Paper published as: Chung, Heejung (2022) “A Social Policy case for a four-day week”. *Journal of Social Policy.*

A Social Policy case for a four-day week

Abstract

There has been an explosion of interest in the “four-day-week” movement across the globe, especially due to its potential in addressing many of the societal challenges left by the COVID-19 pandemic. Four-day-week is a movement set to shorten the working hours of full-time workers without a reduction in pay. I aim to set out the case for a national move towards a four-day-week explaining why social policy scholars should lead the debate. First, I provide evidence of the societal costs of the current long-hours work culture has on workers’ and their family’s well-being and welfare, social inequality, and social cohesion. Shorter working can help tackle these issues by giving workers right to time, shifting the balance between, and the value work and non-work activities have in our lives. Social policy scholars need to lead this debate owing to our existing knowledge and expertise in dealing with these social issues and state-level interventions. In addition, without pressing for fundamental changes in our labour market, we cannot adequately address some of the key challenges we face as a society. The paper ends with key research questions social policy scholars should address as a part of this move.

Key words: Social Policy, four-day-week, working hours, labour market, reform

Introduction

In recent years, we have seen an explosion of interest in the shorter working week or the "four-day week" across the globe, for example, in Spain, India, and New Zealand[i]. In the UK, a cross-party motion was submitted to the Parliament in June 2020 asking for an introduction of a four-day-week (UK Parliament, 2020). More recently in April of 2021, the Scottish National Party has promised a £10million fund to allow companies to pilot and explore the benefits of a four-day-week[ii]. One reason why this movement garnered so much attention is due to the potential it has in addressing many of the societal challenges left by the COVID-19 pandemic. This includes issues such as, increased levels of gender and social inequality, workers' deteriorated mental health issues, and the need to rejuvenate the tourism and hospitality industries that have been hit the hardest due to the pandemic. Much of the debates around the four-day-week movement has been on the productivity gains it can bring. Given that a four-day-week asks employers to pay workers the same salary for shorter working hours, such evidence is crucial in ensuring that companies and the public is on board with its introduction. However, we also need to think about the larger societal changes a reduction in working hours can bring. This is necessary to develop this movement into a national policy strategy introduced to tackle some of our biggest societal challenges around inequalities and sustainability.

Reduction of working hours directly relates to issues around workers' well-being, social inequalities, and defining and shifting norms around the value of work and individual's contribution to society, topics that are at the heart of social policy research. Despite being best placed to lead the discussions, there has not been enough engagement in these topics by social policy scholars. The paper sets out to convince social policy scholars to engage more and lead the debates around policies that directly engage with changing the labour market. We need to lead the debate because without fundamental changes in our labour market and without changing the role 'work' has in our societies, we are unable to adequately address some of the key challenges we face collectively. We need to look beyond the more limited spheres of social policy areas and look at the structural changes necessary to proactively tackle the root cause of problems rather than react to its outcomes. Four-day-week is a good example of such interventions.

The next section defines what a four-day-week is, then explain the impact long-hours working culture has on many issues such as well-being, social inequalities, and social cohesion. This will provide the basis to show how a move towards a four-day-week can help tackle these issues by giving back workers the *right to time* and by changing the notions of and the *value of 'work'*. The essay will also highlight some key research questions social policy scholars should address as a part of this move.

Four-day-week definitions and theories

What is a four-day-week?

The four-day-week is an idea that believes that the full-time standard working hours, currently set around 36-40 hours in most countries, should move to a four-day or a 30-32 hours a week standard without a reduction in pay workers receive (see also, Pang, 2019; Coote et al., 2020). It does not necessary mean that workers must work four days, but it is more about the general idea that there should be a reduction in the number of hours workers work to be considered "full-time equivalent". Thus, the four-day-week can be distinguished from part-time work in that the latter entails a reduction in the number of hours of work but with a proportional reduction in the pay received - e.g., four-days' work for 80% of a full-time pay. It can also be distinguished from a condensed work week, where a full-time equivalent hour (e.g. 40 hours) is carried out in fewer number of days (e.g. four days), where although there is a reduction in the days worked, there is no reduction in the notions of what constitute as a full-time equivalent hours.

Why a four-day-week?

One reason why the four-day-week has gained a lot of interest across the world is due its potential for productivity gains (for example, see Stronge et al., 2019; Pang, 2019). The reason why shorter working can result in increased productivity is because short focused hours can prove to be much more effective in finishing a job compared to long-hours work (Pencavel, 2014; Künn-Nelen et al., 2013). In fact, Parkinson's law states that 'work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion' (Parkinson and Osborn, 1957). There is

evidence on how, for the average UK worker, majority of the 8 hour work days are used for non-work activities - such as coffee making, news reading, talking to colleagues/partner (Vouchercloud, 2016). Long working hours also inhibit workers' recovery time necessary to maintain their well-being, and to increase work engagement and proactive behaviours, ultimately impacting on job performance outcomes (Sonnentag, 2012). What is more, long-hours of work, without ample rest, can result in negative health outcomes (Caruso et al., 2006), increasing sickness, absenteeism, and turn-over intentions (i.e. leaving the job), all of which can be costly for companies. This explains why we see evidence of productivity or profit gains from shorter working hours not only in knowledge-based occupations but also in the more lower-paid[iii], manual or routine occupations (for detailed case studies see, Pang, 2019). Although the productivity gains of a four-day-week is important to highlight, we also need to foster debates around how only through the reduction in working hours can we adequately address some of our most urgent societal problems. To do this, I will first explore the problems the long-hours work culture.

The problems of the long-hours work culture

Performative nature of the long-hours culture

Although we see a trend in the reduction of working hours in most industrialised countries, this is not the case for liberal welfare states such as the US and UK (Schor, 2008)[iv], where long-hours work is still prevalent especially among full-time working men. For example, the average working hours of a male full-time worker in the UK is one of the highest of all European countries at an average of 43.7 hours a week in 2019 (Eurostat, 2021). What is more, a large proportion of workers work very long-hours, with close to 3.5 million workers/13% of total workforce worked over 48hours a week in 2016, much of it as unpaid overtime (TUC, 2017; TUC, 2021). This can be largely explained by the ideal worker culture dominating our societies, where someone who prioritises work above all else and does not have any other responsibilities outside of work is considered to be the model of a productive and committed worker (Acker, 1990; Williams, 1999). In such cultures, long-hours in the office is necessary to signal one's commitment, motivation, productivity and performance (Berdahl et al., 2018) [v]. It is considered the ultimate sign of commitment because as time is a

limited resource, by providing a significant proportion of it to work, you effectively crowd out everything else in your life, signalling the importance work has in your life to your employer and others around you.

Scholars have criticised long-hours worked as being merely performative rather than necessary (Reid, 2011). In fact, workers, especially those who report working very long-hours, exaggerate the number of hours they work (Yanofsky, 2012). However, as many organisations consider long-hours work as a sign of commitment (Mazmanian et al., 2013), many workers 'perform' long-hours work to ensure their competitive edge in the organisation and the labour market as a whole (Reid, 2011). Long-hours work cultures push our societies to become more work-centred (Frayne, 2015) by eliminating or crowding-out the value non-work activities hold. In such societies, work, not leisure, becomes the signifier of dominant social status. The assertion of busyness owning to long-hours spent at work reflects one's position in or an aspiration to high social status, and superiority over others in terms of achievement (Gershuny, 2005). It is not only a source of conspicuous consumption – to show others of one's position – but also is a basis of how individuals evaluate their self-worth (Bellezza et al., 2017).

Long-hours impact on well-being of workers, families

One of the most direct negative outcomes of long-hours work can be found in its impact on individuals' health and well-being. Several studies show how long-hours work and overtime impacts individual's physical and mental health outcomes (for a review, Caruso et al., 2006) costing UK employers more than £10 billion annually (Health and Safety Executive, 2019). However, the negative impact of long-hours work goes beyond its impact on workers and companies. Studies show how working long-hours impacts negatively on workers' relationship with their partners and children (Crouter et al., 2001). For example, when fathers work long-hours, children generate negative views of their father's job and of the time spent together (Strazdins et al., 2017). The reason why long-hours worked by parents can be detrimental for children's socio-emotional and physical well-being (Johnson et al., 2013; for a review, Chung, 2021) is because long working hours prohibit parents from spending time with children.

Long-hours work culture and inequalities

Another problem with the long-hours work culture is that it is largely exclusionary towards those who have responsibilities outside of work (Berdahl et al., 2018). Several studies indicate long-hours work (culture) as the biggest culprit of why women are excluded from some of the most lucrative jobs, or why gender pay gaps are highest in certain occupations (Goldin, 2014; Cha and Weeden, 2014). Women bear, and are expected to bear, the brunt of housework and childcare in heterosexual coupled relationships (Dotti Sani and Treas, 2016; Wishart et al., 2019). Due to this, unlike men and workers without care or other obligations, many women, especially mothers, are unable to 'perform' long-hours work. Long-hours work culture also enforces a strict division of household labour between men and women. Men's long working hours prohibit them from taking a more active role in housework and childcare (Walthery and Chung, 2021) leaving women to pick up the larger bulk (Wishart et al., 2019). This again limits women's labour market capacity (Cha, 2010), leaving them to work in lower-paid part-time roles with few career progression opportunities (Connolly and Gregory, 2008) or make them leave the labour market altogether (Chung and Van der Horst, 2018; Vlasblom and Schippers, 2006). This results in a vicious cycle where men's breadwinning responsibility is emphasised in heterosexual coupled relationships leading them to work/perform longer hours to ensure the financial security of the household. Such divergent labour market patterns impacts the unconscious biases people hold against women and mother's capacity to work (Budig et al., 2012), which limits women's, including non-mothers', progress up to leadership positions. Women are not the only ones who are excluded from this long-hours labour market. Anyone who cannot perform long-hours work, may it be due to informal care responsibilities or self-care, namely those with disability or long-standing illnesses, are also excluded. Therefore, long-hours work culture can be seen as a leading cause of the persistent inequality patterns observed in our labour markets.

Long-hours work and social cohesion

Long-hours work culture is also problematic in that it undermines social cohesion by promoting the stigmatisation of workers who cannot, or thought to be unable to, work long-hours (or work at all) (Chung, 2022). Studies have shown that workers who take up family-friendly arrangements, such as flexible working arrangements, leaves, or part-time etc.,

experience negative career outcomes especially in ideal worker cultures (Chung, 2020b; Williams et al., 2013; Cech and Blair-Loy, 2014). According to the 2018 Eurobarometer, 29% of those surveyed in the UK agree or strongly agreed that flexible working is badly perceived by colleagues. Similarly, 29% of respondents in the 2018 British Social Attitude Survey responded that they would 'definitely' or 'probably' experience negative impact on their career if they asked to work flexibly (Curtice et al., 2019). Workers using flexible working arrangements are stigmatised because by using family-friendly arrangements, it signals to others (managers and colleagues) that you have other responsibilities outside of work, limiting your capacity to devote yourself (completely) to work. The irony here is that despite the fact that those who work flexibly, and workers who have better work-life balance, can be more productive and are more committed to the company (Kelliher and de Menezes, 2019), our social norms around the 'ideal worker' prohibits people from accepting such evidence. The stigma against those who are unemployed or receiving benefits are also prevalent in long-hours work cultures (Baumberg et al., 2012), where job loss is considered a direct loss of social status impacting other's and your own perceived notion of (self-)worth (Sage, 2019; Van Oorschot, 2006).

In sum, long-hours work in our societies, rather than being a necessary function of one's job, has persisted largely as a performance tool to signify one's productivity, commitment, and self-worth. It is, further a root cause of many problems we face in society today, including issues around workers' and their families' well-being, labour market inequality, decline in social cohesion, and the stigmatisation of disadvantaged workers.

How four-day-week can help: some evidence of success

Regaining our right to time

Four-day-week can directly solve issues of well-being of workers by reducing one of the key culprits of work-related illnesses, that is long-hours work and overwork (Kelly and Moen, 2020). It improves workers' well-being by not only allowing individuals more time to recover, but also allowing them to take part in activities outside of work such as spending more time with family and friends. Providing workers more capacity to spend time with

others can also help improve the well-being of others - such as their children and other family members (Chung, 2021). Providing workers more time can also help tackle a range of other challenges we face as a society. For example, shorter working has been shown to be useful in promoting community activities (Putnam, 2000), and can help promote the development of culture and healthy leisure activities that go beyond TV watching (Corneo, 2005). Shorter working can help reduce carbon emissions and tackle global warming and other issues relating to climate change (Knight et al., 2013; Kallis et al., 2013) by removing 'time poverty' which prevents individuals from making 'good' decisions/behaviours. Thus, we as social policy scholars, need to think about providing workers *the right to time* (without reduction in pay or without income insecurity) to address the problems that the long-hours work culture brings.

There is evidence to show how national-level policies introducing shorter working can help bring about change. For example, France introduced a move from 39 to 35-hour work week in 2000, and Portugal legislated a move from 44-to 40-hour standard in 1996. These policy changes have been shown to increase workers' well-being and life satisfaction whilst reducing their work-family conflict (Lepinteur, 2019; Fagnani and Letablier, 2006). The recent Icelandic national-level four-day-week experiment has also shown similar results (Haraldsson and Kellam, 2021), as have the results found in country cases where legal changes have been made towards overtime premiums to make long-hours work more expensive – for example, in Japan and Korea (Hamermesh et al., 2017). There are also existing policies in many countries to enable reduction in working hours for specific groups of the population. This includes parental leave, including part-time parental leave allowing parents to reduce working hours (whilst not reducing their pay) (Koslowski et al., 2021), or partial sick leave systems. However, these existing policies have clear limitations. For example, sick leave is reactive rather than being preventive, and only addresses the issues when things have gone wrong rather than tackle the root cause before problems arise. What is more, they are targeted towards certain groups of the population rather than implemented across the board. This can result in the stigmatisation and negative career consequences for workers who take these arrangements up. For example, workers are penalised for taking up leave and other types of flexible working arrangements (Williams, 2013), and women are sometimes penalised due to assumptions that they will eventually take up these arrangements (Budig and Hodges, 2010). These existing policies do not do enough to bring about change

necessary in addressing social inequality problems brought on by the long-hours work culture, nor does it shift societal values of what is important in life.

Reducing inequalities in the labour market

Four-day-week can help reduce the inequalities in the labour markets caused by the long-hours work culture. Firstly, this is done by encouraging job sharing, with a better redistribution of working hours between those who experience hours insecurity with those who are overworked (Coote et al., 2020; Stronge et al., 2019). For example, there is some evidence that the French 35-hour work week has enabled some redistribution of working hours across income groups (Estevão and Sá, 2008). Further, it is estimated that a move to a four-day-week in the Scottish public sector can generate between 45,000 to 59,000 new (decent) jobs (Autonomy, 2020). Pang (2019) provides case studies in lower-paid service sectors - fast food restaurants, social case settings - where shorter working week entailed increase in the number of positions/jobs. Again, this allows for the redistribution of hours across the workforce, which can be effective in tackling issues of labour market inequalities - but only when done at a national scale. Although this can increase costs, much of it will be saved by reduced costs to the healthcare system by having a healthier workforce. What is more, much of the cost can be reaped back through reduced absenteeism, sickness, and turnover of workers (see Pang, 2019; Autonomy, 2020).

Shorter working hours can enable women, and workers with other responsibilities outside of work who may be limited in the hours they can spend at work better access to lucrative jobs, through the reduction in the number of hours workers are expected to spend at these jobs. In fact, scholars argue that the introduction of the 35-hour work week in France largely explains why France not only has one of the smallest gender gap in working hours, but also a high rate of dual-earning couples (Estevão and Sá, 2008). Shorter working also encourages workers, especially men/fathers who have a higher tendency to work long-hours, to be more involved in childcare and housework, resulting in a more equitable division of domestic work. The recent Icelandic experiment has shown us that it was especially men in heterosexual relationships that took on a greater domestic responsibility, enabling a more equitable share between couples (Haraldsson and Kellam, 2021). This can provide further support for mothers (and others) to take a larger part in the labour market by relieving them from some of

the housework and care responsibilities they previously held. In sum, four-day-week enables a more equitable distribution of both paid and unpaid work across the population.

Social cohesion

At the heart of the four-day-week is a move away from long-hours work as a measure of commitment, motivation and productivity of workers and the view that working shorter hours can increase productivity and efficiently. Such changes can help dismantle the stigmatised view against workers who have previously been penalised (only) because they were unable to perform long-hours - this includes those who work part-time, flexibly, or any workers that balance work with other responsibilities outside of work (Chung, 2022). As more people gain access to time, more workers are able to balance work with other responsibilities outside of work, may it be family, sports and leisure, community activities, or even caring for pets (Kallis et al., 2013; Haraldsson and Kellam, 2021). This can remove the division between the population of those work (long hours) versus those who (only) provide care/carry out unpaid work. In fact, one of the outcomes of the Icelandic four-day-week experiment was exactly this change in work culture, where workers refused long-hours work – putting greater value in non-work activities, even managers showed a greater support towards work-life balance (Haraldsson and Kellam, 2021) where work-life balance was not seen as conflicting with performance outcomes. As we can see from this experiment, when done right, four-day-week can shift people's view of the 'ideal worker' to be someone who is productive while balancing other responsibilities outside of work.

Valuing non-work activities

This leads to another important change a four-day-week can hopefully bring about, that is to move us away from the work-centred society to one where we put equal value in other spheres of life. As we spend a smaller proportion of our lives at work, people will start to put greater value on non-work activities, or activities that do not generate income, similar to what we have seen during the COVID-19 pandemic (Chung et al., 2020; ONS, 2020). Many feminists scholars (e.g., Fraser, 1994) have already argued how care-giving despite playing a crucial role in society is not given the recognition it deserves purely based on the notion that it does not garner market income or contribute to the GDP. Similarly, many activities carried out by individuals that fulfil important functions in society, and help reduce social or

environmental costs, are not currently valued in the same way paid employment is (Taylor-Gooby et al., 2018). However, studies show that as society moves away from the long-hours work culture, shifts can occur in the norms around the value of non-work, non-income generating activities have (Corneo, 2005; Kallis et al., 2013). Such change is especially necessary when we consider how many jobs are at risk due to technological developments in artificial intelligence and automation (Autor, 2015). In future societies, individual value must be attributed to the overall contribution to society not only limited to the market value they generate.

Four-day-week and social policy

Why four-day-week is a social policy issue

There are several reasons why I believe social policy scholars should lead the debate on the need for and how to introduce the four-day-week policy. One main reason is due to the need for a state-level intervention and what that entails legislatively. At the moment, four-day-week policies are largely introduced at the company level, mainly for productivity enhancing and worker recruitment/retainment purposes. However, lower-pay sectors or smaller companies may not feel a need to, find it difficult, or have the capacity to introduce this policy. Relying on company-led approaches may result in a more segmentation – as we've seen in regards to family policy implementations (Chung, 2020a). State intervention can provide a nudge for companies to value workers' time, think about what a more efficient use of it is. We have seen some success of such approach in France, Portugal, and more recently in Korea by imposing restrictions on working hours (Hijzen and Thewissen, 2020). Law restricting the maximum numbers of working hours, as well as increasing overtime premiums (e.g., by setting overtime premiums of hours worked beyond the four-day/32 hour-week) can be useful in accelerating changes in organisations and the labour market as a whole.

A national move to a four-day-week also needs a review of other existing laws and policies to facilitate its intended outcomes. This includes a review of the minimum and living wage to ensure that shorter working does not lead to further income insecurity – as was the case in Korea when introducing its 52-hour limit policy. We will also need to review parental leaves

and other family policies to see if existing institutions enforce or maintain traditional gender roles. Without policy-led changes in the notion of whose responsibility it is to care, the extra time gained by workers may further increase the unequal division of labour between men and women, as was the case in France (Pailhé et al., 2019). Similar reviews will be needed for other policy areas – such as unemployment benefits, pensions etc. to ensure that the change in working hours does not lead to potential negative outcomes for certain groups of the population. The goal of this paper is not to describe in detail all policy changes necessary. Rather, it is to highlight the fact that given such need for a potential overhaul and recalibration of a number of different welfare state policies, social policy scholars need to be in the centre of these debates.

Secondly, social policy scholars already deal with the key issues around the social costs of long-hours work(culture) and concurrently the societal benefits of shorter working- namely on well-being/welfare, social inequalities, and social cohesion. Thus, we are best placed to provide critical evidence needed in setting a national agenda towards a four-day-week. For example, the UK suffers from a shortage of nurses and other health and social care professionals (Buchan et al., 2019) due to issues around workload, stress, and high-levels of workforce turnover. Shorter working hours can potentially help enhance retention and return of nurses who have left, significantly improving the services provided by the NHS, its financial stability, which will enhance the well-being levels of individuals and society as a whole. Social policy scholars already engage in and have the expertise to bring together and connect complex range of evidence necessary to provide these links identifying the societal costs and benefits of a 4-day-week policy intervention. Thirdly, the four-day-week movement should be developed as a part of our work in enhancing human rights – in this case, enhancing the individual's (and their family's) right to time for rest, leisure, care, and other types of activities that provide social value. We have the experience and expertise to ensure that those in more disadvantaged positions are not left behind when such rights are introduced.

Remaining questions and agenda for future research

There are several remaining questions left to be answered. More research around the impact of long-hours work (culture) is needed. For example, in my own research I find that long-hours work culture increases the stigmatisation of flexible workers, which explains why

flexible working can lead to longer working hours and further exploitation of workers (Chung, 2022; Lott and Chung, 2016). We need to investigate how long-hours work culture influences a range of social problems/challenges, for example, the stigmatisation of benefit recipients, the unemployed (e.g., Van Oorschot, 2006; Sage, 2019), welfare attitudes, ideas around redistribution (e.g., Mijs, 2019), and social cohesion. Similarly, we need to examine how long-hours work(culture) limits the positive outcomes of existing social policies. For example, long-hours cultures can limit the positive impact flexible working can have on workers' work-life balance (Chung, 2022) or limit the positive impact generous family policies can have on gender equality and work-life balance (Lee et al., 2016). Related to this, there is still a lack of evidence of what kinds of societal change we can expect from a large-scale shift to a four-day-week, again on workers' and their family and community's welfare, well-being, on patterns of social inequality, social cohesion, and sustainability. Social Policy scholars should take a leading role in examining these questions given our interest in social justice, our understandings around the cost of social problems, and our existing expertise in providing policy solutions for key social challenges. What is more, when discussing the potential solutions to these problems, we should not shy away from arguing for a complete restructuring or rehaul of our labour market structures and norms.

Concluding words

There are several reasons as to why now is the time to think about the introduction of the four-day-week. The COVID-19 pandemic has given rise to high levels of mental health issues across the population (Banks and Xu, 2020), and has amplified inequality patterns across gender and class (ONS, 2021). Four-day-week can help tackle these issues. Shorter working hours is also necessary to rebuild our economy, in addressing the productivity decline, and help rejuvenate tourism, hospitality, and the creative sectors that have been hit the hardest during the pandemic. The pressing need to have policies that address the environmental crisis and the political polarisation are other reasons why a move to shorter working is urgently needed (Coote et al., 2020).

What is more, there are indications that we may move further towards a long-hours work culture. The rise in home-working and the blurring of boundaries that come with it can result

in the encroachment of work to family, longer working hours (Lott and Chung, 2016), and the traditionalization of gender roles (Chung et al., 2021). What is more, the rise in job/income insecurity in the next few years before the economy fully recovers may result in workers needing to work longer to ensure their job and employment security. More specifically for the UK, due to Brexit, there is a threat of scrapping the EU Working Time Regulation that limits the maximum working hours of workers and protects their right to rest/holiday. Rather than reacting to problems that arise from these changes, a national move to a four-day-week may enable us to be proactive in tackling these challenges head-on. There is already great support for a move to four-day-week, with surveys indicating that 2/3rds of both workers and businesses in the UK support it (Smith, 2019; Ibbetson, 2019). The question is whether there is a political will.

The Beveridge report was based on the ideas of full-employment. Full-employment was not only the source of income security, but also as a source of self-fulfilment, providing individuals opportunities to contribute back to society. As we build back from the crisis of the pandemic, we may need a new Beveridge report outlining the need to provide good and decent work (Heins and Chung, 2021). However, to respond to the demands of workers (and businesses) today, we need to ensure that workers' (and their families') right to time is also valued in this new report. The social costs of not doing so have already proven to be too high. The crisis can provide us with an opportunity to build back better, and maybe it is high time we do so.

References

Acker J. (1990) Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4: 139-158.

Autonomy. (2020) A Scottish Four Day Week: initial costings for implementation in the public sector. London: Autonomy.

Autor DH. (2015) Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic perspectives* 29: 3-30.

Banks J and Xu X. (2020) The mental health effects of the first two months of lockdown and social distancing during the Covid-19 pandemic in the UK. IFS Working Papers. https://ifs.org.uk/publications/14874 (Accessed 15th Feb, 2021)

Baumberg B, Bell K and Gaffney D. (2012) Benefits stigma in Britain. *Turn2Us* https://www.turn2us.org.uk/About-Us/Research-and-Insights/Benefits-Stigma-in-Britain (accessed 21st Nov 2017).

Bellezza S, Paharia N and Keinan A. (2017) Conspicuous consumption of time: When busyness and lack of leisure time become a status symbol. *Journal of Consumer Research* 44: 118-138.

Berdahl JL, Cooper M, Glick P, Livingston, R.W. and Williams, J. C. (2018) Work as a masculinity contest. *Journal of Social Issues* 74: 422-448.

Buchan J, Charlesworth A, Gershlick B, and Seccombe, I. (2019) A critical moment: NHS staffing trends, retention and attrition. London: The Health Foundation. https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/upload/publications/2019/A%20Critical%20Moment_1.pdf (Accessed 27th April 2021)

Budig MJ and Hodges MJ. (2010) Differences in disadvantage: Variation in the motherhood penalty across white women's earnings distribution. *American Sociological Review* 75: 705-728.

Budig MJ, Misra J and Boeckmann I. (2012) The motherhood penalty in cross-national perspective: The importance of work–family policies and cultural attitudes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 19: 163-193.

Caruso CC, Bushnell T, Eggerth D, Heitmann, A., Kojola, B., Newman, K., Rosa, R. R., Sauter, S. L. and Vila, B. (2006) Long working hours, safety, and health: toward a National Research Agenda. *American journal of industrial medicine* 49: 930-942.

Cech EA and Blair-Loy M. (2014) Consequences of flexibility stigma among academic scientists and engineers. *Work and Occupations* 41: 86-110.

Cha Y. (2010) Reinforcing separate spheres: The effect of spousal overwork on men's and women's employment in dual-earner households. *American Sociological Review* 75: 303-329.

Cha Y and Weeden KA. (2014) Overwork and the slow convergence in the gender gap in wages. *American Sociological Review* 79: 457-484.

Chung H. (2020a) Company-level family policies: Who has access to it and what are some of its outcomes? In: Nieuwenhuis R and Van Lancker W (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Family Policy.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 535-573.

Chung H. (2020b) Gender, flexibility stigma, and the perceived negative consequences of flexible working in the UK. *Social Indicators Research* 151: 521-545.

Chung H. (2021) How do within-family caring arrangements impact wellbeing and outcomes? Literature review. *Research report.* London: UK Cabinet Office, Government Equalities Office. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme

nt_data/file/957538/Shared_care_and_well-being_outcomes-_Literature_review.pdf (Accessed 4th Feb 2021)

Chung H. (2022) *The Flexibility Paradox: Why flexible working can lead to (self-)exploitation*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Chung H, Birkett H, Forbes S, and Seo, H. (2021) Covid-19, Flexible Working, and Implications for Gender Equality in the United Kingdom. *Gender & Society* 35: 218-232.

Chung H, Seo H, Forbes S, and Birkett, H. (2020) Working from home during the COVID-19 lockdown: Changing preferences and the future of work. Canterbury, UK: University of Kent.

Chung H and Van der Horst M. (2018) Women's employment patterns after childbirth and the perceived access to and use of flexitime and teleworking. *Human Relations* 71: 47-72.

Connolly S and Gregory M. (2008) Moving Down: Women's Part-Time Work and Occupational Change in Britain 1991–2001*. *The Economic Journal* 118: F52-F76.

Coote A, Harper A and Stirling A. (2020) *The Case for a Four Day Week*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Corneo G. (2005) Work and television. *European Journal of Political Economy* 21: 99-113.

Crouter AC, Bumpus MF, Head MR, and McHale, SM (2001) Implications of overwork and overload for the quality of men's family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63: 404-416.

Curtice J, Clery E, Perry J, Phillips, M and Rahim, N (2019) British Social Attitudes : The 36th Report. London: The National Centre for Social Research.

Dotti Sani GM and Treas J. (2016) Educational Gradients in Parents' Child-Care Time Across Countries, 1965–2012. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 78: 1083-1096.

Estevão M and Sá F. (2008) The 35-hour workweek in France: Straightjacket or welfare improvement? *Economic Policy* 23: 418-463.

Eurostat. (2021) Average number of usual weekly hours of work in main job, by sex, professional status, full-time/part-time and economic activity (from 2008 onwards, NACE Rev. 2) - hours (lfsa_ewhun2).

Fagnani J and Letablier M-T. (2006) The French 35-hour working law and the work-life balance of parents: friend or foe? In: Perrons D, Fagan C, McDowell L, et al. (eds) *Gender divisions and working time in the new economy. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 79-90.

Fraser N. (1994) After the family wage: Gender equity and the welfare state. *Political theory* 22: 591-618.

Frayne D. (2015) *The refusal of work: The theory and practice of resistance to work*, London: Zed Books Ltd.

Gershuny J. (2005) Busyness as the badge of honor for the new superordinate working class. *Social research* 72: 287-314.

Goldin C. (2014) A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter. *The American Economic Review* 104: 1091-1119.

Hamermesh DS, Kawaguchi D and Lee J. (2017) Does labor legislation benefit workers? Well-being after an hours reduction. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 44: 1-12.

Haraldsson GD and Kellam J. (2021) Going Public: Iceland's journey to a shorter working week. London: Autonomy.

Health and Safety Executive. (2019) Health and Safety at work: Summary statistics for Great Britain 2018. London: Health and Safety Executive.

Heins E and Chung H. (2021) Time for a new Beveridge Report? Social Policy Association Blog. http://www.social-policy.org.uk/spa-blog/time-for-a-new-beveridge-report/ (accessed 25th March 2021)

Hijzen A and Thewissen S. (2020) The 2018-2021 working time reform in Korea: A preliminary assessment. *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 248.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ibbetson C. (2019) Do employers support a four day working week. London: YouGov.

Johnson S, Li J, Kendall G, Strazdins, L and Jacoby, P. (2013) Mothers' and fathers' work hours, child gender, and behavior in middle childhood. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75: 56-74.

Kallis G, Kalush M, O'Flynn H, Rossiter, J and Ashford, N. (2013) "Friday off": reducing working hours in Europe. *Sustainability* 5: 1545-1567.

Kelliher C and de Menezes LM. (2019) *Flexible Working in Organisations: A Research Overview*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Kelly EL and Moen P. (2020) *Overload: How Good Jobs Went Bad and what We Can Do about it*. Priceton: Princeton University Press.

Knight KW, Rosa EA and Schor JB. (2013) Could working less reduce pressures on the environment? A cross-national panel analysis of OECD countries, 1970–2007. *Global Environmental Change* 23: 691-700.

Koslowski A, Blum S, Dobrotić I, Kaufman, G and Moss, P. (2021) 17th International Review on Leave Policies and Related Research 2021. DOI: 10.18445/20210817-144100-0. Available at: www.leavenetwork.org/annual-review-reports/review-2021/.

Künn-Nelen A, De Grip A and Fouarge D. (2013) Is part-time employment beneficial for firm productivity? *ILR Review* 66: 1172-1191.

Lee S, Duvander A-Z and Zarit SH. (2016) How can family policies reconcile fertility and women's employment? Comparisons between South Korea and Sweden. *Asian journal of women's studies* 22: 269-288.

Lepinteur A. (2019) The shorter workweek and worker wellbeing: Evidence from Portugal and France. *Labour Economics* 58: 204-220.

Lott Y and Chung H. (2016) Gender discrepancies in the outcomes of schedule control on overtime hours and income in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 32: 752-765.

Mazmanian M, Orlikowski WJ and Yates J. (2013) The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization Science* 24: 1337-1357.

Mijs J. (2021) The Paradox of Inequality: Income Inequality and Belief in Meritocracy go Hand in Hand. *Socio-Economic Review* 19(1): 7-35.

ONS. (2020) Coronavirus and how people spent their time under lockdown: 28 March to 26 April 2020. London: Office for National Statistics.

ONS. (2021) Coronavirus (COVID-19) and the different effects on men and women in the UK, March 2020 to February 2021. London: Office for National Statistics.

Pailhé A, Solaz A and Souletie A. (2019) How do women and men use extra time? Housework and childcare after the French 35-hour workweek regulation. *European Sociological Review* 35: 807-824.

Pang AS-K. (2019) *Shorter: How Working Less Will Revolutionise the Way your Company Gets Things Done,* London: Penguin.

Parkinson CN and Osborn RC. (1957) *Parkinson's law, and other studies in administration,* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Boston.

Pencavel J. (2014) The productivity of working hours. *The Economic Journal* 125: 2052-2076.

Putnam RD. (2000) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Culture and politics.* Springer, 223-234.

Reid EM. (2011) Passing as superman: The ideal worker and men's professional identities. *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2011: 1-6.

Sage D. (2019) Unemployment, wellbeing and the power of the work ethic: Implications for social policy. *Critical Social Policy* 39: 205-228.

Schor J. (2008) *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure,* New York: Basic books.

Smith M. (2019) Eurotrack: Europeans support introducing a four day working week. London: YouGov.

Sonnentag S. (2012) Psychological detachment from work during leisure time: The benefits of mentally disengaging from work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21: 114-118.

Strazdins L, Baxter JA and Li J. (2017) Long Hours and Longings: Australian Children's Views of Fathers' Work and Family Time. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79: 965-982.

Stronge W, Harper A and Guizzo D. (2019) The Shorter Working Week: A Radical and Pragmatic Proposal. *Autonomy and Four Day Week Campaign. Available at: https://docs.wixstatic. com/ugd/6a142f_36162778914a46b3a00dcd466562fce7. pdf.*

Taylor-Gooby P, Chung H and Leruth B. (2018) The contribution of deliberative forums to studying welfare state attitudes: A United Kingdom study. *Social Policy & Administration* 52: 914-927.

TUC. (2017) Workers in the UK put in £33.6 billion worth of unpaid overtime a year. London: Trades Union Congress.

TUC. (2021) Workers in the UK put in more than £35 billion worth of unpaid overtime last year - TUC analysis. London: Trades Union Congress.

UK Parliament. (2020) Four-day week in the UK. Early Day Motion 636: tabled on 18 June 2020. In: Parliament U (ed). Westminster, London.

Van Oorschot W. (2006) Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy* 16: 23-42.

Vlasblom JD and Schippers J. (2006) Changing dynamics in female employment around childbirth Evidence from Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. *Work, Employment & Society* 20: 329-347.

Vouchercloud. (2016) How Many Productive Hours in a Work Day? Just 2 Hours, 23 Minutes... London: Vouchercloud.

Walthery P and Chung H. (2021) Sharing of childcare and well-being outcomes: an empirical analysis. London: Government Equalities Office. UK Cabinet Office. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme

nt_data/file/957550/Sharing_of_childcare_and_well-being_outcomes__an_empirical_analysis__1_.pdf (accessed 1st March, 2021)

Williams CL. (2013) The glass escalator, revisited gender inequality in neoliberal times. *Gender & Society* 27: 609-629.

Williams J. (1999) *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams J, Blair-Loy M and Berdahl JL. (2013) Cultural schemas, social class, and the flexibility stigma. *Journal of Social Issues* 69: 209-234.

Wishart R, Dunatchik A, Mayer M, et al. (2019) Changing Patterns in Parental Time Use in the UK. London: Natcen.

Yanofsky D. (2012) That friend who says he works 75 hours a week? He's probably only clocking 50. *Quartz. https://qz.com/16899/that-friend-who-says-he-works-75-hours-a-week-hes-probably-only-clocking-50/ (Accessed 11th Feb 2021)*

---

[i] For more, see coverages: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/15/spain-to-launch-trial-of-four-day-working-week ; https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/india-four-day-work-week-new-labour-code-b1800331.html ; https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/new-labour-codes-india-four-day-week-7182376/ ; https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/20/jacinda-ardern-flags-four-day-working-week-as-way-to-rebuild-new-zealand-after-covid-19; http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20210217000870

[ii] for more information see: https://www.snp.org/manifesto/

[iii] Although some may use lower-skilled jobs, I do not believe these jobs are necessarily low-skilled but more low-paid based on the assumption that may be incorrect.

[iv] See OECD data base: https://data.oecd.org/emp/hours-worked.htm for more

[v] The CEO of Goldman Sacks, a financial company, responded to a group of junior associates asking to 'only 80 hours a week' rather than 100, by saying "If we all go an extra mile for our client, even when we feel that we're reaching our limit, it can really make a difference in our performance", https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/mar/22/goldman-sachs-boss-responds-to-leaked-report-into-inhumane-working-hours . Similarly the CEO of Tesla, Space-X Elon Musk has been known to work 100 or more hours a week, and has said "Nobody ever changed the world on 40-hours a week" https://www.businessinsider.com/elon-musk-nobody-changed-world-40-hours-a-week-not-true-2018-11?r=US&IR=T. The CEO of a Chinese retail company Alibaba is known to work a 9-9-6 schedule, namely working 9am to 9pm, 6 days a week. https://edition.cnn.com/2019/04/15/business/jack-ma-996-china/index.html