

DIVISION OF WORK AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE: A THEORETICAL CONNECT LITERATURE REVIEW

P. M. Nawalkar

IBMRD Research Centre, Ahmednagar, Affiliated to SPPU, Pune

ABSTRACT

Work-life balance has emerged as one of the highly researched areas. The concept has connections with the division of labor concept in the context of gender. The conventional division of household duties: Men taking care of the earnings and women taking care of the household chores are no longer a reality, thanks to the increasing rate of participation of women in the work-force. Linked with the fact that the model of an only-male earning family member has changed, the issue of work-life balance comes more so with higher complications for women. This paper goes into the roots of this transition of the conventional household division of work model and discusses in its context the literature on work-life balance. The paper reviews literature related to both the concepts and presents the transition of the orthodox division of household work model including its repercussions in the form of work-life balance, largely based on the work of Kromydas (2020).

Keywords: *Division of labor Work-life balance, Male-earning, Dual-earning.*

Introduction

Men taking care of the earnings and women taking care of the household chores are no longer a reality, thanks to the increasing rate of participation of women in the work-force. Linked with the fact that the model of an only-male earning family member has changed, the issue of work-life balance comes more so with higher complications for women. This paper goes into the roots of this transition of the conventional household division of work model and discusses in its context the literature on work-life balance. The paper reviews literature related to both the concepts and presents the transition of the orthodox division of household work model including its repercussions in the form of work-life balance. Numerous investigations demonstrate that in the course of the most recent many years the male-provider model in Europe has been declining, while the double worker model increases energy (Gornick and Meyers, 2009; McGinnity and Whelan, 2009; Ochsner and Szalma, 2017). Nonetheless, there is proof that more equivalent interest of ladies in the work market has neither changed individuals' impression of sexual orientation uniformity fundamentally nor has it improved a lot of the way unpaid work, for example, housework is partitioned among couples inside households (Grunow and Evertsson, 2016, 2019; Hofacker and König, 2013; Ochsner and Szalma, 2017; Steiber, 2009; Wallace, 2017).

The conceptual framework of this paper fundamentally revolves around existing theories relevant to work division in households. Furthermore, it is likewise unrelated to theories on work-life balance (WLB). Consequently, for clearness, the most important theories of the two streams will be introduced; be that as it may, the setting of this examination lies a lot nearer to the work division theories instead of the one identified with WLB, and hence prime consideration is given to the previous.

Literature Review

Concerning theories on work division, a surge of writing contends that even though disparities among the exemplary financial factors of social separation, for example, education and class are tenacious, they are shown in various ways across nations. Contrariwise, standard financial hypothetical methodologies will in general disregard the part of settings or suggest that settings across nations don't contrast significantly (Brines, 1994; Crompton, 2006; Fagan, Lyonette, Smith, and Saldaña-Tejeda, 2012; Wright, 1997). While writing is plentiful on the beneficial outcome of education on employability and wages for the two genders, its relationship with WLB isn't that clear to decipher (DottiSani and Scherer, 2018; Kalleberg, 2011; Kromydas, 2015; Steiber, Berghammer, and Haas, 2016). Becker's (1981) sound decision way to deal with the family is considered as a milestone in

family financial matters. Basically, Becker, withdrawing from Mincer's (1958) human capital theory, sees no genuine distinction in dynamic cycles between people, households, firms, or nations where amazing balance is, at last, prevailing through utility augmentation where assets are impeccably dispensed among people or gatherings, for example, households. Full data on every part's near favorable position, opportunity costs, and assignment specialization is expected. In the end, this prompts ideal results on the person as well as on the family unit level. Subsequently, the gendered division of work is dictated by contrasts in near preferences and specialization and are free of intensity relations and women's exploitation from men. Even though Becker recognizes that such exploitation exists, it isn't viewed as a hindrance for an effective division of work inside a family since, when women have no obvious similarity over men in childcare and house-work, there is no monetary impetus for a division of work dependent on gender.

The bargaining theory, then again, recognizes that inside households individual and households' inclinations can be clashing and subsequently bargaining power beats every other factor. There is no redirection from human capital theory fundamental thoughts of utility boost and sane dynamic; anyway, its hypothetical base is more educated by singular decisions and interests, which can thusly struggle with some family's objective as a monetary element (Coltrane, 2000; Crompton, 2006). Time-assignment inside households is a dynamic cycle, where people utilize their bargaining capacity to part a foreordained measure of time into time designated to one or the other work or relaxation (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, and Robinson, 2000; Coltrane, 2000; Crompton, 2006; Heisig, 2011; Lundberg and Pollak, 1996; Parsons, 1949).

An alternate stream of exploration challenges comes nearer from financial aspects by moving the attention on gender roles, recognitions, perspectives and assumptions about social and other cultural standards, showed as gender ideologies that influence singular dynamic cycles (Braun, Lewin-Epstein, Stier, and Baumgärtner, 2008; Deutsch, 2007; Heisig, 2011; Pfau-Effinger, 2004). For instance,

certain time portion choices taken in a family setting are not generally founded on equity and reasonableness (Pahl, 1984; Wallace, 2017). Force relations and social roles that are characterized by gender generalizations can likewise direct time allotment and work division inside couples. Thus, the predominant worldview wins and, in this manner, inequality endures. Inequality particularly engenders where task specialization turns out to be socially one-sided, prompting women to be in a subordinate situation as they are monetarily reliant on men (Brines, 1994; Lewis, 1992; Sullivan, 2004). Also, the 'doing gender' approach begat by West and Zimmerman (1987) regards gender as social development. Gender contrasts are not simply natural or biological. The gendered division of work is proliferated in broad daylight talks and practices where financial levelheadedness is amalgamated by instrumental and moral factors, which thusly can change during the existence course (Duncan, 2005; Naldini and Solera, 2018; West and Zimmerman, 1987). Hakim (2000) centers around preferences all things being equal, contending that, in any event in current Western social orders, women's decision among working and focusing on the family unit is just an issue of preference. Coming to theories on WLB, various hypothetical models have been created in the writing. The most widely recognized are the biological frameworks theory, the positive brain science, and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory. The natural frameworks theory basically treats WLB as a staggering idea where all levels (miniature, meso, and large scale) are continually interfacing and can be similarly facilitative or conflictive (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Kromydas, 2017). At that point, positive brain research zeros in additional on decidedly arranged authoritative conduct, human asset qualities, and mental limits. This theory is situated more towards the miniature and meso level (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2014). At last, the JD-R theory characterizes WLB as the best fit among assets and requests across work and family spaces (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). Tragically, in every one of these theories, the gender dimension and set in the large scale level are basically disregarded. Even though

the theory of the natural framework infers a connection among WLB and setting in the full-scale level, it is hazy what the bearing of this relationship is and whether individuals with various qualities, for example, gender, are influenced the same.

Moving past the individual level, existing writing contends that inside households a higher-instructed male who lives together with a hetero accomplice is bound to be associated with more housework contrasted and a lower-taught one. Subsequently, given that couples are normally educationally coordinated, particularly in financially created nations, women inside couples that are higher instructed, invest less energy on housework contrasted with the lower-taught ones (Coltrane, 2000; Gershuny, 2000; Oinas, 2018). All things considered, likewise, with paid work, a particular gender design appears to exist that arranges kinds of housework as 'manly' or 'female' even in big-time salary gender-populist regimes, for example, the Nordic nations (Tammelin, 2018b). While there is some sign of a gender assembly in the measure of time male and female living together accomplices spend on housework, gender isolation in homegrown tasks as fortified by explicit gender ideologies and generalizations, stays a huge deterrent for accomplishing an equivalent division of work (regarding both paid and unpaid work) in hetero couples (Kan, Sullivan, and Gershuny, 2011).

The past examination has demonstrated that extended periods of paid work for men fortifies the male-provider worldview. Be that as it may, this is genuine when their female accomplices are working extended periods also (Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014). All things considered, the physical and mental weight for women to adjust extended periods of paid work and unpaid housework is huge. Unquestionably, very much organized public childcare and parental leave frameworks diminish the weight of housework on women, boosting them to turn out to be more dynamic in the work market. Simultaneously, the best extent of parental leaves is taken by women, showing a social bias against them as, practically speaking, childcare is generally considered as a somewhat 'ladylike' task

(Tammelin, 2018b). Subsequently, liberal public childcare policies themselves are significant yet insufficient to handle gender inequality inside households as they should be joined by a culture move towards more libertarian discernments on gender where men share the housework/childcare trouble all the more similarly with their female accomplices.

The writing on the markers used to catch WLB, concerning topographical and social contrasts, is restricted. The pointers at present utilized do exclude components with which contrasts between nations of various degrees of financial development or welfare structures can be caught. Besides, the emphasis is infrequently on educational or gender contrasts, though impressive proof demonstrating that women, particularly the lower-instructed, hold work positions with significant levels of weakness while working unsocial hours and in dubious enterprises, for example, call focuses and friendliness (Gautie and Schmitt, 2010; Ghai, 2003; Stier&Yaish, 2014). Individual WLB preferences are more direct to be characterized, however, research on the family level and the impact of institutional factors is restricted (Bianchi and Milkie, 2010; Korpi, Ferrarini, and Englund, 2013). Our article endeavors to fill these holes zeroing in on the connection between educational attainment and gender division of work inside families, as experimentally instrumented by a composite double-pointer for saw WLB that centers around the work-side obstruction into private life. Additionally, the 17 European nations inspected are arranged under the welfare state regime they have a place with, concurring Esping-Andersen (1990), Ferrera (1996), Fenger (2007), Arts and Gelissen (2010) and Gallie (2013). In any case, this is just for illustrative purposes, to recognize whether there are likenesses or contrasts between nations. The flow research recognizes that the customary welfare state regime grouping is respected obsolete by the latest writing, as it doesn't completely mirror the momentum truth of family policies and the gender division of work. Later developments on the welfare regime writing incorporate a gender point of view, while others challenge the conventional welfare regime order (particularly the Southern and Eastern regimes) corresponding to the

gender roles they speak to since family policies, yet also the financial activity rate of women and the frequency of all-day work and dual-earner couples vary altogether across nations (Esping-Andersen, 2009; Saxonberg, 2013; Wall and Escobedo, 2013).

The male bread-winner model certainly or unequivocally acknowledges separate roles for every gender where just men are dynamic in the work market and women accomplish unpaid work (Parsons, 1949; Treas and Drobnič, 2010). In this manner, in social orders where such observations exist, policies that intend to build work market cooperation for women may have antagonistic results. Rather than easing work-life clashes, they may channel women into occupations that are low maintenance, brief and, subsequently, low-paid with low-levels of security, leaving the steady employments and profession laddering to men, while fortifying and duplicating the customary function of men as providers and women as predominantly being answerable for childcare and family tasks (Tammelin, 2018a). The 'moderated' variant of the customary model is the guardian equality model, where conventional gender roles endure inside the family; be that as it may, women and men are dealt with all the more similarly as far as work market investment. Even though this model (either in its center or moderated form) appears to be more normal to Continental, Southern, and Eastern Europe, there are explicit nations inside these nation bunches that essentially vary inside one another in the implementation of parental leave and childcare policies (Saxonberg, 2013; Wall and Escobedo, 2013). The subsequent stream mirrors a framework with a generally low level of strategy mediations where family issues, for example, housework or youngster care, are redistributed either to experts or family members. For this situation, issues, for example, the WLB inside couples are accommodated more by normal agreements between accomplices locally, and less by policymaking and related impetuses. This is the widespread provider model and is generally connected with the Anglo-Saxon nations; nonetheless, late proof shows that it tends to be found in nations, for example, the Netherlands or Portugal (Wall and Escobedo, 2013). At long last, the third model, known as

the Nordic model, concerns a populist culture for paid work and housework just as mindful duties. A few creators contend that as far as childcare and parental leave policies, Norway and Finland may redirect from this model, taking after additional to nations in focal Europe, for example, France and Belgium, while others guarantee that this model doesn't discover application to any nation and remaining parts an ideal world (Tammelin, 2018a; Wall and Escobedo, 2013).

Yates and Leach (2006) contend that changes advancing work adaptability have expanded pessimism among workers, just as outrage and self-preoccupation. Besides, there has been a consistent decrease in workers' ability to take care of their families and to effectively take an interest in networks and this, at last, has prompted an expansion in social rejection. Such a circumstance is probably going to compound during a downturn. Low maintenance work, brief employment organization assignments, adaptable employment, present moment and unexpected work, and free contracting are for the most part instances of non-standard employment that can expand vulnerability and the sentiment of occupation frailty (Kalleberg, 2011). These are the fundamental employment arrangements that have gotten progressively bantered as of late, gradually forming the latest things in present day employment according to social, institutional, and administrative cultural standards. These arrangements outline a reorientation in the conceptualization of work and employment and, alongside this, that of WLB (Eurofound, 2017).

Women are distraught in the work market, having on normal lower wages contrasted with their male partners. Overall, less paid hours and for the most part accomplish more housework than men (Gautie and Schmitt, 2010). Nonetheless, it stays indistinct whether this prompts lower or more elevated levels of announced WLB contrasted with men, particularly inside households. As per past examination on this subject, this likewise relies upon factors, for example, the number of kids living in the family, pay levels, employment status, occupation and industry, the measure of working hours, parts of employment quality on routineness and force of working life or the

recognizable proof of clear limits between working life and non-working life, and open mentalities and observations concerning gender equity (Anttila, Oinas, Tammelin, and Nätti, 2015; Crompton and Lyonett, 2006; Fagan et al., 2012; Gallie and Russell, 2009; Hofacker and König, 2013; McGinnity, 2014; Muñoz de Bustillo, Fernandez-Macias, Anton, and Esteve, 2009; Russell and McGinnity, 2013; Tausing and Fenwick, 2001; Wallace, 2017). This paper utilizes a methodological strategy that represents these factors by utilizing them in relapse models as indicators as control factors. Regardless of whether educational attainment is a significant factor that is emphatically identified with work market results its relationship with WLB is basically disregarded in the writing. Human capital theory and its application to the family level by Becker (1981) regards education as an investment that discovers application just to paid work. It is conceivable however that educational attainment influences rehearse on the individual just as on the family level as for unpaid work also, setting off WLB gender contrasts inside a similar family unit. The financial atmosphere is likewise prone to moderate such impacts contrastingly as gender roles would happen to a lower significance when the economy plunges into a profound downturn like the one of every 2008, or maybe the one that is at present approaching because

of the COVID-19 episode. In most European nations, the monetary emergency of 2008 set off an awful financial descending twisting. Individuals with lower educational capabilities have been influenced the most, both as far as employment and pay (Gallie, 2013; Hurley, Enrique, and Storrie, 2013).

Conclusion and research gap

The theories of division of work or work at the family have advanced quickly throughout the long term and work-life balance has an intriguing association with these theories. The writing survey recommends that the idea of work-life balance is appropriate for those women who are home-creators. It is some sort of conceptual myth that work-life balance applies just to work outside the home. On account of the Covid-19 pandemic, we have seen a mammoth move towards work-from-home. This makes the issue additionally fascinating. This ongoing change has opened a Pandora's box for scientists to take a relook at the idea of work-life balance. Simultaneously existing writing doesn't appear to have zeroed in on explicit areas like the public area, Government workplaces, and such other workplaces. Researchers can contemplate the idea of work-life balance with a sectorial accentuation to increase extraordinary information about the idea.

References

1. Anttila T, Oinas T, Tammelin M, Nätti J. Working-time regimes and work-life balance in Europe. *European Sociological Review*. 2015;31(6):713–724.
2. Arts WA, Gelissen J. Models of the welfare state. Castles FG, Leibfried S, Lewis J, Obinger H, Pierson C, editors. *The Oxford handbook of the welfare state*. 2010 Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199579396.01.0001/oxfordhb-9780199579396-e-39?result=8&rskey=h0kk3>.
3. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2007; 22(3): 309–328. doi: 10.1108/02683940710733115 .
4. Becker G. *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1981.
5. Bianchi SM, Milkie MA, Sayer LC, Robinson JP. Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of labor. *Social Forces*. 2000;79(1):191–228.
6. Bianchi SM, Milkie MA. Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2010;72(3):705–725.

7. Braun M, Lewin-Epstein N, Stier H, Baumgärtner MK. Perceived equity in the gendered division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2008;7:1145–1156.
8. Brines J. Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of sociology*. 1994;100(3):652–688.
9. Bronfenbrenner U. *The ecology of human development. Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1979.
10. Ciccia R, Bleijenbergh I. After the male breadwinner model? Childcare services and the division of labour in European countries. *Social Politics*. 2014;2014:1–30.
11. Coltrane S. Research on household labor: Modelling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 2000;62(4):1208–1233.
12. Crompton R. *Employment and the family. The reconfiguration of work and family life in contemporary societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
13. Deutsch FM. Undoing gender. *Gender & Society*. 2007;21(1):106–127.
14. DottiSani GM, Scherer S. Maternal employment: Enabling factors in context. *Work, Employment and Society*. 2018;32(1):75–92.
15. Duncan S. Mothering, class and rationality. *Sociological Review*. 2005;53(1):50–76.
16. Esping-Andersen G. *The incomplete revolution: Adapting to women's new roles*. Cambridge: Malden; 2009.
17. Esping-Andersen G. *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1990.
18. Eurofound. *In-work poverty in the EU*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union; 2017.
19. Fagan C, Lyonette C, Smith M, Saldaña-Tejeda A. The influences of working time arrangements on work–life integration or ‘balance’: A review of the international evidence. Geneva: International Labour Office; 2012.
20. Fenger HJM. Welfare regimes in Central and Eastern Europe: Incorporating post-communist countries into a welfare-regime typology. *Contemporary Issues and Ideas in Social Science*. 2007;3(2):1–30.
21. Ferrera M. The southern model of welfare in social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*. 1996;6(1):17–37.
22. Gallie D, Russell H. Work–family conflict and working conditions in Western Europe. *Social Indicators*. 2009;93(3):445–467.
23. Gallie D. *Economic crisis, quality of work, and social integration: The European perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013.
24. Gautie J, Schmitt J. *Low-wage work in the wealthy world*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation; 2010.
25. Gershuny J. *Changing times. Work and leisure in postindustrial society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2000.
26. Ghai D. Decent work: Concept and indicators. *International Labour Review*. 2003;142(2):113–145.
27. Gornick JC, Meyers M. *Gender equality: Transforming family divisions of labor*. London: Verso; 2009.
28. Grunow D, Evertsson M. *Couples' transitions to parenthood: Analysing gender and work in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2016.
29. Grunow D, Evertsson M. *New parents in Europe: Work-care practices, gender norms and family policies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2019.
30. Hakim C. *Work–lifestyle choices in the 21st century: Preference theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2000.
31. Heisig JP. Who does more housework—rich or poor—a comparison of 33 countries. *American Sociological Review*. 2011;76(1):74–99.
32. Hofacker D, König S. Flexibility and work–life conflict in times of crisis: A gender perspective. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 2013;33(9/10):613–635.
33. Hurley J, Enrique FM, Storrie D. *Employment polarisation and job quality in the crisis: European jobs monitor 2013*. Dublin: Eurofound; 2013.
34. Kalleberg A. *Good jobs, bad jobs: The rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the united states, 1970s to 2000s*. New York, NY: Russell Sage; 2011.

35. Kan MY, Sullivan O, Gershuny J. Gender convergence in domestic work: Discerning the effects of interactional and institutional barriers from large-scale data. *Sociology*. 2011;45:234–251.
36. Korpi W, Ferrarini T, Englund S. Women's opportunities under different family policy constellations: gender, class, and inequality tradeoffs in Western countries re-examined. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*. 2013;20(1):1–40.
37. Kromydas T. Higher education and labour market dynamics in crisis: A European comparative study (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation) Department of Economics; University of Strathclyde: 2015.
38. Kromydas T. Rethinking higher education and its relationship with social inequalities: Past knowledge, present state and future potential. *Palgrave Communications*. 2017;3(1):1–12.
39. Kromydas, T. (2020). Educational attainment and gender differences in work–life balance for couples across Europe: A contextual perspective. *Social inclusion*, 8(4).
40. Lewis J. Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*. 1992;2(3):159–173.
41. Lundberg S, Pollak RA. Bargaining and distribution in marriage. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 1996;10(4):139–158.
42. McGinnity F, Whelan CT. Comparing work–life conflict in Europe. Evidence from the European social survey. *Social Indicators Research*. 2009;93(3):433–444.
43. McGinnity F. Work–life conflict in Europe. In: Michalos AC, editor. *Encyclopaedia of quality of life and well-being research*. Amsterdam: Springer; 2014. pp. 7233–7236.
44. Mincer J. Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*. 1958;66(4):281–302.
45. Muñoz de Bustillo R, Fernandez-Macias E, Anton JJ, Esteve F. Indicators of job quality in the European Union. Brussels: European Parliament; 2009.
46. Naldini M, Solera C. When husbands and wives don't agree, who 'wins'? Value/practice dissonance in the division of work around parenthood in Italy. In: Musumeci R, Santero A, editors. *Fathers, childcare and work: Cultures, practices and policies*. Bingley: Emerald; 2018. pp. 45–76.
47. Ochsner M, Szalma I. Work–life conflict of working couples before and during the crisis in 18 European countries. In: Breen MJ, editor. *Values and identities in Europe. Evidence from the European social survey*. Abingdon: Routledge; 2017. pp. 77–99.
48. Oinas T. The division of labour within households: Men's increased participation? In: Tammelin M, editor. *Family, work and well-being, emergence of new issues*. Cham: Springer; 2018. pp. 21–33.
49. Pahl R. *Divisions of labour*. Oxford: Basil-Blackwell; 1984.
50. Parsons T. The social structure of the family. In: Ashen R, editor. *The family*. New York, NY: Hayner; 1949. pp. 241–74.
51. Pfau-Effinger B. *Development of culture, welfare states and women's employment in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 2004.
52. Russell H, McGinnity F. Under pressure: The impact of recession on employees in Ireland. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. 2013;52(2):286–307.
53. Saxonberg S. From defamilialization to degenderization: Toward a new welfare typology. *Social Policy & Administration*. 2013;47(1):26–49.
54. Seligman ME, Csikszentmihalyi M. Positive psychology: An introduction. In: Csikszentmihalyi M, editor. *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology*. Dordrecht: Springer; 2014. pp. 279–298.
55. Steiber N, Berghammer C, Haas B. Contextualizing the education effect on women's employment: A cross-national comparative analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2016;78(1):246–261.
56. Steiber N. Reported levels of time-based and strain-based conflict between work and family roles in Europe: A multilevel approach. *Social Indicators Research*. 2009;93:469–488.
57. Stier H, Yaish M. Occupational segregation and gender inequality in job quality: A multi-level approach. *Work, Employment and Society*. 2014;28(2):225–246.

58. Sullivan O. Changing gender practices within the household: A theoretical perspective. *Gender & Society*. 2004;18(2):207–222.
59. Tammelin M. Family, work and well-being, emergence of new issues. Cham: Springer; 2018a.
60. Tammelin M. Work, time and family: Is it possible to identify European family working time regimes? In: Tammelin M, editor. Family, work and well-being, emergence of new issues. Cham: Springer; 2018b. pp. 11–20.
61. Tausig M, Fenwick R. Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work–life balance. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. 2001;22(2):101–119.
62. Treas J, Drobníč S. Dividing the domestic: Men, women, and household work in cross-national perspective. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 2010.
63. Wall K, Escobedo A. Parental leave policies, gender equity and family well-being in Europe: A comparative perspective. In: Almudena MM, editor. Family well-being. European perspectives. Dordrecht: Springer; 2013. pp. 103–129.
64. Wallace C. From the Isle of Sheppey to the wider world. In: Crowand G, Ellis J, editors. Revisiting divisions of labour. The impacts and legacies of a modern sociological classic. Manchester: Manchester University Press; 2017. pp. 140–149.
65. West C, Zimmerman DH. Doing gender. *Gender & Society*. 1987;1(2):125–151.
66. Wright EO. Class counts: Comparative studies in class analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997.
67. Yates CA, Leach B. Why “good” jobs lead to social exclusion. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*. 2006;27(3):341–368.