Bill Allen was coasting along in his truck on the way to a softball game, with two boys seated beside him, when he suddenly realized that one of them wasn’t his. Bill’s biggest fear had come to pass, forgetting one of his boys. He turned around and raced back to day care to retrieve his misplaced son. The concerned staff chided him, adding to his anxiety and embarrassment.

Why was Bill transporting these children in the first place? He and his wife, Sophia Rodriguez, a data entry clerk in a public sector organization, were committed to providing extra structured activities for the two sons they were adopting, despite the additional commute that it required. Believing that these activities were important for their children’s development and demonstrated that they were good parents, they therefore squeezed another commute into a schedule that already was so varied, tight, and hectic that the slightest miscommunication or delay led to disaster.

Each day started with worries, since Bill and Sophia had carefully rehearsed the night before who would transport each of the children to and
from school. Who was picking up the children? Who was looking after Sophia's elderly mother, Alicia, who was in declining health and possibly afflicted with Alzheimer's disease? Who was monitoring Alicia's brother and her son, who were both disabled? At whose house were they meeting for the next gathering of their circle of nearly twenty relatives?

Recurring medical issues disrupted their dreams of a happy family. Some of these interruptions were trivial, though stressful, such as finding out that Alicia had not renewed her prescriptions, taking her to buy some more medicine, and finding that she had forgotten where she got it. Others were as distressing as the collapse from a stroke of an uncle at a New Year's celebration, or the unexpected death of a young niece from a brain hemorrhage.

These sudden crises shattered Sophia's relentless schedule. She was unable to relax. She constantly worried about where she was supposed to be, what she should be doing, and what surprises might derail her plans. Unlike her husband, she was the one with the flexible job, making her the person who had to take corrective action when the unexpected happened.

Bill and Sophia's daily lives were tightly scheduled already, and yet they took on even more obligations because of their sense of moral commitment to family and community. Despite his busyness, Bill dreamed of starting a small business to provide employment for "good" people who just needed a break. Their identities as responsible people rested upon seeking out opportunities to act, and it was precisely these activities that plunged them into busyness.

Bill and Sophia are not alone. For many Americans, busyness is like water to a fish; the context in which life is lived that is so obvious that it often passes without comment. This book is about families who are busy because they do lots of things. The demands of jobs fuel their sense of busyness, but this work often merges with the demands of family and community. People get work done wherever and whenever possible, including at home and in their cars. Family chores and personal tasks can also become interspersed at work, making it difficult to tell where work, family, community, and personal realms begin and end.

Millions of Americans spend countless hours coping with various forms of busyness that permeate their everyday lives. For some people, the focus of their busyness is family; for others it is job and career, or church and religious activities. For still others, busyness involves a combination of deeply held val-
ues or desired social activities. Sometimes, busyness results from a big event, like the catastrophic illness of a family member or a major reorganization at work, but much of it is the accumulation of many small, seemingly inconsequential demands on time, which collectively can be overwhelming. We search for the best ticket prices on the Internet, are “partners” with teachers in our children’s education, and employ a battery of devices that promise to save labor if only we can learn to use and maintain them. Whether it is managing our careers, portfolios, or health, all of us have assumed more and more responsibilities in managing our lives. If shifts in how we spend our time portend change in society then these busy lives are indicative of deep changes in American society over the past few decades.

Busyness is so deeply ingrained in many of today’s families that people often take it for granted. It may seem so obvious as hardly to be worth analyzing. The activities that make up busyness may seem unimportant, but the phenomenon of busyness is anything but trivial. It consumes the lives of countless families. It is transforming America. Busyness reveals issues that reach to the heart of who we are and what we wish to become.

Busyness is at once ordinary and remarkable. Many of us seek ways to develop efficiency in our lives. However commonplace this may seem, we can also see in it something remarkable. Our busyness is more than how to fit everything into the scarce time available. Although we may experience busyness as a lack of time, or as life somehow speeding up, it is about much more than time. A closer look at what we do reveals that many of us put considerable effort into managing our many commitments, and that we try to create buffers of technology and people, which we hope will help us cope. All of this coping and buffering creates hidden work, which we do in addition to everything else.

Busyness is also associated with meaning in our lives. The ways in which we see ourselves are inextricably wrapped up with busyness. Issues of meaning may derive from religious faith, but may equally arise in the context of our hectic days. Busyness involves time, but it is also about creating ourselves as moral beings who live in communities with other people, many of whom are also busy, albeit in varied ways and with different consequences.

This book recounts a journey through busyness undertaken between 1999 and 2001 with fourteen families, each of which has something to teach us about everyday lives filled with commitments and activities. The impetus for
this journey grew from research we conducted in Silicon Valley beginning in 1992, which suggested that balancing or juggling the demands of work and family are more complicated than typically portrayed. In most scholarly accounts, time spent at work is deemed a measure of the intrusiveness of work. While the number of hours is important, however, so are the characteristics of industries, employers, and jobs. Some people spoke of long hours, with little personal control over when they worked. Others worked fewer hours but were subject to their employer’s demand for constant “accessibility.” For still others, work affected home life through a rigorous travel schedule, or simply the challenge of working across time zones. The particular dimensions of work were significant to individuals and the others in their lives.

The details of families and households also required attention. Some people spoke of the difficulties of raising children and how these changed as children grew older. The jobs of spouses mattered too. We found that in families with two career builders, each was typically reluctant to constrain the work habits of the other, since the shoe might soon be on the other foot. Other participants in our study lived in families with one career builder, and the other person often alerted his or her partner when work habits threatened family life. In general, we found that the impact of work on home life was subtle and could not be measured just by the number of hours worked or by counting the interruptions to home life. For example, people brought models and metaphors from the workplace into family life. These included talk about efficiency and productivity, various techniques to manage interpersonal relationships, and tools such as total quality management. Furthermore, despite the emphasis on the impact of work upon family, we heard tales suggesting that elements of family and community life were imported into the workplace. Assumptions and values about how men and women should act, the relationships between family and work, and the responsibilities of superiors and subordinates were often products of family life that played out at work.

As the months passed, we learned more about the complex dance between work and family, but what we found remained tantalizingly incomplete. First, people repeatedly told us they had figured out how to manage the demands of work and family by keeping the realms separate. Yet all too often we saw briefcases lugged home and heard of e-mailing or telephoning interrupting the supposedly separate domain of family. One person, for
example, when asked if she and her husband had any rules about working at home, replied, “No e-mailing at dinner.” Then she laughed and shook her head. Parents often remarked that they interacted with their children until they could put them to bed and then begin a “second shift” of paperwork to be completed before the morning. Such revelations called attention to the gap between what people said and what they actually did. Second, busy people often told us that their families and friends understood and accommodated to their hectic schedules. We could only imagine what those others really said and how their lives were affected by the busyness of a spouse, parent, or friend. We set out to understand more completely how the juggling act of daily life really occurred.

Our research revealed that busyness was widespread, but it was most transparent among working families with children. Not only did parents have their own obligations at work, but they were also affected by the hectic lives of their children. Children, too, had their own forms of busyness and their own views about it, which often differed substantially from those of their parents.

Our journey with the fourteen families began, as ethnographic ones do, with a commitment to study people on their own turf, doing what was important to them. Although we talked with them throughout the day, we did not interview them using our questions, but rather tried to discover what mattered to them about their lives: we learned their questions. The lessons we learned were not always the ones we expected, but they were important to the people in our study.

Our choice was to study a few families in depth, rather than to survey a larger number, so choosing them was critical. We settled on fourteen families whose members said they were middle-class. Within the constraint of a small sample of dual-career families to be studied in depth, we tried to choose ones that would provide a variety of lifestyles. They varied in the number and age of children. Income was a relatively poor criterion of middle-class status in a region where the median house price hovered at about $500,000. Still, the team sought several families whose members expressed middle-class values about lifestyle and education, but who were struggling financially to realize their aspirations. In addition, we sought at least one family whose income and lifestyle placed it beyond the middle class. We also sought families that varied in ethnicity or country of origin.
Our goal was not to seek a representative sample, since this was meaningless with such a small number. Instead, we assumed that a culturally diverse sample of families would increase the variety of strategies used to manage work and family. We also recruited families that included workers from the public and private sectors, as well as from different industries.

We sought to include families who believed that they had found ways to cope with all the commitments of their time, rather than ones who saw themselves as "dysfunctional"—however defined. Our assumption was that the former would teach us about everyday problems and dilemmas, as well as how to handle them, while the latter would only expand the litany of problems. Above all, we needed families whose members were open and would tolerate our presence.

Families participated for several reasons. Many people valued our willingness to spend time with them in order to capture how they saw the world; they contrasted it with the often-glib pronouncements in the media. Many believed that busyness was important, yet overlooked, and they viewed their participation as contributing to their community. Most families, too, contained at least one person who reflected on the family's practices and sought to improve its capacity to cope with complex responsibilities. Although we were explicit that therapy was not part of the study, some people undoubtedly participated in it in order to work through issues within their families.

How to study busy families was also a challenge, for sitting in their homes would likely result in many lonely hours. Family members were mobile and dispersed during much of the day. To provide continuity, we decided that only one of us would study each family and, in fact, we each only met the members of "our" families. Initially, our presence constrained how people acted, but we were soon accepted as part of their lives, someone to be taught the family's way of doing things.

We conducted our fieldwork with each family for about one year, but we did not work with all of them at the same time. Instead, we staggered the study of the different families over a span of three years. We divided our fieldwork into phases that were adapted to each family. First, we shadowed individual family members during their days, often remaining with them for 10–12 hours at a time. This meant arriving early at the family home, accompanying a family member at work, and then returning home with him or her at the end of the day, often stopping to collect children or dinner on