
The author explores the impact of women’s families on their careers, specifically government employment positions. The author further attempts to explain whether or not a woman’s or man’s family has any bearing on his or her networking ability in the governmental workplace. The research article begins with observations about men and women in government positions, especially from research done by other authors. The author also took the issue of “domestic labor” in the employee’s homes, and how the balance between work and home life affected men’s and women’s careers in government positions (9).

Scott’s initial research consisted of 12 interviews, comprised of “seven with women, [and] five with men” (11). In addition, the author picked from a group of 39, “10 with women, 29 with men” for another “related project” (11). From there, Scott issued questionnaires by mail “to government relations managers at all 231 corporations,” chosen for certain “economic and political characteristics” (11). Of the 231 managers, 161 completed the questionnaire, of which “Fifty-eight percent […] [were] men,” and “42% [were] women” (11). Scott then compiled some of the data into an informative table relaying, among other things, the difference between men and women and their marital status, amount of children (if any), and their children’s ages (12). Also based on the information collected, Scott concluded that married women typically spend more time on childcare compared to men who hold positions in the government profession. Scott found men spend more of their time with their children on the weekends rather than throughout the workweek. An important observation by the author shows women have the ability to succeed in government positions partly because of the amount of childcare they receive. This allows these women to devote more time to their profession. Overall, one of the more profound conclusions the author makes is that “the results indicate that neither marriage nor motherhood limits the formation of various kinds of networks that potentially provide useful information and resources” (24-25). The author did make a point that women have fewer opportunities when it comes to meeting with legislators, primarily because of their lack of participation in activities outside of their normal job responsibilities. This hampers women’s ability to freely network with legislators and others in government positions, because many individuals in government conduct business away from the office.

Overall, the author appears unbiased in the application of research from other authors and from the independent research performed. Scott showed the positives women have in comparison to men, rather than displaying a negative hue towards sexist behavior. Scott studied the influence of family ties and their effects on women. The author also extracted from another author that sometimes people see women as “‘uncommitted’ to their careers” if they have children (9). Liff and Ward also found this connection with mothers in the workplace. Additionally, Roth also discussed that women tend to think of their families when pursuing certain careers, whereas, Scott primarily studied the impact that family life has on men and women’s careers.