroit News (February 18).
- Higgins, James V. 1987. "Layoffs Aid Workers with Low Seniority." Detroit News (May 30).
- Job, Ann M. 1984. "Flint GM Workers to Vote on Hours." Detroit News (January 10).
- Job, Ann M. and Robert E. Roach. 1984. "Flint UAW Votes No to 3rd Shift." Detroit News (January 18).
- Miller, Edward. 1986. "Auto Giant's Strategy Could Take Years to Pay Off." Detroit News (November 7).
- Moore, Michael. 1987. "In Flint, Tough Times Last." The Nation (June 6).
- Nehman, John F. 1984. "GM Workers Say 'No' to Added Shift." Detroit News (January 12).
1935. "Oldsmobile is Big Factor in Lansing's Rise." Oldsmobile News (July 17).
- Pollack, Susan R. 1984. "Flint Gets Set for 1984 with Smile of Hope." Detroit News (January 8).
- Risen, James. 1984. "The State of Recovery: A Slumping Flint Pulls Self Back Up." Detroit News (August 5).

- Sedgwick, David and Scott Faust. 1986. "Shutdown Will Hurt Flint Area the Worst." Detroit News (November 7).
- Serrin, William. 1986a. "Growth in Jobs Since '80 is Sharp, But Pay and Quality are Debated." The New York Times (June 8).
- Serrin, William. 1986b. "Part-Time Work New Labor Trend." The New York Times (July 9).
1986. "Shorter Workweeks: An Alternative to Layoffs." Business Week (April 14).
- Sorge, Marjorie. 1986. "GM Closings Hit 29,000." Detroit News (November 7).
1985. "State's Use of Temporary Workers Soars." Detroit News (December 26).
1987. "Summer Jobs Shrink Unemployment." Lansing State Journal (September 2).
1980. "3 Million Surplus in City Budget." Detroit News (November 22).
- Vorse, Mary Heaton. 1937. "Wives of Flint's Strikers Form Emergency Brigade." The New York Times (January 21).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interview Topic Checklist

Nature and location of Job

Motivation to Job share (or work part-time, as temp, to volunteer for inverse seniority layoff)

Hours, schedule (who decides?)

Income, benefits

Union membership

Work history: ever worked full time? when? what kind of job?

Why no longer working full time?

Return to full time?

How spend most time off job?

Other off-job activities?

Things you would like to do with your time off the job that you don't currently do?

Why don't you do these things now? What would have to change so you could do these things?

Difference between time off the job now compared to when you worked full time?

Personal and household data

Concluding questions: anything else about job, hours, schedule, time off?

APPENDIX B

Personal and Household Data Sheet

Race: White Black Hispanic Other (Specify)

Sex: Female Male

1. What is your annual gross (before taxes) income from this job?

0-4,999	40,000-44,999
5,000-9,999	45,000-49,999
10,000-14,999	50,000-59,999
15,000-19,999	60,000-69,999
20,000-24,999	70,000 or more
25,000-29,999	
30,000-34,999	
35,000-39,999	

2. What employee benefits do you receive?

Payment for Time Not Worked

Sick Leave Yes No

Paid Vacation Yes No

Paid Holidays Yes No

Other (Specify)

Group Insurance

Health Yes No

Life Yes No

Long Term Disability Yes No

Other (Specify)

Retirement

Pension Plan Yes No

Deferred Compensation Yes No

Other (Specify)

Other Benefits

Specify:

3. Do you belong to a labor union?
4. How old are you?
5. What is your marital status? Married Not married
If married, how long have you been married?
If not married, were you ever married?
6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than eighth grade
Eighth-eleventh grade
High school (high school diploma or equivalent)
One-three years of college
Four years of college (Bachelor's degree)
Some graduate training
Master's degree
Ph.D. degree
Other (specify; e.g. vocational training)

Household Characteristics

1. Are you the only earner in your household? Yes No
(If your answer is no, go to question 2. If your answer is yes, skip to question 8.)
2. How many other earners live in your household besides yourself?
3. Where does each of the other earners work?
4. What are the job titles of each of the other earners?
5. Can you describe the jobs of each of the other earners?
6. How many hours each week does each of the other earners work? (Get schedule, too.)

7. How much education has each of the other earners completed?

8. What is your estimate of your total household income?

0-4,999	40,000-44,999
5,000-9,999	45,000-49,999
10,000-14,999	50,000-59,999
15,000-19,999	60,000-69,999
20,000-24,999	70,000 or more
25,000-29,999	
30,000-34,999	
35,000-39,999	

9. Does any of this household income come from sources other than job(s) held by earner(s)? Yes No

10. If yes, what are those sources? (For example, alimony, child support, rent, interest or dividends, etc.)

11. Approximately what percentage of your total household income comes from your income?

One-fourth
One-third
One-half
Three-fourths
All
Other (Specify)

12. How many children live in the household?

13. What are the children's ages?

APPENDIX C

Date

Dear Job Sharer,

I am a graduate student in the sociology department at Michigan State University. I am doing research on people who work less than full time--for example, part-time workers, temporaries, job sharers, and work sharers. I am particularly interested in the number of hours individuals work, how those hours are scheduled, and how individuals use their time off the job. Your name has been selected from among those state government employees who job share. However, this research is not sponsored by the State of Michigan.

As someone who works less than full time, would you be willing to participate in an interview about your employment and your use of time off the job? The interview would take approximately one hour of your time. Your identity will remain anonymous, and anything you say will be kept in confidence.

If you are willing to be interviewed, or if you would like more information about this research project, place a checkmark next to the appropriate response on the back of the enclosed postcard. Then fill in your name and phone number and return the card to me. The postage-paid postcard has been pre-addressed for your convenience.

Thank you so much for your consideration. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Negrey
Department of Sociology
Berkey Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

APPENDIX D

Date

To: xxxx part-time employees

From: Cynthia Negrey, Graduate Student,
Department of Sociology, MSU

Re: Interviews

For my dissertation research, I need a few part-time workers to interview about their employment, work schedule, and use of time off the job. Even if your job at xxxx is your second job, I want to talk to you. The interview takes approximately one hour. Volunteers' identities will remain anonymous, and anything said will be kept in confidence. While I have the approval of xxxx management to recruit volunteers, this research is in no way sponsored by xxxx.

If you are willing to be interviewed or want more information about the study, please complete one of the postcards provided below and return it to me. I have a room on the MSU campus which can be used for the interview, but we can negotiate another location if that is preferred.

Thank you and I hope to hear from you soon.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293000516363