

Talk of work: transatlantic divergences in justifications for hard work among French, Norwegian, and American professionals

Jeremy Schulz

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Abstract This article approaches work talk, a neglected but vital object of sociological inquiry, as a possible key to unlocking the mystery of the contemporary work ethic as it appears among male professionals living and working in the United States and Western Europe. This analytical task is carried out through a close examination of the contrasting rhetorics, scripts, and vocabularies anchoring French, Norwegian, and American forms of *hard work talk*. This comparative exercise capitalizes on material from over one hundred in-depth interviews with comparable French, Norwegian, and American male business professionals working in finance, law, consulting, engineering and other professional fields. Scrutinizing the scripts that members of these three groups use to address their motives for working hard in demanding jobs, this article maps a legitimation divide between the American respondents and their French and Norwegian counterparts. The hard work commentaries of the French and Norwegian respondents feature script repertoires that focus exclusively on the stimulating and enriching character of their work activities. By contrast, the commentaries of the American respondents incorporate overachievement scripts addressing both the extrinsic rewards of work and the personality traits that make hard work a natural expression of personality. These hard work commentaries invoke career success and moneymaking as inducements to hard work. But they also invoke personality traits such as drive and the innate aversion to leisure. This transatlantic divide reflects the greater cultural resonance of self-realization in the two European contexts and the fact that the French and Norwegians have embraced a more Maslowian approach to working life. As I argue in the article's conclusion, these transatlantic differences in script repertoires can be viewed as the product of the societally specific cultural configurations at work in the three countries. Such cultural configurations define what it means—in terms of status and authenticity—to work hard in a remunerative and rewarding job.

J. Schulz (✉)
Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley,
410 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
e-mail: jmschulz@berkeley.edu

Keywords Work ethic · Work talk · Cultural repertoires · Scripts · Cross-national sociology · Professionals

This article turns its analytical eye towards what I choose to call *work talk*. With this term I am focusing attention on an empirical phenomenon that, while largely neglected by social science, nevertheless pervades everyday life. For many workers and those close to them, work talk is a common occurrence that is easy to observe in and outside the workplace. As work talk concerns an activity that can monopolize a large proportion of a person's scarce time, energy, and attention, many workers feel inclined to reflect on the meaning and import of their own particular work, other people's work, and even work in a general and abstract sense. In many cases, these reflections give birth to conversations touching on diverse aspects of working life, including workmates and colleagues, work tasks, office politics, or even the broader significance of one's work for the profession, industry, or society.

While examples of work talk surface repeatedly in the many studies of work and workers produced by sociologists and other work scholars, work talk itself has eluded sustained scrutiny. But work talk deserves our attention. By examining work talk we can see how people orient themselves to a life realm with the potential to tell us what we should be trying to accomplish in our necessarily finite lives. This article ventures into this uncharted terrain by taking a close look at a specific form of work talk, namely *hard work talk*. In terms of its themes, hard work talk addresses the motivational sources of work effort and occupational commitments. Hard work talk offers answers to the questions: “What are the reasons I work hard?”; “Why am I working hard?”; and “What motivates me to work hard?” Analytically, instances of hard work talk belong to the broader category of what Mills labeled “vocabularies of motive,” phrases and words that specify particular reasons for acting that accompany particular situations and serve as an “adequate ground” for the conduct (Mills 1940, p. 906). In many instances such vocabularies are marshaled when an audience “questions” this conduct, prompting the actor to supply a convincing and defensible explanation of their behavior, something dubbed an “account” in more recent sociological work (Tilly 2006, 2008; Orbuch 1997; Scott and Lyman 1968). Like other justificatory accounts, hard work talk aligns the focal actor's work practices and orientations with socially acceptable and worthy postures vis-à-vis work, leisure, and other life realms (Berger 1995, pp. 44–48). Such talk, in other words, expresses the actor's affinity for socially valued ways of acting and therefore indicates an awareness of more generalized cultural expectations.¹

These vocabularies, variously labeled “scripts,” “rhetorics,” “repertoires,” or “ritual vocabularies” (Swidler 2001, pp. 53–56; Boltanski & Thévenot 2006; Wuthnow 1996) can surface in a wide variety of forms and interactional contexts. Nevertheless, these rhetorics serve to render the speaker's attachment to hard work and demanding jobs justifiable, meaningful, and praiseworthy in her own eyes and the eyes of various actual and imagined audiences.

¹ At the same time, the articulator of such vocabularies could be engaged in “facework” designed to gain the respect of his interlocutor or other actual and imaginary audiences (Domenici and Littlejohn 2006; Goffman 1967).

Among work-devoted professionals of both sexes (Blair-Loy 2003), hard work talk is a ubiquitous feature of interactions within the workplace and, often, outside it as well. Professionals' hard work talk links particular instances of conduct with the work-centeredness and work-devotion expected of the "unconditional worker" (Christensen 2005). Such work talk scripts figure particularly prominently in the commentaries of the managerial and professional workers employed in white-collar settings who treat their work as their primary "identity anchorage" (Thompson & Bunderson 2001).² Many members of these occupational categories generate large volumes of hard work talk, expending considerable energy making sense of their long work hours and their demanding jobs to all manner of audiences including themselves.

Like other kinds of work talk, hard work talk offers an unusually revealing window onto the meaning and significance of what often constitutes a core life realm. More importantly, hard work talk, as this article shows, plays an indispensable role as a diagnostic indicator that can tell us about a more elusive yet even more tantalizing object of sociological inquiry, namely the *work ethic*.

Long after Weber's writings, the issue of what propels people to work and what motivates them in their work still provokes debate and controversy. Commentaries on the character of contemporary life and the nature of contemporary selfhood still betray a preoccupation with the work ethic. Even as discussions of work and selfhood differ as to the question of whether work constitutes, in the words of C. Everett Hughes, "one of the most important parts of one's social identity" (Hughes 1971, p. 339) or an increasingly marginal dimension in the lives of individuals focused on other life realms (Offe 1989, pp. 141–143), the work ethic nevertheless stands front and center.

This theme exercises a particularly strong fascination when it intersects with the issue of societal context. Ever since Weber identified the United States as the country where the secularized Protestant Ethic had advanced the furthest, speculation about the distinctiveness of the American work ethic relative to its Western European counterparts has run rampant. This article explores the question of transatlantic work ethics by focusing on the ways that similarly work-devoted Western European and American professional men engage with their work, specifically the ways they talk about the act of working hard. Venturing into this terrain using the analytical tools of the recent comparative sociology of cultural "repertoires" (Lamont and Thevenot 2001), this study delves into the work ethics of three groups of comparable employed professional men living and working in three metropolitan areas on both sides of the Atlantic: a group of male French professionals living and working in Paris, a group of Norwegian professionals living in Oslo, and a group of American professionals living and working in San Francisco.

² The ubiquity of this form of talk among American executives and professionals alongside practices such as long-hours work has led sociologists to identify a common syndrome among this group of workers, a syndrome which Hochschild has dubbed the "cult of workaholism" (Hochschild 1997) and Blair-Loy has called the "work devotion schema" (Blair-Loy 2003). This cult has cast a spell over managers and professionals from many corners of the business world, including industrial companies (Fraser 2002; Hochschild 1997), engineering and software companies (Sharone 2004; Rasmussen 2002; Meiksins & Whalley 2002; Cooper 2000; Casey 1995; Kunda 1992), financial firms and investment banks (Roth 2006; Blair-Loy 2003), and law offices (Fuchs-Epstein 1999).

The study: analytic strategy and research design

To ensure adequate comparability between the American respondents and their French and Norwegian counterparts, I adopt the group-level matching strategy used in Lamont's cross-national comparisons (Lamont 2000, 1992). This strategy serves to identify important cross-group convergences and divergences among a broad spectrum of professional and managerial conationals with diverse occupational profiles, life course positions, organizational affiliations, and social origins.

All of the respondents who participated in the study received their educations at top-flight postgraduate institutions and have carved out careers in competitive, prestigious, and remunerative corners of the business world. Drawn from distinct occupational fields, (including engineering management, software development, corporate law, investment banking, and management consulting), their careers span a wide variety of occupational, organizational, and professional contexts. While the majority of the lawyers, accountants, consultants, and investment bankers in each country work as associates in relatively small professional services firms, the majority of the engineering managers and software developers work in larger, more hierarchically organized companies. Many ethnographic and interview-based studies of professionals and professional workplaces are populated by members of these male-dominated occupations.

While the younger respondents are in the midst of launching their careers in these demanding and yet rewarding fields, the older respondents have settled into the early establishment phase of their careers.³ These more experienced professionals have already reaped many of the intrinsic gratifications and pecuniary rewards that come with these jobs. At the same time, the men are well acquainted with the rigors of such jobs and the "extreme" demands they impose on the worker's time and energy (Hewlett et al. 2007).

Respondent recruitment and data collection procedures

This matching strategy combines a multi-prong recruitment procedure relying on two primary recruitment channels in each of the three research sites. Of the prospective interviewees I contacted through these procedures, all but a handful agreed to participate in the project, yielding a very high cooperation rate for this procedure.

The first recruitment procedure enlisted elite postgraduate educational institutions. To identify promising interview candidates, I solicited the assistance of the alumni relations departments at top postgraduate professional programs in each of the three countries under study (France, Norway, and the United States). With the help of these schools, I obtained the names and contact information of alumni who had gone on to work for one of the firms in fields including engineering, management, consulting, software, accounting, finance, banking, and corporate law. These programs naturally

³ Previous research has shown that professional men in the midst of their career launching years are more attuned to career goals than their personal lives, as they are still trying to establish themselves and prove their worth in a competitive and pressure-packed environment (Bartolomé & Lee Evans 1979).

insisted on maximum confidentiality. Once I had obtained a list of prospective interviewees, I made contact with them by email and subsequently by phone.

The second complementary procedure treats prospective respondents' employers as recruitment channels. The first step in the second procedure was the identification of elite law firms, consulting firms, and finance firms, as well as established companies in the technology and banking sectors in the three metropolitan areas under study. Several of the firms were global entities with operations in all three countries. Contact was then made with the appropriate gatekeeping personnel in these organizations, typically upper-level HR staff. These gatekeepers identified and contacted professional employees on my behalf. These two procedures were supplemented with a "snowball" selection procedure. Each of the respondents who had completed an interview was invited to refer additional individuals drawn from their professional or social networks. This supplementary procedure yielded additional respondents in most of the focal occupational categories.

The data for this study come from a rich and extensive corpus of talk yielded by in-depth semi-structured interviews with one hundred and one of these respondents in total (at least thirty-two respondents in each of the three research sites).⁴ The interview guide used in all of the interviews was carefully crafted to elicit spontaneous *hard work talk* regarding involvement in work tasks, work performance, leisure involvements, career advancement and career success, and moneymaking.⁵ The questions posed to the respondents were designed to afford the respondent a full measure of freedom as to which motivational factors he wanted to mention as the primary impetus behind his tendency to work hard. The numerous open-ended "what," "how," and "why" questions afforded the respondents the opportunity to formulate answers in whatever terms came most naturally to them. The list below presents a selection of the interview questions.

- What do you like about your work?
- What leads you to work hard?
- What do you think about how hard you work now?
- Why is it that you work so hard?
- What is it that makes you such a hard worker?
- What would happen if you didn't work hard?
- Can you tell me why do you work these kinds of hours here?
- What do you consider heavy and light work hours?
- Why have you chosen a line of work that is very difficult, in terms of pressure and hours?
- What draws you to this kind of work?
- What is it about your tasks that makes you work hard?
- What do you find so compelling about engaging tasks?

⁴ This study grows out of a larger project dealing with differences in the ways that comparable populations of elite French, Norwegian, and American managers and professionals constitute working life and private life.

⁵ The interviews conducted in Paris were carried out by me and a French-speaking colleague in residence at the École Normale Supérieure who acted as a translator and interpreter. With respect to the interviews carried out in Oslo with the Norwegian interviewees, I developed my skills in Norwegian thanks to the support of a FLAS grant and a grant from the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

- What are your feelings about money in relation to working hard?
- What is it about your work tasks that makes you want to work hard?
- Do engaging work tasks help you to stay motivated so that you can give work your all?
- How would you describe the kind of person you want to be in your work?
- If the firm offered to pay you your current salary but asked you to work 30 hours a week, would this affect your work motivation?

These interviews were carried out during the boom years between 2003 and 2007. All interviews were conducted in person in Paris, Oslo, and San Francisco at a time and location of the respondent's choosing. While the majority of the interviewees selected public venues for the interviews, a small minority of the respondents in each of the three sites elected to hold the interview at their place of work. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded with the aid of MaxQDA, a software package designed for qualitative data analysis.

An overview of the findings: an inventory of scripts

Two analytically distinct types of scripts appear in the interviews: central scripts and marginal scripts. Table 1 presents both the central and marginal scripts together. Each of these types comes in three thematically distinct flavors: scripts thematizing motivations associated with work tasks, scripts relating to the rewards of career success and money, and scripts thematizing motivations relating to identity, personality, and character. Together, these three thematic groupings exhaust the universe of motivational factors that surface in all one hundred and one interviews.⁶

The first set of scripts, work task/work activity scripts, traces the penchant for hard work to the engaging tasks and activities that fully absorb the worker's time, energy, and attention. The second family of career-success scripts addresses sources of work motivation connected to the worker's employment situation rather than his work activities. This second set of scripts concern the motivating potency of status and money income. The most common two scripts that fall into this category are the "career-success script" (I work hard because I want to advance in my career) and the "money-maximizing script" (I work hard because I want to make the most money possible). Finally, the last family of scripts thematizes the sources of hard work motivation connected to personality. The drive script is the most prominent member of this family. When respondents enlist these personality scripts, they identify the sources of their tendency to work hard as facets of their personality such as their innate drive, their aversion to idleness, and their proclivity for overachievement. It is important to

⁶ It is important to note at the outset that hard work rhetorics, scripts, and accounts can thematize either "self-regarding" motivations or "other-regarding" motivations. Some hard work rhetorics trace the motivation for working hard to the worker's self-oriented desires (e.g., to be highly regarded by coworkers), while other rhetorics identify the motivation for working hard as originating in the worker's other-oriented desires vis-à-vis family members and other indirect beneficiaries of his or her hard work.

keep in mind that only self-regarding scripts appear in the interviewees' *hard work talk*. When we survey the themes contained in the scripts and rhetorics emerging from the interviews, in other words, we find references only to self-regarding needs and desires rather than those needs and desires oriented to employers, families, friends, or communities.⁷

In Table 1, we see the distribution of scripts across the three conational groups. As the table makes apparent, there are instances of all three types of scripts in the commentaries of members of all three conational groups. However, the relative centrality of these three varieties varies markedly according to the respondents' nationality. In Goffmanian terminology, while the French and the Norwegians "undercommunicate" (Goffman 1959, 1967) both the career-success scripts and the personality scripts focusing on drive, the Americans "overcommunicate" these scripts. Whereas the French and the Norwegians rely almost exclusively on those hard work scripts relating to the content of their work and its capacity to engage their intellectual and social faculties, the vast majority of the Americans eschew this script in their motivational commentaries on hard work. Conversely, whereas the scripts thematizing career success, moneymaking, and drive anchor the commentaries of the Americans, they recede into the background in the commentaries of the French and the Norwegians. For the Americans' part, their commentaries dwell on the motivational potency of career success and drive while marginalizing the importance of the stimulating and engrossing features of their work tasks and activities.

As the table indicates, in their hard work commentaries the American respondents combine internal character-defined motivations with motivations relating to work's "extrinsic" rewards, namely career success, money, and status. The American respondents, alone among the three conational groups, assign work-content scripts a marginal role in their hard work commentaries. The European professional men, by contrast, frame their habit of working hard as solely a matter of realizing themselves through an engrossing involvement with engaging work tasks. These professional men highlight the suitability of work as an experiential arena where one can realize one's cognitive and social capacities, enjoy mastery, and take pride in one's skills. At the same time they downplay the role of motivational catalysts like career success, status-seeking, drive, and a constitutional aversion to idleness. For the French and Norwegian respondents, in other words, work-content scripts suffice as warrants for hard work. Thus, while the French and Norwegian professionals embrace the potential of stimulating work as a source of self-realization as the justification for the hard work penchant. The American professionals rationalize their proclivity to throw themselves into their work by reference to needs and desires for very different kinds of social and emotional rewards.

⁷ While the breadwinner discourse so common among male workers of all classes and types (Orange 2007, Gerson 1994, Weiss 1990) did surface whenever the respondents discussed the meaning and significance of gainful employment *per se*, it dropped out of sight whenever they addressed their reasons for exerting themselves at demanding jobs, as opposed to remaining merely gainfully employed. All of the respondents did mention their sense of obligation towards their loved ones and dependents, particularly their children, at some point during the course of the interviews.

Table 1 Hard work scripts

	CENTRAL SCRIPTS	MARGINAL SCRIPTS	
FRENCH AND NORWEGIANS	<p>ACTIVITY/TASK MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Work-Content Script I work hard because I enjoy the tasks that I perform.</p> <p>Tasks Worthy of Hard Work = Intellectual Development Script</p> <p>I work hard at my tasks because these tasks enable me to develop my intellectual capacities and potential.</p>	<p>CAREERS/MONEY MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Career-Success Script I work hard to succeed in my job and advance my career.</p> <p>Career Success = Winning Script I work hard to "win the game" because winning affirms my worth and status.</p> <p>I work hard to win. Winning is measured by money, which is an outward sign of my status.</p>	<p>PERSONALITY MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Driven Person/Overachiever Script I work hard because that is what an overachiever/driven person does.</p> <p>Slacker/Boredom Script I work hard because not working hard leaves me bored.</p>
AMERICANS	<p>CAREERS/MONEY MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Career-Success Script I work hard to succeed in my job and advance my career.</p> <p>Career Success = Winning Script I work hard to "win the game" because winning affirms my worth and status.</p> <p>I work hard to win. Winning is measured by money, which is an outward sign of my status.</p>	<p>PERSONALITY MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Driven Person / Overachiever Script I work hard because that is what an overachiever/driven person does.</p> <p>Slacker/Boredom Script I work hard because not working hard leaves me bored.</p>	<p>ACTIVITY/TASK MOTIVATIONS</p> <p>Work-Content Script I work hard because I enjoy the tasks that I perform.</p> <p>Tasks Worthy of Hard Work = Intellectual Development Script I work hard at my tasks because these tasks enable me to develop my intellectual capacities and potential.</p>

Findings: the hard work commentaries

To gain a richer and more complete understanding of these various scripts, we must delve into the commentaries of the respondents. Only through such an examination can we unearth the kinds of ritual vocabularies that anchor the hard work commentaries of the French, Norwegian, and American respondents. The script repertoires articulated by each member of these four trios parallels the script repertoires mobilized by the larger respondent groups consisting of their conationals.⁸ The following analytical section therefore illustrates these ritual vocabularies by presenting commentaries drawn from the body of interviews. This illustrative section is divided up into four subsections, each of which presents interview material from biographically matched trios of respondents (a French respondent, a Norwegian respondent, and an American respondent) who approximate each other in terms of their educational, occupational, or family profiles. Each of these illustrative trios includes respondents who match up well with each other in terms of their occupation, their career stage, and their family status. The following four trios make an appearance:

Illustrative trio 1: younger management consultants

Illustrative trio 2: former consultants in the establishment phase

⁸ Please note: 1) All names are pseudonyms and 2) These illustrative commentaries have been systematically compared with the larger body of talk in order to ensure that they exemplify the script patterns characteristic of the corpus in its entirety.

Illustrative trio 3: corporate lawyers

Illustrative trio 4: engineering managers and technical consultants

By presenting trios that span diverse occupations, stages of the career trajectory, and family statuses, it becomes possible to appreciate the degree to which the hard work scripts are diffused within the three conational groups and the extent to which the cross-national divergences assert themselves between members of different occupational groups and professionals at different stages of the careers.

First illustrative trio: younger management consultants in the launching phase

These three respondents, all young male management consultants in their mid to late twenties commencing the launching phase of their careers, have all followed very similar career trajectories. The Frenchman Marceau Bonnet, the Norwegian Henning Thorvaldsen, and the American Dan Kannon all entered the management consulting world in their late twenties as junior associates after excelling in their business studies at elite universities in their respective countries, where all three had earned an MBA or the equivalent postgraduate business degree. After landing their coveted consulting position in their elite management consultancies, they spent between two and four years working for the consultancy, rising to a level where they exercised managerial responsibilities and oversaw more junior consultants. Having proved themselves as capable professionals working in a very demanding field, all three men looked ahead to a bright professional future in the executive reaches of the business world.

While Marceau Bonnet, Henning Thorvaldsen, and Dan Kannon had all traveled along very similar educational and occupational paths, a juxtaposition of the three men's commentaries on working hard brings to light the cross-national divergences sketched previously. While all three men make extensive use of the work-content scripts, only the American Dan Kannon combines both career-success scripts and drive/overachiever scripts in his script repertoire. The two European men, by contrast, do not avail themselves of these two scripts. Faithful to the work-content script, they state their case without adducing any of the other hard work scripts. For both Marceau and Henning, the most important source of motivation stems from the intrinsically engrossing aspects of work tasks and other aspects of their work activities.

Both Marceau Bonnet and Henning Thorvaldsen put stimulating work tasks front and center. Marceau expounds at length on the manifold gratifications he secures from his rewarding work situation in response to the question "What do you like about your work?":

Marceau Bonnet: I think there are several things that are really great about the job; it's a position where you get to learn the fundamentals of business; it's really a two-three year learning process. You get to learn what matters in business; you get a sense of the business culture. So that's one thing; another thing is that the work is very intellectually stimulating; it's fun to dig into the analytics of the business; you need to research various issues, this is all very stimulating, I would say.

As we can see from this excerpt, when Marceau weighs the motive forces behind his work engagement, he dwells at length on the role of interesting and stimulating work tasks. None of the questions about hard work motivation yield answers referencing either career-success scripts or personality scripts thematizing drive. Parroting Marceau, Henning attributes his willingness to exert himself to the intrinsic interest of the work tasks he performs and the fact that these work tasks help him to develop his capacities. It is for this reason that work deserves his dedication and effort:

Henning Thorvaldsen: Well, the significance of my job right now is a little like the essence of my education; it helps me to learn and evolve as a worker and a person. This is why my work is an important part of my life.

In these replies to questions about hard work and long work hours, we can see how Marceau and Henning foreground the work-task scripts and overlook the scripts focusing on both drive and career success. When it comes to the commentaries of the two European men, these scripts are both conspicuous in their absence, however. An analogous cross-national divergence appears with regard to the interpretations of these motivational candidates offered by Marceau and Henning. For example, when asked to comment on the import of work tasks as sources of work motivation, Marceau expounds at length about the central role of “learning” as an effective goad to work effort:

Marceau Bonnet: What you do at work, the content of what you do, matters a lot, but also you have to learn a lot at work. I would quit my job tomorrow morning if I stopped learning. If I were the minister of industry, for example, I would work 8 days a week because I would be learning so much. Then my eighth day would be spent doing something enriching.

Like his French counterpart, Henning also extols the lure of learning and “developing one’s intellectual and social capacities” as a powerful goad to hard work and the primary reason why he feels so strongly about the quality of his work tasks. When asked about the importance of career success, both men explain that such success only matters to the extent that it leads to more opportunities to engage in stimulating work down the line. In and of itself, the prospect of career success carries little motivational efficacy.

In the motivational commentaries of American Dan Kannon, however, we find these scripts and ritual vocabularies in abundance. Dan distinguishes himself from Marceau and Henning by supplementing career-success scripts with *hard work talk* incorporating the other two families of hard work scripts. When Dan speaks to his reasons for applying himself at his demanding job, he dwells on the financial and career “payoffs” yielded by his employment situation as much or more than the stimulating character of the work itself. Dan’s hard work commentaries convey the message that it is the “value proposition” represented by a job with an elite consultancy rather than the intrinsic rewards of the job’s tasks that make the job’s grueling 70 hour workweeks, unpredictable work hours, and incessant travel “worth it.” This desire to capture this occupational and financial “payoff” is the fuel that sustains his work effort and commitment. As Dan points out in beginning of the interview:

Dan Kannon: I knew [the job] would be hard. I knew there would be a payoff if I worked hard. I knew that at some point, I probably wouldn't like how hard it would be. But when I got an offer with one of the ones that I considered in the elite, it never occurred to me to turn it down. I thought about some of the tradeoffs and I knew that I was signing up for something that might be very hard but the opportunity seemed so attractive. The company had a great reputation and a lot of prestige. And the amount of the starting offer was more money than I've ever made in my life by a lot.

Rather than disavowing the motivational efficacy of money in the same terms as Marceau, Dan dwells on his outsize salary and how much it means to him. He observes that he is "thrilled" to get the large paycheck that comes with his job. Reflecting on the motivational role of money, he characterizes it as one of his "prime drivers." Although he earns a salary approaching \$250,000, Dan admits to worries and feelings of inferiority about the size of his paycheck, particularly in light of the salaries some of his peers earn. He wonders aloud whether one of his friends, a consultant turned private equity banker who earned roughly \$1 million the previous year, secretly scoffs at his measly salary.

Dan Kannon also brings to bear a distinctive suite of hard work scripts, which sets him apart from his French and Norwegian counterparts. First, when he addresses the motivating aspects of the work content, he focuses on the "adrenaline rush." Second, unlike his French and Norwegian counterpart, when he addresses the theme of career success, he stresses the significance of "boosting" his "stock" and "coming out ahead" in the competition to gain a lucrative and prestigious foothold in the upper reaches of the business world. Even if he got to work on the exact same assignments, "there was no way," he announces, that he would "work as hard for a less prestigious firm." Third, the seductive prospect of a high-flying career exerts its motivational pull because of its effectiveness as a conveyer of status in the eyes of peers, family, and the wider world rather than its connection to securing stimulating work assignments in the future.

Like his fellow American respondents, Dan articulates another distinctively American script in accounting for his tendency to outwork others. When discussing the lack of exciting and demanding work and how it affects his work motivation, he dwells at length on the psychic dangers of the unwelcome demobilization that strikes when his prodigious energies go unspent at work. Dan observes that a less demanding job that fails to absorb his plentiful energies would actually undercut his work motivation. One of the reasons why he chose the demanding field of management consulting, he explains, is because a less demanding line of work would leave him with an excessive supply of useless and demobilizing leisure time. Pondering a hypothetical scenario about a "potential life" (Hochschild 1997) where he would work at a substantially less demanding job, Dan speculates about his unhappy fate as an underemployed overachiever:

Interviewer: So let's construct a hypothetical scenario: if you were working at Palmolive or wherever and you were working your pretty relaxed 40-hour weeks, how do you think this would affect your motivation to work hard?

Dan Kannon: That's the great fear; if I were in a normal job with a normal workload, it would leave me less motivated. The experience of working hard is one of the things I like about this job. It ignites my fire.

Moreover, this toxic sea of unearned leisure time would erode his happiness. He would fall into a “couch potato existence,” he imagines, which would leave him bored and listless and ultimately erode his self-esteem. Had he chosen a normal 9-to-5 job that did not impose such heavy demands on his time and energy, he would have afflicted himself with boredom and reduced his overall well-being. To make his point Dan conjures up a scenario involving excessive hours of TV watching and wasted time:

Dan Kannon: Maybe I’d watch more TV. Maybe what I’d do is watch more baseball on TV and eat more chips and that would be unsatisfying and I’d feel pretty bad about that. Now, I feel like I spend my free time really well now, but the thing is it’s partially because I work so hard at my job. Otherwise, I might spend my free time just napping on the couch. So the value of the free time I’d get back wouldn’t compensate for my loss of perceived stature and recognition.

The job of the management consultant serves Dan as an antidote to a potentially empty and boredom-inducing life outside work, as well as the royal road to the highly coveted goals of wealth, stature, and recognition. Here Dan invokes a characteristically American script revolving around demobilization and idleness, a script quite foreign to both Marceau and Henning.

Second illustrative trio: former consultants in the establishment phase

Unlike the first trio of younger management consultants in their mid- to late twenties in the launching phase of their careers, these more seasoned professionals, men in their early to mid-thirties, had moved from management consulting into executive positions within the strategy units of large and well-established companies. All three men had made this switch after enduring years of grueling and unpredictable hours, arduous assignments, and incessant business travel as project managers for elite management consultancies. In this capacity they oversaw projects worth millions of dollars, euros, or Norwegian kroner. They endured heavy demands on their time and energy imposed by clients, partners, and peers.

The Frenchman Stéphane Marlon, the Norwegian Einar Nyborg, and the American Sam King resembled each other closely in terms of their occupational trajectories. Each man had acquired a business-related degree from a prestigious educational institution and begun his post-MBA career in a prestigious management consultancy. Each man had proven himself as a capable professional capable of fielding a myriad of professional challenges. Stéphane secured a management position at a large bank, while Einar went to work for a pan-Scandinavian finance firm as a senior analyst. Sam parlayed his 5 years’ worth of experience as a management consultant into a high-level strategy position within a multinational software company.

The same divide in hard work scripts characterizes the commentaries of this trio. As in the case of the previous trio, the commentaries of Stéphane or Einar are devoid of both career-success scripts and personality scripts, the scripts that figure prominently in the hard work talk issuing from the lips of their American counterpart.

While both Stéphane and Einar expound on the motivational potency of interesting work tasks and a stimulating work environment, avoiding any mention of money-making, career success, drive or boredom, the American Sam King follows in his fellow Americans' footsteps by demonstrating a comfort and facility with both the career success and drive scripts, hard work scripts entirely foreign to his two European counterparts. The following exchange illustrates Stéphane's comfort and fluency with the hard work script thematizing work tasks and work content:

Stéphane Marlon: There is never the idea that I will be at the office when I really want to be at home. If I am in the office, it is because I want to be there because I enjoy what I do. I want to do the tasks which make me feel good. That is why I am working so hard at the job that I have today.

Like the Frenchman Stéphane, the Norwegian Einar, a consultant turned financial analyst, also turns to work content in order to account for his proclivity for hard work. Einar proclaims that there is "nothing more motivating than enjoyable work" and the "most important thing at work is to have fun." Moreover, he would be willing to work for much less money, as long as the firm could guarantee the stimulating character of his work tasks and projects. For Einar, as for his countryman Henning, the intrinsic interest of the work tasks is what makes his work worthy of his nearly unbounded effort and commitment.

When Stéphane comments on the motivating power of work content, he concentrates on the motivational efficacy of intellectually engaging tasks conducive to his professional and personal self-development. Reflecting on his proclivity for working long and arduous hours, Stéphane concludes that he only keeps such long hours and expends such effort because of the "learning potential" supplied by the "intellectually rich" work projects. In articulating this connection, Stéphane focuses on the character of his work tasks and work environment. It is only because it makes him "feel good" to work on intellectually stimulating tasks that he is willing to toil in the office 70 hours a week. Ending his remarks on an emphatic note, he proclaims "Even when I am working 13 hours a day, when I work on something really intellectually engaging, I feel like I could go on forever." The importance of self-development draws an emphatic commentary from Stéphane:

Stéphane Marlon: I want to be the kind of person who has accomplished myself as fully as possible both personally and professionally. This is one of the reasons why I work so hard at this job.

Like the commentary proffered by Marceau, Stéphane's remarks feature many references to self-development through work. Stéphane readily shares his strong desire to develop those intellectual and social skills that blossom most fully in and through his challenging work. These hard work scripts also turn up in the observations of his Norwegian counterpart Einar. Einar gladly fills his twelve-hour days with work because he has a hard time turning his back on tasks that he finds "intellectually challenging and engaging [*givende*]." For him, as for other Norwegians, career success only matters inasmuch as it creates the possibility for more intellectually enriching work down the line. Like the other

Norwegians, Einar is intent on avoiding the grim fate awaiting individuals who wind up repeating the same tasks over and over again. If this fate did befall him, he would wind up “dead of boredom.” The purpose of work, in his view, is to help him realize his latent intellectual, emotional, and social capacities and becoming a fully developed person.

The hard work talk of Sam King presents a stark contrast to the commentaries of Stéphane and Einar. The scripts that do justificatory work in Sam’s commentaries are those scripts that thematize career, moneymaking, and drive. Unlike the hard work talk of European counterparts, Sam King’s commentaries overflow with references to career success and money as spurs to hard work capable of sustaining his habit of working long and arduous hours. During his long stint in management consulting Sam had regularly toiled at the client’s site at “three o’clock in the morning putting together a PowerPoint presentation,” even when “everybody else had given up a long time ago and had gone home.” Even though five years’ worth of these sixteen-hour workdays and incessant travel took a substantial physical and mental toll, he felt fortunate that this job had taught him “what it takes to succeed in the business world” and had “snapped” him “into shape.”

Unlike both Stéphane and Einar, Sam traces his intense desire to work hard to his insatiable hunger for career success and the money that comes in the wake of such success:

Sam King: My feeling on consulting was, if I worked 80 hours a week, I would advance my career at twice the speed. So this is why I was the first one there in the morning and the last one there at night, for weeks on end.

Moreover, like several other Americans and unlike the two Europeans, Sam King expresses a willingness to gut out unappealing projects and uninteresting tasks so that he can reap the economic rewards that go to the person who excels at his job. He confesses that he will “eat a lot of crap” as long as he is “paid well.”

Sam King: It is very important to me to always advance my career, get more recognition, and take a step forward. If I slacked off right now at my current job, today and just kind of coasted a little bit, it would take away the shine that I have right now at my job, which means it takes away the opportunity to move up eventually, or move somewhere else into a great role somewhere else in the business world. So, I’m more than willing to pay up now, and get the reward later.

At the same time, Sam represents himself as someone propelled by the powerful drive to succeed. At each stage of his education and professional career he feels “compelled to push with all my might” in order to reach his ambitious goals. As a junior management consultant working side by side with other ambitious people, Sam is happy to earn a reputation as “the burner” and the “hardcore worker” among his hardworking peers and colleagues. Sam’s drive to succeed has not burst onto the scene recently, but has formed a part of his character for a long time. He has always liked to “do things to death,” whatever the context, circumstances, or task. He could trace this longstanding proclivity for “burning hard” all the way back to his formative

experiences in grade school through his 4 years of college, his 5 years of engineering work, his 2 years of business school, and his 5 years of management consulting. Sam has a lot to say about the “high” he derived from his work as a high-flying business professional working at the “higher altitudes” of the business landscape. Intellectual self-development does not come into play in his *hard work talk*. At the same time, he offers a characteristically American interpretation of the career competition as an effective goad to effort (Duina 2011):

Sam King: One thing I like to think about myself is that I’ve always been kind of hungry, and that’s what has motivated me to work harder. I want to win the game, and the main way I measure winning is how much money I get out of my job. And I’m not ashamed of that. It always comes back to the money. I’m always benchmarking myself against my peers in terms of who is making more money and who has reached the highest level. And so it always comes back to the money. At the end of the day, that’s my primary motivator.

In Sam’s self-reflections the symbolic rewards of a successful high-income career come to the fore as a critical impetus to hard work. But these monetary rewards are themselves invested with a symbolic character. Sam works hard to maximize his income, because by maximizing this income he can win respect from those who matter and come out ahead in the competition for status. By earning a high salary, he is making a statement about where he stands both within his employing organization and vis-à-vis his peers and competitors. Thus, moneymaking exercises its motivational potency because of its contributions to status more than purchasing power.

Sam also fortifies his commentaries with internal scripts regarding his drive and his overachieving character. Sam describes himself as an “overachiever” who feels compelled to work hard by virtue of his personality. Further, he identifies this “need” to work hard as a prominent aspect of the “American spirit,” an ethic he shares with the many equally driven colleagues working in his firm. This aspect of his personality is what propels his work ethic, not the character of the job or the employer:

Interviewer: While you were in the second job, did you work as hard as you did in the first job?

Sam King: Yeah, but only because that’s my personality; it wasn’t the company that inspired that effort. I think a lot of the amount that we work is driven by the need for personal accomplishment. I picked a company which matched my personality. It’s an extreme of the American spirit here; it’s like “we work hard.” I think we’ve got a personality type here that’s pretty driven. We all worked hard in school even before we started our careers.

Unlike Stéphane, his French counterpart, and Einar, his Norwegian counterpart, Sam attributes his penchant for working hard to a longstanding work ethic rooted in his personality. For this American man, the propensity to work hard represents a force whose strength does not fluctuate, no matter the character of his work assignments or work environment. Sam is someone who cannot help working hard, regardless of his work tasks, work environment, and work responsibilities.

Just as he cannot deny his inner drive and his identity as an overachiever, Sam cannot stomach the thought of easing up at work. Any attempt to “slack off” would

compromise his identity as an overachiever and lead to a demoralizing state of demobilization. Sam recalls several periods in his life during which he experienced this state of demobilization precisely because he was not properly engrossed in an all-consuming job. In his long and detailed life history, Sam bemoans the twin afflictions of boredom and depression that inevitably ensue when he eases up at work and gives up on his identity as an overachiever:

Sam King: It's always very conscious to me that I shouldn't slack off at work because it will make me miserable. I have gone through periods of my life where I worked in jobs which did not get my juices going and I became kind of lazy. I quickly found out then that laziness leads to boredom and boredom leads to depression. When I lapsed from time to time, like, later in my career, my first job out of undergrad, where I was in the factory in Florida, I didn't work hard at that job, and that's when I sort of became anti-social, and I just crept away to the apartment after work, and I never really went out, and I was sort of gloomy. When I think back to those relapses, I realized that they happened because I was not working hard and I was being lazy at work and not trying to improve my situation. This was what led me to become bored and then depressed.

In his hard work commentaries, work effort comes across as the preferred means to achieve career success. At the same time it appears as the best means of fending off the threat of a demoralizing demobilization that puts his overachieving self in jeopardy.

Third illustrative trio: corporate attorneys

To demonstrate that the scripts under study are not confined to consultants and business executives, this section presents hard work commentaries drawn from interviews with a trio of corporate lawyers. The discourses of these three lawyers are representative of the larger subgroup of conational lawyers as well as the entire pool of conationals. Like the second trio of business executives, these attorneys have progressed beyond the launching phase of their professional careers. After excelling in their legal studies, Marcel Lasalle (French), Erling Jæger (Norwegian), and Matt Smith (American) had all worked as corporate attorneys in top-flight law firms in their respective countries. In their mid to late thirties at the time of the interview, these men had spent between five and seven years building their reputation as competent and fearless litigators at renowned corporate law firms. Further, all three men specialized in banking and securities law, one of the most prestigious and demanding specialties within the legal profession. During the year of their interview, both Marcel and Erling took home the equivalent of \$180,000 in their own currencies, while Matt earned an income of \$230,000.

Yet again the hard work talk of the American stands apart from the hard work talk of the French and Norwegian respondents, inasmuch as it incorporates different hard work scripts. While the American Matt Smith does adduce to the work-content script, the bulk of his justificatory work is accomplished with the aid of the career-success script and the drive/overachievement script. Neither of these scripts makes an appearance in the hard work commentaries of Marcel or Erling, however.

When asked why they work hard, both Marcel and Erling cite the pleasure they derive from their stimulating work tasks. Marcel calls his work tasks “inspirational,” and observes that he would be happy to continue working twelve-hour days throughout his career if he could always count on such engrossing tasks. Erling, the Norwegian member of this trio, relies entirely on the work-task script we have come to expect from the Norwegians, particularly the script that highlights the leisure-like aspects of work (Conley 2009) as the most potent motivational factors inciting him to work hard. He attributes his habit of working twelve- and thirteen-hour days to the fact that he finds his work as an attorney “incredibly fun” [*fryktelig morsomt*]. These days are only tolerable, he feels, because his work really amounts to his “hobby.” In his view, nothing can substitute for the motivational impetus he receives when he is “having fun at work” and having “tasks that I enjoy.” In these formulations work has been defined as a particularly fulfilling and enriching form of play, an avocation or hobby enjoyable for its own sake. For Erling, it is only when there is a lack of intellectually stimulating assignments that boredom becomes a real possibility.

Matt, the American member of the trio, also makes extensive use of the work-content scripts so popular among his European counterparts. During his first years as a litigator he was surprised to find that he enjoyed the thrust and parry of litigation to the point where he would lose track of time and become completely engrossed in his work for months on end. At the same time, however, Matt explains that his desire to maximize his earnings also plays an important role in sustaining his motivation to endure the long hours, irritating clients, and often tedious assignments. In acknowledging this element, Matt confesses that he would find it hard to remain motivated if the company cut his pay significantly. In his comments Matt represents his interest in maintaining a high income as a critical ingredient in nourishing his motivation for hard work.

Matt Smith: Money is definitely a big reason why I went into corporate law and why I’m willing to work the kinds of hours necessary to make a career here in this firm.

As is evident from this commentary, Matt leaves ample room for the career success and moneymaking scripts. As we can see, like other American members of the illustrative trios and unlike Marcel and Erling, Matt pins his justificatory efforts on these scripts.

However, Matt does stand out from the majority of his American counterparts inasmuch as he also brings up the engrossing aspects of his work activities in a supplementary fashion. However, whereas the Europeans always interpret their engagement with such work tasks as a form of intellectual and social self-development, Matt talks at length about the “adrenaline rush” he experiences when matching wits with other legal professionals on the opposing side:

Matt Smith: I actually don’t have much trouble working really long hours, particularly when the work is exciting. In the heat of the battle there’s just so much adrenaline over such an extended period of time. That’s why it’s easy for the work to really take over your life [for long stretches of time].

Like the other American respondents, Matt interprets the work-content script in a way that highlights the mobilizing aspects of the work experience rather than its

character as a source of intellectual gratification. Matt also articulates characteristically American scripts when weighing the motivational potency of career success and moneymaking. His specification of career success as a matter of winning and gaining status stands as a characteristically American interpretation of this theme. Even if he does resemble his European counterparts in his concern for economic security and his family's standard of living, he stands apart from them in terms of his intense desire to signal a certain socioeconomic status to his wealthy friends and neighbors. As he explains:

Matt Smith: I did choose this demanding job because I knew I could earn a lot of money in it. Money is key for me. This is something I've realized about myself. I hate to say it, but the more money I earn, the better I feel about myself—2X is always better than X as far as money goes. I've also realized that there's some status element to it. My wife and I live in a very materialistic area [the San Francisco Bay Area], and we're surrounded by many educated and wealthy people.

At the same time, like the other Americans, Matt articulates several well-elaborated scripts concerning his drive and his aversion to excessive leisure. A self-described "Type-A" personality, Matt carries on about the dangers of excessive leisure and demobilization in the same way as the other American respondents. Lamenting the demoralizing and demobilizing effects of an unwanted reduction in his workload, he laments the feelings of "boredom" that marred his work life during tepid workweeks when he could barely fill a 40-hour workweek. Relying on the same script as his countrymen, Matt blames short working hours for a falloff in his work motivation and a precipitous drop in his overall well-being.

Interviewer: If the firm offered to pay you your current salary but asked you to work 30 hours a week how would this affect your work motivation and how would you feel about yourself?

Matt Smith: I'd be bored, I gotta tell you. Since I arrived here in San Francisco there have been slow times here where I've just been bored. For me to bill 1900 hours, that's less than a 40-hour workweek of billing. It gets boring and I don't feel good about myself when this happens. I start to wonder whether I'm really such an overachiever after all.

Thus, for Matt as for the other Americans, there is something inherently appealing and motivational about working hard, irrespective of work content. It is through taxing work and grueling work hours that he sustains his conception of himself as an "overachiever."

The hard work scripts elaborated by Marcel and Erling echo those offered by their countrymen. For example, when invited to comment on the reasons why he finds his work tasks so engaging, Marcel echoes his French and Norwegian counterparts and links the motivating power of work tasks to their potential as important sources of intellectual self-development and important catalysts to professional learning. Relying on a characteristically effusive French ritual vocabulary, he hails his work's developmental potential as a means of "self-completion:"

Marcel Lasalle: I like to work hard when I am learning things that I don't already know, learning new skills and competencies [*savoir faire*] that I don't

already have in my professional experience. Second, I am looking to complete myself in my work, to make myself more accomplished by doing things that I like, that challenge me, that push me, that make me progress. This job completes me [*m'accomplir*]. Today I work hard in a job that I adore and that fulfills me.

Marcel continues in this vein by confessing that he “wouldn’t feel good” about himself if he didn’t work hard. If he eased up at work, he asserts, he would forgo the opportunity to develop his intellectual capacities to their “fullest extent.” Interestingly, when addressing the role of money and salary, Marcel does admit that the desire for a high income spurs him to work hard. However, he explains that this high income is only important to him because it serves as a means through which he can underwrite a comfortable standard of living for himself and his family. In virtually the same breath he dismisses the intrinsic importance of “becoming a leader or climbing up the corporate ladder.” Career success, in his opinion, is really only a worthwhile and motivationally efficacious goal if it “opens the door to more interesting work” down the line. Erling, like his French counterpart Marcel, also explains the motivational efficacy of worthy work as a result of its potential as a source of intellectual stimulation and self-development. For him, career success serves as an inducement to hard work only because it enhances his stock at work and paves the way for stimulating work assignments in the future. It has little to do with validating him as a winner.

Fourth illustrative trio: engineering managers and technical consultants

The fourth and final illustrative trio of respondents all work in the fields of engineering, engineering management, and technical consulting. Vallois Sauville (French), Leif Halvorsen (Norwegian), and Chuck Brown (American), all men in their early to mid thirties, hold postgraduate engineering or technical degrees from well-regarded institutions and have amassed extensive experience on both the technical and management sides of the high-tech industry. At the time of the interview, each man works demanding but not extreme workweeks in their respective companies. As with the other trios, the American member of the trio (Chuck Brown) brings home somewhat more income and pays somewhat less of his income in taxes than his European counterparts.

Both the Frenchman Vallois Sauville and the Norwegian Leif Halvorsen shy away from the career-success scripts as well as the scripts thematizing drive. Like their countrymen, they adduce only the work-content scripts. Long workdays and frequent travel do not bother Vallois, as long as he can always “look forward to great projects.” Reprising the work-content script so popular with his fellow Norwegians, Leif asserts that he is happy to endure the unpredictability of a hectic work schedule designed to accommodate his clients, so long as he is confident that they will continue to present him with challenging assignments he finds “engaging and interesting.”

Yet again, the Frenchman and the Norwegian foreground the indispensability of demanding but intellectually stimulating work as a catalyst for self-development. When asked “What is it about interesting tasks that keeps you motivated to work hard?” Vallois offers the response, “I am always seeking to develop myself, to

augment my intellectual and technical capabilities.” Leif also leans heavily on this self-development script. In response to the same question, Leif repeatedly and emphatically highlights his desire for work that can help him “realize” himself. Repeatedly extolling his work as “rich in learning” [*lærerikt*], he emphasizes the motivational power of interesting assignments and the motivational void created by dull work tasks:

Leif Halvorsen: As long as I feel that I’m working with something intellectually exciting, I don’t feel that I’m sacrificing so much when I work a lot. If it’s professionally intriguing and fun, then 60 hours per week is about right, but if it’s boring work, and you feel like Charlie Chaplin on the assembly line [in the movie *Modern Times*], then 20 hours per week is too much. Personally, I have a very strong desire to make sure that I remain passionate about what I’m doing from a professional perspective and that I’m working with intellectually [*faglig*] exciting stuff. It’s about burning for something intellectually fulfilling.

However, Leif is more open to acknowledging the motivating potency of money than the vast majority of his fellow Norwegian respondents. When he rhapsodizes about the meaning and significance of career success and money, Leif makes it clear that he does find his generous salary motivating. However, Leif differentiates himself from the Americans even here, as he highlights the material benefits of the salary rather than its symbolic significance as a sign of his relative stature. For Leif, a high salary means nothing more than a “good economic foundation.” Status and winning do not enter into the picture.

Not surprisingly, the American Chuck Brown is the sole member of the trio enamored of the hard work scripts thematizing motivational sources other than work content. Chuck Brown implicates not only his interesting work assignments as an impetus to hard work, but also his interest in “getting ahead in my career” and his desire to affirm the identity of someone who “kicks butt” at work as factors fueling his motivation to work hard. He also emphasizes the importance of his high salary. In the absence of such a high salary, he explains, he just “wouldn’t be able to muster this kind of energy for work.” Finally, Chuck relies heavily on the personality scripts absent in the commentaries of Vallois and Leif, expounding at length on the importance of hard work as a way of maintaining the identity of the overachiever. Thus, whereas Vallois and Leif both focus exclusively on the singular motivational role played by work content, the American Chuck Brown expounds at length about the importance of achieving a high level of career success and maximizing his salary so that he can take his place as one of the “big boys.” In this slightly indirect way he echoes the other American respondents by using hard work scripts that represent outsize salaries as tickets to high status as much as economic security and a comfortable standard of living.

But, again, even career success does not suffice as a motive for hard work in the American’s commentary. Like the other Americans, Chuck expounds repeatedly on the force of his ineluctable “drive” to succeed and his indefatigable work ethic:

Chuck Brown: So when I started working at Consulting Inc., I worked quite a bit on the weekends—not because I necessarily had to do this but because it was in me. That’s what I had always done. My work hours have remained relatively

constant for a long time. When I was younger, my dad and I would spend time together every Saturday morning. He ran his own business building and selling lockers. And so I would help him build and install lockers when I grew old enough. So I grew up getting up at six in the morning every day and going to work on the weekends. To this day I just can't sit still. So I can't work short days. I'm unable personally to work low hours. I don't think I could work an 8-hour day if I tried. I don't think I could physically do it. I've been working ten-hour days since I was fourteen years old and I think it's built into my body to get up and do something hard and well and do extra to distinguish myself or my company or whatever it is. I've never taken a sick day in my career.

Characterizing himself as an “overachiever,” Chuck points out that he has never limited himself to an 8-hour workday, and he cannot imagine himself working such “short” hours. Like the other members of his family, the proclivity for hard work has deep roots in his personality and in his past.

The two script repertoires

The juxtaposition of the three groups with respect to their characteristic script repertoires reveals a striking divergence in the American respondents' script repertoires versus the script repertoires deployed by the French and Norwegian respondents. In their commentaries the French and Norwegians rely exclusively on what can be described as a devotional-avocational script repertoire. This script repertoire focuses on the various characteristics of work activity and work content as the primary spurs to hard work (Stebbins 2004). In the commentaries of the French and Norwegians, in other words, any work worthy of effort and any demanding job worthy of commitment contributes to the development of intellectual and social capacities that would otherwise lie fallow.

In its pure form, the devotional-avocational repertoire represents the penchant for hard work as the product of a stimulating and enriching engagement with particular tasks, environments, and responsibilities. The devotional-avocational repertoire thus singles out the work activity itself as the decisive stimulus to hard work. If the worker applies himself to his work, it is a response to the intrinsic gratifications he derives from his devotion-worthy work. In the devotional-avocational script repertoire, the willingness to work hard is cast as the fruit of an engrossing involvement with intrinsically enriching and enjoyable work tasks, work environments, and work responsibilities. The prospect of success in one's career, for the French and Norwegian respondents, prompts one to work hard only inasmuch as it leads to more fulfilling work assignments and more autonomous work conditions. Conversely, insofar as it effaces the employment situation as a motivational factor, the devotional-avocational script minimizes the motivational role of work's institutional correlates, namely jobs, careers, and paychecks.⁹ The ideal-typical devotional-avocational script repertoire singles out the engaging characteristics of the work activities, rather than career success or drive, as the most motivationally potent aspects of the work situation as a whole.

⁹ If moneymaking is mentioned by the French or the Norwegians, it is interpreted in an instrumental light as a means of procuring the goods of life, particularly economic security and a comfortable standard of living.

Unlike the French and Norwegians, the Americans spice their commentaries with elements from a very different justificatory repertoire. Even if a handful of the Americans mention the opportunities their work gives them to exercise and develop their intellectual and social capacities, the bulk of the Americans' justifications for hard work revolve around its connection to career success, moneymaking, or drive, overachievement and a longstanding aversion to idleness. Unlike the thematically coherent devotional repertoire, the overachievement repertoire intertwines two very different strands, namely the strand connected to the person's "public engagements" (socially visible career success and moneymaking) and the strand connected to the person's inner involvements (drive, work ethic, industriousness) (Jepperson 1992, p. 140).¹⁰ The Americans' rhetorical arsenal thus binds together the institutional and the subjective dimensions of the self in a slightly schizophrenic way.

From a slightly different angle of vision, one could characterize the difference between these two script repertoires as a distinction between two different motivational models relating to hard work. The devotional-avocational repertoire foregrounds a forward-looking motivational engine that makes engaging work the linchpin of self-development and self-realization. The overachievement repertoire features two different motivational engines. Insofar as it highlights inner drive and the aversion to idleness, it puts forward a characterological model in which the propensity to work hard emerges from a longstanding character trait with roots stretching into the past. If there is a forward-looking aspect to this model, it manifests itself in the career success and moneymaking scripts, scripts that represent the most effective motivational engine as the forward-looking desire for wealth and particularly status.

To the sociological eye there is a striking resemblance between the overachievement repertoire and the classic Protestant Ethic first sketched by Weber. First, like Weber's Protestant Ethic, the overachievement repertoire presents work effort as the preferred existential locus for the actualization of a morally pure self. Weber's ascetic vocationalist, as we recall, seeks evidence of his own sinlessness and Godliness in his toil and its pecuniary fruits. In the Calvinist tradition, paid work is invested with a "heroic" status as the royal road to moral standing and "world mastery" (Weber 2002 [1920], Mennell 2007, p. 250; Kalberg 1992, p. 339). This activity cult and fear of idleness (Duina 2011, p. 132, 170; Zerubavel 1981, p.56) prescribes unceasing activity in a work-related calling as an antidote to self-doubt and feelings of unworthiness. According to this "gospel of work" (De Grazia 1962) the main impetus to hard work is a moral one: one should work hard because working hard makes one a moral person.

Second, both the overachievement repertoire and the classic Protestant Ethic manifest a similar stance towards career success and moneymaking. The

¹⁰ While the career success strand points outward, towards institutional self-anchorages in the social world of jobs and organizations, the drive strand gestures inward, towards the inner world of institutionally unmediated impulses and desires relating to personal identity projects and interpersonal relations (Taviss Thomson 2000, Turner 1976). The role of the overachiever, as Taviss Thomson remarks, straddles the occupational and the nonoccupational domains. It is relevant to working life, but it is also a nonoccupational role which children or adolescents embrace before they enter the workplace, as members of families or students (Taviss Thomson 2000, p. 96).

validating power of work, in both cases, works in and through its pecuniary rewards. The search for money-mediated validation is cast as the decisive motivational stimulus sustaining work commitment. As Serge Moscovici observes, the only reason why Weber's Protestant ascetic chases after profit and wealth is because he treats the monetary value attached to the fruits of his labor as a valid measure of his own worth in the eyes of the Almighty (Moscovici 1993 [1988], p. 169). To maximize his chances of spiritual certification, the Protestant ascetic maximizes his money income; the more money he earns from his work, in other words, the less anxiety he suffers in regards to his spiritual status. The same maximizing logic anchors the overachievement ethic.

Furthermore, in the overachievement repertoire money income matters more on account of its symbolic potency as an index of success than it matters on account of its power as a means of acquisition. Thus, though the overachievement repertoire presents a substantial income as an important motivational engine spurring hard work, money itself is framed as a symbolization of comparative performance and personal worthiness rather than a mere instrument of material acquisition (Wuthnow 1996, pp. 125–131). When the Americans mobilize the overachievement repertoire, they gesture towards a particular framing of money as the impersonal valuation of "individual achievement as such." The overachievement repertoire thus embodies the Simmelian view of money as an impersonal index of achievement and a means of inter-individual comparison (Simmel 1978 [1907], p. 341). As Simmel observes, translating achievement into money income enables individuals doing diverse kinds of work to commensurate their performances according to a common metric.

The overachievement repertoire recapitulates both the anti-idleness and the moneymaking strands of the Calvinist work ethic. But it also recalls this work ethic inasmuch as it exhibits a relative indifference to the characteristics of the work activity that engages the worker's mind, body, and soul. It is in this respect that the devotional-avocational repertoire strays far from Weber's classic Protestant Ethic. This repertoire elevates experiential gratifications to the apex of hard work motivation and diverts attention away from the temporally distant spiritual or worldly rewards that certify the spiritual status of the devoted worker. It makes work motivation contingent solely on the intrinsic qualities of the work tasks and work activities that confront the worker.

Macrocontexts: stratification/authenticity configurations

Despite their formidable occupational accomplishments, these Western Europeans dwell exclusively on the content of their work as the motive force behind their commitment to hard work. For the French and Norwegian respondents, the primary imperative guiding their justificatory efforts is the concern to associate hard work and work-centrism with something more elevated than the craving for career success or the urgencies of a compulsive industriousness. For them, working hard is best rationalized and legitimated by reference to the quest to realize one's higher capacities. The absence of overachievement scripts among the French and the Norwegians serves to underline the all-important

purity of the relationship between the upper-middle class man and his often rewarding work.¹¹

The Americans in this study, men who have acquitted themselves very well in the competition for socioeconomic status, feel compelled to legitimate their attachment to hard work and all-consuming jobs not only by invoking their work's stimulating content, but by appealing to their unflagging desire for occupational success and their constitutional affinity for work effort and aversion to leisure. The Americans enthusiastically exploit a cultural repertoire that emphasizes both the goal of occupational success and drive as the key characterological trait sustaining the work effort necessary to succeed. In the French and Norwegian cases, the only script repertoire qualified to serve in this capacity is the devotional-avocational repertoire. The American respondents are the ones who buttress their justifications for hard work with frequent and emphatic references to their quest for occupational success, their drive to exert themselves at work, and their aversion to idleness. These men, socialized in a context where striving after success and deferring to one's drive count as perfectly legitimate reasons to bury oneself in work, try to anchor their commitment to hard work in multiple foundations, not only in a search for a self-development and self-realization that hinges on the attractiveness of work tasks but in the very fabric of one's self.

This gap in hard work scripts must be understood in relation to the distinctiveness of the three macrocontexts under study. Each of these macrocontexts presents professional and managerial men with a particular stratification/authenticity configuration relevant to their experience of work, leisure, and private life (Kalberg 1992). These configurations make particular scripts more or less compelling as rhetorical resources appropriate for accounts of hard work (Jepperson 1992; Lamont 1992). The American professional man encounters a prevailing stratification/authenticity configuration at once egalitarian and strongly oriented to occupational achievement. For individuals socialized in this environment, particularly upper-middle class men, upward mobility is premised on participation in an open and individualized competition to achieve economic status. This competition is open to all comers and its outcome is supposed to reflect faithfully the skills contestants bring to the competition and the effort they put into it (Duina 2011; Münch 1992, p. 151). The results, in other words, should afford each individual a particular individualized ranking or position vis-à-vis other

¹¹ Here I follow other sociologists of culture and posit hard work talk as the *explanandum* in an ecological model of cultural causation. In this model ecological factors reign supreme as the decisive macrolevel sources of cross-societal variation in cultural patterns (Kaufman 2004, p. 336). These ecological factors shape the cultural opportunity structure faced by the individual who expresses and enacts particular "symbolic preferences" when he or she engages in specific forms of facework (Berger 1995; Lamont 1992) by determining whether and to what extent the already-socialized individual is exposed to particular cultural forms circulating in his or her cultural environment and how he or she receives these cultural forms. This type of ecological account was used to great effect in Lamont's study of the boundary-marking discourses of French and American upper-middle class male managers and professionals (Lamont 1992, pp. 134–137). Seeking to advance beyond explanations rooted in differences between indefinable "national characters," Lamont proposes a sophisticated ecological explanation for the discrepancies she observes between the cultural repertoires characteristic of her two groups of respondents. Because Lamont's French and American respondents are exposed to contrasting macrocultural influences circulating within their respective social environments, Lamont argues, they confront contrasting cultural "supply sides" stemming from society-wide macrocultural and institutional factors. These factors generate different menus of cultural forms and diffuse these menus across the entire society.

individuals. And this ranking should reflect the contestant's own personal commitment to the competition as well as the effort and skills he or she brings to it.¹² In this cultural environment of individualized competition, scripts that trace work motivation to drive and career success acquire a compelling character that they lack in other cultural environments.

The French stratification/authenticity configuration lacks these tendencies. In this post-aristocratic culture, status and authenticity claims are grounded primarily in membership between more and less "noble" social groups subject to publicly codified classification schemes defining a social hierarchy (Bourdieu 1984 [1979]). In this environment one works hard to signal one's membership in a collectively defined elite group. Claims to personal fitness and worthiness derive from one's membership in this group. In this modern-day "society of orders," (D'Iribarne 2006, 1989), the commitment to a demanding work life can only be justified by invoking the intellectually stimulating quality of the work activities. As Baudelot and Gollac (2004) and Lamont (1992) both remark, the French upper-middle class men feels obliged to represent his commitment to work and occupational life as a matter of pursuing his intellectual "passion" rather than besting his competitors (Lamont 1992, p. 138). Less elevated motives should not fuel the desire to burn the midnight oil.¹³

The stratification/authenticity configuration encountered by the Norwegian professional, while distinct from the configuration confronted by the French professional, also delegitimizes drive, the aversion to idleness, and the hunger for career success as inducements to hard work. For the Norwegian professional man, as for the French professional man, work effort naturally emerges from the person's devotional relationship to stimulating work activity as opposed to an instinctive proclivity for industriousness and a reflexive aversion to idleness.¹⁴ Working conspicuously long hours, in this context, is seen as a sign of *illegitimate* status striving. One of my Norwegian respondents, the financial officer at a venture capital firm, criticized what he saw as inauthentic overwork in strong and unambiguous terms. As Rune said:

I would never measure the worth of a person by the number of hours they spend in their job...I think this is crazy. I would be skeptical if I met someone who saw themselves as worthy because they worked 70 hours a week just because they felt compelled to show others how hard they could work. I would wonder what kind of reality they were living in. It only makes sense to work these kinds of hours when you really love your work.

¹² The ranking should also associate success with a measurable "relativizing" indicator of personal worth and achievement (Simmel 1978 [1907]) such as money. Money earnings enable comparisons of one individual's achievements with those of others working in different fields.

¹³ Even for successful professionals and managers (*cadres* and *cadres supérieurs*) working in the elite parts of the business world, occupational success has to compete with rival status currencies as a basis for legitimate claims to social status and personal worth. As Lamont notes, in the French and particularly the Parisian context, displays of cultural sophistication, analytical prowess, and verbal dexterity (i.e., "distinction") perform better as status signals than ostentatious displays of wealth.

¹⁴ It is quite possible that particular work-content scripts, deployed in particular interactional situations, also serve their male articulators as cultural resources useful in establishing masculine workplace identities. Thus, the drive script may serve the Americans as a kind of cultural credential useful in establishing their identities as the "go-to-guys" or "iron men" in their workplaces (Kellogg 2011; Cooper 2000).

Here Rune expresses an animus towards this equation of character and work effort so popular among the Americans. At the same time Rune describes himself as an “ordinary person” who doesn’t “have three generations of professionals in the family.” He also speaks at length about the fact that Norwegians “care less about social status than Americans.” In Norway, as he put it, you “don’t need to amass a pile of money” to be considered a success. His comments illustrate the way in which Norwegians denigrate conspicuous work effort as a kind of distasteful status striving rather than a fitting basis for establishing personal worth. In this unusually solidaristic and egalitarian society, hard work is supposed to issue from a devotional engagement with work activity (Daloz 2007). In the egalitarian Norwegian environment, as in the post-aristocratic French environment, the successful upper-middle class professional man can afford to dedicate himself to work solely for the sake of self-development.

For different reasons, the overachievement repertoire lacks resonance in the French and Norwegian contexts. In the French context, it is the post-aristocratic stratification/authenticity configuration, with its intellectualist vision of working life, which renders the work-content scripts more compelling than both the drive script and the career-success script. In the Norwegian stratification/authenticity configuration, naked occupational ambition acquires a distasteful quality as it bespeaks an overriding concern with something superficial and valueless (see Nelson & Shavitt 2002). Thus, invocations of drive and a hunger for career success become inappropriate as rationales for hard work motivation in the two European macro-contexts.

Although the specificities of the American environment play an important role in making the overachievement repertoire a viable hard work rhetoric for successful American professional men, stratification/authenticity configurations are not the only factors that blunt the appeal of the overachievement repertoire as rhetorical resource. The fact that only the American professionals avail themselves of this repertoire so readily suggests that they do indeed face what one could call particular “incentive environments” with respect to hard work. Differing from the incentive conditions confronted by their French and Norwegian counterparts, the American’s incentive environment lends the career success and money-making scripts a compelling character that it lacks in both France and Norway.

The scripts thematizing moneymaking and career success, for example, acquire a particularly resonant character when the professional works in an environment offering the possibility of a high take-home salary without substantial employment security. While the French and Norwegian professionals earn less money than their American counterparts, they do enjoy protections against individual “without cause” dismissals that the Americans lack. This is exactly the kind of incentive environment in which the Americans live and work; they earn between ten percent and twenty percent more than their French and Norwegian counterparts, and yet they work for employers who can fire them “at will.”¹⁵ For the European respondents, particularly the Norwegians, it makes little sense to work long hours in order to secure the relatively low take-home salaries of high-level executives afflicted with high marginal tax rates. Knut, one of the Norwegian management consultants considering a career as a senior executive in a Norwegian firm, sees little point in shouldering more responsibilities and larger workloads in return for marginal increases in pay. “Why should one work more hours,” Knut asks rhetorically, if “out of

¹⁵ This experience reflects the more restrictive HR systems dominant in the more heavily regulated Western European context as against the laissez-faire American environment (Begin 1997).

every additional two hundred thousand Kroner in salary, one immediately loses one hundred thirty thousand Kroner in taxes?" Mindful of the big bite that the Norwegian government would take out of his additional salary, Knut feels that the additional salary would not justify the longer work hours and intense pressure of a CEO position.

Conclusions: from work rhetorics to work ethics

This comparative analysis reveals divergences in the script repertoires of American and Western European professional men. While the European repertoire turns a blind eye to the motivational possibilities of career success and drive, the American repertoire is alive to them. This transatlantic legitimation divide points to a correlative transatlantic divide in work ethics. For the French respondents and the Norwegian respondents, individuals loyal to the devotional-avocational repertoire, it suffices to invoke the scripts that reference the intrinsic appeal of work and its conduciveness to self-realization and self-development. These European professional men shrink from invoking industriousness, the aversion to idleness, or the hunger for individual status as the dominant motivations behind hard work. This legitimation divide, along with the correlative divide in work ethics, suggests that the highly compensated and richly rewarded male professional does not necessarily exert himself at work because it presents itself to him as a form of recreation or leisure.

The study's findings demonstrate that an analysis of hard work talk, and work talk more generally, can illuminate not only cultural repertoires but work ethics and orientations towards working life as well. The article thus reveals a genuine transatlantic divergence in work ethics as well as forms of hard work legitimation. By examining the motive vocabularies (Campbell 1991; Mills 1940) incorporated within hard work talk, we can discern the "verbalizations" appropriate as explanations of working hard and justifications of the practice. Work talk thus constitutes a fitting object of study for a cultural sociology oriented to practices as well as talk itself.

As this analysis shows, both Western European professional men and their American approach their engagement with hard work in profoundly different ways. This transatlantic divergence in justificatory talk bespeaks a transatlantic divergence in work ethics. This transatlantic divide in hard work talk is not simply a matter of talk or accounts, in other words, but reflects an underlying faultline between the orientations towards work, work effort, and occupational success most characteristic of ideal-typical Americans and Europeans.¹⁶

¹⁶ These findings also call to mind the arguments made by McLelland, Swanson, Baum, and Parsons in the 1960s and 1970s and Jepperson in the 1990s about the cultural distinctiveness of the American versus the continental European models of selfhood and its implications for the relationship between the self and its occupational engagements. These scholars argued that the ideal-typical American makes his occupational pursuits a deeply personal affair even as he recognizes their intrinsically social character. However, while the ideal-typical American personalizes his occupational engagements in this way, the ideal-typical German withdraws the personal self from work, approaching his work self as a contrived "persona" created to satisfy social demands emanating from the coercive external environment (Baum 1979, pp. 100–101; Swanson 1967; Parsons 1954 [1949], p. 321). In the European context, then, the single-minded pursuit of occupational performance and success can betray an overinvestment in an inauthentic and artificial identity while in the American context such publicly visible occupational achievement validates claims to a distinctive and desirable kind of selfhood (Jepperson 1992, p. 141).

Recent cross-national survey-based research on work-related orientations and attitudes supplies strong corroborative evidence favoring the presence of this deeper divide (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2010; Heller and Ruiz-Quintanilla 1995; Furnham 1990). These survey-based studies suggest that Americans and Western Europeans indeed differ in their approaches to the various aspects of occupational life, including work content, occupational success, work performance, and work effort. As it turns out, it is the modal Western European who looks to work content as a central source of life satisfaction. For the modal American, work only matters as a source of meaning and satisfaction insofar as it yields extrinsic rewards such as wealth and status. Instead of “work-shy” Western Europeans and “work-crazed” Americans (Boeri et al. 2008), therefore, what we see are two groups who search for happiness in different facets of working life. It is the modal Western European who is more likely to perceive satisfying work activities as the essential ingredient in personal well-being while it is the modal American who discerns the potential for satisfaction in the extrinsic rewards associated with successful work performance and the work effort leading to desirable occupational performance.

This transatlantic chasm comes across most clearly in Okulicz-Kozaryn's analysis of data from multiple surveys showing that work content actually means *more* to Western Europeans than to their American peers (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2010). As his data indicates, it is the Europeans who find fulfillment in the “work process” itself. For the Americans what makes work a suitable source of happiness is not the intrinsic gratification of the work activities but the likelihood that work performance will yield desired extrinsic rewards. Moreover, as work effort is the crucial ingredient in work performance, at least in the eyes of Americans, the Americans do not associate happiness dividends with leisure, as do the Europeans.¹⁷ In fact, as Okulicz-Kozaryn's analysis demonstrates, the Americans, unlike their European counterparts, seem to derive satisfaction simply from working longer hours. This emphasis on the joys of the striving regarded as indispensable to occupational achievement thus reflects the American affinity for what some scholars have called the effort-reward equation (Duina 2011).

Similar conclusions emerge from the one other transatlantic comparative study that illuminates hard work talk among groups of conational professionals with the aid of interview material. While *Money, Morals, and Manners* only touches on hard work talk, it does reveal important differences in the ways that comparable upper-middle class French and American men perceive work effort, work content, work performance, and occupational success. Drawing on her in-depth interviews with groups of comparable male American and French professionals and managers, Lamont concludes that the Americans derive a sense of moral “purity” and personal worthiness in career success that eludes their French counterparts (Lamont 1992, pp. 40–42). As far as moneymaking and material success are concerned, what seems like an obvious and natural object of striving for the upper-middle class American male can appear deeply suspect in the eyes of the upper-middle class French male hostile towards careerism

¹⁷ Not only do the modal American and the modal Western European gravitate towards different parts of the intrinsic-extrinsic spectrum of work orientations (Johnson et al. 2007) mapped by social psychologists, but the modal American assigns more importance and centrality to working life, regarded as a life realm opposed to leisure (Peterson & Ruiz-Quintanilla 2003).

(Lamont 1992, p. 137). While the American respondents praise occupationally successful people as people with strong moral character, the French respondents dismiss career success and moneymaking as shallow triumphs with no bearing on character. Indeed, in the opinion of one of her French respondents, people who pursue career success at the expense of other worthier life goals worship a false idol and make themselves “completely ridiculous” (Lamont 1992, p. 65).¹⁸

Because this repertoire locates the needs that propel hard work in the uppermost slot atop the Maslowian pyramid, it is entirely compatible with a Maslowian work ethic that emphasizes personal growth and self-realization through meaningful and engaging work activities (Maslow 1970 [1954]).¹⁹ Thus, when the Norwegian and French respondents put self-realization front and center as the exclusive source of their hard work motivation, they are claiming that their work merits their dedication because it engages their higher faculties—as hard workers they are emphasizing their credentials as individuals propelled by needs at the pinnacle of Maslow’s hierarchy. Conversely, by remaining silent on the subject of extrinsic rewards, they are expressing their distance from baser needs such as social status or wealth. In Maslow’s scheme social status and wealth are both “esteem” needs located in the middle tier of the Maslowian hierarchy and thus outranked by self-realization. The Americans, by contrast, affirm the motivational potency of these baser gratifications connected to work’s extrinsic rewards.

The work ethic of the French and Norwegians takes a Maslowian form, as it gives pride of place to the highest-order needs in the Maslowian hierarchy. In the overachievement repertoire so salient in the hard work talk of the Americans, working hard becomes a matter of extrinsic rewards and the inner drive for achievement, which itself reaches outwards towards the social and pecuniary aspects of work. For the Americans, men who live in a society where both work effort and career success deliver their own satisfactions, hard work retains legitimacy without any nourishment from these higher-order aspirations. Only Western Europeans, shielded from insecurity by their relatively generous welfare states, can afford to commit the lion’s share of their time and their energies to working life—and thus indirectly to capitalism—*purely* because it offers tasks that can stimulate the higher faculties such as the intellect and the spirit. Given their affinity for this kind of ennobling engagement with work, we can say that the Europeans much more than the Americans embrace the classical Greek ideal of *scholē* as the ultimate measure of a work life well-lived.

¹⁸ Many of Lamont’s French respondents also looked askance at the idea of working hard as an employee working to achieve the goals of an organization. They did not see the point of exerting themselves in the service of their employer’s goals. Among Lamont’s “anti-work” Parisian respondents, working to the bone as an employee is considered a particularly egregious exercise in foolhardiness. In the opinion of these Parisian professionals, the person who exerts himself at work and sweats blood for his employer is essentially donating his time and energy to an exploitative entity that will suck him dry without giving him anything back in return (Lamont 1992, pp. 43–44). Interestingly, this view was not voiced by any of her American respondents.

¹⁹ The outlook on working life as a self-realizing realm calls to mind the “therapeutic attitude” Bellah and his coauthors identify as a crucial ingredient in the self-perception of the American middle-class (Bellah et al. 1985, p. 123). It also bears a resemblance to what C. Wright Mills calls the “hedonistic vocabulary of motives” where individuals trace their reasons for action to its pleasurable or painful consequences (Mills 1940, p. 906, 913).

Acknowledgments I would like to thank Mary Blair-Loy, Stanley Brandes, Jean-Pascal Daloz, Cristina Flesher Fominaya, Neil Fligstein, Sigtona Halrynjo, Marion Fourcade-Gourinchas, Arlie Hochschild, Gabe Ignatow, Ron Jepperson, Michèle Lamont, Benjamin Moodie, Victor Nee, Trond Petersen, Laura Robinson, Jennifer Silva, Neil Smelser, Richard Swedberg, and Ann Swidler for their comments, close readings, and insightful feedback. The article has also benefited immensely from the close reading and constructive comments of the Editors and reviewers for *Theory and Society*. A special thanks goes to Laura Robinson for her invaluable assistance with the French-language interviews. I also wish to acknowledge the logistical support of the UC Berkeley Department of Sociology and the UC Berkeley Department of Scandinavian Studies, as well as the Centre de Sociologie des Organisations and the Department of Sociology at the University of Oslo where I was in residence while collecting some of the data. I would also like to thank the Labor and Employment Research Fund of the University of California and the American-Scandinavian Foundation for their financial support of the project. Finally, I want to express my deep appreciation to all of my interviewees who graciously and generously gave of their scarce time despite their extended work weeks and hectic schedules.

References

- Bartolomé, F., & Lee Evans, P. A. (1979). Professional lives versus private lives: Shifting patterns of managerial commitment. *Organizational Dynamics* Spring 1979.
- Baudelot, C., & Gollac, M. (2004). *Travailler Pour être Heureux? Le Bonheur et le Travail en France*. Paris: Editions Fayard.
- Baum, R. C. (1979). Authority and Identity: The case for evolutionary invariance. In R. Robertson & B. Holzner (Eds.), *Identity and authority: Explorations in the theory of society*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Begin, J. (1997). *Dynamic human resource systems: Cross-national comparisons*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Company.
- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Berger, B. (1995). *An essay on culture: Symbolic structure and social structure*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boeri, T., Burda, M., & Kramarz, F. (Eds.). (2008). *Working hours and job sharing in the EU and the US: Are Europeans lazy? Are Americans crazy?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984 [1979]). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, C. (1991). Reexamining mills on motive: A character vocabulary approach. *Sociological Analysis*, 52(1), 89–97.
- Casey, C. (1995). *Work, self, and society: After industrialism*. London: Routledge.
- Christensen, K. E. (2005). Achieving work-life balance. In B. Schneider & L. Waite (Eds.), *Being together; working apart*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Conley, D. (2009). *Elsewhere USA: How we got from the company man, family dinners, and the affluent society to the home office, blackberry moms, and economic anxiety*. New York: Random House.
- Cooper, M. (2000). Being the 'Go-to-Guy': Fatherhood, masculinity, and the organization of work in silicon valley. *Qualitative Sociology*, 23(4), 379–405.
- D'Iribarne, P. (1989). *La Logique de l'honneur—Gestion des Entreprises et Traditions Nationales*. Paris: Seuil.
- D'Iribarne, P. (2006). *L'étrangeté Française*. Paris: Seuil.
- Daloz, J.-P. (2007). Political elites and conspicuous modesty: Norway, Sweden, and Finland in comparative perspective. *Comparative Social Research*, 23, 173–212.
- De Grazia, S. (1962). *Of time, work, and leisure*. New York: the Twentieth Century Fund.
- Domenici, K., & Littlejohn, S.W. (2006). *Facework: Bridging theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Duina, F. (2011). *Winning: Reflections on an American obsession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Fraser, J. A. (2002). *White-collar sweatshop: The deterioration of work and its rewards in corporate America*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Fuchs-Epstein, C. (1999). *The part-time paradox: Time norms, professional lives, family, and gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Furnham, A. (1990). *The protestant work ethic: The psychology of work-related beliefs and behaviors*. London: Routledge.
- Gerson, K. (1994). *No Man's Land: Men's changing commitments to family and work*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon.
- Heller, F., & Ruiz-Quintanella, A. (1995). *The work ethic*. Ithaca, NY: Center for Advanced Human Resources Studies, Cornell University.
- Hewlett, S. A., Luce, S., Southwell, C., & Bernstein, L. (2007). *Seduction and risk: The emergence of extreme jobs*. New York: Center for Work-Life Policy.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hughes, C. E. (1971). Work and Self. *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Jepperson, R. (1992). National scripts: The varying construction of individualism and opinion across the modern nation-states unpublished PhD dissertation. Yale University.
- Johnson, M. K., Mortimer, J., Lee, J., & Stern, M. (2007). Judgments about work: Dimensionality revisited. *Work and Occupations* 2007.
- Kalberg, S. (1992). Culture and work in contemporary western germany. In Münch & Smelser (Eds.), *Theory of culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kaufman, J. (2004). Endogenous explanation in the sociology of culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 335–357.
- Kellogg, K. (2011). *Challenging operations: Medical reform and resistance in surgery*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, morals, and manners: The culture of the French and American upper-middle classes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, M. (2000). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Lamont, M. & Thevenot, L. (2001). *Comparative cultural sociology: Regimes of justification in France and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Maslow, A. (1970 [1954]). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Meiksins, P., & Whalley, P. (2002). *Putting work in its place: A quiet revolution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mennell, S. (2007). *The American civilizing process*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1940). Situated action and vocabulary of motives. *American Sociological Review*, 5, 904–913.
- Moscovici, S. (1993 [1988]). *The invention of society: Psychological explanations for social phenomena*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Münch, R. (1992). Social change in the United States: The system of equality and inequality. In H. Haferkamp & N. Smelser (Eds.), *Social change and modernity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nelson, M. R., & Shavitt, S. (2002). Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 33.
- Offe, C. (1989). *Disorganized capitalism: Contemporary transformations of work and politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2010). Europeans work to live and Americans live to work. *Journal of Happiness Studies*.
- Orbuch, T. (1997). People's accounts count: The sociology of accounts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 455–478.
- Orrange, R. (2007). *Work, family, and leisure: Uncertainty in a risk society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Parsons, T. (1954 [1949]). Controlled institutional change. In *Essays in sociological theory: Pure and applied*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Peterson, M. F., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, A. (2003). Cultural socialization as a source of intrinsic work motivation. *Group & Organization Management*, 28(188).

- Rasmussen, B. (2002). Kunnskapsarbeidere i dot-økonomien. *Tidsskrift for Arbejdsliv* 4(2), 25–43.
- Roth, L. (2006). *Selling women short: Gender and money on wall street*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review*, 33(1), 46–62.
- Simmel, G. (1978 [1907]). *The philosophy of money* (trans. Tom Bottomore and David Frisby). London: Routledge.
- Sharone, O. (2004). Engineering overwork: Bell-curve management at a high-tech firm. In C. Fuchs Epstein & A. Kalleberg (Eds), *Fighting for time: Shifting boundaries of work and social life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Stebbins, R. (2004). *Between work and leisure: The common ground of two separate worlds*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Swanson, G. (1967). *Religion and regime: A sociological account of the reformation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Swidler, A. (2001). *Talk of love: How culture matters*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Thompson, J., & Bunderson, J. (2001). Work-nonwork conflict and the phenomenology of time: Beyond the balance metaphor. *Work and Occupations*, 28(1), 17–39.
- Thomson, I. T. (2000). *In conflict no longer: Self and society in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Tilly, C. (2006). *Why?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2008). *Credit and blame*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Turner, R. (1976). The real self: From institution to impulse. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 81(5), 989–1016.
- Weber, M. (2002 [1920]). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. trans Stephen Kalberg. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.
- Weiss, R. (1990). *Staying the course: The emotional and social lives of men who do well at work*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wuthnow, R. (1996). *Poor Richard's principle: Recovering the American dream through the moral dimension of work, business, and money*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zerubavel, E. (1981). *Hidden rhythms*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Jeremy Schulz holds an NSF funded postdoctoral fellowship at Cornell University's Center for Economy and Society. He earned his PhD thesis in the Department of the Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. His research examines the influence of societal environments and cultural contexts on the ways in which French, Norwegian, and American professionals experience and organize work, family, and private life. His article, “Zoning the Evening: Constructing the Evening Work-Life Boundary among French, Norwegian, and American Business Professionals,” received the *2010 Shils-Coleman Award* from the *American Sociological Association's* theory section. His postdoctoral projects examine the ways in which differently situated individuals handle different kinds of debt. He is particularly interested in stances towards debt tied up with “productive” goods and services such as education and medical care and how these stances intersect with gender and social stratification. His previous publications contribute to several other areas, including theory, qualitative methods, sociology of ideology, and sociology of consumerism. His website is www.jeremyschulz.org.