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CHAPTER 10

The work-family interface

Erin Kramer Holmes a , Clare R. Thomas a , Richard J. Petts b , and E. Jeffrey Hill a

a School of Family Life, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, United States
b Department of Sociology, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, United States

In this chapter, we focus our attention on the work–family interface. We ground our discussion in an ecological systems framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hill & Holmes, 2018; Voydanoff, 2002). Within this framework, we address three other related theories of the work–family interface: boundary theory, role theory, and gender theory. We then introduce the literature on the work–family interface and focus our attention on the experiences of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, work-to-family and family-to-work spillover and crossover, workplace flexibility, parental leave policies, and day-care arrangements. We highlight these theories and experiences because they represent defining features of the work–family interface within the United States (Hill & Holmes, 2018; Holmes, Baumgartner, Marks, Palkovitz, & Nesteruk, 2010) and globally (Behson, Holmes, Hill, & Robbins, 2018; Shockley, French, & Yu, 2018). We close with a brief conclusion summarizing our review. Though we have tried to emphasize research in multiple countries and regions, more research has focused on developed countries such as those found in Australia, North America, and Western Europe than in Africa, Asia, and South America. We recognize that cultural characteristics imbedded in different regions and countries moderate dimensions of the work–family interface, and we invite our readers to consider how their own cultural practices and assumptions shape their research regarding the work–family interface as they ponder this chapter (see House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2018).

Ecological systems framework

Though researchers use several prominent theories to study the work–family interface, we focus on an ecological systems framework because of its interdisciplinary breadth. We also introduce boundary theory, role theory, and
gender theories that are often embedded in ecological systems exploring the work-family interface (see also Hill & Holmes, 2018).

According to Bronfenbrenner (1986) individuals develop within the context of several environmental systems: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. In Voydanoff’s (2002) application of this theory, work and family are microsystems, which interact in unique ways based on the larger cultural context (or macrosystem) in which microsystems occur. Interactions between work and family are identified as the mesosystem. In this theoretical context, features of family life may influence the relationship between work and family characteristics, work-family conflict, and work and family outcomes in diverse ways based on the macrosystem in which each is embedded, such as the extent of industrialization or development in a given country (Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco, & Lau, 2003), or other cultural dimensions such as institutional collectivism, future orientation, power distance, etc. (House et al., 2004; Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2018). Attention to cultural dimensions also requires us to acknowledge that the type of work one does differs by context. For example, while workplace flexibility is a well-studied support, the type of work (e.g., childcare, farming, retail, food services, manual labor, etc.) may make flexibility options less likely, or may alter the nature of the options available to the worker.

This framework also proposes links between work, family, and child development. Adults’ work environments and the family are each part of systems affecting children’s development (Holmes, Holladay, Hill, & Yorgason, 2018). This perspective suggests that adults’ work—an exosystem—affects child development through its influence on family processes, such as spillover between work and family and its effect on parent-child relationship quality (Bumpus, Crouter, & McHale, 2006; St. George & Fletcher, 2011), or parent-child interactions in other contexts such as school (Holmes et al., 2018). The exosystem also exists in diverse macrosystemic contexts. Thus, the cultural systems of childcare may include grandparents caring for grandchildren (Jappens & Van Bavel, 2012), or other issues in adult development such as caring for aging parents (Hill, Erickson, Fellows, Martinengo, & Allen, 2014).

Boundary theory
As stated above, processes that occur within the home, workplace, and other overlapping systems occur within a broader socioeconomic context called a macrosystem. This macrosystem encompasses any group whose members “share resources, hazards, lifestyles, opportunity structures, life course options, and patterns of social interchange” (Bronfenbrenner, 1993, p. 23).
Boundary theory enhances our understanding of the interplay between macrosystems and other ecological systems by acknowledging that boundaries between a person’s family roles and roles in the workplace are often situated within this broader macrosystem context (Clark, 2000). These boundaries include location, time, and psychological presence (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000).

In general, the more permeable the boundary between work and family, the greater the integration of roles. Conversely, the less permeable the boundary, the greater the segmentation of roles. The degree to which the boundary between family and workplaces is permeable is a key point of analysis with boundary theory. For example, when the physical boundary between work and family is very permeable (e.g., working in one’s family room while the children play nearby in the same room), there is greater potential for work-family conflict.

**Role theory**

To further enhance the understanding of the work–family interface, scholars may combine ecological systems theory with role theory. Role theory posits two perspectives relevant to the work–family interface: role strain and role enhancement (Barnett & Gareis, 2006b). On the one hand, role strain suggests that individuals experience conflict and stress as they try to meet the demands of multiple roles (Goode, 1960). The larger the number of roles, the more intense the conflict that exists. From this role strain perspective, time and energy spent fulfilling the duties of one role reduce time and energy available for other roles; stressors associated with one role negatively impact performance in other roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

On the other hand, role enhancement proposes that participation in one role brings about rewards and privileges that enhance performance in other roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Marks, 1977; Voydanoff, 2002). Being an employee and being a parent both require significant amounts of time and energy. It is important to understand the relationship between these competing roles; whether it is one of conflict or enhancement; and how it affects home life, including family relationships (Buehler, O’Brien, & Walls, 2011).

**Gender theories**

For many years, conversations about gender difference in the work–family interface were focused primarily on biological sex differences (Livingston, 2018). Key theorizing about gender in psychology, sociology, and family studies expanded these theoretical models (e.g., Clark, Rudolph, Zhdanova, Michel, & Baltes, 2017; Pedulla & Thébaud, 2015). Now many theories
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acknowledge that gender is socially constructed (West & Zimmerman, 1987), and that social constructions of gender include gender role ideologies (e.g., traditional vs egalitarian), traits (e.g., masculine vs feminine vs androgynous), social expectations, and social norms (Holmes et al., 2010; Livingston, 2018). As such, gender becomes another core feature of an ecosystemic approach to studying the work-family interface. Based on the permeability of boundaries and roles (as discussed above), gender expectations and norms at home and at work will likely intersect, contributing to a complex system of expectations for individuals in their roles as parents, spouses, employees, and coworkers.

Gender ideologies and attitudes are impacted by a number of processes at the national level including the average educational levels in the country (Judge & Livingston, 2008), the gender ideologies of individuals within the country (Sjöberg, 2010), and the extent to which egalitarian behaviors exist between men and women within a given country (Grove, 2005). For example, countries with a higher education level per individual (on average) are likely to have more culturally egalitarian attitudes. With this in mind, some scholarly attention has focused on assessing national-level views of gender in families and workplaces (Grove, 2005; Hofstede, 1983; House et al., 2004) and has also focused on household structure and income inequality between the sexes (World Economic Forum, 2013). At these national levels, gender views have differential impact on wage gaps (Fortin, 2005; Weichselbaumer & Winter-Ebmer, 2005).

We offer one caution to our readers: while gender theories have expanded our view away from biological sex differences alone, we also acknowledge that biological sex still informs features of the work-family interface. For example, biological aspects of pregnancy, childbirth, and breastfeeding intersect with cultural expectations and norms about who will care for children, when parents will return to work after having a child, etc. In our sections on parental leave and day care, we discuss ways these issues may differentially impact men and women.

In summary, understanding and conceptualizing gender requires acknowledging the complexity of social constructions of gender and the realities of biology as features of the work-family interface at individual, family, and national levels (Livingston, 2018).

Research on work-family interface

With these theoretical models in place, we begin our review of the literature. Our review explores work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, work-to-family and family-to-work spillover and crossover, workplace
flexibility, parental leave policies, and day-care arrangements. We end with
an exploration of gender as a core feature of the work-family interface.
Throughout, we highlight cross-cultural findings when possible to ac-
knowledge that the work-family interface is a global phenomenon; we also
address cross-cultural differences acknowledging that culture is an import-
ant moderator of associations between work and family.

What is the work family interface?
The work-family interface is a broad concept referring to the myriad ways
families and workplaces intersect. Scholars make the key assumption that
work and family influence one another in mutual and bidirectional ways,
flowing from work to family and from family to work (see, e.g., Frone,
Yardley, & Markel, 1997). These processes can be negative or positive, either
inhibiting or facilitating processes between and within the two spheres of
work and family. Finally, the way these spheres impact each other has impli-
cations for parenting (e.g., Behson et al., 2018; Holmes et al., 2010; Petts &
Knoester, 2018), child development (e.g., Bumpus et al., 2006; Holmes et al.,
2018; St. George & Fletcher, 2011), romantic relationships (e.g., Amstad,
Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011; McAllister, Thornock, Hammond,
Holmes, & Hill, 2012), individual well-being (e.g., Holmes, Erickson, &
Hill, 2012; Petts, 2018), and capacity to care for extended family members
such as aging parents (e.g., Hill et al., 2014).

Work-to-family and family-to-work conflict
Conflict has been historically defined as “a form of inter-role conflict in
which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutu-
ally incompatible so that participation in one role [such as family] is made
more difficult by participation in another role [such as work]” (Greenhaus
& Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Conflict between work and family is viewed as
bidirectional. Thus, any conversation about conflict in the work-family in-
terface includes both work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work
conflict (FWC). WFC and FWC are two of the most frequently studied
features of the work-family interface (see also Hill & Holmes, 2018).

Reports from the National Study of the Changing Workforce suggest that
work-family conflict increased among men and women in the United States
over the past 30 years (Aumann, Galinsky, & Matos, 2011; Kelly et al., 2014).
One report suggested that 70% of employees’ experience conflict between
their work and nonwork lives (Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009). The rise
in WFC may be due to the ideal worker schema (Moen & Roehling, 2005).
The ideal worker schema assumes that employees must be highly committed full-time workers whose work demands are set by the employer’s needs (Moen & Roehling, 2005). Individuals who meet this ideal worker schema are assumed to be the best employees; those who deserve wage increases and work promotions. As one may imagine, demographic shifts in the labor market and in the family may collide with the ideal worker schema to create increases in WFC and FWC. For example, in the US women’s labor force participation increased—particularly among women with infants and small children (Toossi & Morisi, 2017)—at the same time that men have increased their desire to be warmer, more nurturing, and more actively involved parents than men in prior generations (Kuo, Volling, & Gonzalez, 2017). Shifting expectations for parents in their family roles have collided with both mothers’ and fathers’ expectations to conform to the ideal worker schema. This produces tension for both mothers and fathers between the potentially competing demands of being an ideal employee and being an actively involved parent (Blair-Loy, 2003; Holmes et al., 2010). Interestingly, parents are not the only individuals feeling these tensions. WFC is increasing among single adults in the United States (Schieman et al., 2009).

Four of the most commonly studied predictors of WFC are work hours (Buehler & O’Brien, 2011; Byron, 2005; Ng & Feldman, 2008), workload (Jin, Ford, & Chen, 2013; Schieman & Young, 2015), schedule flexibility (Poelmans & Chenoy, 2008; see below section for a fuller accounting of flexibility), and workplace support from supervisors and colleagues (Allen, 2001; Frone et al., 1997; Kelly et al., 2014; Kossek & Michel, 2011). Most research supports the claim that longer work hours (Byron, 2005; Ng & Feldman, 2008), and heavier workloads (Hill, Martinson, & Ferris, 2004; Jin et al., 2013; Schieman & Young, 2015), increase WFC and FWC (Ng & Feldman, 2008). Most research also supports the claim that schedule flexibility, and workplace support, reduce WFC (Allen & Shockley, 2009; Byron, 2005; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006).

Cultural and social norms influence the values, beliefs, and roles associated with WFC and FWC (Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000). Some have wondered how the differing conception of time between western and Asian countries may yield differences in the experience of WFC and FWC, respectively. These comparisons yield mixed findings with some detecting no difference in WFC or FWC (Jin et al., 2013; O’Brien, Del Pino, Yoo, Cinnamon, & Han, 2014), others finding significantly higher FWC in Asian societies (Hassan, Dollard, & Winefield, 2010; Lu, Gilmour, Kao, & Huang, 2006), and still others discovering lower WFC in Asia.
The work-family interface

(Hassan et al., 2010; Masuda et al., 2012). Luk and Shaffer (2005) found evidence that time commitment and work role expectations increased WFC, and parental demands increased FWC in Hong Kong.

A recent metaanalysis tried to sort out these mixed findings, and the authors concluded that there were few significant mean differences in the experiences of WFC and FWC cross-culturally (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2015). Their metaanalysis further clarified that significant differences resulted from gender inequality (e.g., higher FWC in countries with more inequality), and from being in a more collectivistic rather than individualistic culture. For example, employees from Confucian Asian countries (e.g., China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) report more FWC compared to those in Anglo countries (e.g., Australia, United Kingdom, and United States), but findings regarding WFC are less conclusive (Shockley et al., 2018).

**Work-to-family and family-to-work spillover and crossover**

Like WFC and FWC, spillover and crossover between work and family are mutual, bidirectional, potentially negative, or potentially positive (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Spillover and crossover represent:

“processes whereby stress, strain, or other emotions (positive or negative) are carried over within and across individuals and domains. Spillover is the within-person transmission of experiences and/or emotions, from work to home or from home to work, or the same individual. Crossover is an interpersonal process that occurs when job stress, psychological strain, or other emotions experienced by one person affect the level of strain or outcomes experience by another person in the same social environment” (Brough & Westman, 2018, p. 630).

Discussions of boundaries and roles become critical to assessing the correlates of work-to-family and family-to-work spillover and crossover. Boundary theories help scholars theorize about how the permeability, flexibility, and strength of boundaries between home and work can contribute to within person spillover and between persons crossover (Clark, 2000; Lourel, Ford, Gamassou, Guégen, & Hartmann, 2009). Below we distinguish between the research findings focused on negative and positive spillover, and negative and positive crossover. Role theories help scholars consider how performing one role well may enhance one’s mood or one’s sense of efficacy in one domain (either work or family), and through permeable boundaries may spillover into one’s personal sense of efficacy in the roles one fills in another domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). One’s mood or efficacy may also crossover, impacting relationships with coworkers, supervisors, children, or romantic partners (Brough & Westman, 2018).
**Negative spillover**

WFC and negative work-family spillover are closely related with the main difference being that work-family conflict is more focused on roles, while spillover emphasizes an individual’s emotions (Cho & Tay, 2016). In affective spillover models, an individual’s negative moods and experiences in one domain are assumed to impact their performance in another domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000) and may influence one’s perceptions of subsequent events, fueling the negative emotional response across domains (Judge & Ilies, 2004; Rusting & DeHart, 2000). For example, a bad experience at work may make a mother feel discouraged, and her discouraged affect may make it more challenging for her to feel positive when she comes home for dinner. The more negative emotions she experiences across domains, the more likely these multiple negative experiences are to reinforce her bad mood. Because moods may fluctuate within and across days, some scholars have explored the transmission of negative spillover across days using daily diaries (Heller & Watson, 2005; Sonnentag & Binnewies, 2013). These studies have confirmed that spillover can occur within the same day and across days, and have explored how trying to regulate emotions in one domain may make it more difficult to continue to regulate similar emotions in another (Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998).

Cultural ideas about the expression (Mesquita & Delvaux, 2012) and the interpretation of emotion (Chun, Moos, & Cronkite, 2006) also play a role in negative spillover, though considerably more work needs to be conducted to better understand cultural attitudes about emotional expression. For example, in comparisons between Asian Americans and European Americans, researchers found that it was more difficult and potentially more maladaptive for European Americans to suppress their emotions than for Asian Americans or East Asians to do so (Mauss & Butler, 2010; Soto, Perez, Kim, Lee, & Minnick, 2011).

Negative spillover becomes an important part of the work-family interface because it is correlated with depression and anxiety (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003), physical health (Grzywacz, 2000), FWC (Rotondo & Kincaid, 2008), general life stress (Lourel et al., 2009), job satisfaction (Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009), and family relationships (Matias et al., 2017). While spillover from work to family and family to work is assumed to be bidirectional, more work continues to be done to better understand how these processes mutually impact one another in families and workplaces across cultural contexts.
Positive spillover

Although a great deal of research in the work-family realm focuses on work-family conflict and negative spillover, some positive spillover from work-to-family and family-to-work also exists. According to Edwards and Rothbard (2000), positive work-to-family spillover has been viewed as “work satisfaction that enhances family functioning,” while family-to-work spillover is considered something that enhances work functioning. When the effects of the spillover are beneficial for the other domain, it is considered positive spillover, as opposed to negative (Cho & Tay, 2016; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Whether the spillover is positive or negative, it is focused on the relationship between work satisfaction and family (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), as opposed to role conflict. The concept of spillover acknowledges that family and work are intricately connected and can either be at odds or support one another. While negative spillover explains the effects of the domains being at odds, positive spillover shows the benefits of each domain supporting the other.

When the domains of family and work support each other, both domains benefit. For example, positive work-family spillover is associated with greater life satisfaction (Cho & Tay, 2016), improved work attitudes (Kirchmeyer, 1992), and commitment (Orthner & Pittman, 1986). Thus, both domains improve when the spillover is positive, resulting in decreased psychological distress and greater family satisfaction (Haar & Bardoel, 2008).

Positive spillover is associated with individual personality (Polatci & Akdoğan, 2014) mood (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), older age (Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002), and work and family environments. When flexibility and support (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) as well as improved resources (Hakanen, Peeters, & Perhoniemi, 2011) are available in work and families, the spillover is positively associated in both directions and enhances well-being. Because almost no family can escape the obligation to work, and many individuals who work also have families, understanding the interplay between both domains is essential for each one to function properly and benefit each other.

Positive and negative crossover

As noted above, spillover and crossover are related but distinct constructs. Our search of the literature suggests that crossover is less studied than spillover, thus we combine our review of positive and negative crossover effects into one section.
Processes whereby intrapersonal crossover occurs can be complex. Crossover may occur as the result of hostile marital interactions (Westman, 2002; Westman & Etzion, 2005), a partner’s mental health (Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005), a partner’s positive affect (Hammer et al., 2005), a partner’s empathy (Liu & Cheung, 2015a), children’s misbehavior (Frone et al., 1997), or a partner’s WFC (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008). Crossover in these situations may result in either negative effects such as worsened depression and physical health for one’s partner (Shimazu, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2009), or positive effects such as happiness (Rodriguez-Muñoz, Sanz-Vergel, Demerouti, & Bakker, 2014) and marital satisfaction (Liu & Cheung, 2015b; Liu, Ngo, & Cheung, 2016). The effects of crossover appear to be significant and meaningful even after accounting for within-persons effects (Bakker et al., 2008; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Liu et al., 2016; Shimazu et al., 2009). More recent models are considering the importance of gender role ideology when sex differences are detected in crossover processes (Liu & Cheung, 2015a, 2015b; Liu et al., 2016; Westman, Vinokur, Hamilton, & Roziner, 2004) and are also considering how each partner impacts the other to produce crossover effects over time (Muller & Brough, 2017).

Finally, acknowledging spillover and crossover between families and workplaces across the globe is becoming more and more important as current demographic data shows that dual-earner couples with children represent the most common employment pattern in the OECD (2018), and in China (Ho, Chen, Cheung, Liu, & Worthington Jr., 2013). For example, between 50% and 66% of couples in Denmark, Finland, Israel, Poland, Portugal, and Slovenia both work full-time (OECD, 2018). Another 35% of couples in Austria, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands consist of one partner who works full time and another who works part-time.

**Influences on the work-family interface**

**Workplace flexibility**

Workplace flexibility is “the ability of workers to make choices influencing when, where, and for how long they engage in work-related tasks” (Hill et al., 2008, p. 152). Though its specific implementation may differ by industry, size of employer, wage group, age of the employee, and gender of employee, variations of workplace flexibility are ubiquitous (Galinsky, Sakai, & Wigton, 2011). Numerous studies reveal that workplace flexibility is generally associated with outcomes beneficial to individuals, families,
and employers (Hill & Holmes, 2018). In a metaanalysis comprised of 58 studies, Allen, Johnson, Kiburz, and Shockley (2013) found workplace flexibility was associated with lower work-to-family conflict, but unrelated to family-to-work conflict. In an international study including 75 countries (N = 24,436), Hill, Erickson, Holmes, and Ferris (2010) found that employees with workplace flexibility were able to work an average of 8 hours or more per week more before reporting work-family conflict than those without workplace flexibility. Though objectively beneficial, research also suggests that some employees choose not to use workplace flexibility, even when offered, out of fear of being stigmatized (Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013).

Workplace flexibility includes three basic domains: schedule flexibility (when work is done), location flexibility (where work is done), and reduced workload (for how long work is done). We will now briefly summarize some of the current research related to workplace flexibility in each of these three specific categories.

**Schedule flexibility**

Schedule flexibility permits employees to adapt their work schedules. Flextime allows workers to choose when they work from among a range of acceptable work hours (Coenen & Kok, 2014). In his metaanalysis, Byron (2005) revealed that flextime predicted lower work-to-family conflict and lower family-to-work conflict. Grzywacz, Carlson, and Shulkin (2008) found that flextime was associated with less stress and burnout for individuals and less work-family conflict for employees. Flextime was also associated with less negative work-family spillover and stress symptoms, especially among female workers, single parents, and/or employees with higher family workloads (Jang, Zippay, & Park, 2012).

Other research reveals that offering schedule flexibility may relate to positive outcomes for all employees involved, even those who do not use the flexibility (Hayman, 2009). An employee’s perceived flexibility predicted work-family fit even better than used flexibility (Brown & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2016; Clark et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2008). “Indeed, just the perception that the flexibility would be available when needed appears to be sufficient” (Jones et al., 2008, p. 781).

Another type of schedule flexibility is the compressed work-week, where the employee works 40 hours per week in fewer than 5 days. Common arrangements include four 10-hour days or three 12-hour days (with an extra day of work every other week). In a metaanalysis of 40 studies, utilization
of compressed work-week was associated with improved work-life balance (Bambr, Whitehead, Sowden, Akers, & Petticrew, 2008). Grzywacz et al. (2008) found that using a compressed work-week was related to less individual stress and burnout.

**Location flexibility**

Location flexibility is defined as working outside the conventional workplace and communicating through telecommunications or computer-based technology (Nilles, 1994). One way to offer flexibility to employees is to telecommute, or work remotely from their traditional places of employment (generally home), on a part-time or full-time basis (Coenen & Kok, 2014; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001). The empirical research generally supports the positive influence of telecommuting on individuals, families, and employers. In a metaanalysis of 46 empirical telecommuting studies, Gajendran and Harrison (2007) found that telecommuting was associated with higher perceived autonomy, lower work-family conflict, higher job performance, lower turnover intent, and less role stress. Golden (2006) discovered that telework was positively related to commitment and negatively related to turnover intentions, and that work exhaustion mediated these relationships. In a metaanalysis of 22 studies conducted by Martin and MacDonnell (2012), telework was shown to have a positive relationship to four organizational outcomes (productivity, employee retention, organizational commitment, and performance). Age was a significant moderator of the relationship between telecommuting and organizational commitment, with younger employees being more committed to organizations where telecommuting was an option. When examining gender differences, Clark et al. (2017) found that men specifically benefit from telecommuting, feeling a stronger commitment to their jobs and intention for longevity, and Kurowska (2018) discovered that men more easily balance work and family responsibilities while working from home.

There have been ambiguous results about whether or not telecommuting has a positive or negative influence on overall job satisfaction. However, recent studies indicate that telecommuting is positively associated with job satisfaction (Clark et al., 2017; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007; Golden & Veiga, 2005), but that this relationship may be curvilinear based on the number of hours worked virtually per week (Golden & Veiga, 2005). Such a finding may be due to the fact that employees who telecommute exclusively tend to have less positive relationships with coworkers (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007) and/or because it may limit their career advancement opportunities (McCloskey & Igbaria, 1998).
Reduced workload

Reduced workload involves working fewer hours and having fewer job responsibilities than what is typically expected for fulltime employment. There is increasing pressure for employers to allow employees to work part time in order to meet work and family demands (Barnett & Gareis, 2000). Historically, part-time jobs have been lower status jobs with less pay and fewer opportunities for advancement than full-time jobs (Barnett & Hall, 2001). However, more recently, many part-time workers have chosen (with the support of their employers) to remain in high-status, high-paid employment but work fewer hours per week (Hill et al., 2004). Because of the negative connotations of part-time employment, some prefer to label it reduced-hours employment (Barnett & Gareis, 2000).

Wadsworth and Facer (2016) discovered that employees working a 4/40 schedule (allowing employees to work 40 hours per week across 4 days) had lower levels of work-family conflict and greater productivity than those who do not work 4/40 schedules. Some research suggests that individual benefits of part-time work are associated with transition to parenthood. Part time work benefits both the mother and the father as they begin to raise children by allowing them more time with their children for enrichment activities or daily routines, improving the parent child relationship (Kim, 2018). Holmes et al. (2012) found that part-time work was the most common employment preference for mothers during the 3 years following childbirth. In a study of mothers with young children, Hill et al. (2004) compared those working full-time with those working regular part-time schedules. The regular part-time group reported significantly lower work-to-family interference, work-to-family strain, job travel, and unnecessary work, and greater work-family fit, job flexibility, and family success. A common perceived drawback is that working reduced-hours leads to reduced career opportunities—a so-called “Mommy track” (Hill et al., 2004). However, in a study of professionals and managers working in part-time positions, Lee and MacDermid (1998) found that 35% of the participants were actually promoted during the time of their study. Reduced work hours may benefit dual-earning families, allowing more time to care for responsibilities within the home (Schooreel & Verbruggen, 2016).

One final issue to consider regarding reduced workload is whether or not employers should use age-specific practices such as reduced work hours, additional leave, or early retirement benefits for those above age 50 (Bal & Jansen, 2016; Johnson, 2011). Theoretically, flexibility options in the workplace would be moderated by the age of the worker because
work-family demands change based on different constraints and opportunities that accompany age. Practically, however, less formal practices are being implemented (Matz-Costa & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2010). There is some evidence that reduced work hours for aging employees may benefit employers by reducing turnover, enhancing recruitment, and improving overall job performance in their organizations (Bal & Jansen, 2016), and that these changes represent the changing needs and capacities of aging employees. Unfortunately, it appears that regardless of the benefits, flexibility is used to attract applicants, but not always implemented based on applicants’ individual needs (Way et al., 2015).

Parental leave

Parental leave is a key policy that may help to facilitate work-family balance by allowing workers to take time off work after the birth of a child to be home and adjust to having a new child. In contrast to other work-family issues in which extensive research has been conducted in the United States, more is known about parental leave internationally than within the United States. This is due, at least in part, to the United States being one of only a handful of countries (the others are Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Suriname, and Tonga), and the only OECD country, that does not have a national paid parental leave policy (World Bank Group, 2018). The only national leave policy in the United States is the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), which provides eligible employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave following childbirth (Blum, Koslowski, Macht, & Moss, 2018). There is variation between states though, with six US states (California, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Work, and Washington) and Washington DC having passed and/or implemented paid parental leave policies (National Partnership for Women and Families, 2018). Due to the lack of statutory paid leave policies, US workers are often reliant on employers to provide paid parental leave, but only 16% of workers have access to paid family leave at their workplace (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018b).

In contrast to the United States in which access to paid parental leave is uncommon, paid maternity leave is available in the vast majority of countries throughout the world, and 42.5% of countries (94% of OECD countries) have policies that provide fathers access to either paid paternity leave or paid parental leave that can be shared by mothers and fathers (International Labour Organization, 2014; Raub et al., 2018; World Bank Group, 2018). Globally, the median length of paid maternity leave provided is 14 weeks,
matching the International Labour Organization (ILO) minimum standard for promoting gender equality, but well-paid parental leave benefits (i.e., wage replacement of at least 66%) extend as long as 24 months in some countries (Blum et al., 2018). The Nordic countries (Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden), in particular, have served as the model for parental leave policies. Policies in the Nordic countries provide 35–59 weeks of paid parental leave at 70%–100% wage replacement, and this time is divided into a reserved part for mothers, a reserved part for fathers, and time that may be shared between parents (Blum et al., 2018). Despite the widespread availability of paid parental leave, less than half of countries meet the ILO standard of providing well-paid parental leave (International Labour Organization, 2014; World Bank Group, 2018).

According to the ILO, providing paid parental leave is a fundamental human right and necessary to maintain work–family balance, particularly for women (International Labour Organization, 2014). Parental leave is believed to be beneficial to families for a number of reasons. First and foremost, parents are more likely to juggle multiple roles today as women’s labor force participation remains high. Consequently, the majority of parents (71% of mothers and 93% of fathers in the United States) work in paid employment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018a). Access to parental leave can help to alleviate role conflict by allowing parents to transition parenthood without having to also manage their roles as workers (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010).

Second, parental leave may help to promote maternal and child health. By allowing mothers to take time off to physically and mentally recover from pregnancy and childbirth, and fathers to take time off to help out at home, parental leave may reduce mothers’ stress, risk of depression, and other negative health outcomes (Chatterji & Markowitz, 2012; Petts, 2018; Staehelin, Bertea, & Stutz, 2007). Indeed, longer periods of maternity leave are associated with reduced stress and a lower risk of depression for mothers (Avendano, Berkman, Brugiavini, & Pasini, 2015; Chatterji & Markowitz, 2012; McGovern et al., 1997; Petts, 2018). There is also some evidence that paternity leave may be positively associated with mothers’ health outcomes (Bratberg & Naz, 2014; Redshaw & Henderson, 2013).

Parental leave may also promote child health and development. Spending time with young children is fundamental to child development; by providing time for parents to bond with their new child, parental leave may promote parental sensitivity and responsiveness and consequently encourage healthy child development (Waldfogel, 2006). Indeed, longer periods of parental leave are associated with greater engagement by both mothers and
fathers (Chatterji, Markowitz, & Brooks-Gunn, 2013; Clark, Shibley Hyde, Essex, & Klein, 1997; Huerta et al., 2014; Petts, 2018; Petts & Knoester, 2018). Greater access to parental leave is also associated with lower infant mortality, a reduced risk of low birth weight, higher immunization rates, and more frequent breastfeeding (Baker & Milligan, 2010; Hajizadeh, Heymann, Strumpf, Harper, & Nandi, 2015; Huang & Yang, 2015; Ruhm, 2000; Tanaka, 2005). There is also some evidence from Norway suggesting that greater access to parental leave has long-term consequences for children including higher academic performance and higher wages in adulthood (Carneiro, Løken, & Salvanes, 2015; Cools, Fiva, & Kirkeboen, 2015).

Parental leave may also help to prevent discrimination toward women and promote gender equality. Cultural norms emphasizing that women should be primarily responsible for children continue to persist, which leads women to be especially likely to take time off for childbirth (even if they do not have access to parental leave). Consequently, women experience a wage penalty due to motherhood and employers may also discriminate against women (Budig & England, 2001). Providing parental leave (with job protection) helps to protect women against this discrimination, and may also help to promote gender equality. Indeed, access to generous parental leave policies is associated with improved labor market outcomes for women such as increased labor market participation, higher-income, and a smaller motherhood wage penalty (Baum & Ruhm, 2016; Berger & Waldfogel, 2004; Budig, Misra, & Boeckmann, 2016; Rossin-Slater, Ruhm, & Waldfogel, 2013; Waldfogel, 1998). Furthermore, allowing both mothers and fathers to take time off for the birth of a child may help to facilitate gender equality by encouraging and enabling both parents to share in childcare tasks.

Indeed, fathers who take longer periods of paternity leave are more engaged in their child’s life and are also more likely to share in childcare and housework tasks than fathers who take shorter leaves or no leave at all (Almqvist & Duvander, 2014; Büning, 2011; Haas & Hwang, 2008; Huerta et al., 2014; Kotsadam & Finseraas, 2011; Nepomnyaschy & Waldfogel, 2007; Petts & Knoester, 2018; Pragg & Knoester, 2017). Employer support for working fathers, such as leave and flexibility, also supports better work-life balance for both men and their working spouses (Harrington, Van Deusen, Sabatini Fraone, Eddy, & Haas, 2014).

Finally, access to parental leave may also help to reduce socioeconomic inequality. Current parental leave policies both internationally and in the United States often have eligibility requirements that may limit access to
leave for workers who are socioeconomically disadvantaged (International Labour Organization, 2014; McKay, Mathieu, & Doucet, 2016; Petts, Knoester, & Li, 2018; World Bank Group, 2018). Low socioeconomic status workers are also often unable and/or unwilling to take unpaid leaves or leaves with low wage replacement due to income constraints, and this is particularly true for fathers (Harrington et al., 2014; Moss, Duvander, & Koslowski, 2019; O’Brien, 2009; Petts et al., 2018). Providing well-paid parental leave may particularly benefit more disadvantaged populations and help to reduce the disparities between high- and low-income workers. Indeed, more generous parental leave policies are associated with lower poverty rates and improved health particularly for disadvantaged populations (Lichtman-Sadot & Bell, 2017; Misra, Moller, Strader, & Wemlinger, 2012; Petts, 2018). Overall, evidence suggests that greater access to paid parental leave—and more generous parental leave policies—provides benefits to families that may enable them to more effectively balance their work and family lives.

Daycare arrangements

Global daycare practices

Laws and policies are strongly influenced by culture and values (Lewis, 2008; Lokteff & Piercy, 2012, pp. 104–105). Thus, childcare policies often reflect the values of the individual society. Our review of global daycare policies suggests that current daycare policies across the globe are lacking in accessibility and affordability (Szelewa & Polakowski, 2008). While global parental leave policies after childbirth have gained traction, less priority has been given to childcare after parental leave ends.

Countries across the world largely differ in their childcare access and policies (Davis & Powell, 2003; Fagnani, 2007; Szelewa & Polakowski, 2008). UNESCO and UNICEF have historically worked to increase child access to quality care and education in lower income countries and countries in socioeconomic transition (Rosenberg, 2004). However, countries like Uganda have not only struggled with policy implementation, but with tracking the actual needs of children in working families (Pence et al., 2004). Childcare and education is different in lower income countries because of the struggles inherent in rural, unskilled areas; they often rely less on government assistance and more on community programs (Leroy, Gadsden, & Guijarro, 2012), as well as families, and individuals within villages (Pence et al., 2004). In many low-income countries, families are less concerned with daycare policies and more concerned with whether or not their child will live to adulthood (Kinney et al., 2012).
Many higher-income countries have implemented policies supporting working parents and especially working mothers (Davis & Powell, 2003). For example, France and Germany have legally recognized the family as a key societal institution (Fagnani, 2007); and Finland has developed policies focused on the well-being of children and the importance of having women actively participate in the workforce (Lammi-Taskula, 2008). Japan is leading the world in their publicly funded childcare as well as specific policies for childcare and parental leave (Lambert, 2007), and the United Kingdom has revamped their policies to increase public expenditure specifically for childcare purposes (Lewis, 2008). This new global focus on childcare increases employment opportunities for parents, which many believe will result in better economic growth and improved quality care for children across the socioeconomic spectrum.

However, even with these policies, many individuals still do not have access to the formal childcare opportunities that they need. According to an Australian report, even when policies focus on increasing opportunities for single-parent families, many of these policies still fall short (Whiteford & Adema, 2007). Although Germany has recognized the family as a legal institution, it still maintains the view that children are best cared for in the home, which has resulted in a value system that limits childcare opportunities and reduces parents’ capacity to participate in the workforce and care well for their children (Fagnani, 2007).

Some countries continue to struggle to implement institutionalized childcare, most notably the United States (Davis & Powell, 2003), Korea (Won & Pascall, 2004), and Ireland (Murphy-Lawless, 2000). Although some employers offer childcare options (Bordone, Arpino, & Aassve, 2017), the lack of institutionalized polices harms low-income, single-parent families who cannot afford to pay out of pocket for care, and limits work opportunities. Without assistance for long-term childcare, many are forced to choose between employment and parenthood. For example, Korea has one of the lowest rates of state expenditures for childcare in the OECD (2001). As women’s workforce presence has increased, the average number of women bearing children has decreased (Won & Pascall, 2004). Mexico follows similar trends (Joplin et al., 2003).

Countries such as Australia, Sweden, and England have developed hybrid systems for childcare using privatized methods to meet demand for daycare (Brennan, Cass, Himmelweit, & Szebehely, 2012). Although this marketization can lead to improved quality in private childcare organizations (White & Friendly, 2012), the competitive nature of private childcare also increases
the cost of quality care sometimes reducing quality or limiting access for low-income children (Mahon, 2002). Whether countries institute strict government led policies, a hybrid of competitive private childcare, or no institutional childcare at all, most daycare systems have been inadequate for providing quality childcare to working families across socioeconomic levels.

**Daycare practices and the work-family interface**

When childcare is available, fathers and mothers are more likely to utilize it (Lammi-Taskula, 2008). Without policies in place, however, it is often more cost-effective for one parent to remain at home and care for the child(ren); based on societal values, that parent is often the mother (Barrientos & Kabeer, 2004; Whiteford & Adema, 2007). The lack of childcare policies often results in disadvantages for women in the workforce (Martin, 2007), or negative child development outcomes (Hughes-Belding, Hegland, Stein, Sideris, & Bryant, 2012). When workforce opportunities become limited because of lack of childcare, families are forced to acknowledge the limits of what they can accomplish in the constraints of the current workforce priorities and institutional availabilities (Lewis, 2008).

When institutional childcare policies are lacking and privatized care is too expensive, extended family members often take part in informal daycare arrangements for children. Grandparents in particular have begun to play a pivotal role in childcare (Arpino, Pronzato, & Tavares, 2014; Bordone et al., 2017; Da, 2003), with up to 50% of grandparents across Europe (Glaser et al., 2010) and the United States (Hank & Buber, 2009) providing childcare for relatives. In countries like India, broader family units including aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, and grandparents are all integral for helping raise children (Sharma & LeVine, 1998). However, as grandparents age, they can become less of a resource and more of a problem as adults struggle to manage both the care of their children and their parents. Many of these less structured childcare provisions are often based less on the quality of the childcare and more on the necessity of childcare (Hank & Buber, 2009). Although high-quality care can have lasting, positive effects on child cognitive development (Hughes-Belding et al., 2012), most countries either do not have the necessary childcare policies in place (Davis & Powell, 2003; Murphy-Lawless, 2000), or the policies are inadequate for the current demand (Fagnani, 2007; Szelewa & Polakowski, 2008; Whiteford & Adema, 2007).

Current researchers argue that quality childcare should be viewed as a human right (Davis & Powell, 2003). Childcare provides opportunities for steady economic growth (Barrientos & Kabeer, 2004; Whiteford & Adema, 2007),
and healthy child development. In our estimation, attention to childcare policies and practices can provide equal opportunities in the workforce for multiple family forms and across diverse socioeconomic lines.

**Conclusion**

Ecological systems theory alerts scholars to the complexity of the work–family interface, emphasizing that work and family have the potential to mutually influence one another, and that this influence exists across multiple levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Hill & Holmes, 2018; Voydanoff, 2002). Ecological systems theory further asserts that this influence exists in the larger context of cultural and social norms (Allen et al., 2015), permeable and impermeable boundaries (Clark, 2000), family and work roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), and gender roles, traits, and expectations (Livingston, 2018). We believe that understanding these multiple features of an ecological systems perspective will offer deeper insight into these complex processes between workplaces and families (Hill & Holmes, 2018).

Our review demonstrates that processes between work and family have important implications for individual mental and physical health (e.g., Hajizadeh et al., 2015; O’Brien et al., 2014), family relationships (e.g., Ho et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2016; Matias et al., 2017), children’s development (e.g., Holmes et al., 2018; Hughes-Belding et al., 2012), job satisfaction (e.g., Ilies et al., 2009; Masuda et al., 2012), organizational functioning (e.g., Clark et al., 2017), and economic growth (e.g., Whiteford & Adema, 2007). Much of this work is being tested cross-culturally, giving us a better understanding of how cultural attitudes and beliefs shape the work–family interface (e.g., Hofstede, 2001; Shockley et al., 2018). Finally, it is apparent from our review that single-parent families, low-income families, less educated families, families with young children, and families in countries or in workplaces with fewer resources (such as institutionalized leave and childcare practices) are at greater risk and deserve continued attention (e.g., Craig & Habgood, 2018). We hope this will contribute to the reduction of inequality around the globe.
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