**Parents' experiences of work-family conflict:
Does it matter if coworkers have children?**

Florian Schulz¹ & Mareike Reimann²

08.11.2021

Update: June 2022

The final version of this preprint has been accepted for publication in the

Journal of Family Research: <https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-780>

¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3865-6668>; ✉ florian.schulz@ifb.uni-bamberg.de

² <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8007-4840>; ✉ mareike.reimann@uni-bielefeld.de

Objective: *To examine how the perception of work-family conflict relates to the share of parents in women's and men's direct coworking environments.*

Background: *The framework of supplementary and complementary person-team fit posits that individuals' relative positions within their coworking environments have an impact on their wellbeing. Depending on women's and men's parenthood status and the corresponding (dis-)similarity compared to their colleagues, this idea was applied to the perception of work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts.*

Method: *Time-based and strain-based work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts were analyzed by gender and parenthood with random effects panel regression models using longitudinal data from the LEEP-B3-survey, a large-scale linked employer-employee survey from Germany (2012/2013 and 2014/2015; 2,228 women and 2,656 men). The composition of the respondents' working groups was included as a moderating interaction variable.*

Results: *Mothers and fathers of children aged 0–11 years reported higher work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts than parents of older children and childless women and men. For mothers of children aged 0–11 years, a higher share of parents in their working groups was associated with less time-based family-to-work conflict. For fathers of children aged 0–11 years, the same associations were found for overall work-to-family conflict, strain-based work-to-family conflict as well as for all dimensions of family-to-work conflict.*

Conclusion: *Similarity between the team members regarding parenthood seemed to reduce mothers' and fathers' perceptions of work-family conflict beyond several other situational characteristics of the individuals and the workplaces.*

Key Words: environment, gender, Germany, person-team fit, similarity, dissimilarity.

1. Introduction

Work-family conflicts arise when expectations of working and private life interfere with one another and expose individuals to time, role and behavioral strains that work in either direction, i.e., resulting in work-to-family (WFC) and family-to-work (FWC) discords (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Gutek et al., 1991; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Voydanoff, 2005).

Over the last decades, major changes in female labor market participation and the expansion of public childcare, among others, have questioned the traditional gendered division of labor and increasingly produced work-family conflicts for women and men, mothers and fathers (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). Such inter-role conflicts are natural to every individual, and call for adjustments, negotiations and coping strategies in individual and coupled living and working arrangements, as they were found to be associated with health-related issues, couple dynamics, or individual well-being (Allen et al., 2000; Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Greenhaus et al., 2006).

Empirical research aiming to uncover how perceptions of work-family conflict vary by individual and situational characteristics has flourished over the last years, and different operationalizations and antecedent settings of WFC and FWC were subject to large-scale quantitative analyses. Today, much is known about positive, negative, or zero correlations between WFC/FWC and several demographic characteristics of women and men, such as gender or parenthood. Family demands such as care responsibilities or marital tension, and work demands such as long or irregular working hours or work pressure, are associated with the experience of higher conflicts. Further, research identified the supportive or impeding roles of family characteristics, such as spousal support, or workplace characteristics, such as job autonomy, supervisor support, or schedule flexibility, for the individual experience of conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Byron, 2005; Greenhaus et al., 2006; Michel et al., 2011).

Beyond these individual and environmental characteristics, it is plausible to assume that individual experiences of WFC and FWC are further affected – directly or indirectly – by the immediate social context in which individuals interact. This can be the overall context of the work organization (Behson, 2002; Kossek et al., 2011), but also the more direct context of the working group. Drawing on the ecological idea that individuals evaluate their situation in relation to other individuals around them, the present study aims to assess if the composition of employees' direct working group by parenthood moderates women's and men's, mothers' and fathers' perceptions of WFC and FWC. Previous research applying this approach to other domains has been rare, but even nonexistent in the field of work-family conflict. Arguing from the standpoint of a life-stage neighborhood fit, for example, Swisher et al. (2004, pp. 281–282) argued that women's and men's perception of family friendliness highly depends on the “match between a couple's life stage and the demographic structure of their neighborhood.” The present study adapts this idea to the parenthood structure of the workplace, and how individual workers fit in there.

In light of this, the present study contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it presents the first study on how the distribution of parents among coworkers moderates work-family conflict. Using large-scale longitudinal data from “LEEP-B3” (Diewald et al., 2014), a linked employer-employee survey which is representative of large organizations in Germany, it offers new insights in the associations between gender, parenthood and work-family-conflict using the share of coworking parents as a predictor as well as a moderator. Second, it uses a broad set of relevant outcomes, including work-to-family conflict, family-to-work-conflict, as well as the strain- and time-based dimensions of these two forms. Third, it offers gender-sensitive reasoning and empirical modeling, as work- and family-roles in a still conservative context such as Germany are subject to traditional gender construction. The findings of the present report may be of practical relevance regarding organizational work-

family policies, because a sensitive management of the composition of working groups may be considered as a factor to women's and men's, mothers' and fathers' well-being.

2. Background

Based on the demands-resources approach, it has been argued that demands at the workplace as well as in the family usually (re-)produce and reinforce work-family conflicts.

Concurrently, resources such as support in the workplace or in the family were suggested to mitigate this inter-role conflict (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Usually, previous research used many different indicators of work and family demands and resources as individual variables of women and man to assess their impact on work-family conflict, supporting this theoretical approach in virtually every single aspect under study (Byron, 2005; Michel et al., 2011).

From ecological or social comparison perspectives, it has been argued that it is not only characteristics associated with individuals that influence women's and men's perceptions of well-being or supportiveness, but the context, its composition, and individuals' relative positions within their environments have an impact as well. In the workplace context, individuals are embedded in different environments, for instance in the overall organizational context, in different departments, or in different work teams. For example, Jiang et al. (2014) drew on the frog pond and relative deprivation approaches and found that academic staff members whose departments were less affected by budget cuts reported higher work stress levels than similarly affected staff members in departments with higher budget cuts. Analogously, Swisher et al. (2004) found that couples with own children rated their neighborhoods as more family-friendly when there were more other families with children around.

Within this broader context, concepts of "person-environment fit" or "person-team fit" (van Vianen, 2018) were applied to hypothesize the associations between individuals' relation

to context characteristics and individual outcomes. The basic idea of these approaches and their variants is that the match between individual characteristics and the attributes of the context, for example in terms of demographics, goals, or values, shapes individual as well as organizational and contextual outcomes, such as satisfaction, happiness, or team functioning (van Vianen, 2018). Swisher et al. (2004) extended this model with a life-course perspective, arguing that individuals' relative positions in the social space change over time, because different stages in life go hand in hand with different challenges, demands, and needs.

From the viewpoint of family research, the latter is arguably most important regarding parenthood. Applying Swisher et al.'s (2004, p. 283) "life stage-neighborhood fit" approach to the working environment, the present study uses this idea to assess "the degree to which a [working environment; FS & MR] is a good fit for the interests, abilities, and needs of [parents; FS & MR] at varying life stages." Depending on women's and men's parenthood status, and the corresponding (dis-)similarity compared to their respective environment of coworkers, the positive or negative scenarios given in Table 1 will guide the empirical analysis of the present study.

The theoretical idea behind these scenarios is based on the distinction between supplementary and complementary person-team fit (De Cooman et al., 2016; Gibbard et al., 2017; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007). Supplementary person-team fit is associated with high similarity between team members and team characteristics, creating coworking environments in which satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment are closely connected to the perception of similarity. Complementary person-team fit is, in contrast, associated with high dissimilarity between specific individuals and the other team members, as they add their unique characteristics, values, or competencies to a team in need of these building blocks of possible team success.

Transferred to the scope of this study, women and men can either be childless or have children, and their situations compared to the other workers in their direct working

environment can either be highly similar or rather different. For each combination, there is a “positive scenario”, in which the relative position of the individual under study spawns less, and a “negative scenario”, which spawns more work-family conflict. Whereas the positive scenario is covered by the original ideas of supplementary and complementary person-team fit (De Cooman et al., 2016; Gibbard et al., 2017; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007), the negative scenario extends this view to emphasize that high similarity or uniqueness not necessarily implies positive outcomes.

Table 1. Positive and negative scenarios of women’s and men’s person-team fit and expected work-family conflict

	„Positive scenario“: „less WFC/FWC”	„Negative scenario“: „more WFC/FWC”
Low similarity	„Unique situation”	„Sole exception”
High similarity	„Common ground”	„Usual competition”

In a coworking environment with low similarity from the perspective of an individual, i.e., a mother or father in a team of mostly childless coworkers, or a childless woman/man in a team of mostly parents, the “positive scenario” predicts that the “unique situation” of the individual will be treated with care and different kinds of support, which should lead to less work-family conflict. The “negative scenario”, in turn, predicts that the “sole exception” of this individual might be acknowledged, but at the same time it would not be treated any special because not any individual case should matter. This should eventually lead to more work-family conflict.

In a coworking environment with high similarity from the perspective of an individual, i.e. a mother or father in a team of mostly parents, or a childless woman/man in a team of mostly childless coworkers, the “positive scenario” predicts that there is a “common ground” among all coworkers, and everyone knows the situation of the others well, creating a climate of understanding and support – this would lead to less work-family conflict. The “negative

scenario”, in turn, predicts a situation of “usual competition” in which the situation is common and nothing special to everyone, because all coworkers are regarded as equal – this would lead to more work-family conflict.

Because all of these scenarios are theoretically possible, and thus “empirically open predictions”, the following empirical analysis will provide evidence to decide which of these expectations is most plausible.

3. Method

3.1 Data and sample

The analysis was based on the first two waves (t1: 2012/2013; t2: 2014/2015) of the LEEP-B3 data, a linked employer-employee panel data set that has been collected as part of the study “Interactions between Capabilities in Work and Family Life” (Diewald et al., 2014). The longitudinal study was composed of an employer survey with work organizations from various segments of the economy including both the private and the public sector, and an employee survey based on a simple random sample of employees within these organizations. The employees who participated in the survey are representative of the employees of large work organizations (> 500 employees) in Germany and are heterogeneous in occupations, jobs, and socioeconomic groups. Employee interviews were conducted using computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI), employer interviews were mainly conducted face-to-face. T1 comprised 100 organizations and 6,454 employees, response rate was 29% for employees. T2 comprised 6,338 employee interviews including 4,359 panel respondents, and a refreshment sample of 1,959 employees. After the restriction to respondents working in teams with a maximum of 20 employees (17.6%), and listwise elimination due to missing values on dependent or independent variables, the final sample used for the analyses included 4,938 cases (2,228 women, 2,656 men).

Table 2. Work-family conflict scale by Carlson et al., (2000), as applied in the LEEP-B3-survey

	(Sub)Dimension	Items	Cronbach's α (t1)
Work-to-family conflict (overall $\alpha = 0.85$)	Time-based work-to-family conflict	My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.	0.85
		The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities	
		I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.	
	Strain-based work-to-family conflict	I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family	0.78
		Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.	
		When I get home from work I am often too physically tired to participate in family activities and responsibilities.	
Family-to-work conflict (overall $\alpha = 0.73$)	Time-based family-to-work conflict	I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.	0.75
		The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.	
		The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.	
	Strain-based family-to-work conflict	Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.	0.69
		Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.	
		Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.	

Note: German translation of these items were used in the original survey.

3.2 Outcome variables

Time-based and strain-based work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts were measured using the work-family conflict scale developed by Carlson et al. (2000). Each subscale is represented by three items (Table 2). The items measure how often respondents experienced time-based and strain-based WFC and FWC, ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). For each of the four strain-based and time-based subdimensions of conflicts, the values of three items were summed up. For the composite measures (WFC/FWC), the values of six items for the respective direction of conflicts were summed up. All variables were standardized by dividing the sum scores by the number of items and values, resulting in a range between 0 and

1 each, with higher values indicating higher levels of perceived conflicts. All analyses were reproduced with factor scores, but the results did not change.

3.3 Predictors and controls

The main predictors were the gender of the respondent (1=male), the parenthood status of the respondent, defined by having either no child aged 18 years or younger in the household, the youngest child aged 0–11 years in the household, or the youngest child aged 12–18 years in the household, and the shares of parents in the direct working group of each respondent, ranging from 0 (0 %) to 1 (100 %), controlled for the absolute size of the working group divided by 10.

Moreover, all analyses controlled for the respondent's age (in years), education (in years), and whether the respondent was in a partnership (1=yes). At the individual job level, actual working hours, the use of flexible working hours (1=yes), having supervising responsibilities (1=yes), and hourly earnings (logarithmized) were included. Job autonomy (Breugh, 1985) was measured using three items ('During my working hours, I have control over the sequencing of my work activities', 'I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done', 'I am able to define what my job objectives are') on 5-point scales that were then added to an index and standardized to ranging between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating greater occupational autonomy (Cronbach's α t1=0.72). Parenthood of the supervisor (1=yes) and gender of the supervisor (1=male) were also considered. To capture actual social support at the workplace, respondents were asked whether their supervisors supported employees in their efforts to reconcile work with family life, and whether colleagues helped one another to get their work done when one had to leave early or came to work late for personal reasons on 5-point scales ranging from 'applies completely' to 'does not apply at all' (1=high social support [1, 2]; 0=low social support [3-5]). Eventually, all

models control for different survey years (0=2012/13; 1=2014/15). For the multivariate analyses, all variables were mean centered, except for dichotomous variables (Table 3).

Table 3. Descriptives of all variables, by survey year and gender

	2012/2013				2014/2015			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
<i>Dependent variables</i>								
WFC	0.416	0.231	0.413	0.214	0.375	0.226	0.374	0.209
WFC–time	0.424	0.287	0.459	0.269	0.377	0.281	0.406	0.262
WFC–strain	0.409	0.227	0.368	0.216	0.373	0.220	0.343	0.209
FWC	0.197	0.144	0.205	0.148	0.203	0.157	0.210	0.148
FWC–time	0.119	0.157	0.124	0.156	0.119	0.162	0.124	0.148
FWC–strain	0.275	0.119	0.286	0.203	0.287	0.214	0.296	0.206
<i>Predictors</i>								
No child ≤18 in household	0.484	0.500	0.447	0.497	0.519	0.500	0.462	0.499
Youngest child 0–11 in household	0.293	0.455	0.349	0.477	0.267	0.442	0.325	0.469
Youngest child 12–18 in household	0.223	0.416	0.203	0.403	0.215	0.411	0.212	0.409
Share of parents ^a	0.562	0.323	0.555	0.329	0.627	0.293	0.612	0.284
<i>Controls</i>								
Age	42.39	8.139	42.62	8.315	43.92	8.396	44.00	8.617
Years of education	14.28	2.741	14.35	2.875	14.23	2.748	14.27	2.835
In partnership	0.834	0.372	0.874	0.332	0.824	0.381	0.854	0.354
Hourly earnings (log)	2.054	0.070	2.119	0.061	2.061	0.060	2.120	0.053
Actual working hours	35.50	10.53	43.18	7.038	35.63	9.532	42.34	6.403
Flexible hours	0.576	0.494	0.646	0.478	0.686	0.464	0.720	0.449
Supervisory role	0.303	0.460	0.473	0.499	0.264	0.441	0.424	0.494
Job autonomy	0.705	0.187	0.722	0.182	0.703	0.186	0.727	0.451
Supervisor is a man	0.556	0.497	0.869	0.338	0.554	0.497	0.860	0.347
Supervisor parent	0.723	0.448	0.777	0.416	0.725	0.447	0.786	0.410
Support by supervisor high	0.757	0.429	0.715	0.451	0.768	0.422	0.753	0.432
Support by coworkers high	0.779	0.415	0.804	0.397	0.786	0.410	0.801	0.400
Team size	0.726	0.507	0.693	0.462	0.752	0.515	0.692	0.463
N	1,447		1,676		1,853		2,171	

Notes. ^a Share of parents in the direct working group of respondents; means and standard deviations (if applicable), rounding differences to 1 may apply. LEEP-B3 Survey, own calculations.

3.4 Modelling

Random-effects regression models were used to estimate differences in the perception of work-family conflict between parents and childless individuals depending on the share of parents among their direct coworkers. This approach utilizes the longitudinal structure of the “LEEP-B3” linked employer-employee data (Diewald et al., 2014) to obtain more efficient estimates of group differences for time-constant variables than simple cross-sectional models (Petersen, 2004). Regarding a possible “causal” interpretation, a within-estimator would have

been the model of choice. However, only very few intra-person changes, such as the transition to parenthood or a notable change in respondents' coworking environments, were observable in the data. Thus, the random-effects approach allowed to include each case in the analysis (observed once or twice), and to estimate the coefficients for the basically time-constant variables that discriminate between parenthood status and the composition of the direct working group.

To answer the research questions, a series of random-effects regression models was estimated, predicting (a) the composite measure of WFC, (b) the time-based dimension of WFC, (c) the strain-based dimension of WFC, (d) the composite measure of FWC, (e) the time-based dimension of FWC, and (f) the strain-based-dimension of FWC. In addition, several sensitivity checks were performed to assess the robustness of the results, most notably all analyses were re-estimated for different subsamples and with different age groups of the youngest child in the household. Yet, none of these checks proved to alter the main conclusions of the study.

4. Results

Table 4 shows the results of the random-effects regression models of women's perception of WFC and FWC, and Table 5 shows the results of the same models for men. Figure 1 shows the linear predictions of the perceived work-family conflicts, which were calculated as margins at the means from these models. Women with and without children consistently reported higher levels of WFC and FWC compared to men and fathers. For instance, childless women's perceptions of WFC averaged a score of about 0.432 compared to childless men's average perception of 0.360. This applied to all subdimensions of conflicts but one: Women without children under the age of 18 years in the household reported less time-based and strain-based FWC than mothers and men. Conflict perceptions for all other dimensions were

highest for mothers with the youngest child aged 0–11 years of age. Moreover, both women and men perceived higher WFC than FWC.

Figure 1. Predictive margins of WFC, time-based WFC, strain-based WFC, FWC, time-based FWC, and strain-based FWC, by gender and age of the youngest child in the household

Notes. The predictive margins of WFC, time-based WFC, strain-based WFC, FWC, time-based FWC, and strain-based FWC were calculated from the random-effects regression models. “LEEP-B3 Survey”, 2012/2013 and 2014/2015; own calculations.

As the results in Table 4 indicate, having the youngest child aged 0–11 years in the household was associated with higher levels of mothers’ reported WFC and FWC in each model compared to women without children or mothers with children aged 12–18 (there was no difference between the latter two groups in any model). The share of parents in the direct coworking environment of women was statistically significant ($p < .1$) only for the time-based dimension of FWC, reducing the conflict for all three groups. For the same outcome, “FWC time”, the interaction coefficient of childless women with the share of parents was positive and statistically significant ($p < .05$), indicating a slight convergence in the perception of

“FWC time” with an increasing share of parents in the direct coworking environment of women (Figure 2).

Table 4. Random-effects regression models on women’s perception of work-family conflict

	WFC	WFC	WFC	FWC	FWC	FWC
		time	strain		time	strain
No child <= 18 in household ^a	-0.028** (0.010)	-0.041** (0.013)	-0.018+ (0.010)	-0.055*** (0.007)	-0.089*** (0.007)	-0.022* (0.010)
Youngest child 12-18 in household ^a	-0.030** (0.011)	-0.035* (0.014)	-0.027* (0.012)	-0.031*** (0.008)	-0.065*** (0.008)	0.001 (0.011)
Share of parents in direct working group	-0.015 (0.021)	-0.005 (0.027)	-0.023 (0.022)	-0.016 (0.016)	-0.032+ (0.016)	-0.003 (0.022)
No child * share of parents	-0.001 (0.027)	-0.005 (0.034)	0.002 (0.028)	0.016 (0.020)	0.039+ (0.020)	-0.002 (0.028)
Youngest child 12–18 * share of parents	0.016 (0.032)	0.018 (0.040)	0.018 (0.033)	0.001 (0.023)	-0.011 (0.025)	0.016 (0.033)
Age	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001* (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)
Years of education	0.005** (0.002)	0.006** (0.002)	0.004* (0.002)	0.003* (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)
In partnership ^b	0.011 (0.010)	0.015 (0.013)	0.007 (0.010)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.000 (0.008)	-0.016 (0.010)
Hourly earnings (log)	-0.018 (0.077)	0.087 (0.097)	-0.137+ (0.080)	-0.031 (0.056)	0.004 (0.058)	-0.066 (0.079)
Actual working hours	0.007*** (0.000)	0.009*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001+ (0.000)	0.000 (0.001)
Flexible working hours ^c	-0.033*** (0.008)	-0.045*** (0.010)	-0.023** (0.008)	0.012* (0.006)	0.016** (0.006)	0.009 (0.008)
Supervisory role ^d	0.034*** (0.008)	0.041*** (0.011)	0.027** (0.009)	-0.003 (0.006)	0.014* (0.006)	-0.018* (0.009)
Job autonomy	-0.115*** (0.021)	-0.132*** (0.026)	-0.105*** (0.021)	-0.013 (0.015)	-0.014 (0.015)	-0.016 (0.021)
Supervisor is a man ^e	-0.024** (0.008)	-0.016 (0.010)	-0.031*** (0.008)	0.003 (0.006)	0.009 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.008)
Supervisor Parent ^f	-0.003 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.011)	0.003 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.006)	-0.009 (0.006)	-0.005 (0.009)
Support by supervisor high ^g	-0.068*** (0.008)	-0.072*** (0.011)	-0.067*** (0.009)	-0.022*** (0.006)	-0.023*** (0.006)	-0.022* (0.009)
Support by coworkers high ^h	-0.044*** (0.008)	-0.045*** (0.011)	-0.047*** (0.009)	-0.009 (0.006)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.011 (0.009)
Team size	-0.010 (0.007)	-0.013 (0.009)	-0.005 (0.007)	-0.009+ (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.012+ (0.007)
Survey year = 2014/2015 ⁱ	-0.033*** (0.006)	-0.038*** (0.007)	-0.028*** (0.006)	0.012** (0.004)	0.002 (0.005)	0.021*** (0.006)
Constant	0.567*** (0.019)	0.601*** (0.023)	0.539*** (0.019)	0.256*** (0.014)	0.188*** (0.014)	0.326*** (0.019)
N(observations)	3,300					
N(respondents)	2,282					

Notes. Reference categories: ^a Youngest child aged 0–11 in the household; ^b No partnership; ^c No flexible working hours; ^d No supervisory role; ^e Supervisor is a woman; ^f Supervisor is childless; ^g Support by supervisor is low; ^h Support by colleagues is low; ⁱ Survey year is 2012/2013. Unstandardized B-coefficients, standard errors in parentheses, levels of significance: *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p <.1 (two-tailed). “LEEP-B3 Survey”, 2012/2013 and 2014/2015; own calculations.

Figure 2. Time-based FWC of childless women and mothers, by the share of parents in their coworking environments

Notes. The linear predictions of time-based FWC were calculated from the regression models in Table 4 as margins at the means, which were adjusted by setting all covariates to the sample means. Predicted outcomes and 95%-confidence intervals. “LEEP-B3 Survey”, 2012/2013 and 2014/2015; own calculations.

For men, Table 5 shows that having no underaged children in the household was associated with a significantly lower perception of WFC and FWC compared to having the youngest child aged 0–11 years. Again, living together with the youngest child aged 12–18 in the household was not significantly different from having no children in the household. The slope of the coefficients representing the share of parents in the direct coworking environments of men and fathers were negative and statistically significant in each model.

Figure 3 facilitates the interpretation of the statistically significant interaction coefficients in the models for WFC, WFC strain, FWC, FWC time, and FWC strain. For these outcomes, the interactions of parenthood and the share of parents in the direct working groups were all positive, indicating different slopes for men without children in the household and for fathers with the youngest child aged 12–18 years in the household compared to fathers with the youngest child aged 0–11 in the household. Whereas an increasing share of parents

seemed to be associated with a decreasing perception of WFC, WFC strain, FWC, FWC time, and FWC strain for the latter group, it appeared to be associated with an increasing perception in the two former groups.

Table 5. Random-effects regression models on men's perception of work-family conflict

	WFC	WFC time	WFC strain	FWC	FWC time	FWC strain
No child <= 18 in household ^a	-0.025** (0.008)	-0.040*** (0.010)	-0.009 (0.009)	-0.022*** (0.006)	-0.028*** (0.006)	-0.017* (0.009)
Youngest child 12-18 in household ^a	-0.009 (0.009)	-0.029* (0.012)	0.011 (0.010)	-0.020** (0.007)	-0.018* (0.007)	-0.023* (0.010)
Share of parents in direct working group	-0.052** (0.017)	-0.050* (0.022)	-0.055** (0.018)	-0.045*** (0.014)	-0.029* (0.014)	-0.061** (0.019)
No child * share of parents	0.020 (0.022)	-0.003 (0.028)	0.046+ (0.024)	0.065*** (0.018)	0.031+ (0.018)	0.098*** (0.024)
Youngest child 12-18 * share of parents	0.069* (0.027)	0.051 (0.034)	0.078** (0.029)	0.074*** (0.022)	0.066** (0.022)	0.083** (0.030)
Age	-0.001+ (0.000)	-0.002** (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)
Years of education	0.003* (0.001)	0.004* (0.002)	0.002 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
In partnership ^b	0.016 (0.010)	0.020 (0.013)	0.011 (0.011)	-0.017* (0.008)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.032** (0.011)
Hourly earnings (log)	0.077 (0.075)	0.303** (0.093)	-0.158* (0.079)	-0.082 (0.057)	-0.105+ (0.058)	-0.062 (0.079)
Actual working hours	0.006*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)
Flexible working hours ^c	-0.015* (0.007)	-0.040*** (0.009)	0.011 (0.007)	0.012* (0.006)	0.012* (0.006)	0.013+ (0.008)
Supervisory role ^d	0.029*** (0.007)	0.042*** (0.009)	0.017* (0.007)	-0.005 (0.005)	0.002 (0.005)	-0.011 (0.007)
Job autonomy	-0.165*** (0.019)	-0.199*** (0.024)	-0.134*** (0.021)	-0.035* (0.015)	-0.006 (0.016)	-0.064** (0.021)
Supervisor is a man ^e	0.003 (0.010)	0.008 (0.012)	-0.004 (0.010)	0.003 (0.008)	-0.003 (0.008)	0.008 (0.010)
Supervisor Parent ^f	0.003 (0.008)	0.002 (0.010)	0.003 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.006)	-0.004 (0.006)	-0.007 (0.008)
Support by supervisor high ^g	-0.066*** (0.007)	-0.087*** (0.009)	-0.052*** (0.007)	-0.019*** (0.006)	-0.030*** (0.006)	-0.009 (0.008)
Support by coworkers high ^h	-0.037*** (0.007)	-0.041*** (0.009)	-0.035*** (0.008)	-0.003 (0.006)	-0.007 (0.006)	-0.000 (0.008)
Team size	-0.000 (0.006)	0.000 (0.008)	0.001 (0.007)	0.005 (0.005)	0.009 (0.005)	0.001 (0.007)
Survey year = 2014/2015 ⁱ	-0.021*** (0.005)	-0.023*** (0.006)	-0.020*** (0.005)	0.007+ (0.004)	0.001 (0.004)	0.014* (0.005)
Constant	0.451*** (0.018)	0.512*** (0.023)	0.398*** (0.019)	0.244*** (0.014)	0.163*** (0.014)	0.327*** (0.019)
N(observations)				3,847		
N(respondents)				2,656		

Notes. Reference categories: ^a Youngest child aged 0–11 in the household; ^b No partnership; ^c No flexible working hours; ^d No supervisory role; ^e Supervisor is a woman; ^f Supervisor is childless; ^g Support by supervisor is low; ^h Support by colleagues is low; ⁱ Survey year is 2012/2013. Unstandardized B-coefficients, standard errors in parentheses, levels of significance: *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.1 (two-tailed). “LEEP-B3 Survey”, 2012/2013 and 2014/2015; own calculations.

Figure 3. WFC, strain-based WFC, FWC, strain-based, and time-based FWC of childless men and fathers, by the share of parents in their coworking environments

Notes. The linear predictions of overall WFC, strain-based WFC, overall FWC and strain-based FWC were calculated from the regression models in Table 5 as margins at the means, which were adjusted by setting all covariates to the sample means. Predicted outcomes and 95%-confidence intervals. “LEEP-B3 Survey”, 2012/2013 and 2014/2015; own calculations.

5. Conclusion

Work-life balance, the reconciliation of family and work, or the more “negative” notion of work-family conflicts have become increasingly relevant indicators for women’s and men’s well-being in modern societies over recent decades. Using longitudinal data from the “LEEP-B3”-Survey, a large-scale linked employer-employee survey in Germany from 2012/2013 and 2014/2015, the present study provided the first investigation of how the share of parents in the direct coworking environments of women and men at their workplaces was related to their perceptions of work-to-family and family-to-work conflicts.

Four findings surfaced in this analysis. First, women with and without children consistently reported higher levels of WFC and FWC compared to men and fathers. This applied to all subdimensions of conflicts but one: Women without children under the age of 18 years in the household reported less time-based and strain-based FWC than mothers and men. Moreover, both women and men perceived higher WFC than FWC.

Second, living together with the youngest child aged 0–11 years, which is up to the age until children in Germany usually transit from primary to secondary education, was found to be associated with more WFC and FWC, for both genders, and compared to women and men who did not live together with children, or mothers and fathers with older children in their households. Concurrently, a higher share of parents in the direct working group did not change the perception of WFC or FWC for women, but reduced the experience of almost all indicators of work-family conflict for men. Apparently, all men seemed to benefit more from a higher share of parents in their respective working groups with regard to work-family conflict than women.

It may be the case that in working groups with high shares of parents there is an overall understanding of possible struggles in reconciling work and family obligations because a large share of the team members shares similar experiences. Therefore, there might be a supportive atmosphere not only towards other parents but towards all team members if

they have to handle conflicts, especially when they emerge in the private life and are carried to the work life. A possible explanation for men profiting more from higher shares of parents in the direct working group than women do may be that, generally, men are more strongly confronted with the expectations of the ‘ideal worker norm’. In working groups with many parents, however, direct co-workers are likely to struggle fulfilling these expectations as well. Thus, the comparison with parents in the direct working environment may help to relieve the stress especially for men because they do not have to compare themselves with men who are able to fulfill the ideal norm expectations more easily.

Third, more detailed analyses showed different slopes for the associations between the share of parenthood and specific indicators of work-family conflict for different groups of women and men. For mothers with the youngest child aged 0–11 in the household, an increasing share of parents in their coworking environment promoted less time-based FWC. For fathers of children aged 0–11, the same was found for WFC, strain based WFC as well as for all indicators of FWC.

Fourth, concerning the theoretical arguments proposed in this study, the findings provided evidence in favor of the supplementary person-team fit approach in its “positive notion” that was labeled the “common ground” scenario above. Parents, and fathers slightly more than mothers, seemed to benefit more from a high share of parents in their coworking environments. In these cases, similarity between the team members regarding parenthood seemed to reduce the perception of work-family conflict beyond several other situational characteristics of the individuals and the workplaces.

The latter has possible implications for family-friendly policies in work organizations. In line with the literature on the new organizational responsibility for supporting employees’ integration of work and family life (Moen, 2015), employers should consider differences in the composition of teams when offering family-friendly measures. In addition to the importance of offering flexible working arrangements, working from home or childcare

opportunities, putting together teams based on similarity in parenthood instead of sole functional reasons might be an additional starting point for improving work-life integration and well-being of women and men.

Going beyond the scope of the present study, three limitations warrant further investigation. First, this study was limited to the German context. Although Germany is a prime example for studying the concurrence of change and stability in gender inequality, broader conclusions on women's and men's work-family conflict should rely on comparative studies for other countries as well.

Second, to get closer to any kind of "causal" interpretation of the associations between parenthood and the composition of the working group in terms of similarity or dissimilarity, larger samples with much more events would be needed to spell out the analyses in more detail. In this respect, the question of (self-)selection into specific working environments remains reserved for future research with appropriate data and over longer periods. Yet, the present study provided a basic indication that the composition of the coworkers is of relevance regarding conflict perceptions and well-being.

Third, the sample of the present study included employees from large organizations (> 500 employees) only. Team structures and team dynamics may be very different in small and medium organizations, just because of the pure size of working groups. Thus, the implications for work-family conflict experiences may be somewhat different. Similarly, the data did not include a measurement on the frequency or intensity of interactions with members of the direct working group. However, the implications of the share of parents on the direct working group may depend on how the collaboration with the working group is organized and how employees interact with others members of the team.

In this context, it might be interesting to consider the extent of work-family conflicts experienced by supervisors and co-workers as well. As parents experience higher levels of conflicts overall, especially in the case of high shares of parents in the working group, there

might be less resources left to compensate individual reconciliation conflicts because a larger part of the team is burdened by those conflicts already. Therefore, future research is needed to further analyze more detailed aspects of the team composition in the relationship of the share of parents with work-family conflicts.

Data availability statement

The datasets analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to legal data restrictions by the “Institut für Arbeitsmarkt und Berufsforschung”, Nürnberg, Germany. Data are only available on request for analyses to be conducted locally at Bielefeld University in cooperation with current project members. Replication files to this article will be made available by the authors from “OSF”.

Acknowledgments

The authors declare no conflict of interest. Florian Schulz acknowledges support from the Bavarian State Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Affairs within the yearly working program of the State Institute for Family Research at the University of Bamberg. The content of this article does not reflect the official opinion of the Bavarian State Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Affairs. Responsibility for the information and views expressed herein lies entirely with the authors. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Work and Family Researchers Network virtual conference on February 12, 2021.

References

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278>

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Which dominates? The relative importance of work-family organizational support and general organizational context on employee outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1845>
- 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(3), 705–725.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00726.x>
- Breaugh, J. A. (1985). The measurement of work autonomy. *Human Relations*, 38(6), 551–570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678503800604>
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 169–198.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249–276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713>
- De Cooman, R., Vantilborgh, T., Bal, M., & Lub, X. (2016). Creating inclusive teams through perceptions of supplementary and complementary person-team fit: Examining the relationship between person-team fit and team effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 41(3), 310–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115586910>
- Diewald, M., Schunck, R., Abendroth, A.-K., Melzer, S. M., Pausch, S., Reimann, M., Andernach, B., & Jacobebbinghaus, P. (2014). The SFB882-B3 Linked Employer-Employee Panel Survey (LEEP-B3). *Journal of Contextual Economics - Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 134(3), 379–390. <https://doi.org/10.3790/schm.134.3.379>

- Gibbard, K., Griep, Y., De Cooman, R., Hoffart, G., Onen, D., & Zareipour, H. (2017). One big happy family? Unraveling the relationship between shared perceptions of team psychological contracts, person-team fit and team performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01966>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2006). Health consequences of work-family conflict: The dark side of the work-family interface. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Employee health, coping and methodologies* (pp. 61–98). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555\(05\)05002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(05)05002-X)
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258214>
- Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(4), 560–568. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.4.560>
- Jiang, L., Probst, T. M., & Benson, W. L. (2014). Why me? The frog-pond effect, relative deprivation and individual outcomes in the face of budget cuts. *Work & Stress*, 28(4), 387–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.965241>
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work-family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Moen, P. (2015). An institutional/organizational turn: Getting to work-life quality and gender equality. *Work and Occupations*, 42(2), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888414568085>

- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurria, R. (1996). *Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales*. 81(4), 400–410.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400>
- Petersen, T. (2004). Analyzing panel data: Fixed- and random-effects models. In M. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 331–345). Sage.
- Piasentin, K. A., & Chapman, D. S. (2007). Perceived similarity and complementarity as predictors of subjective person-organization fit. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(2), 341–354.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X115453>
- Swisher, R., Sweet, S., & Moen, P. (2004). The family-friendly community and its life course fit for dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2), 281–292.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00020.x>
- van Vianen, A. E. M. (2018). Person-environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 75–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work demands and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: Direct and indirect relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 707–726.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05277516>