

Gertraud Koch, Stefanie Everke Buchanan (eds.)

PATHWAYS TO EMPATHY

*New Studies on Commodification, Emotional Labor,
and Time Binds*

campus

Channeling Time and Energy into Work and Home: The Rationales of Americans and Norwegians

Jeremy Schulz

The idea that commodified and economic “ways of viewing” have reshaped everyday life in recent years has attracted its share of skepticism. It is still unclear, for example, whether and to what extent individuals across Western societies perceive their stocks of financial and social resources as “investments” whose returns are supposed to be maximized (Zelizer 2010; Davis 2009; Williams 2005). After all, as Williams shows in the case of the UK, self-servicing labor and non-monetized exchange still command a large proportion of many individuals’ time, attention, and effort. When it comes to everyday practice, it is debatable whether the economic logics of commodity production and monetized commodity exchange have displaced the non-economic logics such as gift-giving and mutual obligation that operate outside the economic sphere mediated by market relations (Hochschild 2012; 2011; 2004; Williams 2005; Margolis 1998).

But even if we accept the premise that the logics of commodity exchange and economic rationality have actually altered the ways that individuals conceive of their relationships with one another, it is still unclear whether these logics have transformed the ways that individuals perceive, allocate, and handle their inner resources of time, talent, and energy. In addressing this elusive question, this chapter asks how economic logics enter into individuals’ frames of their life realm engagements, the temporal allocations, and their vital energy resources. More specifically, the chapter examines the role of two distinct kinds of economic logics, the logic of commensuration and the logic of economization, in relation to two different kinds of frames: life realm frames and energy frames. While commensuration has to do with the measurement of qualitatively distinct phenomena according to a common metric, economization has to do with the conservation and replenishment of intrinsically scarce resources. Both the commensurating and economizing logics can be seen as subspecies of the calculative rationality that serves as the hallmark of capitalist practice for Weber (Brubaker 1984; Weber 1946).

The life realm frames appear when individuals characterize their engagements with the two most fundamental “experiential realms” in contemporary commodity-producing society, namely the realm of work and the realm of private life (Nippert-Eng 1995; Hochschild 2003). Such life realm frames can apply both to the day-to-day dispositions of time and energy as well as long-term decisions about careers, jobs, and personal lives which unfold over months, years, and sometimes decades. Energy frames manifest themselves when individuals characterize their strategies for disposing of their vital energies and managing fatigue and tiredness.¹ This chapter asks whether, and to what extent, these frames betray the influence of either the commensurating logic or the economizing logic. To the extent that a *commensurating logic* surfaces in these life realm frames, both realms are represented as reducible to a common underlying denominator rather than as qualitatively distinctive domains (Espeland and Stevens 1998). When housework is commensurated with paid work, for example, cooking, cleaning, and other typically unpaid forms of work are measured according to the same units of marketable output as forms of paid work (Hochschild and Machung 1989). To the extent that energy frames bear the stamp of an economizing logic, they define the conservation of scarce energy—rather than the disposition of surplus energy—as the central challenge in everyday life.

In inquiring into the role of these economic logics, individuals’ frames of life realms and vital energy flows, I delve into the commentaries of successful American and Norwegian business professionals of both sexes and multiple family statuses. I ground the analysis in data drawn from over one hundred professional men and women employed by a variety of corporate private-sector employers located in Oslo and San Francisco.² Like San Fran-

¹ The deeply social character of such energy frames are readily apparent in the existing sociological study of fatigue talk, a Norwegian book entitled *Trotthetens Tid [The Time of Tiredness]* by Ulla-Britt Lilleas and Karin Widerberg. This study draws on interviews and tiredness diaries to illuminate the “doing” of tiredness and fatigue among adult Norwegians (Widerberg 2006; Lilleas and Widerberg 2001). The study demonstrates that, in order to come to grips with one’s own tiredness (or lack thereof), one must by necessity interpret one’s own mental and bodily sensations through socially constituted lenses. Even the extent to which we attend to our inner energy flows or tune them out reflects the influence of culturally and socially mediated experiences. As it turns out, age, generation, gender, occupation, and family background all make a large difference to how any given individual experiences tiredness, enacts tiredness, and expresses tiredness to themselves and to others in their social environments.

² This chapter draws on material collected for my dissertation project. This project examines the impact of the French, Norwegian, and American cultural and social contexts on the

cisco’s population, Oslo’s population contains a comparatively high proportion of high-earning professionals working in demanding jobs. Each group of respondents in the two sites includes professional men and women spanning multiple occupations. The work hours of the Americans ranged from fifty hours per week on the low end to over sixty-five hours per week on the high end, while the Norwegians logged between forty-five hours per week and slightly over sixty hours per week. As far as their earnings are concerned, the American respondents earned somewhat more than their Norwegian counterparts working in comparable positions in the same occupations.

Drawing on narratives gleaned from these in-depth interviews,³ I show that the American and Norwegian professionals stand apart where these two economic logics are concerned. When they talk about their efforts to bring the two life realms into balance, only the Americans articulate narratives that incorporate a commensurating logic; the presence of a non-commensurating logic figures more prominently in the commentaries of the Norwegian respondents. However, the opposite pattern surfaces when these professionals address their strategies for handling their own vital energies. Here the Norwegian respondents adopt an economizing logic whereas the Americans give voice to a non-economizing logic. In the following sections I show how my Norwegian and American respondents articulate these frames in their commentaries about their engagements with work and private life, and their stances towards vital energy and tiredness.

Life Realm Frames: American tradeoffs

In this section, I analyze the ways in which the task of harmonizing the demands of work life and private life is framed in the narratives of the American respondents. It is exclusively in the commentaries of the American professionals that the commensurating framing, a framing signaled by the presence of the term “tradeoffs” appears. Furthermore, over three-quarters of the

ways that comparable populations of French, Norwegian, and American managers and professionals constitute their work lives and private lives.

³ This analysis focuses on frames and narratives rather than actual practices. The link between practices and narratives/frames is complex. Moreover, there is usually more intra-group diversity when it comes to practices, since they are more influenced by life circumstances unique to the individual. It is therefore usually easier to discern cross-national divergences where frames and narratives are concerned (see also Schulz 2012; 2011).

American respondents reference such tradeoffs when they touch upon the challenge of harmonizing their commitments to work and private life. The narratives of these men and women thematize tradeoffs between what they gain from boosting their earnings and what they gain from investing more in private life. In doing so, they implicitly commensurate the higher quality of life brought about by increases in purchasing power—typically accompanied by longer work hours and more demanding jobs—with the higher quality of life arising from more personal time. The language of tradeoffs is absent in the narratives of the Norwegians.

In discussing their personal and professional biographies, the Americans recall the numerous “tradeoffs” which have shaped their jobs, career trajectories, and personal lives. At the time of the interview, John was a very successful thirty-five year old American investment banker, with four children and a stay-at-home wife, and logging between 55 and 60 hours at work per week, far fewer hours than he had worked while launching his banking career. John repeatedly cites the long-term and short-term tradeoffs he had to make. On one side of the scale was the option of spending more time at his already-demanding job—and garnering more recognition at work and opportunities for increasing his already considerable earnings. Balanced against this option was the chance to spend more of his scarce free time with his family. Such tradeoffs could be avoided by anyone in his position, claimed John. As he put it:

You have to feel that *the tradeoffs* you are making are worth it ... and for me they are worth it ... I am always asking myself ‘what’s the incentive for me to blow it out and have a really great year and work really hard and do these 15 great things at work versus spend time with my four kids? *It’s a tradeoff ... and I’d assume that anyone would make these tradeoffs ...*

Other American professionals cite the “lifestyle tradeoff” involved in demanding, long-hours, business services work. One man who already breached the 65-hour weekly mark on a regular basis balked at the idea of adding another ten hours to his weekly totals. Time scarcity was already a familiar challenge in his life, and he had no wish to “exacerbate” the problem, as he put it. As a new father, he already confronted strains over childcare even though his wife worked significantly fewer hours than he did. However, there was no reason to reject a 75-hour workweek in principle, assuming the longer work hours came with a larger paycheck. This tradeoff could make sense for him and his wife:

If [my wife and I] were in a different place now, where it was more important to make a ton of money or as much money as we could in the next five years, we might be willing to sacrifice the lifestyle entirely, and *then the tradeoff* would be worth it.

His wife contrasted her own very different tradeoff scenario with his work-life tradeoff scenario, associating his tradeoff with his assumption of the provider role:

JS:⁴ Would you be inclined to work harder if they added 10% to your salary?

RES: No, *the tradeoff is not worth it to me ...* I think my husband would ... he considers himself the primary breadwinner and I do too ... and so he fortunately or unfortunately carries the burden of bringing home the bacon, quote-unquote, ... although my salary isn’t much lower now than his ... the long-term trajectory for his salary is higher than mine.

Monica, a forty-five-year-old executive at a large accounting firm, had considered many non-business careers when younger, including medical careers that required much more training. In the end she had opted to launch a career in a very demanding corner of the business world, in large measure because she could not see herself “trading off” more unpaid time spent in education for the possibility of making money as a professional. Indeed, Monica had rejected the idea of becoming a physician primarily because she could not envision investing enormous amounts of time attending medical school when she could be earning money and enhancing her economic security and quality of life. Just as she traded off time against the opportunity to make money when younger, as a busy professional she now trades off longer work hours, as a proxy for her earnings, against more time for the leisure pursuits she enjoys in her private life. She explained this tradeoff scenario in terms of the additional security and standard of living she could obtain by securing a thirty-percent bump in her salary versus a thirty-percent reduction in her work hours:

If I could [get] another thirty percent in pay, I could really improve my financial situation. I could get my own house in a great neighborhood, go on better vacations, save more money for retirement. On the other side, cutting back my hours by thirty percent—with no change in my salary—would certainly improve my personal life. I could spend much more time socializing with my friends and maybe get a serious hobby going.

⁴ In this interview excerpt the initials “JS” stand for the author and interviewer, and the initials “RES” stand for the respondent.

While she was content to continue working the hours she currently worked—around fifty-five hours per week—she could easily envision a different balance between her work hours and her private life. Just as these Americans imagine themselves trading off pay—and thus their standard of living—for a fuller personal life and more private time, they perceive the career choices and decisions of their fellow professionals as driven by similar tradeoffs. One consultant who had worked in both San Francisco and Stockholm took note of the fact that these different groups perceive the same tradeoffs quite differently.

[Professional] people here [in San Francisco] are more willing to make the kind of sacrifices that seem really strange to the Swedes, to work 55 to 70 hours a week is like insanity to the Swedish people ... and I think to the people who work right around here in downtown LA, that's a lot of hours but it's certainly not insanity ... *it's a tradeoff that makes sense to people here ...*

Thus, it is through the framing of tradeoffs that the Americans apply a commensurating rationality to their decisions regarding work hours, routines, and particularly jobs and careers.

Interestingly, these tradeoffs have little to do with ideal allocations of time and energy between work and private life. John, the investment banker we met earlier, had made a major tradeoff when he became an investment banker, a job that made it almost impossible to spend any time with his four children during the early years of their lives. Prior to his promotion to his current position, John routinely worked over eighty hours per week. Yet John explicitly rejects the label of “workaholic” and defines himself as someone who does *not* live for his work. In fact, the long hours he spent at work were at odds with his vision of a more fulfilling life, a life which would be almost entirely devoted to parenting:

Ultimately, I'd love to be at home all the time with my kids ... I'm someone who's happy to come home, I don't need to be in the office ... I love to take vacations, I love to be with my kids ... if I could do my job in four hours a week, I'd do it in four hours a week ... I'd love to do that, but I can't.

As is clear from this commentary, John wishes to be more involved in the upbringing of his children and to spend more time in their company, but realizes that this goal conflicts with his commitment to a greedy job and profession, and a very high salary. His idealized commitment to “active parenting” (Blair-Loy 2003) runs counter to his commitment to supporting the family financially and ensuring an acceptable standard of living for them.

For John, as for many of the parenting Americans of both sexes, family life can serve as life's primary emotional anchorage, even when it is starved of time and energy by work (Orrange 2007; Hochschild 2003: 206–207; Weiss 1990). An acceptable standard of living from John's standpoint includes a multi-million dollar home in a “decent” neighborhood, private school for his four children, and a host of other very expensive goods and services. For John and other hard-driving, high-earning, and ambitious American professionals, one can aspire to be fully invested in one's personal and family life, even as one works long hours and dedicates oneself to a greedy job. But, even as someone who works long hours in a greedy job, out of felt necessity as the family's provider, John still feels that he has some margin for self-directed decision-making relating to his hours. He can adjust his work hours by five to ten hours per week and his income by five to ten percent a year. Within these margins is where he can exercise his autonomy.

Energy Frames: American Expenditurism

When vital energy is conceived as an intrinsically scarce resource, it becomes subject to an economizing logic of budgeting and replenishment, as will be illustrated with the conservationist Norwegians. With the expenditurist Americans, however, the main challenge is not the budgeting and replenishment of this scarce resource, but the lack of suitable opportunities to expend reserves of vital energy that outstrip the demands imposed by life. These American expenditurists not only take evident pride in pushing themselves “to the limit” at work and give little thought to the price they may pay in the future, but seek demanding work precisely so that they can expend energies that would otherwise find no outlet.

Paradoxically, these American expenditurists anticipate the inevitable period of enervation, whether after a week, a month, or a year of leaving nothing behind. Many could recall reaching points of near-total collapse and “heroic exhaustion,” in the words of one American engineer. A expenditurist lawyer who aspires to arrive at the end of project cycle with “nothing left in the tank,” told me that she does not dwell much on the “hangover” that she admits is the inevitable aftermath of such a heroic expenditure of energy. Many of the expenditurists could envision the day when this hangover would strike. In a reflective moment during our interview, Larry, a manage-

ment consultant in his forties, speculates in a half-joking tone about the inevitability of his future physical collapse. In the midst of a project that requires him to work over sixty hours per week and commute across the United States on a weekly basis, Larry acknowledges that his body might not cooperate with his punishing work schedule indefinitely:

I might not realize that I'm getting tired because I say 'I'm not tired, I can keep working' ... but one day my body might just say 'no more' ... and give up on me.

The equally spendthrift Sam, an American self-described "hardcore" management consultant not only works double shifts five days a week, but delights in pushing himself to the limit during these grueling marathons; declaring "At midnight when I quit work I don't want to have anything left." This ability to "burn hard" was something he prizes not just in himself, but in others as well. When I asked him who in the business world deserved his admiration, he told me about a CEO who could excel at his job without much sleep. He envies this man for his evident ability to "burn hard, day in and day out":

I read a long, long time ago, I think it was one of the ex-Ford Motors CEOs, the guy from Australia who was kicked out about five or six years ago, I forgot his name. There was a big write-up on him, and they said that one of his secret weapons was that he can get by on very little sleep. He just *burns hard, day in and day out*, and I thought, I hugely admire those types of leaders. That's where I want to end up.

Interestingly, several of the American spendthrifts conceive of the workplace both as the primary source of energy and the life realm that warrants the greatest investment of energy. For instance, because Tyler struggles to envision a way of energizing himself mentally outside of work, he remains thankful that his workday lasts long enough to absorb sufficient amounts of energy that would otherwise go to waste. Even though he enjoys an active family life and the company of his wife, he explains that an eight-hour workday would leave him with too much energy to spare. What he craves is the chance to give "150 percent" to his work so that he can say he has "left nothing on the field" when he reaches the end of the workday. Tyler worries that shorter work days, workdays lasting less than ten or eleven hours, would leave him restless and would not provide an outlet for his prodigious energies, energies that should be expended at work and not outside it.

Life Realm Frames: Norwegian Priority-setting

Where roughly three-quarters of the American respondents mention making "tradeoffs" in their commentaries on balancing work and private life, about the same proportion of the Norwegian counterparts speak of "prioritizing" one realm over the other realm. So, for the young and childless engineer Jørgen, private life and free time are more enjoyable than work and therefore merit the designation as a "top priority". Many of the parenting Norwegian professionals of both sexes recall their decisions to give "lower priority to" [*nedprioritere*] their work lives when they became parents. These men and women also freely criticize the parenting practices of those with the opposite priorities; individuals who "lived for their work" and gave lower priority to their families, in their view, had not simply gone astray but had erred in their prioritization [*å ta feil prioritering*]. In assessing the priorities of others, these Norwegians make judgments about the fitness of their priorities relative to the priorities of "most people". For instance, in the commentary of a young consultant working out of the Oslo office of a hard-charging global strategy outfit (where 60 to 70-hour workweeks are common) the culture clash between the firm's work expectations and the typical work expectations in the Oslo business world is a matter of discrepant priorities:

I think a lot of people don't understand the priorities of people working here [in this office] and I can understand that ... most people want to find a satisfactory job that can support their lifestyle and enable them to spend time on other stuff but the people here live for their work and most people have never experienced that.

Unlike the vision of tradeoffs upheld by the Americans, the priority framing implicitly claims that work life and private life must be ranked against one another. It denies the possibility of commensurating the two realms, in other words. Indeed, several of the Norwegians assert forcefully that a thriving work life cannot compensate for a deficient private life. As Thorvald explains:

There have been times in my life when my personal relationships were falling apart while my career and work life was going really well. But I figured out that putting more of myself into work, even though I enjoyed my work, could not make up for a terrible personal life. And earning more money could not make me happier either. That's when I realized that there was no amount of work success that could compensate. I had to give more of a priority to my personal life.

Unlike the notion of making tradeoffs, which allows for the commensuration of the two life spheres and renders them subject to commensuration,

the concept of setting priorities suggests that the relationship between the two life spheres is something like the "lexicographic" ordering analyzed by philosophers, logicians, and economists (Huemer 1995). In this type of ordering, one cannot trade off increments of improvement in one realm for increments of improvement in the other realm, since the two realms are non-substitutable. To give the sphere of personal life priority over the sphere of work life is, logically speaking, to generate an ordering where no amount of improvement in the second-ranked realm can make up for any decrease in the quality of the first-ranked realm.⁵

Energy Frames: Norwegian Conservationism

When the Norwegian professionals put work life and private life in balance by setting private life as their priority, they implicitly characterize the two life realms as incommensurable, and invoke an anti-economistic understanding of the two realms. However, when they deal with their own vital energies, they adopt an understanding that actually treats these energies in an economistic way, as scarce resources that have to be husbanded and budgeted rationally. With their "conservationist" energy framing, they approach their own vital energies as scarce internal resources calling for good stewardship and careful management. Self-appointed caretakers of their own energy supplies, these men and women made efforts to regulate their energy expenditures at work in order to ensure the availability of an "energy surplus" [*overskudd*] in the home sphere. Thus, wherever possible, they try to ensure enough private time so that they can recharge their depleted batteries, whether through rest, family time, organized leisure, or purely passive restorative activities such as movie-watching. In this way, they enact what Foucault calls the imperative of "self-care," a directive with a long and distinguished history stretching back to classical times (Foucault 1988: 18–22).

A surprisingly large number of the Norwegian professionals, both women and men, endeavor to preserve their energies at work so that they will not suffer from debilitating energy deficits at home. Anders, a Norwegian management consultant and father to a small boy, made a point of avoiding

⁵ As economists and others have noted, lexicographic rankings can disrupt economic behavior. Such preferences may deny the social actor the capacity to weigh different consumption possibilities against one another by measuring them according to a common metric.

working himself "to the bone" so that he could bring enough energy back to the home environment. By working reasonable [*fornuftig*] hours, he assures himself that he had "enough surplus energy [*overskudd*]" for his other commitments at home, particularly his parenting duties. But a sixty-hour work week, he speculates, would not only make it difficult to participate fully in his home life, but would actually impair his ability to fulfill his duties in the workplace:

If I am to do a good job at work the next day, I can't leave myself completely exhausted today. I don't want tomorrow's workday to pay the price for today's all-nighter. I want to have the mental surplus energy [*overskudd*] to really produce at work the next day—if one consumes so much of one's own energies and motivation [today] that one doesn't want to go to work tomorrow, then that's not good.

The same preoccupation with future shortfalls of energy at home and at work figures in the commentary of another male Norwegian consultant, a younger man without children. In his view, there is little point in over-consuming one's energies during the workday, because this expenditure would inevitably compromise one's capacity to work effectively the following day. Moreover, without adequate private time outside of work, he could not meet the following workday with sufficient reserves of energy. When I asked him whether he could envision working sixty hours a week on a regular basis, he responded:

If I were to go up to sixty hours a week at work ... it would interfere with the [non-work] activities I get my energy from. Also, I don't believe that I would get more work done [in this situation]. I wouldn't work that effectively. I think that the hours I get off from work make me ready for the next workday.

Like many of his fellow Norwegian professionals, he worries that an excessive expenditure of effort and energy at work would act counterproductively by reducing his overall efficiency. The same framing and reasoning characterize the remarks of a young Norwegian engineer who had no family whatsoever and therefore few external constraints on his working time. This man rarely worked more than forty-five hours per week. One of his primary criteria for deciding when to call it quits is the relative quality of his work product. When this quality starts to slip, he takes it as a sign that he was wasting his time and his employer's money and that he had reached a point where it was time to quit the office.

Since these Norwegians view the work realm as the primary energy-depleting zone, they take careful note of their energy expenditures while in

the workplace. In the words of one Norwegian energy conservationist, it is critical to "listen to one's body" during the periods when work imposes heavy demands on one's time and energy. A number of the Norwegians comment on the way that deadlines and "crunch-times" drain their energies. They lament the rare occasions when this happens, because it makes it difficult for them to work efficiently and also to discharge their parenting duties at home, or engage in the organized leisure pursuits which many of them enjoy in the spare time. When the Norwegians adopt a conservationist approach, they treat energy as an inherently finite resource that has to be replenished on a regular basis and should not be over-consumed during a given time period. In this way, they implicitly budget their accounts of vital energy in ways that mirror the budgeting of money and economic resources. Energy resource is managed as fungible from one time period to the next. Just as one can overdraw one's bank account, one can overdraw one's energy "account". This application of an accounting logic to vital energy, as we will see, is culturally specific. The American expenditureists embrace a decidedly non-economizing alternative to this framing of vital energy resources.

Conclusion: The Two Patterns

The interview evidence presented here suggests that economic logics do make their presence felt in the commentaries and narratives of successful urban business professionals in the US and in Norway. Both groups adopt a mix of economic and non-economic frames in their narratives about allocating time and energy in their everyday lives. Whereas the priority-setting of the Norwegians shields private life from the claims of work life, the expenditureist approach of the Americans actually reinforces the claims of a greedy work life when it comes to vital energy. These four distinctive frames are grouped together in the table below according to their relationship to economic and non-economic logics.

First, the American respondents are in a better position to earn comparatively large sums of money in return for large investments of time and energy in work. Thus, it makes more sense to the Americans to trade off additional investments in working life, either measured as increments of work time or more demanding jobs, against private life, and approach their efforts to balance work and private life as a series of tradeoffs. This situation makes the

<i>Advantaged life realm</i>	<i>Form of rationality</i>	
	<i>Economic</i>	<i>Non-economic</i>
Work	Trading off private life and time for money and success (commensurating logic)	Expending inexhaustible vital energy (non-economizing logic)
Personal life	Conserving scarce vital energy (economizing logic)	Prioritizing life realms (non-commensurating logic)

Logics and Advantaged Life Realms

logic of commensuration more appealing. It is perhaps more surprising that their energy frames lack any hint of an economizing logic. As we recall from the interviews, these individuals keep their distance from the logic of scarcity when they address their ways of handling vital energy. In their expenditureist narratives, disposing of excess energy is the challenge, not preserving scarce energy. Further research is needed to find out exactly why these Americans adopt such a puzzling perspective on their own resources of vital energy.

The reverse combination appears in the narratives articulated by the Norwegian respondents. These Norwegians resist economic logics in their conceptions of life realms. But they nevertheless embrace the logic of scarcity where vital energy is concerned. These professionals make their private life a priority *vis-à-vis* their work life, implicitly making a case that the two life realms cannot be translated into a common unit of measurement. Interestingly, none of the Norwegians claim that work ought to take priority over private life. Indeed, the more determined the Norwegians are to limit the amount of time and energy credited to work life, the more they cite their priorities as incompatible with long work days, demanding jobs, and long work weeks. With respect to their vital energies, however, the Norwegians represent their vital energies as scarce, in danger of overuse, and in need of economizing. They therefore speak as if they feel compelled to preserve their energy surplus to avoid overdrawing their energy accounts. And so, the Norwegians are the ones who dispose of their temporal and energy resources in ways that help them to protect private life from the encroachments of greedy work.

So how can we explain these patterns? In accounting for these differences, we must contrast the life circumstances of the two groups, particularly their engagements with work, money, and private life. These differences in frames arise from both the institutional environments in which the two

groups work, and the cultural landscapes they inhabit. As the Norwegians exercise more control over their work lives, particularly the proportion of their lives that work consumes, they can more easily adopt the frames favoring the claims of personal life *vis-à-vis* work life. Given their situation, it is easier for them to make private life an inviolate priority rather than represent it as something that can be commensurated with a better standard of living. Living in a more lucrative but more demanding work world, the American professionals conceptualize their work time as an investment that can be adjusted in light of their preferences relating to private life. As the interview evidence shows, it is the American respondents who gravitate towards an economic logic when they trade off a more fulfilling private life against the better standard of living obtained through a larger paycheck. Whereas the Americans' work environment creates conditions favorable to the adoption of a commensurating logic when it concerns their engagements with work life and private life, it thus facilitates the adoption of an anti-economizing logic when it comes to the management of vital energy. As far as vital energy is concerned, the less predictable work environment of Americans affords them less leeway to budget their energies from day to day and week to week, hindering their attempts to economize their vital energies.

However, the differing work environments of the Norwegians and Americans cannot in themselves account for the divergences in these patterns. In fact, some of the Norwegians who speak of setting priorities and budgeting their vital energies actually work in very demanding and unpredictable jobs and careers. Nevertheless, they embrace the frames that advantage private life versus work life, demonstrating their commitment to the ideal of the multidimensional life. As the interviews suggest, this ideal exerts a stronger grip upon Norwegian professionals than it does among American professionals.

In demonstrating the diversity of frames through which individuals perceive their inner resources, and the uneven penetration of economic logics, this study suggests that such logics have left some frames untouched even as they have left their imprint on other frames. In Norway, the commensurating framing has gained no real foothold, at least among the professional classes, while the economizing framing holds sway. The reverse situation prevails among the American respondents. It is therefore likely that this commensurating framing surfaces more frequently, at least among the professional classes, in less egalitarian societies with greedier work environments, such as the United States. Conversely, this commensurating framing is less common in Scandinavian societies with an uncommon degree of gender and class

egalitarianism, societies where the claims of private life are more strongly sanctioned by the culture.

Works Cited

- Brubaker, Rogers (1984), *The limits to rationality*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Blair-Loy, Mary (2003), *Competing devotions*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Davis, Gerald F. (2009), *Managed by the markets: How finance reshaped America*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Espeland, Wendy Nelson, and Mitchell Stevens (1998), "Commensuration as a social process", in: *Annual review of sociology*, 24, 313–343.
- Foucault, Michel (1988), "Technologies of the self", in: Luther H. Martin, Patrick H. Hutton, and Huck Gutman (eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 16–49.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell (2003), *The commercialization of intimate life: Notes from home and work*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (2004), "The commodity frontier", in: Jeffrey Alexander, Gary T. Marx, and Christine L. Williams (eds.), *Self, social structure, and beliefs: Explorations in sociology*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 38–56.
- (2011), "Emotional life on the market frontier", in: *Annual review of sociology*, 37, 21–33.
- (2012), *The outsourced self: Intimate life in market times*, New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell, and Anne Machung (1989), *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*, New York: Viking.
- Huemer, Michael (1995), *Ethical intuitionism*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lilleas, Ulla-Britt, and Karin Widerberg (2001), *Trøtthetens tid*, Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Margolis, Diane R. (1998), *The fabric of self: A theory of ethics and emotions*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nippert-Eng, Christena E. (1995), *Home and work*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Orange, Robert M. (2007), *Work, family, and leisure: Uncertainty in a risk society*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schulz, Jeremy (2011), "Framing couple time and togetherness", in: Anita Garey, and Karen Hansen (eds.), *At the heart of work and family*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 85–99.
- (2012), "Talk of work", in: *Theory and society*, 41, 603–634.
- Weber, Max (1946), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. In Hans Gerth and Charles Wright Mills (eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Weiss, Robert S. (1990), *Staying the course: The mental and emotional lives of men who do well at work*, New York: The Free Press.
- Widerberg, Karin (2006), "Embodying modern times: Investigating tiredness", in: *Time & society*, 15, 105–120.
- Williams, Colin C. (2005), *A commodified world: Mapping the limits to capitalism*, London: Zed Books.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (2010), *Economic lives: How culture shapes the economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Time for Business?! Time Binds of Female Founders and Their Familial Origin

Caroline Ruiner

Introduction

Though a disproportionate rise in self-employment of women can be observed, only 32.1 percent of all self-employed academics were female in Germany in 2011 (Eurostat Labour Force Survey 2012). In search of an explanation for this under-representation, there have been numerous studies on the women's characteristics, their motivation to become self-employed and their economic success (see e. g. Clark and James 1992; Moore and Buttner 1997; Lee and Rogoff 1998; Bruni et al. 2004; Loscocco and Smith-Hunter 2004; Fehrenbach and Lauxen-Ulbrich 2006; Brush et al. 2009). These studies reveal that women establish businesses *differently* to men, i. e. more slowly, more carefully, on a smaller scale, and less oriented to growth and economic profit. Similarly, they more often run single-person enterprises in domestic contexts leading to delimitations and blendings between work-life and life-world.

In this context, entrepreneurial time management is conceived of as being decisive for the success of the self-employed as it depends on their personal strategies and behaviors, how they structure and organize their everyday lives. This requirement has already been taken up by career advice literature with headings such as "Time Management for Entrepreneurs" or "Time Management—Introducing the Entrepreneur's Secret Weapon to Maximizing Productivity". These guidebooks connote that the challenge of entrepreneurial time management can be met and is learnable—it only takes encouragement, a few tips and some information which can be acquired in the appropriate literature, and, where necessary, with the help of coaches. So far, this idea of *making* a successful entrepreneur with the help of training and consulting has been too narrowly discussed, as the questions of how these strategies and behaviors originally emerge, based on the founders' prerequisites, have not yet been asked.

Three decades after the publication of Arlie Russell Hochschild's *The Managed Heart*, the processes of commodification of emotion she wrote about now reach into all areas of labor processes, extending even to private life and intimate relationships. The contributors to this volume take up her concepts to study the diversity of this economic intrusion into family, education, and nursing in the service sector as well as into corporate management. Aside from the powers and interests that force these developments, these essays argue, there are also productive uses and active resistances to them.

ISBN 978-3-593-39894-5



9 783593 398945

www.campus.de