2020-6

The work-family interface

Erin K. Holmes
Brigham Young University - Provo, erin_holmes@byu.edu

Clare R. Thomas
Brigham Young University - Provo

Richard J. Petts
Ball State University

E. Jeffrey Hill
Brigham Young University - Provo

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

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 acknowledge that the work-family interface is a global phenomenon; we also address cross-cultural differences acknowledging that culture is an important 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 implications 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 mutually 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 interface 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, Märtinson, & 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

(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 (Polatcia & 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 (Bambra, 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, & Kirkebøen, 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; Bünning, 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 USUnited 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 (Rosemberg, 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.

References

Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414–435. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774.

Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel Psychology, 66*(2), 345–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12012.

Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). Metaanalysis of work–family conflict mean differences: Does national context matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *90*, 90–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.07.006.

Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. (2009). Flexible work arrangements: Help or hype? In D. R. Crane & E. J. Hill (Eds.), *Handbook of families and work: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 265–284). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Almqvist, A., & Duvander, A. (2014). Changes in gender equality? Swedish fathers' parental leave, division of childcare and housework. *Journal of Family Studies*, *20*, 19–27. https://doi.org/10.5172/jfs.2014.20.1.19.

Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A metaanalysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(2), 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022170.

Arpino, B., Pronzato, C., & Tavares, L. (2014). The effect of grandparental support on mothers' labour market participation: An instrumental variable approach. *European Journal of Population*, *30*(4), 369–390. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-014-9319-8.

Aryee, S., Fields, D., & Luk, V. (1999). A cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Management*, *25*(4), 491–511. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500402.

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(3), 472–491. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315.

Aumann, K., Galinsky, E., & Matos, K. (2011). *The new male mystique*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Avendano, M., Berkman, L. F., Brugiavini, A., & Pasini, G. (2015). The long-run effect of maternity leave benefits on mental health: Evidence from European countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, *131*, 45–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.037.

Baker, M., & Milligan, L. (2010). Evidence from maternity leave expansions of the impact of maternal care on early child development. *The Journal of Human Resources*, *45*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.45.1.1.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Dollard, M. F. (2008). How job demands affect partners' experience of exhaustion: Integrating work-family conflict and crossover theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 901–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.901.

Bal, P. M., & Jansen, P. G. W. (2016). Workplace flexibility across the lifespan. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, *34*, 43–99. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120160000034009.

Bambra, C., Whitehead, M., Sowden, A., Akers, J., & Petticrew, M. (2008). "A hard day's night?" The effects of compressed working week interventions on the health and work-life balance of shift workers: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *62*(9), 764–777. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2007.067249.

Barnett, R., & Gareis, K. (2000). Reduced-hours employment. The relationship between difficulty of trade-offs and quality of life. *Work and Occupations*, *27*, 168–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888400027002003.

Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2006b). Role theory perspectives on work and family. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods, and approaches* (pp. 209–222). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Barnett, R. C., & Hall, D. T. (2001). How to use reduced hours to win the war for talent. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*, 192–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00024-9.

Barrientos, S., & Kabeer, N. (2004). Enhancing female employment in global production: Policy implications. *Global Social Policy*, *4*(2), 153–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468018104045107.

Baum, C. L., & Ruhm, C. J. (2016). The effects of paid family leave in California on labor market outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *35*, 333–356. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21894.

Behson, S. J., Holmes, E. K., Hill, E. J., & Robbins, N. L. (2018). Fatherhood. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface*. (pp. 614–628). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.03.

Berger, L. M., & Waldfogel, J. (2004). Maternity leave and the employment of new mothers in the United States. *Journal of Population Economics*, *17*, 331–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-003-0159-9.

Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 705–725. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00726.x.

Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Blum, S., Koslowski, A., Macht, A., & Moss, P. (2018). *International review of leave policies and research 2018*. Available at: http://www.leavenetwork.org/lp_and_r_reports/.

Bordone, V., Arpino, B., & Aassve, A. (2017). Patterns of grandparental child care across Europe: The role of the policy context and working mothers' need. *Ageing and Society*, *37*(4), 845–873. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X1600009X.

Bratberg, E., & Naz, G. (2014). Does paternity leave affect mothers' sickness absence? *European Sociological Review*, *30*, 500–511. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcu058.

Brennan, D., Cass, B., Himmelweit, S., & Szebehely, M. (2012). The marketisation of care: Rationales and consequences in Nordic and liberal care regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *22*(4), 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928712449772.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 723–742. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.6.723.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. H. Wozniak & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *The Jean Piaget symposium series. Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments* (pp. 3–44). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Brough, P., & Westman, M. (2018). Crossover, culture, and dual-earner couples. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 629–645). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.034.

Brown, M., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2016). A mediational model of workplace flexibility, work–family conflict, and perceived stress among caregivers of older adults. *Community, Work & Family*, *19*(4), 379–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2015.1034656.

Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, *66*, 204–225. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2017.37.56.

Budig, M. J., Misra, J., & Boeckmann, I. (2016). Work-family policy trade-offs for mothers? Unpacking the cross-national variation in motherhood earnings penalties. *Work and Occupations*, *43*, 119–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888415615385.

Buehler, C., & O'Brien, M. (2011). Mothers' part-time employment: Associations with mother and family well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *25*(6), 895–906. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025993.

Buehler, C., O'Brien, M., & Walls, J. K. (2011). Mothers' part-time employment: Child, parent, and family outcomes. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *3*, 256–272. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2011.00110.x.

Bumpus, M. F., Crouter, A. C., & McHale, S. M. (2006). Linkages between negative work-to-family spillover and mothers' and fathers' knowledge of their young adolescents' daily lives. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *26*(1), 36–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431605282652.

Bünning, M. (2011). What happens after the 'daddy months'? Fathers' involvement in paid work, childcare, and work after taking parental leave in Germany. *European Sociological Review*, *31*, 738–748. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv072.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018a). *Employment characteristics of families—2017*. Available at: https://www.bls.gov/news.release/famee.nr0.htm.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018b). *Access to paid personal leave* December 2017. Available at: https://www.bls.gov/ebs/paid:personal_leave_122017.htm.

Byron, K. (2005). A metaanalytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*, 169–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009.

Carneiro, P., Løken, K. V., & Salvanes, K. G. (2015). A flying start? Maternity leave benefits and long-run outcomes of children. *Journal of Political Economy*, *123*, 365–412. https://doi.org/10.1086/679627.

Chatterji, P., & Markowitz, S. (2012). Family leave after childbirth and the mental health of new mothers. *The Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics*, *15*, 61–76. https://doi.org/10.3386/w14156.

Chatterji, P., Markowitz, S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2013). Effects of early maternal employment on maternal health and well-being. *Journal of Population Economics*, *26*, 285–301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-012-0437-5.

Cho, E., & Tay, L. (2016). Domain satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between work–family spillover and subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *31*, 445–457. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9423-8.

Chun, C., Moos, R. H., & Cronkite, R. C. (2006). Culture: A fundamental context for the stress and coping paradigm. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 29–53). Dallas, TX: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-26238-5 2.

Clark, M. A., Rudolph, C. W., Zhdanova, L., Michel, J. S., & Baltes, B. B. (2017). Organizational support factors and work–family outcomes: Exploring gender differences. *Journal of Family Issues*, *38*(11), 1520–1545. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15585809.

Clark, R., Shibley Hyde, J., Essex, M. J., & Klein, M. H. (1997). Length of maternity leave and quality of mother–infant interactions. *Child Development*, *68*, 364–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131855.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, *53*(6), 747–770. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001.

Coenen, M., & Kok, R. A. W. Workplace flexibility and new product development performance: The role of telework and flexible work schedules. *European Management Journal*, *32*(4), (2014). 564–576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.12.003.

Cools, S., Fiva, J. H., & Kirkebøen, L. J. (2015). Causal effects of paternity leave on children and parents. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, *117*, 801–828. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjoe.12113.

Craig, L., & Habgood, R. (2018). Cultural considerations in the division of labor. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 646–660). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.035.

Da, W. W. (2003). Transnational grandparenting: Child care arrangements among migrants from the People's Republic of China to Australia. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *4*(1), 79–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-003-1020-4.

Davis, M. F., & Powell, R. (2003). The international convention on the rights of the child: A catalyst for innovative child care policies. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *25*, 689–719. https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2003.0031.

Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 178–199. https://doi.org/10.2307/259269.

Fagnani, J. (2007). Family policies in France and Germany: Sisters or distant cousins? *Community, Work, and Family*, *10*, 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800601110769.

Fortin, N. M. (2005). Gender role attitudes and the labour-market outcomes of women across OECD countries. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *21*(3), 416–438. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gri024.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*, 723–729. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gri024.

Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *50*, 145–167. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577.

Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: Metaanalysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*, 1524–1541. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524.

Galinsky, E., Sakai, K., & Wigton, T. (2011). Workplace flexibility: From research to action. *The Future of Children*, *21*(2), 141–161. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2011.0019.

Glaser, K., Ribe, E., Waginger, U., Price, D., Stuchbury, R., & Tinker, A. (2010). *Grandparenting in Europe*. London, UK: Grandparents Plus.

Golden, T. D. (2006). Avoiding depletion in virtual work: Telework and the intervening impact of work exhaustion on commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *69*, 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.003.

Golden, T. D., & Veiga, J. F. (2005). The impact of extent of telecommuting on job satisfaction: Resolving inconsistent findings. *Journal of Management*, *31*(2), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271768.

Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, **25**(4), 483–496. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092933.

Greenhaus, J., & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 76–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/258214.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *The Academy of Management Review*, *31*(1), 72–92. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625.

Grove, C. N. (2005). Worldwide differences in business values and practices: Overview of GLOBE research findings. In *Global leadership solutions*. Grovewell LLC.

Grzywacz, J. G. (2000). Work-family spillover and health during midlife: Is managing conflict everything? *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *14*(4), 236–243. https://doi.org/10.4278/0890-1171-14.4.236.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *65*(1), 248–261. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00248.x.

Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work–family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, *51*(1), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2002.00028.x.

Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D., & Shulkin, S. (2008). Schedule flexibility and stress: Linking formal flexible arrangements and perceived flexibility to employee health. *Community, Work & Family*, *11*(2), 199–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802024652.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111.

Haar, J. M., & Bardoel, E. A. (2008). Positive spillover from the work–family interface: A study of Australian employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *46*(3), 275–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/1038411108095759.

Haas, L., & Hwang, C. P. (2008). The impact of taking parental leave on fathers' participation in childcare and relationships with children: Lessons from Sweden. *Community, Work & Family*, *11*, 85–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800701785346.

Hajizadeh, M., Heymann, J., Strumpf, E., Harper, S., & Nandi, A. (2015). Paid maternity leave and childhood vaccination update: Longitudinal evidence from 20 low-and-middle-income countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, *140*, 104–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.07.008.

Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C., & Perhoniemi, R. (2011). Enrichment processes and gain spirals at work and at home: A 3-year crosslagged panel study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(1), 8–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02014.x.

Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *50*(2), 185–203. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1557.

Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work–family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *10*, 138–154. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.138.

Hank, K., & Buber, I. (2009). Grandparents caring for their grandchildren: Findings from the 2004 Survey of Health, Aging, and Retirement in Europe. *Journal of Family Issues*, *30*, 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x08322627.

Harrington, B., Van Deusen, F., Sabatini Fraone, J., Eddy, S., & Haas, L. (2014). *The new dad: Take your leave*. Boston, MA: Boston College Center for Work and Family.

Hassan, Z., Dollard, M. F., & Winefield, A. H. (2010). Work-family conflict in East vs. Western countries. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *17*, 30–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601011016899.

Hayman, J. R. (2009). Flexible work arrangements: Exploring the linkages between perceived usability of flexible work schedules and work/life balance. *Community, Work & Family*, *12*(3), 327–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800902966331.

Heller, D., & Watson, D. (2005). The dynamic spillover of satisfaction between work and marriage: The role of time and mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 1273–1279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1273.

Hill, E. J., Erickson, J. J., Fellows, K. J., Martinengo, G., & Allen, S. M. (2014). Work and family over the life course: Do older workers differ? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *35*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-012-9346-8.

Hill, E. J., Erickson, J. J., Holmes, E. K., & Ferris, M. (2010). Workplace flexibility, work hours, and work-life conflict: An extra day or two. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *24*(3), 349–358. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019282.

Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive effect of job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, *50*(1), 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00049.x.

Hill, E. J., & Holmes, E. K. (2018). Families and workplaces. In B. H. Fiese, M. Celano, K. Deater-Deckard, E. N. Jouriles, & M. A. Whisman (Eds.), *Applications and broad impact of family psychology*: Vol. 2. American Psychological Association handbook of contemporary family psychology (pp. 379–395). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hill, E. J., Jacob, J. I., Shannon, L. L., Brennan, R. T., Blanchard, V. L., & Martinengo, G. (2008). Exploring the relationship of workplace flexibility, gender, and life stage to family-to-work conflict, and stress and burnout. *Community, Work & Family*, *11*, 165–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802027564.

Hill, E. J., Märtinson, V., & Ferris, M. (2004). New-concept part-time employment as a work-family adaptive strategy for women professionals with small children. *Family Relations*, *53*(3), 282–292. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.0004.x.

Ho, M.Y., Chen, X., Cheung, F. M., Liu, H., Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2013). A dyadic model of the work–family interface: A study of dual-earner couples in China. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030885.

Hofstede, G. (1983). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *14*(2), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490867.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holmes, E. K., Baumgartner, J., Marks, L. D., Palkovitz, R., & Nesteruk, O. (2010). Contemporary contradictions and challenges facing married fathers and mothers. In K. S. Pearlman (Ed.), *Marriage: Roles, stability, and conflict* (pp. 157–171). Hauppage, NY: Nova Science.

Holmes, E. K., Erickson, J. J., & Hill, E. J. (2012). Doing what she thinks is best: Maternal psychological wellbeing and attaining desired work situations. *Human Relations*, *65*(4), 501–522. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711431351.

Holmes, E. K., Holladay, H. M., Hill, E. J., & Yorgason, J. (2018). Are mothers' work-to-family conflict, school involvement, and work status related to academic achievement? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *27*(6), 1881–1898. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1021-8.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.), (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Huang, R., & Yang, M. (2015). Paid maternity leave and breastfeeding practice before and after California's implementation of the nation's first paid family leave program. *Economics and Human Biology*, *16*, 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2013.12.009.

Huerta, M., Adema, W., Baxter, J., Han, W., Lausten, M., Lee, R., & Waldfogel, J. (2014). Fathers' leave and fathers' involvement: Evidence from four OECD countries. *European Journal of Social Security*, *16*, 308–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/138826271401600403.

Hughes-Belding, K., Hegland, S., Stein, A., Sideris, J., & Bryant, D. (2012). Predictors of global quality in family child care homes: Structural and belief characteristics. *Early Education & Development*, *23*(5), 697–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2011.574257.

Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(1), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2009.36461938.

International Labour Organization (ILO). (2014). *Maternity and paternity at work: Law and practice across the world*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Jang, S. J., Zippay, A., & Park, R. (2012). Family roles as moderators of the relationship between schedule flexibility and stress. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*(4), 897–912. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00984.x.

Jappens, M., & Van Bavel, J. (2012). Regional family norms and child care by grandparents in Europe. *Demographic Research*, *27*(4), 85–120. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2012.27.4.

Jin, J. F., Ford, M. T., & Chen, C. C. (2013). Asymmetric differences in work–family spillover in North America and China: Results from two heterogeneous samples. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *113*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1289-3.

Johnson, R. W. (2011). Phased retirement and workplace flexibility for older adults: Opportunities and challenges. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *638*, 68–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716211413542.

Jones, B. L., Scoville, D. P., Hill, E. J., Childs, G., Leishman, J. M., & Nally, K. S. (2008). Perceived versus used workplace flexibility in Singapore: Predicting work-family fit. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *22*(5), 774. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013181.

Joplin, J. R. W., Shaffer, M. A., Francesco, A. M., & Lau, T. (2003). The macro-environment and work-family conflict: Development of a cross cultural comparative framework. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *3*(3), 305–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595803003003004.

Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2004). Affect and job satisfaction: A study of their relationship at work and at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 661–673. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.661.

Judge, T. A., & Livingston, B. A. (2008). Is the gap more than gender? A longitudinal analysis of gender, gender role orientation, and earnings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(5), 994–1012. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.994.

Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., Oakes, J. M., Fan, W., Okechukwu, C., Davis, K. D., … Casper, L. (2014). Changing work and work-family conflict: Evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Sociological Review*, *79*(3), 485–516. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414531435.

Kim, J. (2018). Workplace flexibility and parent–child interactions among working parents in the U.S. *Social Indicators Research*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2032-y.

Kinney, M.V., Kerber, K. J., Black, R. E., Cohen, B., Nkrumah, F., Coovadia, H., … Lawn, J. E. (2012). Sub-Saharan Africa's mothers, newborns, and children: Where and why do they die? *PLoS Medicine*, *7*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000294.

Kirchmeyer, C. Nonwork participation and work attitudes: A test of scarcity vs. expansion models of personal resources. *Human Relations*, *45*, (1992). 775–795. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500802.

Kossek, E. E., & Michel, J. (2011). Flexible work schedules. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 535–572). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kotsadam, A., & Finseraas, H. (2011). The state intervenes in the battle of the sexes: Causal effects of paternity leave. *Social Science Research*, *40*, 1611–1622. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.06.011.

Kuo, P. X., Volling, B. L., & Gonzalez, R. (2017). Gender role beliefs, work–family conflict, and father involvement after the birth of a second child. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *19*(2), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000101.

Kurowska, A. (2018). Gendered effects of home-based work on parents' capability to balance work with nonwork: Two countries with different models of division of labour compared. *Social Indicators Research*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2034-9.

Lambert, P. A. (2007). The political economy of postwar family policy in Japan: Economic imperatives and electoral incentives. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, *33*(1), 1–29.

Lammi-Taskula, J. (2008). Doing fatherhood: Understanding the gendered use of parental leave in Finland. *Fathering*, *6*(2), 133–148. https://doi.org/10.3149/fth.0602.133.

Lee, M. D., & MacDermid, S. M. (1998). *Improvising new careers: Accommodation, elaboration, transformation*. West Lafayette, IN: The Center for Families at Purdue University.

Leroy, J. L., Gadsden, P., & Guijarro, M. (2012). The impact of daycare programmes on child health, nutrition, and development in developing countries: A systemic review. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, *4*(3), 472–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2011.639457.

Lewis, J. (2008). Child care policies and the politics of choice. *The Political Quarterly*, *79*(4), 499–507. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2008.00962.x.

Lichtman-Sadot, S., & Bell, N. P. (2017). Child health in elementary school following California's paid family leave program. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *36*, 790–827. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22012.

Liu, H., & Cheung, F. M. (2015a). The moderating role of empathy in the work-family crossover process between Chinese dual-earner couples. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *23*(3), 442–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072714547612.

Liu, H., & Cheung, F. M. (2015b). Testing crossover effects in an actor-partner interdependence model among Chinese dual-earner couples. *International Journal of Psychology*, *50*(2), 106–114. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12070.

Liu, H., Ngo, H. Y., & Cheung, F. M. (2016). Work-family enrichment and marital satisfaction among Chinese coupes: A crossover-spillover perspective. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *23*(2), 209–231. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039753.

Livingston, B. A. (2018). Gender, gender norms, and national culture: Global work-family at multiple levels. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 599–613). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.032.

Lokteff, M., & Piercy, K. W. (2012). "Who cares for the children?" Lessons from a global perspective of child care policy. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *21*(1), 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-011-9467-y.

Lourel, M., Ford, M. T., Gamassou, C. E., Guégen, N., & Hartmann, A. (2009). Negative and positive spillover between work and home. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *24*, 438–449. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910959762.

Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S. F., & Huang, M. T. (2006). A cross-cultural study of work/family demands, work/family conflict, and wellbeing: The Taiwanese vs. British. *Career Development International*, *11*, 9–27. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430610642354.

Luk, D. M., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Work and family domain stressors and support: Within and cross-domain influences on work-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *78*, 489–508. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26741.

Mahon, R. (2002). Child care: Toward what kind of "social Europe"? *Social Politics*, *9*(3), 344–379. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/9.3.343.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, *42*(6), 921–936. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094577.

Martin, B. H., & MacDonnell, R. (2012). Is telework effective for organizations? A metaanalysis of empirical research on perceptions of telework and organizational outcomes. *Management Research Review*, *35*(7), 602–616. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211238820.

Martin, C. (2007). A baby-friendly state: Lessons from the French case. *Pharmaceuticals, Policy and Law*, 9, 203–210.

Masuda, A. D., Poelmans, S. A. Y., Allen, T. D., Spetor, P. E., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., … Moreno-Velazquez, I. (2012). Flexible work arrangements availability and their relationship with work-to-family conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison of three country clusters: Work-to-family conflict across countries. *Applied Psychology. An International Review*, *61*, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00453.x.

Matias, M., Ferreira, T., Vieira, J., Cadima, J., Leal, T., & Matos, P. M. (2017). Work-family conflict, psychological availability, and child emotion regulation: Spillover and crossover in dual-earner families. *Personal Relationships*, *24*(3), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12198.

Matz-Costa, C., & Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (2010). Workplace flexibility as an organizational response to the aging of the workforce: A comparison of nonprofit and for-profit organizations. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *36*, 68–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/01488370903333645.

Mauss, I. B., & Butler, E. A. (2010). Cultural context moderates the relationship between emotion control values and cardiovascular challenge versus threat responses. *Biological Psychology*, *84*, 521–530. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2009.09.010.

McAllister, S., Thornock, C., Hammond, J., Holmes, E. K., & Hill, E. J. (2012). The influence of couple emotional intimacy on job perceptions and work-family conflict. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, *40*(4), 330–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-3934.2012.02115.x.

McCloskey, D. W., & Igbaria, M. (1998). A review of the empirical research on telecommuting and directions for future research. In *The virtual workplace* (pp. 338–358). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-87828-947-6.

McGovern, P., Dowd, B., Gjerdingen, D., Moscovice, I., Kochevar, L., & Lohman, W. (1997). Time off work and the postpartum health of employed women. *Medical Care*, *35*, 507–521. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005650-199705000-00007.

McKay, L., Mathieu, S., & Doucet, A. (2016). Parental-leave rich and parental-leave poor: Inequality in Canadian labour market based leave policies. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, *58*, 543–562. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185616643558.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How family friendly work environments affect work-family conflict: A metaanalytic examination. *Journal of Labor Research*, *4*, 555–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-006-1020-1.

Mesquita, B., & Delvaux, E. (2012). A cultural perspective on emotional labor. In A. Grandey, J. Diefendorff, & D. Rupp (Eds.), *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work* (pp. 251–272). New York: Psychology Press/Routledge.

Misra, J., Moller, S., Strader, E., & Wemlinger, E. (2012). Family policies, employment and poverty among partnered and single mothers. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, *30*, 113–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2011.12.001.

Moen, P., & Roehling, P. V. (2005). *The career mystique: Cracks in the American dream*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

Moss, P., Duvander, A., & Koslowski, A. (2019). *Parental leave and beyond: Recent international developments, current issues, and future directions*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Muller, W., & Brough, P. (2017). Work, stress, and love: Investigating crossover through couples' lived experiences. In J. Fitzgerald (Ed.), *Foundations for couples therapy: Research for the real world* (pp. 464–474). New York, NY: Routledge.

Muraven, M., Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Self-control as a limited resource: Regulatory depletion patterns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 774–789. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.774.

Murphy-Lawless, J. (2000). Changing women's lives: Child care policy in Ireland. *Feminist Economics*, *6*(1), 89–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/135457000337697.

National Partnership for Women and Families. (2018). *State paid family and medical leave laws, July 2018*. Washington, DC. Available at: http://www.nationalpartnership.org/research-library/work-family/paid-leave/state-paid-family-leave-laws.pdf.

Nepomnyaschy, L., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Paternity leave and fathers' involvement with their young children: Evidence from the American ECLS-B. *Community, Work & Family*, *10*, 427–453. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800701575077.

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). Long work hours: A social identity perspective on metaanalysis data. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *29*(7), 853–880. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.536.

Nilles, J. (1994). *Making telework happen: A guide for telemanagers and telecommuters*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

O'Brien, K. M., Del Pino, H. V., Yoo, S. K., Cinnamon, R. G., & Han, Y. J. (2014). Work, family, support, and depression: Employed mothers in Israel, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *61*, 461–472. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036339.

O'Brien, M. (2009). Fathers, parental leave policies, and infant quality of life: International perspectives and policy impact. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *624*, 190–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716209334349.

OECD. (2001). *Starting strong.* Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/newsroom/earlychildhoodeducationandcare.htm.

OECD. (2018). *OECD family database: The labour market position of families* Retrieved December. 2018 from http://www.oecd.org/els/family/database.htm.

Ollier-Malaterre, A., & Foucreault, A. (2018). GLOBE cultural dimensions: Implications for global work-family research. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface*. (pp. 69–85). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.003.

Orthner, D. K., & Pittman, J. F. (1986). Family contributions to work commitment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *48*, 573–581. https://doi.org/10.2307/352043.

Pedulla, D. S., & Thébaud, S. (2015). Can we finish the revolution? Gender, work-family ideals, and institutional constraint. *American Sociological Review*, *80*(1), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414564008.

Pence, A. R., Amponsah, M., Chalamanda, F., Habtom, A., Kameka, G., & Nankunda, H. (2004). ECD policy development and implementation in Africa. *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, and Practice*, *5*(3), 13–29.

Petts, R. J. (2018). Time off after childbirth and mothers' risk of depression, parenting stress, and parenting practices. *Journal of Family Issues*, *39*, 1827–1854. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X17728984.

Petts, R. J., & Knoester, C. (2018). Paternity leave-taking and father engagement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *80*, 1144–1162. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12494.

Petts, R. J., Knoester, C., & Li, Q. (2018). Paid paternity leave-taking in the United States. *Community, Work & Family*, https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2018.1471589.

Poelmans, S. A. Y., & Chenoy, R. (2008). Investigating workplace flexibility using a multi-organization database: A collaboration of academics and practitioners [Special issue]. *Community, Work & Family*, *11*, 1–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802172576.

Polatcia, S., & Akdoğan, A. (2014). Psychological capital and performance: The mediating role of work family spillover and psychological well-being. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, *5*(1), 1–15.

Pragg, B., & Knoester, C. (2017). Parental leave use among disadvantaged fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, *38*, 1157–1185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15623585.

Raub, A., Nandi, A., DeGuzman Chorny, N., Wong, E., Chung, P., Batra, P., … Heymann, J. (2018). *Paid parental leave: A detailed look at approaches across OECD countries*. Los Angeles, CA: World Policy Analysis Center.

Redshaw, M., & Henderson, J. (2013). Fathers' engagement in pregnancy and childbirth: Evidence from a national survey. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, *13*, 70. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2393-13-70.

Rodriguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Engaged at work and happy at home: A spillover–crossover model. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *15*(2), 271–283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9421-3.

Rosemberg, F. (2004). Early child-care and educational policies for the developing world: The Brazilian case. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, *34*(4), 481–491. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-005-2739-9.

Rossin-Slater, M., Ruhm, C., & Waldfogel, J. (2013). The effects of California's paid family leave program on mothers' leave-taking and subsequent labor market outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *32*, 224–245. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21676.

Rotondo, D. M., & Kincaid, J. F. (2008). Conflict, facilitation, and individual coping styles across the work and family domains. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(5), 484–506. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810884504.

Ruhm, C. J. (2000). Parental leave and child health. *Journal of Health Economics*, *19*, 931–960. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6296(00)00047-3.

Rusting, C. L., & DeHart, T. (2000). Retrieving positive memories to regulate negative mood: Consequences for mood-congruent memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 737–752. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6296(00)00047-3.

Schieman, S., Milkie, M., & Glavin, P. (2009). When work interferes with life: The social distribution of work-nonwork interference and the influence of work-related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review*, *74*, 966–987. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400606.

Schieman, W., & Young, M. (2015). Who engages in work-family multitasking? A study of Canadian and American workers. *Social Indicators Research*, *120*, 741–767. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0609-7.

Schooreel, T., & Verbruggen, M. (2016). Use of family-friendly work arrangements and work–family conflict: Crossover effects in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *21*(1), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039669.

Sharma, D., & LeVine, R. A. (1998). Child care in India: A comparative developmental view of infant social environments. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *81*, 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219988005.

Shimazu, A., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2009). How job demands affect an intimate partner: A test of the spillover-crossover model in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *51*(3), 239–248. https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.L8160.

Shockley, K. M., French, K. A., & Yu, P. P. (2018). A comprehensive review and synthesis of the cross-cultural work-family literature. In W. Shen, K. Shockley, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 9–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108235556.002.

Sjöberg, O. (2010). Ambivalent attitudes, contradictory institutions ambivalence in gender-role attitudes in comparative perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, *51*(1–2), 33–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715209347064.

Sonnentag, S., & Binnewies, C. (2013). Daily affect spillover from work to home: Detachment from work and sleep as moderators. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *83*, 198–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.008.

Soto, J. A., Perez, C. R., Kim, Y. H., Lee, E. A., & Minnick, M. R. (2011). Is expressive suppression always associated with poorer psychological functioning? A cross-cultural comparison between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese. *Emotion*, *11*, 1450–1455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023340.

St. George, J. M., & Fletcher, R. J. (2011). Fathers online: Learning about fatherhood through the internet. *Journal of Perinatal Education*, *20*(3), 154–162. https://doi.org/10.1891/1058-1243.20.3.154.

Staehelin, K., Bertea, P. C., & Stutz, E. Z. (2007). Length of maternity leave and health of mother and child—A review. *International Journal of Public Health*, *52*, 202–209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-007-5122-1.

Szelewa, D., & Polakowski, M. P. (2008). Who cares? Changing patterns of childcare in Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *18*, 115–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928707087589.

Tanaka, S. (2005). Parental leave and child health across OECD countries. *The Economic Journal*, *115*, F7–F28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0013-0133.2005.00970.x.

Toossi, M., & Morisi, T. L. (2017). *U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, spotlight on statistics: Women in the workforce before, during, and after the great recession*. https://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2017/women-in-the-workforce-before-during-and-after-the-great-recession/pdf/women-in-the-workforce-before-during-and-after-the-great-recession.pdf.

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02023001007.

Wadsworth, L. L., & Facer, R. L. (2016). Work–family balance and alternative work schedules: Exploring the impact of 4-day workweeks on state employees. *Public Personnel Management*, *45*(4), 382–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026016678856.

Waldfogel, J. (1998). The family gap for young women in the United States and Britain: Can maternity leave make a difference? *Journal of Labor Economics*, *16*, 505–545. https://doi.org/10.1086/209897.

Waldfogel, J. (2006). *What children need*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Way, S. A., Tracey, J. B., Fay, C. H., Wright, P. M., Snell, S. A., Chang, S., & Gong, Y. (2015). Validation of a multidimensional HR flexibility measure. *Journal of Management*, *41*, 1098–1131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312463940.

Weichselbaumer, D., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2005). A metaanalysis of the international gender wage gap. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *19*(3), 479–511. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0950-0804.2005.00256.x.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*(2), 125–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243287001002002.

Westman, M. (2002). Crossover of stress and strain in the family and in the workplace. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), Vol. 2. *Research in occupational stress and well-being* (pp. 143–181). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press/Elsevier.

Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (2005). The crossover of work–family conflict from one spouse to the other. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *35*(9), 1936–1957. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02203.x.

Westman, M., Vinokur, A. D., Hamilton, V., & Roziner, I. (2004). Crossover of marital dissatisfaction during military downsizing among Russian army officers and their spouses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 769–779. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.769.

White, L. A., & Friendly, M. (2012). Public funding, private delivery: States, markets, and early childhood education and care in liberal welfare states—A comparison of Australia, the UK, Quebec, and New Zealand. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, *14*(4), 292–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2012.699789.

Whiteford, P., & Adema, W. (2007). What works best in reducing child poverty: A benefit or work strategy. *OECD Social Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 51*. http://www.oecd.org/els.

Williams, J. C., Blair-Loy, M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2013). Cultural schemas, social class, and the flexibility stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, *69*(2), 209–234. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12012.

Won, S., & Pascall, G. (2004). A Confucian war over childcare? Practice and policy in childcare and their implications for understanding the Korean gender regime. *Social Policy and Administration*, *38*(3), 270–289. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2004.00390.x.

World Bank Group. (2018). *Women, business and the law 2018*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Economic Forum. (2013). *The global gender gap report*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work–family conflict: A Sino–US comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(1), 113–123. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556390.