Conflict between Work and Family: An Investigation of Four Policy Measures *

Leah Ruppanner
University of Hawaii, Hilo
Department of Sociology
200 W. Kawili Street
Hilo, HI 96720
lruppann@hawaii.edu
Word Count: 7,860

* Please address correspondence to: Leah Ruppanner, Department of Sociology, 200 W. Kawili Street, Hilo, HI 96720 (E-mail lruppann@hawaii.edu).

Conflict between Work and Family: An Investigation of Four Policy Measures

ABSTRACT

Welfare states enact a range of policies aimed at reducing work-family conflict. While welfare state policies have been assessed at the macro-level and work-family conflict at the individual-level, few studies have simultaneously addressed these relationships in a cross-national multi-level model. This study addresses this void by assessing the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and family-friendly policies in 10 countries. Applying a unique multi-level data set that couples country-level policy data with individual-level data (N = 7895) from the 2002 International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), the author analyzes the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and four specific policy measures: family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and early childhood education and care. The results demonstrate that mothers and fathers report less family-work and mothers less work-family conflict in countries with more expansive family leave policies. Also, in countries with longer school schedules mothers report less and women without children more work-family conflict.

In the context of women's increased labor force participation, conflict between work and family has received much attention. Work and family are considered greedy institutions that compete for individuals' time (Friedman, Christensen & DeGroot 1998; Pitman 1994). As more couples come to rely on a dual-earner wage, the number of individuals balancing work and family demands is higher today than ever before (Eagle, Icenogle, Maes & Miles 1998). In response to these competing demands, many industrialized nations have developed some set of work-family policies aimed at reducing work-family demands (Gornick and Meyers 2004). While these policies have been shown to encourage continuous maternal labor force participation (Gornick, Meyers and Ross 1997; Korpi 2000) in part by reducing work and family demands (Leira 1993; Orloff 1994; Sainsbury 1994), the relationship between work-family reconciliation policies and conflict between work and family is less clear.

Specifically, work-family reconciliation policies are assumed to reduce conflict between work and family in part by alleviating competing work and family demands. Indeed, Author A and B (forthcoming) document that mothers report less family-work conflict in countries with more expansive childcare policies (measured as an aggregated index). Similarly, Crompton and Lyonette (2006) find that individuals in Finland and Norway, two countries with expansive childcare policies, report less work-life conflict than those in France, Britain and Portugal. As these studies indicate, individual-level reports of work-family conflict are structured by one's family-responsive policy environment. However, these studies are limited in the following ways. Crompton and Lyonette (2006) identify a "societal effect" by which work-family conflict varies by country but the authors do not explicitly model multi-level effects. Author A and B (forthcoming) do model multi-level effects but apply an aggregated measure of the four childcare policies used in this study: family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and early

childhood education and care (ECEC) (source Gornick and Meyers 2003). They document a negative relationship between the aggregated policy index and mothers' family-to-work conflict but the aggregated measure masks important variation in policy effects. What is more, one of the policy components - family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and ECEC - may be driving these significant effects. Thus, the need to investigate a disaggregated childcare policy measure that tests for distinct effects for these four policy types is needed. Taken together, these studies indicate the need to explore work-family conflict in multi-level cross-national context.

This study addresses these limitations in the following ways. First, I analyze the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and the four strategically selected work-family reconciliation policies identified above: family leave, work hour scheduling, school scheduling, and ECEC. Work-family and family-work conflict are the extent to which experiences in the work or family domain affect one's role performance and experiences in the other domain (Bolger et al. 1989) and have been shown to be two distinct experiences that must be measured separately (Dilworth 2004; Ferrarini 2006; Grzywacz, Almeida and McDonald 2002; Frone 2003; Jacobs 2004; Hill 2005). Second, I run separate models for men and women to assess differences in the individual-level and country-level work-family and family-work conflict effects. Men and women experience conflict between work and family in significantly different ways (Doumas, Margolin and John 2003; Dilworth 2004; Hill 2005; Parasuraman and Greenhaus 2002; Wharton and Blair-Loy 2006), a relationship largely neglected in some previous research (Bernas and Major 2000; Barnett 1998).

To test for multi-level relationships, this study applies a unique data set that pairs individual-level data from the 2002 International Social Survey Programme with Gornick and Meyer's (2003) policy measures for family leave, work hour scheduling, school scheduling, and

ECEC. The data are analyzed using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to test for multi-level effects. The results highlight that work-family and family-work conflict are distinct experiences that affect men and women in different ways and are affected by specific public policies.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

The theoretical approaches to work-family conflict build on role theory. Role theory posits that adopting multiple roles can create strain (Goode 1960; Kahn et al. 1964). This inter-role strain, or when the demands of one role are incompatible with demands of the other, can result in conflict between work and family (Greenhaus and Buetell 1985). Building on role theory, researchers have theorized specific individual-level characteristics associated with inter-role strain. From this body of research, the job demands-resources (JD-R) perspective has been theorized and supported in previous research (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Schieman et al. 2009; Schieman and Young 2010; Voyandoff 2007). The JD-R perspective theorizes that work characteristics can be divided into two areas: resources and demands. Resources are characteristics that contribute to the emotional, physical and psychological well-being of a worker while demands are detrimental across these domains (Bakker et al. 2003; Bakker and Demerouti 2007). Indeed, several demand characteristics contribute to work-family conflict including work hours, job dissatisfaction and job stress (Bowen 1998; Eagle et al. 1998; Williams and Alliger 1994).

However, the relationship between job resources and work-family conflict is less theoretically clear. For example, many resources including job autonomy and social support at work are negatively associated with work-family conflict (Schieman et al. 2009). By contrast, other job resources including being a supervisor and flexible scheduling are associated with more work-family conflict (Maume and Houston 2001; Voyandoff 2007). In response to these

contradictory findings, the stress of higher status hypothesis is offered as a complimentary explanation. According to this hypothesis, positions with more resources can also be those with higher status that require employees to demonstrate their commitment to the job in part by giving primacy to work responsibilities over those of the family (Blair-Loy 2003). In this respect, some work related resources like flexible scheduling can weaken the boundaries between work and family life and contribute to conflict between these domains (Schieman, Whitestone, and Van Gundy 2006; Schieman et al. 2009). This study speaks directly to these relationships.

While the JD-R and stress of higher status hypothesis explain the relationship between work characteristics and work-family conflict, previous research has applied the ecological systems perspective to explain the relationship between family characteristics and work-family conflict. This perspective identifies work and family microsystems that affect one another through permeable boundaries (Voydanoff 2002). Thus, characteristics in both domains can influence each other to create work-family and family-work conflict (Hill 2005). In this respect, the ecological systems perspective theorizes role permeability in both directions but not a detailed understanding of how home characteristics affect conflict between work and family. Thus, a more detailed theorization of effects is warranted.

Specifically, the JD-R theory could be extended to explain home characteristics as the home demands-resources (HD-R) perspective. Consistent with the JD-R perspective, home demands are factors that are detrimental to one's psychological, emotional and physical well-being and resources contribute to well-being in these areas. Home demands would include housework hours, being divorced, the presence of young children, family stress and dissatisfaction, and other factors that contribute to strain in the home. Indeed, previous research has documented that housework increases home demands that can contribute to work and family

stress (Coltrane 2000) and that home dissatisfaction and stress contribute to work and family conflict (Greenhaus and Buetell 1985; Williams and Alliger 1994). Home resources could include outsourcing housework and childcare to the market through housecleaners, nannies, and take-out food as well as having a spouse that is more egalitarian and contributes a larger share of the housework.

This study offers the HD-R perspective as a complimentary theoretical framework to the JD-R perspective. However, as this is the first study to theorize a HD-R perspective, many of the resources measures described above are absent from the data. Specifically, the ISSP does not collect detailed measures on the types, frequency and quantity of outsourcing for housework and childcare. What is more, the ISSP asks questions about the allocation of housework to a third party (which includes relatives) only for married or cohabiting respondents. Given that restricting the sample to married or cohabiting respondents would reduce the sample size by 40%, these measures are not included in the analyses. However, the ISSP does collect detailed data on home demands which include: the respondent's housework hours, marital status, home stress and dissatisfaction and the presence of children in the home. Thus, this study includes these measures as home demands.

THEORIZING WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT IN THE MACRO-CONTEXT

This study expands this individual-level research to a cross-national sample and includes country-level indicators of work-family reconciliation policies. I expect work-family reconciliation policies to be associated with less conflict between work and family for all workers as more expansive policies indicate a more family-responsive welfare state. This environment, while aimed at parents, may have beneficial spillover to all workers managing work and life demands. Thus, family-responsive welfare policies may have ameliorating effects on nonparents

work-family and family-work conflict. The models test for this effect. I also expect family-responsive welfare policies to play an essential role in explaining parents' conflict between work and family. The specific hypotheses for parents are outlined in more detail below.

Family leave is expected to reduce both work-family and family-work conflict for parents as they have more time to care for a young child when the family demands are greatest. Parents of young children in countries with expansive family leave policies should have more resources and flexibility to make their childcare decisions, which should reduce family-work and work-family conflict. By contrast, parents of young children in countries with limited family leave either return to work after childbirth, reduce their work hours to care for their children, or quit their job (Gornick and Meyers 2004). For those who do remain in the labor force in countries with limited family leave, balancing work and family demands is largely an individual responsibility. Working mothers may experience the most difficulty managing dual work and family roles as they are disproportionately responsible for childcare (Coltrane 2000) and are more likely to report that job demands interfere with job performance (Keene and Reynolds 2005). By contrast, mothers report more work-family balance when fathers are more involved in childcare (Fagan and Press 2008) which may be facilitated by more expansive family leave benefits. Thus, more expansive family leave benefits are expected to be negatively correlated with family-work and work-family conflict for parents of young children.

More expansive school schedules that have children enter school at younger ages and attend school for more days and for longer hours may be either positively or negatively correlated with family-work and work-family conflict. Requiring children to be in school at younger ages, for longer hours and for more weeks may be negatively associated with family-work and work-family conflict as the school system frees up parents' time for employment

(Gornick and Heron 2006), which may be especially valuable for mothers who remain disproportionately responsible for the childcare. On the other hand, some countries value long work hours as an indicator of hard work and diligence (Lee 2004; Gornick and Heron 2006) and legislating longer school schedules may be an indicator of this cultural value. Thus, legislating longer school schedules may be an indicator of a longer work hours for everyone, which may be positively correlated with both family-work and work-family conflict. These relationships are further explored in subsequent analyses.

Work scheduling, or limiting work hours and providing more vacation time, should also reduce family-work and work-family conflict. Having more discretionary time may be negatively correlated with family-work and work-family conflict as parents have greater flexibility in managing competing work and family demands (Gornick and Heron 2006; Epstein and Kalleberg 2006). Indeed, Higgins, Duxbury and Johnson (2000) find part-time work to be associated with less work-family conflict for professional and hourly female workers. What is more, Kossek, Lautsch and Eaton (2006) demonstrate that mothers who use policies report lower levels of depression. In this respect, access to policies that limit work hours has important consequences for workers managing work and family boundaries (Kossek and Friede 2006). Also, legislating shorter work schedules allows fathers to reduce their labor force participation to levels more equal to mothers', thus permitting a more equal division of unpaid work (Fagnini and Letablier 2004). Indeed, greater job flexibility at the individual-level is negatively associated with family-work conflict (Keene and Reynolds 2005) and positively associated with mothers' reports of work-life balance (Fagan and Press 2008), a relationship which may extend to work scheduling policy as well. Thus, limiting work scheduling may reduce family-work and work-family conflict for both parents.

The presence of ECEC that provides longer hours of care for children of younger ages should be negatively associated with family-work and work-family conflict. Parents living in countries where ECEC is reliable and widely available should report less family-work and work-family conflict as the burden of securing quality childcare is alleviated. The presence of more expansive ECEC may be especially beneficial to mothers who are disproportionately responsible for childcare (Coltrane 2000) as the state assumes partial responsibility for this care. By contrast, parents in countries with limited ECEC are more likely to have to find their own childcare that may be both expensive and unreliable, two factors which are likely to increase conflict between work and family. Thus, more expansive ECEC is expected to be negatively correlated with family-work and work-family conflict.

While more expansive work-family reconciliation policies are assumed to be beneficial, it is important to note that these policies can have broader negative impacts. For example, Berger and Waldfogel (2004) find that more expansive family leave erodes women's market skills and ultimately contributes to gender inequality in labor force participation. Similarly, Morgan and Zippel (2003) find that longer paid childcare leaves reinforce traditional divisions of care in the home and have negative consequences on women's long-term earnings and employment patterns. Finally, Misra, Budig, and Moller (2007) show that single mothers experience the highest levels of poverty in welfare states that support women's care work over market work. These studies demonstrate that work and family policies are not always family-friendly nor do they always encourage equality. The results of this study should be interpreted within this broader context.

DATA

The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is an annual cross-national collaboration of survey organizations in selected developed countries that surveys individuals on a range of topics. The 2002 ISSP module includes measures of family and changing gender roles including measures of family-work and work-family conflict. This individual-level data were merged with indices constructed from Gornick and Meyers' (2003) policy measures (family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling and ECEC) for the 10 countries included in both data sets. These countries include: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United States. Respondents were included if they are at least 18 years old and currently working.¹ The effective sample size is 7,895 respondents.

Measures

Work-Family and Family-Work conflict

Work-family and family-work are measured separately. Work-family conflict is the mean of the following measures: (1) I have come home from work too tired to do the chores which need to be done; (2) It has been difficult for me to fulfill my family responsibilities because of the amount of time I spent on my job ($\alpha=0.69$). Family-work conflict is the mean of responses to the following questions: (1) I have arrived at work too tired to function well because of the household work I had done; and (2) I have found it difficult to concentrate at work because of my family responsibilities ($\alpha=0.66$). Responses are on a four-point scale of the frequency the respondent experienced these situations in the past three months (never, once or twice, several times a month, or several times a week). Higher scores represent greater family-

¹Although limiting the sample to only respondents who are currently working and have children would be valuable, the sample size of working parents is too small to analyze at multiple levels.

work and work-family conflict. Respondents missing data on any of the conflict measures were excluded from the sample.

Policy measures: family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and ECEC

The policy indices for family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and ECEC are from Gornick and Meyers' (2003) data. The authors compile measures from a range of data sources and compute three indices for policies that affect families with children under six, with children six or older and with children of all ages. The final index is a compilation of the previous two. This summed index has been applied to previous work-family conflict research (Author A and B forthcoming). However, with the exception of a few countries, the ordering of countries from high to low on these three measures is by and large equivalent. Thus, the three policy measures do not necessarily illustrate significant policy variation in work-family reconciliation resources. By contrast, the separate policy components of these indices (family leave, school scheduling, work scheduling, ECEC) demonstrate substantial variation in the types of policies that countries offer. For example, Belgium offers expansive work scheduling policies but limited family leave. The United Kingdom offers limited family leave but relatively expansive work and school scheduling policies. Thus, the separate measures provide important insight into their relationship to family-work and work-family conflict.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Family leave is an index of the number of weeks of full pay available to mothers, the presence of paternity leave dichotomously coded, a gender equality/incentives for fathers scale, paid leave offered after a child's third birthday, paid sick leave dichotomously coded, and expenditures on leave (in U.S. dollars). The family leave measures were weighted and coded to be consistent with Gornick and Meyers' (2003) equations so that higher values represent more

extensive family leave. The measures were summed and then divided by the highest summed value. Thus, the country that offers the most extensive family leave policies of the entire sample has a value of 1.0 and higher values represent more extensive family leave.

School scheduling is an index of four measures: the starting age of compulsory education, the hours per day of instruction, the days per year of school, and the presence of after-school care (categorically coded). Similar to family leave, the measures were coded according to the Gornick and Meyers' (2003) equations so that higher values represent longer school scheduling. The measures were summed and then divided by the highest summed value so that the maximum score is 1.0 and higher values represent more extensive school scheduling.

The working schedule index includes: the number of normal weekly work hours and normal vacation time in days. The measures were coded according to the Gornick and Meyers' (2003) equations so that higher values represent more extensive work scheduling. The measures were summed and then divided as stated above.

Finally, ECEC is an index of ten measures: guaranteed childcare slot for children 0 to 2, enrollment of children under 1 in public childcare, enrollment of children 1 to 2 in public childcare, cost to government of children aged 1 to 2 in public childcare, enrollment of children 3-5 in public childcare, cost to government of children 3 to 5 in public childcare, hours of childcare for ages 3 to 5, enrollment of children at age 6 in public childcare, quality of childcare, and tax relief for children in childcare. The measures were coded according to the Gornick and Meyers' (2003) equations so that higher values represent more extensive care. The measures were summed and then divided by the highest summed value with higher values representing more extensive ECEC.

Individual-Level Measures

Job Resources

Supervisor status is dichotomously coded (1=supervisor, 0=not supervisor) based on the question, “In your main job, do you supervise anyone or are you directly responsible for the work of other people?” Education is divided into having a college degree or not, based on respondents’ reports of the highest degree they completed. Given the cross-national nature of the data, measuring education as completing a college degree provides the greatest consistency in the measure across countries. Respondents reported their earnings for the past year. Since earnings are recorded in each country’s currency, earnings are transformed into z-scores, relative to each country’s distribution, for both sexes combined.

Job Demands

Respondents reported how many hours they work in a normal week; those reporting zero work hours are excluded from the sample. Job pressure is measured on a five-point scale with higher values representing stronger agreement to the following statement: “There are so many things to do at work, I often run out of time before I get them all done.” Job stress is on a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree with higher values representing greater job stress. Job dissatisfaction is on a seven-point scale from completely satisfied to completely dissatisfied, with higher values representing greater dissatisfaction.

Family Demands

Housework hours are the respondents’ average number of housework hours per week, excluding childcare hours. Respondents reported the number of children in the household under the age of 6 years old and aged 6 to 17 years old, which are dichotomously coded into dummy variables: child under 6 present, and child 6 to 17 present. Home pressure is measured on a five-point scale with higher values representing stronger agreement to the following statement:

“There are so many things to do at home, I often run out of time before I get them all done.”

Home stress is measured on a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree with higher values representing greater home stress. Family-life dissatisfaction is on a seven-point scale from completely satisfied to completely dissatisfied, with higher values representing greater dissatisfaction. Home pressure, home stress and home dissatisfaction are on the same scales as job pressure, job stress and job dissatisfaction.

Controls

The gender egalitarianism index is composed of six items: (1) A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works; (2) All in all, family life suffers when the woman has a full-time job; (3) A job is alright, but what most women really want is a home and children; (4) Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay; (5) Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person (reverse coded); (6) A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family. Responses are on a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree and were averaged into an index. Those missing data on two or more questions were excluded and the Cronbach's alpha is 0.74 with higher values representing more egalitarian attitudes. Age is also controlled for in the models.

ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

To address the multi-level relationships between work-family reconciliation policies and individual level work-family and family-work conflict, I use hierarchical linear models (Bryk and Raudenbush 2002). I first have an empty model to test whether work-family and family-work conflict varies cross-nationally. I then test for relationships between individual-level characteristics and work-family and family-work conflict for men and women. Finally, I include

cross-level interactions to test for significant relationships between the policy measures and work-family and family-work conflict for men and women and for parents of young children.

The equation at the individual level is:

$$(1) Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_{1j} + \sum \beta_{kj} X_{ij} + r_{ij}$$

Where Y_{ij} equals the reported work-family and family-work conflict for respondent i in country j and β_0 is the individual-level intercept and β_{1j} measures the effect of a preschooler on women's/men's work-family or family-work conflict across all countries. X_{ij} reflects the respondent's individual-level attributes, and β_{kj} is the effect of these attributes on work-family or family-work conflict; r_{ij} is the level-1 error term, which is assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of zero.

The complete country-level equation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0j} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(FL_j) + \gamma_{02}(WS_j) + \gamma_{03}(SS_j) + \gamma_{04}(ECEC_j) + u_{0j} \\ (2) \beta_{1j} &= \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(FL_j) + \gamma_{12}(WS_j) + \gamma_{13}(SS_j) + \gamma_{14}(ECEC_j) \\ \beta_{kj} &= \gamma_k \end{aligned}$$

From this equation, γ_{00} is the average level of perceived work-family and family-work conflict across all countries for respondents with mean characteristics and zeros on the dichotomous measures. In other words, the intercept can be interpreted as the mean conflict for a man or woman who has no child, is married, has no college degree, is not a supervisor, and is average on all other individual-level characteristics. FL_j is the effect of this family leave; WS_j is the effect of work scheduling; SS_j the effect of school scheduling and $ECEC_j$ the effect of early childhood education and care in country j on work-family or family-work conflict (β_{0j}). The error

term at the policy level is u_{0j} . The first line of this equation tests the hypothesis that living in a more family-responsive country will be associated with less work-family or family-work conflict for respondents *without* children.

The second line of the equation tests the hypothesis that family-responsive policies ameliorate family-work or work-family conflict for parents of young children. As such, the equation introduces these policy measures to help explain variance in this measure. The models are estimated with fixed effects and thus the error term is not included in the model.² In all of the models, the individual-level variables are centered at their grand means with the exception of the dichotomous individual-level variables.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the individual-level results for men and women's family-work and work-family conflict. Model 1 is the empty model that tests whether family-work and work-family conflict varies by country. Across all of the models, the intercept is significant indicating that family-work and work-family conflict reports do vary by country for men and women. Model 2 introduces the individual-level characteristics. For job resources, having a college degree is associated with more family-work conflict for men and work-family conflict for women. Also, being a supervisor is associated with more work-family conflict for both men and women. This supports the stress of higher status hypothesis that argues positions with more resources can encourage individuals to weaken the boundaries between work and family. The

² The country-level sample size is relatively small ($n=10$) which limits the estimation of the variance components. Specifically, including the error term partitions the variance across countries *and* policy environments. Thus, including the error term in creates an oversaturated model that wipes out the significant policy effects. Estimating the models with fixed effects (error term is dropped) tests whether parents are significantly different than nonparents for the entire sample (not varying by country) and whether this effect varies by policy environment. Estimating these as fixed effects reflect a limitation of the data. Specifically, collecting the rich country-level data included in this study is a challenge as the data is incomplete for many of the world's countries. Thus, complete data across a range of family-responsive policy measures is only collected for a handful of countries. For HLM models, the small sample size at level-2 poses some limitations in estimating the variance. For these reasons, the error term must be dropped. However, what is lost in sample size is gained in the detail of the policy measures applied here.

results of this study suggest that being in a supervisor position encourages workers to bring work home.

For women, all of the job demands are positively associated with work-family and family-work conflict. For men, job pressure and job dissatisfaction are positively associated with family-work conflict and weekly work hours, job stress and job dissatisfaction are positively associated with work-family conflict. The results suggest that women are more sensitive to job demands across both types of conflict. For home demands, housework hours, home stress, pressure and dissatisfaction and having a young child in the home are positively associated with family-work conflict for both men and women. Divorced women are also more vulnerable to family-work conflict than are married women suggesting that marriage ameliorates some of women's family demands. Family-work conflict does not vary by marital status for men demonstrating that divorce has pernicious effects for women but not men. For men and women, home pressure and dissatisfaction are positively associated with work-family conflict. Men's housework hours are negatively and women's home stress is positively associated with work-family conflict. The presence of a child in the home is not significantly associated with work-family conflict for men or women. In terms of controls, holding a more egalitarian gender role ideology and being older are negatively associated with family-work and work-family conflict for men and women. The results largely support the JD-R, stress of higher status and home demands theories and demonstrate that work-family and family-work conflict are experienced in different ways for men and women.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Table 3 presents the multi-level results for men's work-family and family-work conflict. The individual-level results are consistent with Table 2 and thus are not presented. Also, all of

the models control for the country-level effects at the intercept to test the hypothesis that living in a family-responsive policy environment benefits working men without children. Counter to expectations, none of these policy measures are significant at the intercept and thus are not presented. What is more, having a young child in the home is not significantly associated with men's work-family conflict. While the country-level results for fathers of young children are presented in Table 3, none of the coefficients are significant and thus are not discussed.

Consistent with expectations, fathers of young children do report more family-work conflict. The cross-level effects test the hypothesis that family-responsive policies are negatively associated with this conflict. Model 1 introduces the family leave measure which is not significant. Model 2 adds the school scheduling measure which is not significant. Model 3 introduces the work scheduling measure which is not significant but the negative relationship between family leave and family-work conflict becomes significant. This suggests that this effect is net of variation in work scheduling. Model 4 is the complete country-level model that includes ECEC which is not significant. However, the negative relationship between family-work conflict and family leave remains robust net of all the family-responsive measures. In other words, fathers report less family-work conflict in countries with more expansive family leave, net of other family-responsive benefits.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Table 4 provides the country-level results for women's family-work and work-family conflict. Consistent with the model for men, all of the models include the country-level measures at the intercept - only the significant coefficients are presented. Also, the individual-level results are consistent with Table 2 and thus are not presented. In terms of family-work conflict, mothers of young children report more family-work conflict than do women without children and, as

indicated by model 1, family leave is negatively associated with family-work conflict for these mothers. Model 2 introduces the school scheduling measure which is not significant but the negative coefficient for family leave remains significant and negative. Model 3 adds work scheduling and model 4 ECEC neither of which are significantly associated with mother's family-work conflict. However, across all models, mothers in countries with more expansive family leave report less family-work conflict. Thus, consistent with the results for men, living in a country with more expansive family leave policies benefits parents in terms of family-work conflict. Counter to expectations, however, more expansive family-responsive policies have no effect on family-work conflict for women without children (at the intercept).

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

The results for women's work-family conflict provide a more complicated relationship between policy and conflict. As for men, mothers of young children did not report significantly different work-family conflict net of individual-level controls. However, the inclusion of country-level measures demonstrates diverging relationships at the intercept and for mothers of young children. Model 1 includes the family leave measure which is not significant. Model 2 adds the school scheduling measure which is significant at the intercept but not for mothers of young children. Specifically, women in countries with more expansive school scheduling report *more* work-family conflict. As hypothesized, longer school schedules may reflect a greater cultural emphasis on long work hours which may result in greater work-family conflict. The results of this study support this hypothesis. Model 3 introduces the work scheduling measure which is not significant. However, net of work schedule, the negative coefficient for having a young child in the home and family leave become significant; the positive coefficient for school schedule remains significant at the intercept. This suggests that the negative relationship between

family leave and mothers' work-family conflict is explained, in part, by the positive yet non-significant effect of work scheduling.

Model 4 introduces the ECEC measure which is positive but not significant. With the inclusion of this measure, the negative coefficient for school scheduling becomes significant. Net of all policy controls, school scheduling remains positive and significant at the intercept and the negative coefficient for having a young child in the home and family leave remain significant. In other words, net of other level-two measures, longer school scheduling has a significant positive relationship on work-family conflict for women without children but a significant negative relationship on work-family conflict for mothers of young children. This relationship could be explained in the following ways. One mechanism relates to women's employment patterns. Women are most likely to work as teachers, especially elementary school teachers and in after-school care, and thus, expanding school scheduling may benefit mothers of young children at the expense of women who are working these jobs. However, school scheduling is not correlated with the work hours of the female teachers and childcare providers but the sample of this population is extremely small (3.2%). A second mechanism relates to cultural values of work. Longer school scheduling may be an indicator of a country's overall emphasis on longer work hours. Indeed, women's work hours are positively correlated with school scheduling (0.027 $p < 0.010$) and with individual work hours more generally (0.042 $p < 0.001$). These results suggest that women in countries with longer school schedules work longer hours, which likely contributes to work-family conflict.

DISCUSSION

In their work, Kelly et al. (2008) argue for the importance of multi-level research on work-family conflict. This paper is one step in this direction. Using a unique multi-level data set

for ten countries, I test for the relationship between individual work-family and family-work conflict and four public policy indicators: family leave, work scheduling, school scheduling, and ECEC. The results of this study are valuable in the following ways. First, the results point to important individual-level characteristics associated with work-family and family-work conflict, illustrating who is most vulnerable to conflict between work and family. Second, the results demonstrate important differences in individual-level and public policy effects for men and women.

The results largely support the JD-R, stress of higher status and HD-R theories. Consistent with JD-R predictions, all of the job demands are positively associated with women's work-family conflict reports. What is more, these demands are also positively associated with their family-work conflict reports suggesting that women are especially vulnerable to conflict between these domains. The JD-R theory is also largely supported for men as most of the job demands are positively associated with their work-family and family-work conflict reports. The job resource results lend support to the stress of higher status hypothesis. Specifically, although considered a resource, being a supervisor is positively associated with men and women's work-family conflict indicating that workers in these supervisorial positions are more likely to bring work home. This study also presented the HD-R theory as a complimentary theory for the JD-R perspective. Indeed, the demands component of the HD-R theory is empirically supported in this research. Living in a home with greater demands is associated with more work-family and family-work conflict for men and women. What is more, many of the effects for these measures are consistent for men and women including the positive relationship for home pressure and dissatisfaction and work-family and family-work conflict. The results suggest that home demands affect men and women's work-family and family-work conflict in similar ways.

The results also point to important differences in family-work and work-family conflict for men and women. Women appear to be more sensitive to stress as home stress is positively associated with work-family conflict and job stress with family-work conflict—these relationships are not significant for men. Women also appear to experience a greater penalty for entering the male “sphere” of work than men who enter the female “sphere” of the home. Women’s work hours are positively correlated with family-work conflict, net of housework hours, but men’s housework hours are negatively correlated with work-family conflict, net of work hours. In other words, men who make greater housework contributions benefit in that they report less work-family conflict. By contrast, women who make a greater market contribution are penalized in that they report more family-work conflict. These results suggest that women who expand their roles into market labor experience greater family-work conflict.

The level-two results depict the importance of specific policy indicators and family-work and work-family conflict. One of the most striking findings is that longer school schedules are positively associated with work-family conflict for women without children yet are negatively correlated with mothers’ work-family conflict. As discussed above, further exploration of the correlation among these measures indicates that respondents in countries with longer school schedules, measured through school hours and days, also report longer work hours. This suggests that the school schedule measure is a proxy for a greater cultural emphasis on longer work hours as an indicator of industriousness (Lee 2004; Gornick and Heron 2006). The diverging effects for mothers of young children and women without children suggest that school scheduling plays a distinct role for these populations. It may be that mothers of young children reduce their labor force hours upon the birth of a child in countries where long hours are valued and thus report less work-family conflict associated with this reduction. Or, longer school scheduling may provide

mothers with a work-family conflict benefit above and beyond any reductions in labor force hours. Modeling these relationships is beyond the scope of this paper but future longitudinal studies should sort through these effects.

The multi-level results demonstrate that more expansive family leave plays a central role in structuring work-family and family-work conflict for parents of young children. The family leave variable included in this study is an expansive measure of a range of benefits. Specifically, the index includes the duration of paternity leave, gender incentives for fathers' participation, paid leave after a child's third birthday and paid sick leave. In this respect, the family leave indicates an expansive approach to supporting parents across a variety of experiences and for an extended period of time. The results of this study demonstrate that this policy is effective in structuring parents' conflict between work and family. Specifically, more expansive family leave is associated with lower reports of family-work conflict for mothers and fathers of young children, the targeted population for these policy offerings. What is more, family leave policies are also negatively associated with mothers' work-family conflict suggesting that these policies benefit mothers more expansively.

These results could be explained in multiple ways. First, access to family leave policies may provide both parents with greater resources to accommodate family demands. For example, mothers report more family-work conflict which may be exacerbated when children are sick (Dilworth 2004). Having access to sick leave during this time allows mothers to stay home with the child which may reduce her family-work conflict. These benefits may extend to fathers who may be equally likely to stay at home when family demands are high or may report less family-work conflict because this burden is alleviated by their wives. Reducing family-work conflict may directly affect work-family conflict as well. Specifically, by reducing family-work conflict,

parents are less frequently interrupted at work by family demands and may be more focused and productive during the workday which may reduce the likelihood that they will bring work home (work-family conflict). In this respect, family policy may play an indirect as well as direct role in alleviating parents' work-family conflict. Ultimately, the results demonstrate that family leave policies play a central role in explaining parents' conflict between work and family. Taken together, the results of this study suggest that expanding family leave may benefit parents of young children in terms of conflict between work and family. What is more, less conflict may result in broader benefits to the health and well-being of this population.

This research, however, is not without limitations. A major limitation of this study, as with most cross-national research, relates to equivalence of the policy measures included in this study. The public policies included in this study are treated as equivalent across countries. However, public policies may vary in their effectiveness and use by country. Indeed, Crompton and Lyonette (2006) find that even though France has expansive childcare policies, French respondents report relatively high work-family conflict demonstrating the contradictions of this country case. In this respect, a more detailed analysis of specific countries might identify important variation to these country-level findings. A second limitation relates to the countries included in this study. This research draws on data from 10 nations, all of which are western nations. Thus, the results may not be generalizable to a broader population and future research would benefit from a more expansive sampling of countries and policies. What is more, the small sample size at the country-level presents important methodological limitations for the HLM models. Specifically, the variance for parents of young children was estimated as a fixed rather than random effect in the models due to limitations in the country-level sample size. While the application of Gornick and Meyers (2003) policy indices provide a rich and detailed country-

level measure, this posed important limitations to the data analysis. Future research should expand this model to include a wider range of countries and should focus on specific policy and widely available policy measures to broaden the sample. Finally, since this study applies cross-sectional data, I cannot provide concrete policy recommendations. Longitudinal data that models reports of work-family and family-work conflict and policy over time would provide concrete evidence of the effectiveness of these policies.

While this study has limitations, the results demonstrate that policy measures at the country-level structure conflict reports at the individual-level. Specifically, family leave plays an important role in explaining parents' conflict between work and family. Future research in this area should explicitly focus on this policy measure.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T.D. (2001) Family-supportive Work Environments: The role of Organizational Perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-420.
- Arthur, M. M. & Cook, A. (2004). Taking Stock of Work-Family Initiatives: How Announcements of “Work-family reconciliation policies” human Resource Decisions affect Share-Holder Value. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 57, 599-613.
- Arthur, M.M. (2003). Share Price Reactions to Work-Family Initiatives: An Institutional Perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 166-191.
- Bakker, A B. and Demerouti, E. (2007) “The Job-Demands-Resources Model: State of the Art.” *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 22:309-28.
- Bakker, AB. and Geurts, S. (2004) “Toward a Dual-Process Model of Work Home Interference.” *Work and Occupations* 31:345-66.
- Barnett, R. and Marshal, N. (1992) Worker and Mother Roles, Spillover Effects, and Psychological Distress, *Women Health* 18:9-40.
- Barnett, R.C. (1998). Toward a Review and Reconceptualization of the Work-family Literature. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 124, 125-182.
- Barnett, R.C., & Hyde, J.S. (2001). Women, Men, Work, and Family: An Expansionist Theory. *American Psychologist*, 56, 781-796.
- Barnett, R.C., Gareis, K.C., & Brennan, R.T. (1999) Fit as a Mediator of the Relationship between Work Hours and Burnout, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(4), 307-317.
- Barnett, R.C., Gareis, K.C., & Brennan, R.T. (1999) Fit as a Mediator of the Relationship between Work Hours and Burnout, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(4), 307-317.
- Baxter, J. (1997) Gender Equality and Participation in Housework: A Cross-National Perspective, *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 28: 220-247.
- Berger, L. and Waldfogel, J. (2004) Maternity Leave and the Employment of New Mothers in the United States. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17, 1432-1475.
- Berk, S. 1985. The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Bernas, K. H. & Major, D. (2000). Contributors to Stress Resistance: Testing a Model of Women’s Work-Family Conflict. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24 (2), 170-178.

- Blair-Loy, M. (2003) *Competing Devotions: Career and Family Among Women Executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowen, G. (1998) Effects of Leader Support in the Work Unit on the Relationship Between Work Spillover and Family Adaptation, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 19:25-52.
- Boyar S.L., Maertz, C.P., Pearson, A.W. (2005) The effects of Work-Family Conflict and Family Work Conflict on Non-Attendance Behaviours, *Journal of Business Research*, 58(7), 919-925.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the Family as a Context for Human Development: Research Perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 723-742.
- Clifton, T.J. & Shepard, E. (2004). Work and Family Programs and Productivity: Estimates Applying a Production Function Model. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25, 714-728.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- Coltrane, S. (2000) Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work, *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1208- 1233.
- Crompton, R. and Lyonette, C. (2006) "Work-Life 'Balance' in Europe. *Acta Sociologica* 49:379-393.
- Dilworth, J. (2004). Predictors of Negative Spillover from Family to Work. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 241-261.
- Doumas, D., Margolin, G., and John, R. (2003). The Relationship between Daily Marital Interaction, Work and Health-Promoting Behaviors in Dual-Earner Couples. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 3-20.
- Eagle, B., Icenogle, M., Maes, J. and Miles, E. (1998) "The Importance of Employee Demographic Profiles for Understanding Experiences of Work-Family Interrole Conflicts", *Journal of Social Psychology* 138:690-709.
- Fagan, J. and Press, J. (2008). Father Influences on Employed Mothers' Work-Life Balance. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 1136-1160.
- Fagnani, J. and Letablier, M.T. (2004). Work and family life Balance: The Impact of the 35-Hour Laws in France. *Work, Employment, and Society*, 10(3), 551-572.
- Feree, M. (1990). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and Family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52: 866-884.

- Ferrarini, T. (2006) Families, States and Labour Markets: Institutions, Causes and Consequences of Family Policy in Post-War Welfare States. Northhampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Friedman, S. D., Christensen, P., & De Groot J. (1998) Work and Life: The end of the Zero-Sum Game, *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 119-129.
- Frone, M. R. (2003) Work-family balance, in J.C. Quick and L. E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M.R., Russel, M. and Cooper, L.M. (2000). Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict: Testing a Model of the Work-Family Interface, in N. Sastry and S. Pandey (Eds.) *Women Employees and Human Resource Management*. (pp. 133-161). New Delhi, India: Orient Longman.
- Frone, M.R., Russel, M. and Cooper, M.L (1997). Relation of Work-Family Conflict to Health Outcomes: A Four-Year Longitudinal Study of Employed Parents. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 70(4), 325-335.
- Goode, W.J. (1960). A Theory of Role Strain. *American Sociological review*, 25, 483-496.
- Gornick, J. & Heron, A. (2006). The Regulation of Working Time as Work-Family Reconciliation Policy: Comparing Europe, Japan, and the United States. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 8(2), 149-166.
- Gornick, J. & Meyers, M. (2004). More Alike than Different: Revisiting the Long-Term Prospects for Developing “European-Style” Work-family Policies in the United States. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 6(3), 251-273.
- Gornick, J. and Meyers, M. (2003). *Families that Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Gornick, J., Meyers, M. and Ross, K. (1997) Supporting the Employment of Mothers: Policy Variation across Fourteen Welfare States, *Journal of European Social Policy* 7:45-70.
- Greenhaus, J. and Beutell, N. (1985) Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles, *The Academy of Management Review* 10:76-88.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Powell, G.N. (2006). When Work and Family are Allies: A Theory of Work-Family Enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72-92.
- Grzywacz, J., Almeida, D. and McDonald. D. (2002) Work-Family Spillover and Daily Reports of Work and Family Stress in the Adult Labor Force, *Family Relations* 51:28–36.

- Hammer, L.B., Allen, E., & Grisby, T.D. (1997). Work-family conflict in Dual-Earner Couples: Within-Individual and Crossover Effects of Work and Family. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 50, 185-203.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L and Johnson, K. (2000). Part-Time Work for Women: Does it Really Help Balance Work and Family? *Human Resources Management*, 39, 17-32.
- Hill, E. J., Martinson, V., Hawkins, A., & Ferris, M. (2003). Studying “Working Fathers”: Comparing Fathers’ and Mothers’ Work-Family Conflict, Fit, and Adaptive Strategies in a Global High-Tech Company. *Fathering*, 1, 239-261.
- Hill, E.J. (2005) “Work-family Facilitation and Conflict. Working Fathers and Mothers, Work-Family Stressors and Support”, *Journal of Family Issues* 26: 793 -819.
- Jacobs, J. (2004) *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, P.R., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Keene, J. And Reynolds, J. (2005). Gender Differences in Negative Family-to-Work Spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 275-299.
- Kelly, E., Kossek, E., Hammer, L., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K., Murphy, L., & Kaskubar, D. (2008). Getting There from Here: Research on the Effects of Work-Family Initiatives on Work-Family Conflict and Business Outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 305-349.
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of inequality: Gender, class, and patterns of inequalities in different types of welfare states, *Social Politics*, 7, 127-191.
- Kosset, E., Lautsch, B. and Eaton, S. (2006). Telecommuting, Control and Boundary Management: Correlates of Policy use and Practice, Job Control and Work-Family Effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68: 347-367.
- Kosset, E and Freide, A. (2006). The Business Case: Managerial Perspectives on Work and Family. In Pitt-Catsoupes, M., Kossek, E. E., Sweet, S. Editors. 2006. *The Handbook of Work-Family: Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives, Methods, and Approaches*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (LEA) Press. Foreword by Rosabeth Moss Kanter
- Lee, S. (2004). Working-hour gaps: Trends and Issues, in : J. Messenger (ed) *Working Time and Workers’ Preferences in Industrialised Countries: Finding Balance*. Routledge: London, pp 29-59.
- Leira, A. (2002) *Working Parents and the Welfare State: Family Change and Policy Reform in Scandinavia*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

- Major, V.S., Klein, K.S. and Ehrhart, M.G. (2002) Work Time, Work Interference with Family and Psychological Distress, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87:427-436.
- Maume, D. and Houston, P. (2001) Job Segregation and Gender Differences in Work-Family Spillover Among White-Collar Workers, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 22:171-189.
- Misra, J., Budig, M., and Moller, S. (2007) Reconciliation policies and the effects of motherhood on employment, earnings and poverty, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 9:2, 135-155.
- Moen, P., & Sweet, S. (2002) Two careers, One Employer: Couples Working for the Same Corporation, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61 (3), 466-483.
- Morgan, K. and Zippel, K. (2003) Paid to Care: The Origins and Effects of Care Leave Policies in Western Europe, *Social Politics* 10:49-85.
- Orloff, A. (1993) Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States, *American Sociological Review* 58:303-328
- Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J.H. (2002). Toward reducing Some Critical Gaps in Work-Family Research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 299-312.
- Perkins, H. W. & DeMeis, D. (1996). Gender and Family Effects of the "second-shift" domestic activity of college-educated young adults. *Gender and Society*, 10(1), 78-93.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Blum, T. C. (2000). Work-Family Human Resource Bundles and Perceive Organizational Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1107-1117.
- Pittman, J. F. (1994) Work-family Fit as a Mediator of Work Factor on Marital Tension: Evidence from the Interface of Greedy Institutions, *Human Relations*, 467(2), 183-209.
- Raudenbush, S. & Bryk, A (2002). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Application and Data Analysis Methods*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosenfeld, R. 1996. Women's Work Histories. *Population and Development Review* 22:199-222.
- Sainsbury, D. (1994) *Gendering Welfare States*. New York, NY: Sage Publishing.
- Sanchez, L. & Thomson, E. (1997). Becoming mothers and fathers: parenthood, gender and the division of labor. *Gender and Society*, 11(6), 747-772.
- Schieman, S., Branch McBrier, D., and Van Gundy, K. (2003) "Home-to-Work Conflict, Work Qualities, and Emotional Distress." *Sociological Forum* 18: 137-64.

Schieman, S., Kurashina Whitestone, Y. and Van Gundy, K. (2006) "The Nature of Work and the Stress of Higher Status." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 47:242-57.

Schieman, S., Glavin, P. and Milkie, M. (2009) "When Work Interferes with Life: Work-Nonwork Interference and the Influence of Work-Related Demands and Resources." *American Sociological Review* 74: 966-88.

Stavrou, E. T. (2005) Flexible Work Bundles and Organizational Competitiveness: A Cross-National Study of the European Work Context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 923-947.

Stevens, D., Minnotte, K., Mannon, S. and Kiger, G. (2007). Examining the "Neglected Side of the Work-Family Interface": Antecedents of Positive and Negative Family-to-Work Spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 242-262.

Stevens, D., Kiger, G. and Riley, P. (2006) His, Hers, or Ours? Work-to-Family Spillover, Crossover, and Family Cohesion, *The Social Science Journal* 43:425-436.

Thompson, Anne and Niall Bolger. 1999. Emotional Transmissions in Couples Under Stress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:38-48.

Voydanoff, P. (2007) *Work, Family, and Community: Exploring Interconnections*. Mahwah, NJ. Routledge Publishing.

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict: Direct and Indirect Relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 837-868.

Voydanoff, P. (2002). Linkages between the Work-Family Interface and Work, Family, and Individual Outcomes: An Integrative Model. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(1), 138-164.

Williams, K. and Alliger, G. (1994) Role Stressors, Mood Spillover, and Perceptions of Work-Family Conflict in Employed Parents, *The Academy of Management Journal* 37:837-868.

Wharton, A., and Blair-Loy, M. (2006). Long Work Hours and Family Life: A Cross-National Study of Employees' Concerns. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 415-436.

Table 1. Family-Friendly Policy Measures by Country (Computed from Gornick and Meyers 2003)

	Family Leave	School Scheduling	Work Scheduling	ECEC
Belgium	0.29	0.89	0.75	0.97
Denmark	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00
Finland	0.83	0.85	0.88	0.93
France	0.52	0.85	0.96	0.96
Germany	0.56	0.89	0.80	0.86
Netherlands	0.10	0.91	0.82	0.89
Norway	1.00	0.84	0.84	0.92
Sweden	0.77	0.94	0.94	0.95
UK	0.10	0.88	0.80	0.86
US	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.83

Table 2. Hierarchical Linear Model Results for Individual-Level Measures for Men (n=3779) and Women (n=4116) (2002 ISSP)

	Men				Women			
	Family-Work		Work-Family		Family-Work		Work-Family	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Intercept	1.325 ***	1.302 ***	2.217 ***	2.176 ***	1.374 ***	1.334 ***	2.239 ***	2.208 ***
Job Resources								
Supervisor	---	-0.002	---	0.068 **	---	0.021	---	0.095 ***
College Degree	---	0.054 **	---	0.018	---	0.013	---	0.103 ***
Earnings	---	0.000	---	0.000	---	0.000	---	0.000
Job Demands								
Weekly Work Hours	---	0.001	---	0.007 ***	---	0.002 **	---	0.010 ***
Job Pressure	---	0.051 ***	---	0.182	---	0.046 ***	---	0.134 ***
Job Stress	---	0.013	---	0.125 ***	---	0.017 *	---	0.112 ***
Job Dissatisfaction	---	0.054 ***	---	0.068 ***	---	0.068 ***	---	0.090 ***
Home Demands								
Housework Hours	---	0.006 ***	---	-0.005 *	---	0.002 *	---	0.000
Home Pressure	---	0.069 ***	---	0.150 ***	---	0.068 ***	---	0.172 ***
Home Stress	---	0.057 ***	---	0.002	---	0.058 ***	---	0.041 ***
Home Dissatisfaction	---	0.062 ***	---	0.084 ***	---	0.075 ***	---	0.089 ***
Divorced	---	0.039	---	0.001	---	0.097 ***	---	0.057
Single	---	-0.027	---	-0.044	---	-0.027	---	0.014
Child under 6	---	0.063 **	---	0.034	---	0.132 ***	---	-0.057
Child 6 to 17	---	0.014	---	0.038	---	0.030	---	-0.039
Individual Characteristics								
Gender Egalitarianism	---	-0.074 ***	---	-0.071 ***	---	-0.090 ***	---	-0.086 ***
Age	---	-0.002 *	---	-0.006 ***	---	-0.002 **	---	-0.004 ***
Variance Components								
Level-1 Variance (σ^2)	0.25	0.212	0.718	0.519	0.292	0.235	0.670	0.454
Intercept (τ_{00})	0.008 ***	0.005 ***	0.007 ***	0.002 **	0.012 ***	0.003	0.008 ***	0.004 ***

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001

Note: Models control for level-2 effects on intercept in all level-2 models. These level-2 results are not significant and thus not presented in

Table 4. Hierarchical Linear Model Results for Policy Indicators for Women (2002 ISSP)

	Family-Work				Work-Family			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.333 ***	1.333 ***	1.333 ***	1.333 ***	2.208 ***	2.207 ***	2.207 ***	2.207 ***
School Scheduling	---	---	---	---	---	1.062 **	1.236 *	0.998 *
CROSS-LEVEL EFFECTS								
Child under 6	0.139 ***	0.141 ***	0.143 ***	0.157 ***	-0.052	-0.055	-0.063 *	-0.074 *
Child under 6 x Family Leave	-0.242 ***	-0.247 ***	-0.222 **	-0.169 *	-0.165	-0.149	-0.260 **	-0.281 **
Child under 6 x School Scheduling	---	0.349	0.425	0.638	---	-0.698	-1.056	-1.163 *
Child under 6 x Work Scheduling	---	---	-0.056	0.021	---	---	0.263	0.203
Child under 6 x ECEC	---	---	---	-6.247	---	---	---	3.755
Variance Components								
Level-1 Variance (σ^2)	0.235	0.235	0.235	0.235	0.454	0.454	0.454	0.454
Intercept (τ_{00})	0.004 ***	0.004 ***	0.004 ***	0.004 ***	0.004 ***	0.004 ***	0.005 ***	0.004 ***

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001

Note: Models control for level-2 effects on intercept in all level-2 models. These level-2 results are not significant and thus not presented in models.

Table 3. Hierarchical Linear Model Results for Policy Indicators Men (2002 ISSP)

	Family-Work				Work-Family			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.302 ***	1.302 ***	1.302 ***	1.302 ***	2.176 ***	2.176 ***	2.177 ***	2.177 ***
CROSS-LEVEL EFFECTS								
Child under 6	0.067 **	0.067 ***	0.064 ***	0.059 **	0.041	0.042	0.039	0.033
Child under 6 x Family Leave	-0.068	-0.070	-0.151 *	-0.194 **	-0.052	-0.058	-0.152	-0.200
Child under 6 x School Scheduling	---	0.301	-0.046	-0.260	---	0.880	0.474	0.219
Child under 6 x Work Scheduling	---	---	0.216	0.171	---	---	0.251	0.201
Child under 6 x ECEC	---	---	---	4.645	---	---	---	5.426
Variance Components								
Level-1 Variance (σ^2)	0.212	0.212	0.212	0.212	0.519	0.519	0.519	0.519
Intercept (τ_{00})	0.004 ***	0.005 ***	0.005 ***	0.005 ***	0.002 **	0.002 **	0.002 **	0.001 *

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001

Note: Models control for level-2 effects on intercept in all level-2 models. These level-2 results are not significant and thus not presented in models.

Appendix 1. Descriptive Statistics for Level-1 Variables (2002 ISSP)

	Mean or %	SD
LEVEL-1 MEASURES		
Work-Family Spillover	2.240	0.84
Family-Work Spillover	1.360	0.53
Work Characteristics		
Weekly Work Hours	38.25	12.00
Supervisor	34%	
Employed Government	29%	
Employed Industry	59%	
Self-Employed	10%	
Job Stress	3.35	1.17
Job Dissatisfaction	2.82	1.09
Home / Family Characteristics		
Housework Hours	9.43	6.92
Home Stress	2.53	1.07
Home Dissatisfaction	2.46	1.04
Married	60%	
Divorced	11%	
Single	29%	
Child under 6	17%	
Child 6 to 17	34%	
Individual Characteristics		
Gender Egalitarianism	3.52	0.75
Age	40.81	11.47
College Degree	24%	
Female	52%	
Earnings	0.014	
N=7,895

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Ruppanner, L

Title:

Conflict Between Work and Family: An Investigation of Four Policy Measures

Date:

2013-01-01

Citation:

Ruppanner, L. (2013). Conflict Between Work and Family: An Investigation of Four Policy Measures. SOCIAL INDICATORS RESEARCH, 110 (1), pp.327-347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9933-3>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/283196>