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Abstract

Work-family conflict and time pressure have emerged as potent and pervasive stressors in the daily lives of Canadian workers. Yet little is known about the socioeconomic distribution of these work-family outcomes, or the underlying mechanisms, because previous research has largely focused on homogeneous samples, typically consisting of well-educated managers and/or professionals. Drawing on the Stress Process Model as an overarching framework, and through statistical analyses of confidential data from Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (2006), the dissertation at hand seeks to address this significant gap in knowledge by exploring how and why socioeconomic status (i.e., education or occupation) affects exposure to work-family conflict and time pressure. The findings of this dissertation are largely consistent with (limited) previous research, demonstrating that higher-status individuals in terms of education, occupation, or income are more exposed to work-family conflict and time pressure than their lower-status counterparts. Only in the case of work-to-family conflict do the findings diverge somewhat from this pattern, as individuals in both the highest and lowest occupational groups have the greatest and identical exposure to this work-family outcome. Further, the socioeconomic distribution of work-family conflict is invariant across gender and parental status. However, gender and
parenthood jointly condition the occupational distribution of time pressure, such that mothers in managerial occupations have the greatest exposure.

Job- and home-related demands and resources consistently affect work-family conflict and time pressure across socioeconomic groups. However, constellations of job- and home-related demands and resources tend to differ between socioeconomic groups, largely accounting for the observed socioeconomic distributions of work-family conflict and time pressure. This suggests that, in order to be effective, government and workplace policies and programs intended to ease earning- and caring-role combination must be designed with an understanding of the unique circumstances that give rise to work-family issues among higher- and lower-status individuals.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Since the late 1980s, there has been increasing scholarly and public interest in the interface between (paid) work and family, fueled by changing workplace demographics—namely, the labour force participation of women, particularly wives and mothers of young children—and men’s greater participation in housework and (more so) childcare (Byron 2005; Casper and Bianchi 2002; Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004; Whitehead, Korabik, and Lero 2008). Countless studies have debunked the myth that work and family are “separate spheres” by demonstrating that they are closely interconnected: work conditions affect family life, just as family conditions affect work life. Although work and family are mutually influential in both beneficial and deleterious ways, most research has focused on the challenges involved in combining earning and caring roles\(^1\)—chief among them being work-family conflict and time pressure (Carlson and Grzywacz 2008). Much of what we know about work-family conflict and time pressure, their antecedents and outcomes, reflects the circumstances and experiences of privileged members of society with respect to socioeconomic status: well-educated managers and professionals (Williams 2010).\(^2\) This is problematic when we consider that the minority of workers in both

\(^1\) It is Beaujot (2000) who first expressed the main functions of families as “earning and caring.” I borrow this terminology from him.

\(^2\) It is not just scholars who have focused on the work-family interface as it pertains to managers and professionals. Popular interest in this topic similarly concerns managers and professionals, particularly the experiences of women (formerly) in these occupations. In 2003, *New York Times Magazine* featured a cover story with the headline: “Q: Why don’t more women get to the top? A: They choose not to.” The corresponding article, written by Belkin, heralded what she called the “opt-out revolution,” in which women with advanced degrees from elite universities leave behind the stresses and strains of the executive suite for full-time motherhood. As the headline suggests, she argued that these women were gladly returning home as a matter of choice—reflecting their own preferences or biological pulls, rather than workplace pushes. Although Belkin’s article and others like it have been refuted by scholars (e.g., Percheski 2008; Stone 2008; Stone and Lovejoy 2004), they have so shaped public discourse about the work-family interface that many, perhaps even most, people see work-family conflict and time pressure as “champagne problems” enjoyed by upper-middle-class women in white-collar jobs (Williams 2010). This is problematic not only because the psychological and economic consequences for women who opt-out of being “just a housewife” are ignored, but also because the significance of work-family conflict and time pressure as real problems for non-professionals (and men) is obscured.

Interestingly, there has been a parallel shift in television programming away from the struggles of working-class women, humorously making ends meet and caring for their families in the late 1980s through to the late 1990s (e.g., *Roseanne* and *Grace Under Fire*), toward the workplace triumphs and tragedies of women in high-level
Canada and the United States are managers or professionals. Specifically, 32% of employed Canadians aged 15 years and older were managers or professionals in 2011, as were 37% of employed Americans over the age of 16 years in 2010. More importantly, it is unlikely that managers’ and professionals’ experiences of the work-family interface are generalizable to non-professionals, due to differences in the demands confronted by these socioeconomic groups, their resources, and the solutions they devise to deal with their problems (Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004). Thus, the focus on well-educated managers and professionals in the extant literature has sharply restricted our understanding of work-family issues as they play out across socioeconomic lines.

The dissertation at hand aims to address this knowledge gap by using the Stress Process Model as an overarching framework for considering how and why socioeconomic status influences work-family conflict and time pressure among Canadians. To this end, I analyze confidential data from a nationally-representative survey of Canadians conducted in 2006: Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey. These data are ideal for examining socioeconomic differences in work-family conflict and time pressure because—in addition to measures of the dependent variables and focal predictors—they include measures of a wide variety of work and family conditions that the Stress Process Models suggests to be underlying mechanisms. Hence, I am

occupations that were previously reserved for men (e.g., police chiefs and special detectives, FBI agents, hospital administrators, surgeons and other medical doctors, lawyers and law-firm partners, and even president of the United States) and the privileged lives of “real” housewives (Douglas 2009). How the media covers the work-family interface and portrays women matters because, as Douglas (2009) explains, “…the media has become such powerful and ubiquitous institutions in society, shaping public understandings of which issues and which people are important and which ones are not…the media are funhouse mirrors that magnify certain kinds of people, values, attitudes and issues, while minimizing others and rendering them invisible. Through the repetition of particular images and the erasure of others, the media play a central role in constructing a national ‘common sense’ about who we are and who we should be. And these distorted reflections contain and perpetuate significant class biases by either ignoring or silently ridiculing most women who make less than $100,000 a year…”

able to shed some much-needed light on the role of socioeconomic status in the work-family interface.

The remainder of this introductory chapter is organized by four major sections, which provide important background for the empirical chapters that follow. In the first section, I outline dramatic changes in work and family since the 1960s that have effectively made coordinating earning and caring role more problematic for more people. Another part of the problem is inadequate institutional supports for workers with family responsibilities. Overall, this section explains why the work-family interface is now a pressing social issue.

The second section pertains to the conceptualization of the work-family interface, covering such issues as its theoretical origins; definitions of key concepts (i.e., work-family conflict and time pressure); and components of the prevailing conceptual model and their interrelationships. The third section focuses on socioeconomic status in relation to the work-family interface. It documents the middle-class bias that characterizes the work-family literature. Further, it suggests that scholars’ failure to consider socioeconomic status comparatively vis-à-vis the work-family interface owes to their uncritical acceptance of role theory as a theoretical backdrop, as well as to their reliance on ecological systems theory alone for contextualization. I recommend that the Stress Process Model be more widely incorporated into the literature because it suggests mechanisms by which socioeconomic status (and other features of social structure) affects the work-family interface at the micro-level. The fourth and final section provides an overview of the dissertation, focusing on the empirical chapters.

1 The Dilemma of Coordinating Earning and Caring Roles: Past and Present

Since the 19th century, when industrialization transferred production from households to specialized factories, families have faced the dilemma of coordinating earning and caring roles (Heymann 2000 & 2005). Until the 1960s, most families, particularly middle-class families, solved this dilemma by enacting a gendered division of labour (Bianchi and Raley 2005; Luxton 2001). Specifically, men supported their wives and children financially by concentrating on
(paid) employment and women supported their husbands and children emotionally and functionally by concentrating on caregiving and housekeeping. This gendered division of labour was reinforced by gendered ideologies of domesticity (i.e., work and family as separate spheres, governed by distinct moralities, that men and women, respectively, were naturally suited to inhabit) and childrearing (i.e., motherhood as women’s primary vocation), not to mention the fact that discrimination against women in the labour market was legal and widespread (Crompton 2006).

In the latter half of the 20th century, the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker model of work and family relations became less universal, less attainable, and perhaps even less desirable as a solution to the dilemma of coordinating earning and caring roles (Bianchi and Raley 2005). Women’s educational and occupational opportunities expanded with both the civil and women’s rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s and the shift from a manufacturing to service-based economy (Bianchi and Raley 2005; Luxton 2001; Ranson 2005). At the same time, women experienced a foreclosing of opportunities to stay home. Cost of living increases, together with men’s declining economic fortunes (i.e., employment rates and earnings), mean that men can no longer financially support their families single-handedly. The increasing fragility of marriage in an age of separation and divorce render women vulnerable to poverty if they look to men as lifetime sources of financial support. Improved methods of contraception facilitated fertility decline, with the implication that women are spending less of their adult lives in active childcare. Changing gender ideologies, fuelled by the revitalization of the feminist movement, have contributed to a general devaluation of homemaking as a life pursuit. Thus, women have been pushed to build their lives around employment—whether or not they are wives and/or mothers.

From the 1960s onward, the labour-force participation of women, particularly wives and mothers of young children, increased dramatically (Arat-Koc 2001; Lechner and Creedon 1994; Tan 2008; Ranson 2005). It follows that dual earners have replaced male breadwinners/female homemakers as the usual pattern in conjugal families (Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004; Rosenthal 2000). Although women have assumed greater earning roles within families (albeit usually not to the same extent as men), their disproportionate responsibility for domestic labour continues (Crompton and Lyonette 2007; Luxton 2001). However, there is evidence that women have cut-back on housework and men have picked up some of the slack (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie
Men have also significantly increased their participation in childcare, in line with a new ideal of fatherhood that emphasizes both economic provision and direct involvement in the lives of children. The total workload of parents in dual-earner households—that is, time spent on both employment and domestic labour—is roughly equivalent for women and men (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). A less gendered division of labour in families means that more people (i.e., women and men) experience the dilemma of coordinating earning and caring roles firsthand (Bianchi and Raley 2005; OECD 1994, as cited in Ellingsæter 1999). It also seems that the dilemma of coordinating earning and caring roles has become more intense because the demands of work and family have increased in recent decades, for five of reasons. First, single-parent (mother) families have become increasingly common, with elevated rates of non-marital births, marital dissolution, and partnership dissolution among cohabiting couples (Whitehead 2008). For single parents, tensions between work and family are compounded by the fact that they do not have a spouse/partner with whom to share them and, for mothers, that they face elevated vulnerability to poverty.

Second, childrearing norms have become more rigorous, especially for mothers. According to Hays (1996), a new ideology of motherhood has emerged, known as “intensive mothering,” that lays ultimate responsibility for children in the hands of their mothers. It also sets high standards for childcare: the “best” childrearing methods are child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, laborious, and financially expensive. Specifically, intensive mothering involves spending plenty of ‘quality time’ with children, fostering their development through exposure to a variety of extracurricular activities, and making constant efforts to enrich their environment (Roxburgh 2012). Consistent with the intensive mothering model, scholars have observed the emergence of a new ideal of fatherhood, particularly among fathers in dual-earner families (Coltrane 1996; Marsiglio, Day, and Lamb 2000; Townsend 2002). Although these childrearing norms are primarily enacted by middle-class parents, Bianchi and her colleagues

---

4 This is not to say that the weight of coordinating earning and caring roles falls equally on women and men. In spite of the new ideal of fatherhood, mothers still have “ultimate responsibility” for the nurturance and development of children (Hays 1996; McMahon 1995; Walzer 1998). Hence, it is usually mothers who make arrangements for child care and then pay for it with their own earnings (Crawford and Pollack 1990, as cited in Brandon 1999) and/or who adjust their labour-force participation in a downward fashion to care for children themselves (Beaujot and Ravanera 2009; see also Mennino and Brayfield 2002: 227-228 for a succinct review of relevant research).
(2006) argue that they are spreading to all parents. After all, the middle-class version of family often defines the cultural ideal, even among those who cannot achieve it. Also, the duration of children’s dependency on parents has been prolonged, with delayed entry into full-time employment, marriage, and parenthood among young adults (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). Again, this pattern is more common among the middle class because these parents are better able to balance continued financial support of their grown children against the necessity of ensuring their own retirement (Berlin, Furstenberg, and Waters 2010).

Third, long-term changes in the functions of families, from fulfillment of instrumental needs to fulfillment of expressive needs, have been strengthened, as women’s labour force participation has undermined the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker model and, with it, patterns of mutual dependency between spouses/partners (Beaujot 2000). As a result, family relationships are now predicated on emotional gratification, as opposed to subsistence, to a greater extent than ever before. Expressive needs represent heavy demands on family relationships, with significant consequences if they go unmet: individuals are more prone to abandon family relationships when their emotional well-being is not being satisfied.

Fourth, more people (women) are simultaneously caring for family members at both ends of the age spectrum: children and elders (Neal and Hammer 2007; Lechner and Creedon 1994). Population aging, stemming from the long-term decline in fertility and increase in longevity, has accelerated and it will become increasingly rapid as the baby-boom generation reaches retirement ages. The trend of delayed childbearing, emerging in the mid-1970s, means that many individuals are raising children later in life—at the same time as their aging parents begin to need assistance. Hence, they are “sandwiched” between the care needs of their children and elderly parents.\(^5\)

Fifth, how much and when people work has changed, with economic restructuring since the 1970s. Technological advances and innovations that have saved time and money by replacing

\(^5\) Some scholars, such as Rosenthal (2000), argue that the sandwich generation is one aspect of demographic change that has been overstated. At present, the sandwich generation is relatively small: Using data from the 2002 GSS, Williams (2005) estimated that 712,000 Canadians between the ages of 45 and 64 years had co-resident children under the age of 25 years and also performed some type of elder care.
workers, coupled with the relocation of many factory jobs to developing countries with lower labour and production costs, have driven a shift from reliance on manufacturing to services for employment and economic growth (Whitehead 2008). In comparison to manufacturing, where jobs are typically well-paying and often unionized, with substantial health, vacation, and retirement benefits, service jobs are fairly diverse (Acker 2006; Morris and Western 1999). The growth of service jobs means more high-paying, skilled jobs in upper-tier industries like finance, medicine, and education, but it also means even more low-paying, unskilled jobs in lower-tier industries like retail and hospitality. Importantly, the distinction between “good” and “bad” service jobs is becoming increasingly blurred due to the demise of employment relations known as the “internal labour market” in upper-tier industries. Morris and Western (1999) explain that “In stylized form, the internal labor market was characterized by the lifetime job. Workers started at one company, stayed with it, and were guaranteed job security and yearly raises.” Further, the internal labour market was characterized by a formal hierarchy of jobs within firms that were primarily filled by internal promotions, rather than external recruitment. Given increasing globalization of the economy and rapid technological changes, there is greater emphasis on productivity and cost control in business as important bases of competition (Fredriksen-Goldsen and Scharlach 2001; Morris and Western 1999). Both productivity and cost control require flexibility in who is hired, for how long, for how much, and for which tasks (Morris and Western 1999). To achieve this flexibility, some employers have adopted high-performance work systems—to the benefit of themselves as well as their employees. However, downsizing and “precarious” work arrangements (i.e., part-time, temporary, and contract work) have also become increasingly common in upper-tier industries. This overloads “surviving” employees and leaves them “working scared” under the perceived threat of job loss. Also, employers’ efforts to promote flexibility encourage weakened commitment to reward systems

---

6 According to Kumar (2000: 1), “High-performance work systems...underscore flexible job designs and work arrangements, team or group work, greater information sharing and employee involvement in decision making, and cooperative labour-management relations to foster a participatory enterprise culture. They signify a strategic approach to human resource development and utilization, emphasizing the need to develop a highly skilled, highly flexible, and highly motivated work force and a human resource management system that promotes creativity and initiative among employees. By making better use of employee skills and knowledge, the new approach is intended to help organizations to become lean, cost efficient, and flexible, and more responsive to changing markets and technologies. At the same time new systems of work and rewards promise workers challenging, satisfying, and more secure jobs, higher wages, and opportunities for greater control, autonomy, and participation.”
designed to retain skilled employees, such as generous benefits packages, steadily growing paycheques, and opportunities for career advancement (Fredriksen-Goldsen and Scharlach 2001; Sweet and Meiksins 2008). Thus, many good service jobs have acquired characteristics that are usually associated with bad ones.

In this economic context, a growing number of managers and professionals are spending long hours at work and taking additional work home—a trend that is facilitated by communication technology (e.g., e-mail and cellular phones) and laptop computers, which make it possible to work at all times and from anywhere (Fredrikson-Goldsen and Scharlach 2001; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). At the opposite end of the occupational hierarchy, time spent at work is short and shrinking (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Non-standard work hours (i.e., evenings, nights, and weekends) and schedules (i.e., rotating and on-call shifts) are relatively more common here, particularly in lower-tier service industries (Perry-Jenkins 2005). All told, long work hours, non-standard work hours that involve periods formerly considered to be family time, and non-standard work schedules that are unpredictable contribute to a sense that work is increasingly spilling over into family life.

For the reasons discussed above, the dilemma of coordinating earning and caring roles has become more problematic for more people. The dearth of institutional supports for workers with family responsibilities has also played an important role here (Arat-Koc 2001; Duxbury and Higgins 2006). Formal work-family workplace policies, defined as the policies and practices of employers that facilitate the combination of work and family (e.g., flexibility in work hours, schedules, and place of work; options for leave; on-site childcare and/or referral services), are increasingly linked, in theory, to recruitment and retention issues, individual and group performance, and greater employee commitment (Kossek 2005). Accordingly, over the past few decades, such policies have proliferated as a means of attracting and retaining employees, primarily highly-valued (skilled) ones. However, they frequently go unused by employees, owing to a lack of publicity and/or cultural barriers (Kossek 2005; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). The ideal worker norm, which defines the best employees as those who do not allow family responsibilities to encumber their work hours or commitment, prevails in workplaces (Williams 2000). It follows that face time (i.e., being physically present at the workplace) and long hours are often viewed as indicators of employees’ dedication to work (Thompson, Andreassi, and
Many employees are reluctant to use work-family policies in workplaces, then, for fear that doing so will have negative consequences for their careers (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Thompson et al. 2005).

In Canada, the government has also provided little in the way of supports for workers with family responsibilities, particularly when compared to Scandinavian countries. For one thing, paid maternity and parental leaves, which help parents to care for their children during the critical first year/s of life, are limited. Maternity and parental benefits are administered through the Employment Insurance program and they are available only to workers who have accumulated at least 600 insured hours in the last 52 weeks or since their last claim (Service Canada 2014). Successful claimants are eligible for 15 weeks of maternity benefits, compensated at only 55% of previous earnings up to a ceiling of $514.00 per week. Parental benefits, which can be taken by either mothers or fathers, are available for an additional 35 weeks at the same wage-replacement rate. Maternal and parental benefits, totaling 50 weeks of paid leave for both parents combined, must be taken within 52 weeks of a child’s birth or adoption.

Regulated childcare is not widely available in Canada: it covers only 12% of children between infancy and 12 years of age (Ranson 2005). Further, monthly fees for regulated childcare are prohibitively expensive, even though parents who are working or studying are eligible for a tax deduction and low-income parents are eligible for subsidies (Doherty, Friendly, and Beach 2003). What is more alarming is that a report on early childhood education and care in Canada, recently released by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), reveals that even though regulated childcare is generally provided by supportive adults who protect children’s health and safety, many programs fail to provide the types of experiences that are necessary to support children’s social, language, and cognitive development (Doherty et al. 2003).

There is a structural mismatch between work and family in the context of the increasing prevalence of dual-earner and single-parent families, intense work and family demands, and inadequate institutional supports for workers with family responsibilities. In effect, the male breadwinner/female-homemaker model of work and family relations continues to be institutionalized (i.e., contemporary institutions, including the culture and organization of employment, domestic labour, community and welfare services, reflect its basic gendered
assumptions), even though it has clearly unraveled (Crompton 2006; Crompton, Lewis, and Lyonette 2007; Marcus-Newhall, Casad, LeMaster, Peraza, and Silverman 2008; Moen and Yu 2000). As a result, it has largely been left up to people, as individuals, couples, and families, to absorb tensions between earning and caring roles—often to the detriment of their personal well-being (Duxbury and Higgins 2006; Sayer 2007). The National Study on Balancing Work and Caregiving in Canada reveals that 60% of Canadian employees experience at least moderate levels of work-to-family interference and 58% experience at least moderate levels of family-to-work interference (Duxbury and Higgins 2012). Work-family conflict reduces mental health, with these effects being demonstrated for general mental health and well-being, dissatisfaction with life, psychosomatic symptoms, depression, general psychological distress, medication use, cigarette use, drinking problems, substance-dependence disorders, clinical mood disorders, and clinical anxiety disorders (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Mullen, Kelley and Kelloway 2008). Work-family conflict is also related to poor overall physical health, co-occurrence of multiple chronic health problems, hypertension, and obesity. Similarly, 72% of Canadian employees experience at least moderate levels of (total) role overload, also known as time pressure (Duxbury and Higgins 2012). Time pressure has been linked to increased levels of anxiety, fatigue, burnout, depression, and emotional and physiological stress (Duxbury, Lyons, and Higgins 2008). Thus, work-family conflict and time pressure are prevalent among Canadians, with potentially serious consequences for their mental and physical health.

2 Conceptualizing the Work-Family Interface

In this section, I switch gears, from the social and economic context of the work-family interface at the macro level to multiple roles and their implications for well-being at the micro level. Here, I address how the work-family interface plays out for individuals—what determines (antecedents) and becomes (outcomes) of that. Most of the relevant literature comes from psychology, with the implication that the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface is asocial. By this I mean that the role of social structure in the work-family interface has not been considered. Thus, sociologists can make important contributions to the work-family literature by doing so.
2.1 Role (Strain) Theory

Most of the literature on the work-family interface has role (strain) theory as its theoretical backdrop (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008; Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, and Baltes 2009). From a structural perspective, “role” refers to culturally-defined norms—expectations of rights and duties—that are associated with a given social position (Biddle 1986; Stryker 2001; Turner 2001). Individuals either internalize these expectations or experience them from external sources, or both, and they are judged by both themselves and others on the basis of how well they conform to them. Since institutions are comprised of social positions that individuals enact, roles effectively link the micro and macro levels. Specifically, roles guide individuals’ attitudes and behaviours within social positions and, in that way, they contribute to the smooth operation of institutions.

Individuals typically occupy multiple roles, such as worker, spouse/partner, and parent. According to Goode (1960: 483), it is normal for them to experience “role strain,” defined as “the felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations” and manifested as actual or perceived inability to adequately meet expectations for those social positions (Fredriksen-Goldsen and Scharlach 2001). Since work and family are enacted in separate environments, entailing distinct norms and requirements, role strain related to the work-family interface originates from conflicting expectations between these roles (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008). Compounding this inter-role conflict is the fact that individuals operate under fixed amounts of time and energy, meaning that they may be forced to make concessions in their role performance. Otherwise, individuals will experience role overload, as their total role obligations are over-demanding relative to their time and energy.

In line with role theory, scholars have typically viewed the work-family interface negatively, in terms of concepts like work-family conflict and time pressure (Carlson and Grzywacz 2008). Positive and integrative perspectives have also emerged (e.g., work-family enrichment and work-family balance, respectively), reflecting notions that work and family may have a symbiotic and even synergistic relationship (e.g., Barnett and Hyde 2001; Marks 1977; Marks and MacDermid 1996). However, neither of these perspectives on the work-family interface has reached a level of theoretical development and conceptual clarity that is comparable to that of the negative perspective (Carlson and Grzywacz 2008). For this reason, the present
research focuses on socioeconomic status in relation to the leading concepts of the negative perspective on the work-family interface: work-family conflict and time pressure.

2.2 Work-Family Conflict and Time Pressure

Work-family conflict and time pressure are related concepts, in that they are sub-categories of the broader concept of role strain (Hecht 2001). Scholars often use these concepts interchangeably (e.g., Beaufot and Andersen 2007; Tézli and Gauthier 2009), but they are, in fact, distinct. Work-family conflict is a specific form of inter-role conflict that is “experienced when pressures arising in one role are incompatible with pressures arising in another role...when participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in another role” (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985: 77). It is bi-directional in nature, meaning that work can interfere with family (i.e., work-to-family conflict) and family can interfere with work (i.e., family-to-work conflict) (Bellavia and Frone 2005). However, work and family boundaries are asymmetrically permeable, such that work-to-family conflict occurs more often than does family-to-work conflict (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992b).

Time pressure refers to chronic cognitions of not having enough time and emotional experiences of being rushed, accompanied by stress (Szollos 2009). In the work-family literature, time pressure has typically been conceptualized as (total) role overload, consistent with its roots in role theory. The equivalence of time pressure and role overload is evident from Duxbury and her colleagues’ (2008: 125) working definition of the latter concept:

...role overload...can be defined simply as having too much to do and not enough time in which to do it. Role overload means feeling rushed and time cramped, feeling physically and emotionally exhausted and drained, and not having enough time for oneself.

I prefer the term “time pressure” to “role overload” because it is more intuitive, but these concepts are synonymous. In the context of the work-family interface, time pressure/role overload can be formally defined as perceptions that the collective demands of multiple roles are so great that time resources are insufficient to adequately fulfill them to the satisfaction of self and others (Duxbury, Lyons, and Higgins 2008).
Having defined work-family conflict and time pressure, it should be clear that they are distinct concepts. Work-family conflict occurs when demands related to one role inhibit one’s ability to meet the demands of the other role, whereas time pressure occurs when one has altogether too many role demands relative to the time available to meet them (Duxbury et al. 2008; Hecht 2001). It follows that work-family conflict is bi-directional (i.e., work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict), whereas time pressure encompasses the totality of time pressures that individuals face in fulfilling the responsibilities of both earning and caring roles.

2.3 Prevailing Conceptual Model of the Work-Family Interface

Conceptual models of the work-family interface map the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict and their interrelationships. In the 1990s, Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992a) articulated a conceptual model of the work-family interface that has dominated the literature since its publication (Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer 2007). More importantly, it has been empirically validated in individual studies (Aryee, Fields, and Luk 1999; Carlson and Kacmar 2000; Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992a) and meta-analytically (Ford et al. 2007). At the heart of this model, depicted in Figure 1-1, is the understanding of work-family conflict as a key mediating variable that partially accounts for cross-role relations between work and family. That is to say that work-family conflict links the conditions of one role (work or family) to outcomes in other role (family or work). Distinguishing between work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict (and suggesting that they are reciprocally related), Frone and his colleagues posit unique, domain-specific antecedents and outcomes of the two directions of work-family conflict: work conditions affect family distress via work-to-family conflict and family conditions affect job distress via family-to-work conflict. Since job and family distress are related to global measures of personal well-being, such as depression, both directions of work-family conflict indirectly affect it as well. Work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict also directly affect depression.
Figure 1-1. Prevailing Conceptual Model of the Work-Family Interface.

Source: Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992a: 66)
Although time pressure is not included in the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface as a mediator of the relationship between work and family characteristics, on one hand, and job and family distress and depression, on the other hand, it probably plays this role (see Roxburgh 2004). The relationship between work-family conflict and time pressure is unclear, since most work-family research either focuses on one or the other concept or ignores the distinction between them and uses them interchangeably (Duxbury et al. 2008; Hecht 2001). However, it is well-established that work-family conflict and time pressure share antecedents and certain outcomes, including job, family, and life satisfaction (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Duxbury et al. 2008). This is not surprising, as both work-family conflict and time pressure are forms of role strain. Time pressure can be substituted for work-family conflict in the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface, then, with minor modifications to reflect that fact that it is non-directional. Specifically, time pressure is affected by both work and family conditions and it affects both job and family distress as well as depression.

The prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface incorporates only a few work and family “stressors,” as well as psychological involvement in each role, as antecedents of work-family conflict and, both directly and indirectly, job and family distress and depression. As research has progressed, additional work and family conditions—most notably those which may serve as resources—have been recognized as relevant in this regard. Hence, in identifying antecedents of the work-family interface, I draw on Voydanoff’s (2007; 2008) conceptual model.

2.3.1 Antecedents of Work-Family Conflict and Time Pressure

Voydanoff (2007; 2008) has implemented a demands and resources approach, overlaid with work-family border/boundary theory, to conceptualize the processes through which work and family conditions influence work-family conflict (and other “linking mechanisms”) and ultimately personal well-being. Work and family characteristics are essentially demands or resources in the work-family interface:

Demands are structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations, and norms to which individuals must respond or adopt by exerting physical or mental effort. Resources are structural or psychological assets that may be used to facilitate performance, reduce demands, or generate additional resources (Voydanoff 2008: 39).
Two types of demands and resources are distinguished, yielding a fourfold typology of work and family characteristics: within-domain demands and resources and boundary-spanning demands and resources (Voydanoff 2008). Boundary-spanning demands and resources differ from within-domain demands and resources in two ways. First, within-domain demands and resources are related to the structure and content of activities in one domain, whereas boundary-spanning demands and resources—pertaining to connections between work and family—are inherently part of two domains. Within-domain demands and resources originate in one domain and serve as demands and resources only in that domain. Boundary-spanning demands and resources originate in one domain and serve as demands and resources in that domain, but they also serve as demands and resources in the other domain. Second, boundary-spanning demands and resources influence work-family conflict and personal well-being through different processes than do within-domain demands and resources. Within-domain demands limit participation in the other domain through processes of time and energy drain and negative psychological spillover; within-domain resources enhance participation in the other domain by way of improvements in individuals’ competencies and positive psychological spillover. In order to understand the processes through which boundary-spanning demands and resources influence work-family conflict and personal well-being, it is necessary to briefly review Clark’s (2000) work/family border theory.

Work/family border theory views relationships between the work and family domains as a continuum ranging from segmentation to integration (Voydanoff 2007 & 2008). At the segmentation end of the continuum, the work and family domains are mutually exclusive, with distinctive mentalities and no temporal or physical overlap. At the integration end of the continuum, the work and family domains are indistinguishable in terms of the people, tasks, and thoughts involved. The extent to which segmentation or integration characterizes work and family is determined by how permeable and flexible the boundaries are between these domains. Permeability refers to the degree to which elements from one domain enter into the other domain (e.g., receiving telephone calls from home while at work). Flexibility refers to the degree to which temporal and spatial boundaries between the work and family domains allow roles to be enacted in various settings and at various times (e.g., flexible work schedules in which one can choose starting and ending times, or vary these times, to meet family needs). Segmentation is
characterized by low permeability and inflexible boundaries, whereas integration is characterized by high permeability and flexible boundaries.

Boundary-spanning demands and resources pertain to permeability and flexibility that is associated with varying degrees of work-family segmentation or integration (Voydanoff 2008). Boundary-spanning demands complicate role performance across domains through boundary permeability; boundary-spanning resources ease role performance across domains through boundary flexibility. Since boundary-spanning demands and resources focus on aspects of the work and family domains that directly address how they connect with each other, they are antecedents of both directions of work-family conflict.

Within-Domain Demands. Within-domain demands, characteristics of the structure and content of a domain that hinder role performance in the other domain, are of two types: time-based and strain-based (Voydanoff 2008). Time-based demands reflect the fact that time is a finite resource, meaning that time or involvement in one domain effectively limits time and involvement in the other domain through a process of resource drain. In the work domain, time spent on employment and non-standard work hours/schedules are time-based demands. In the family domain, time spent caring for children, doing housework, and assisting elderly parents or other relatives are time-based demands.

Strain-based demands operate through a process of negative psychological spillover, in which psychological responses to poor conditions in one domain (e.g., negative emotional arousal, interpersonal withdrawal, energy depletion, and stress) carry over to attitudes and behaviour in the other domain. Strain-based demands include characteristics of the social organization of work and family, such as job demands and insecurity, marital conflict, children’s problems, caregiver strain, and unfairness in the division of domestic labour between spouses/partners.

Within-Domain Resources. Within-domain resources, characteristics of the structure and content of a domain that facilitate or improve role performance in the other domain, are of two types: enabling resources and psychological rewards (Voydanoff 2008). Enabling resources in one domain, such as skills, abilities, and social support from others in that context, increase individuals’ competences in the other domain. In the work domain, characteristics of job design,
such as job autonomy and skill utilization, and workplace support from supervisor/s and co-workers are enabling resources. In the family domain, family adaptability, cohesion, and support from spouse/partner and other relatives are enabling resources.

Psychological rewards include privileges, status security and enhancement, and personality enrichment. In addition, they include psychological resources related to feeling esteemed and valued as well as intrinsic rewards like meaningful activities. Psychological rewards are accompanied by psychological benefits, such as motivation, a sense of accomplishment, self-esteem, and ego gratification. It follows that psychological rewards operate through a process of positive psychological spillover, in which psychological responses to good conditions in one domain (e.g., positive emotional arousal, interpersonal availability, energy creation, and gratification) carry over to the other domain such that they enhance participation in it. The meaning, pride, and respect that individuals derive from performing of their earning and caring roles are examples of psychological rewards in the work and family domains, respectively.

**Boundary-Spanning Demands.** Boundary-spanning demands pertain to boundary permeability between the domains of work and family: the extent to which aspects of one domain can enter into the other domain (Voydanoff 2008). Low boundary permeability implies difficult role transitions across domains. Boundary-spanning demands that are associated with low boundary permeability are overnight travel for work and commuting time between home and workplace. High boundary permeability implies role blurring or blending, such that distinctions between earning and caring roles becomes unclear. Boundary-spanning demands that are associated with high boundary permeability are performing work activities at home and performing family activities at work.

**Boundary-Spanning Resources.** Boundary-spanning resources pertain to boundary flexibility between the domains of work and family: the degree to which the activities of earning and caring roles can be performed in various settings and at various times. In the work domain, boundary-spanning resources are workplace policies and programs that enhance the temporal and/or spatial boundary between work and family. Work supports, such as flexible work schedules, dependent-care benefits, and arrangements that allow employees to perform at least
some of their work at home (e.g., telecommuting), help employees to meet their family responsibilities without reducing their work hours or performance. Family supports, such as parental and dependent-care leave, the option of taking time off from work to meet family responsibilities, and part-time work, enhance flexibility by reducing employees’ work hours and performance. Also, workplace cultures that are supportive of employees’ dual roles as earners and carers can increase boundary flexibility by legitimizing the use of workplace policies and programs to coordinate work and family responsibilities.

In the family domain, boundary-spanning resources also take the form of work, family, and normative supports. Spouses/partners, other relatives, and friends may help individuals to meet their work responsibilities by performing dependent care and housework. Spouses/partners may also help individuals to meet their family responsibilities by taking on more (paid) work, thereby freeing them to devote more time and energy to dependent care and housework. Additionally, relatives and friends may provide normative support to individuals who are attempting to combine work and family by acknowledging the value of such attempts and giving them emotional and instrumental assistance.

### 2.4 Summary

From the perspective of role (strain) theory, when individuals occupy multiple roles, such as work, spouse/partner, and parent, it is normal for them to experience role strain—felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations—due to conflicting expectations and finite amounts of time and energy. Work-family conflict and time pressure are distinct forms of role strain. Work-family conflict occurs when performance of the family role is complicated by performance of the work role (i.e., work-to-family conflict) and vice versa (i.e., family-to-work conflict), whereas time pressure occurs when multiple roles are altogether too demanding relative to the time available to perform them.

In the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface, work-family conflict is a “linking mechanism” between the work and family characteristics (antecedents) and personal well-being (outcomes). Specifically, work-to-family conflict partially mediates the relationship
between work conditions and family distress; family-to-work conflict partially mediates the relationship between family conditions and job distress. Job and family distress are related to depression, so both directions of work-family conflict indirectly affect it as well. Work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict also directly affect depression.

Time pressure is another linking mechanism between work and family conditions and personal wellness. Since it is non-directional, both work and family conditions are relevant antecedents, and both job and family distress are relevant outcomes, of time pressure. Through its influence on job and family distress, time pressure indirectly affects depression. It also directly affects depression.

Work and family conditions constitute demands or resources in the work-family interface. These demands and resources are of two types, giving rise to a fourfold typology: within-domain demands and resources and boundary-spanning demands and resources. Within-domain demands and resources are related to the structure and content of one domain (work or family), whereas boundary-spanning demands and resources are inherently part of both domains (work and family). Within-domain demands and resources also influence work-family conflict and personal well-being through different processes than do boundary-spanning demands and resources. Within-domain demands and resources limit/enhance participation in the other domain through resource drain/gain, improvements in individuals’ competencies, and negative/positive psychological spillover. Boundary-spanning demands and resources pertain to permeability and flexibility in the boundaries between the work and family domains, which complicate/ease role performance across domains.

Within the fourfold typology of work and family characteristics, further distinctions are made. Within-domain demands are of two types: time-based and strain-based. In the work domain, time spent on employment and non-standard work hours/schedules are time-based demands; job demands and insecurity are strain-based demands. In the family domain, time spent caring for children, assisting elderly parents or other relatives, and doing housework are time-based demands; marital conflict, children’s problems, caregiver strain, and unfairness in the division of domestic labour between spouses/partners are strain-based demands. Within-domain resources are also of two types: enabling resources and psychological rewards. Job autonomy,
skill utilization, and workplace support from supervisor/s and co-workers are enabling resources in the work domain, as are family adaptability, family cohesion, and support from spouse/partner and other relatives in the family domain. The meaning, pride, and respect that individuals get from earning and caring roles are psychological rewards in their respective domains.

Boundary-spanning demands exist in circumstances of both low and high permeability in the boundaries between the work and family domains. With low permeability, role transitions are difficult, as in the cases of overnight travel for work and long commutes between home and workplace. With high permeability, role blurring or blending occurs, when, for example, work activities are performed at home (or vice versa). Boundary-spanning resources enhance flexibility in the boundary between the work and family domains. Examples of such resources are work-family policies and programs in the workplace; workplace cultures that are supportive of both earning and caring roles; and functional and normative support of workers with family responsibilities from relatives and friends.

3 Socioeconomic Status in Relation to the Work-Family Interface

3.1 Middle-Class Bias of the Work-Family Literature

Scholars suggest that it is no coincidence that interest in the work-family interface has increased dramatically since the 1980s, with the influx of white, middle-class women into the labour market (Estes 2003; Marshall and Barnett 1991). After all, working-class and poor, immigrant, and racial/ethnic-minority women and have been “balancing” work and family for generations (Albelda 2001; Casper and Bianchi 2002; Morgen 1990). A pervasive critique of the work-family literature is that it reflects the circumstances and experiences of the middle or “professional-managerial” class (e.g., Ammons and Kelly 2008; Greenhaus 2008; Hennessy 2009; Hertz 1999; Lambert 1999; Marks and Leslie 2000; Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004; Poppleton, Briner, and Kiefer 2008; Stebbins 2001; Stevens, Minnotte, and Kiger 2004;
As Dodson and Bravo (2005: 122) explain:

…a review of the expanding literature on work and family reveals that, for the most part, the issues that define the field are based on middle-class family life. The harsh time bind, the domestic labor balance of dual-earner couples, gender-based roles that lead to “mommy-tracking,” and the career off-ramps associated with marriage and childbearing capture the work-family dilemma as it is known by the American middle class. This same focus is reflected in emerging programs and policies to address the tensions between career and family care. Flexible work schedules, job sharing, telecommuting—approaches to alleviating the work-family crunch—have been used in some workplaces but tend to be available only to higher-wage employees. Above all, most work and family discourse presumes an income sufficient to provide for a family’s basic needs.

Additional evidence of the middle-class bias that characterizes the literature comes from Casper and her colleagues’ (2007) review of work-family research published in industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behaviour journals between 1980 and 2003. They find that nearly 70% of work-family studies that reported sample characteristics focused on managers and/or professionals, whereas only 6% of these studies included employees in such lower-level occupations as production, operations, and labour (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, and Lambert 2007).

The disproportionate focus on managers and professionals in the work-family literature has been attributed to the fact that they are the most highly-valued workers in today’s labour market (Lambert 1999; Stebbins 2001). Webber and Williams (2008) suggest other reasons: managerial and professional careers are structured in such that work and family are particularly incompatible; focusing on women managers and professionals, in particular, is consistent with the liberal feminist agenda to promote women to top leadership positions (see also Percheski

---

7 Managers and professionals are the “middle” between the working and capitalist classes (Acker 2006). They occupy a contradictory class location, in that they exercise delegated authority or specialized knowledge and expertise in the interests of their employers (capitalists), but, like other workers, they are controlled by their employers and exploited within production (Goldthorpe and Erikson 1993; Wright 1997). Further, managers and professionals receive remuneration that is above the costs of producing and reproducing their labour power and, in that way, they appropriate part of the social surplus from production as “skill” or “loyalty rent” (Wright 1997). Employers rely on such mechanisms to achieve desired levels of commitment, cooperation, and effort from professionals and managers (Goldthorpe and Erikson 1993; Wright 1997).
and, as elite members of society, what women professionals do is seen as culturally important and serves as a model for other women (see also Stone 2007a and Blair-Loy 2003). There is also a sense that looking at the experiences of the “best and brightest” constitutes a weak test of the challenges involved in combining earning and caring roles. As Stone (2007b: 15) asks, rhetorically: “If the most privileged women of society cannot successfully combine work and family, who can?” (see also Swiss and Walker 1994).

What is interesting about these explanations for the emphasis on managers and professionals is that they reveal ambivalent assumptions about how socioeconomic status shapes individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface. On one hand, combining earning and caring roles is viewed as particularly problematic for managers and professionals. On the other hand, managers and professionals are recognized to have certain resources from which non-

---

8 I would suggest two other reasons for scholars’ attention to work-family issues among high-level women executives. The first reason relates to Hakim’s (2000; 2003) preference theory. This theory emphasizes personal values and decision-making at the micro level as explanations and predictors of women’s choices between market work and family work. When genuine choices are available to women in this regard, as they are in Western Europe, North America, and other “modern” societies (due to the contraceptive and equal opportunities revolutions, the expansion of white-collar occupations and jobs for secondary earners, and the rise of individualism), women enact their preferences through three lifestyles. Adaptive women, who are the majority, prefer to combine employment and family work without giving a fixed priority to either. Work-centered women, a minority, are focused on competitive activities in the public sphere—in careers, sports, politics, or the arts, with family being fitted around these activities, if marriage and/or motherhood occur at all. Finally, home-centered women, also a minority, prefer to give priority to private and family life, tending to have more children and avoid paid employment after marriage unless financially necessary. Although Hakim argues that home-centred women do not necessarily invest less in acquiring qualifications, as educational systems function as both marriage markets and training institutions, it is hard to believe that women with little intention of making use of human capital would make the personal sacrifices necessary to earn advanced degrees simply to land a husband. This is especially true when we consider that meeting the requirements of these educational programs is generally time- and energy-consuming, leaving little leftover for socializing with prospective husbands. Looking at high-level women executives, it is reasonable to assume that they have work-centered preferences (otherwise they would not have pursued advanced education in the first place). When these women take less demanding jobs (i.e., self-imposed de-skilling) or opt-out to attend to their family responsibilities, then, it can be safely attributed to workplaces that are hostile to them, given the ideal worker norm, rather than to adaptive or home-centered preferences.

The second reason is that the working class, including those leading “settled” lives, are frequently denigrated by the classes above as bigoted simpletons (Williams 2010; Ehrenreich 1989). Quoting “class migrants,” individuals born and raised working class who joined the middle class as professors through elite education, Williams (2010) suggests that such negative views often hold sway even among otherwise enlightened scholars. Said one class migrant: “It is striking to me and many other working-class academics that faculty who would never utter a racial slur will casually refer to ‘trailer trash’ or ‘white trash’” (Williams 2010: 154). It is not beyond the realm of possibility that class stereotypes influence who scholars consider to be (un)worthy of research.
professionals do not benefit to the same extent, which may ease combination of earning and caring roles. Yet these assumptions have rarely been empirically evaluated through comparative research (Bianchi and Milkie 2010). Scholars have studied aspects of the work-family interface for a variety of occupations in isolation: managers and/or professionals (e.g., Carrier 1995; Eaton and Bailyn 1999; Guillaume and Pochic 2009; Halrynjo and Lyng 2009; Hewlett 2007; Hilbert, Shaw, Johnson, and Andrey 2008; Hill, Mead, Dean, Hafen, Gadd, Palmer, and Ferris 2006; Lyness and Judiesch 2008; Martins, Eddleston, and Veiga 2002; Moen, Kelly, and Huang 2008; Stone 2007a; Stone and Lovejoy 2004), executives (e.g., Blair-Loy 2001 & 2003; Ezzedeen and Ritchey 2009), physicians and other medical professionals (e.g., Barnett and Gareis 2000; Barnett, Gareis, and Carr 2005; Clawson, Gerstel, and Crocker 2009; Gareis and Barnett 2002; Shows and Gerstel 2009), lawyers (Blair-Loy and DeHart 2003; Leiper 1998; Wallace 1997; Young and Wallace 2009); stockbrokers (Blair-Loy 2009), accountants (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, and Parasuraman 1997), scientists and/or engineers (e.g., Blackwell and Glover 2008; Post, DiTomaso, and Farris 2009; Ranson n.d.; Watts 2009), teachers (Guedouzi 2006); IT workers (Armstrong, Riemenschneider, Allen, and Reid 2007; Quesenberry, Trauth, and Morgan 2006; Thomas and Ganster 1995), lower-wage workers (e.g., Backett-Milburn, Airey, McKie, and Hogg 2008; Lambert 1999; Swanberg 2005), and manual workers (Lautsch and Scully 2007). Alternatively, they have studied how middle-class couples balance work and family (e.g., Becker and Moen 1999; Forsberg 2009; Haddock, Zimmerman, Ziemba, and Lyness 2006) or how working-class and/or low-income families face unique work-family issues (e.g., Barnett, Del Campo, Del Campo, and Steiner 2003; Burton, Lein, and Kolak 2005; Crouter and Booth 2004; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Henly and Lambert 2005; Perry-Jenkins 2005). Thorne (2004: 173) summarizes the state of the literature well: “Although research on paid work and family life has flourished over the last two decades, it is much too sliced up; for example, the literature on dual-earner middle-class families tends to be set apart from studies of working-class and impoverished families.” Yet how socioeconomic status shapes individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface is best understood through a relational lens (Estes 2003; Thorne 2004).

I would suggest that socioeconomic status has only rarely been considered comparatively in relation to the work-family interface because there is no theoretical or conceptual precedent for so doing within the literature. Part of the problem lies in scholars’ uncritical acceptance of
role theory as the theoretical backdrop of the work-family interface. Sociologists, anthropologists, and academic feminists have identified the deficiencies of role theory, which have effectively been imported to the work-family literature. Role theory falsely reifies certain social ideologies into concrete realities or objective templates called roles (Jackson 1998). In this way, it perpetuates the illusion that the normative behavioural expectations associated with a role reflect the actual behaviour of the majority of people. Deviations from role expectations are, in the context of role theory, individual problems that result from inadequate internalization of social norms, obscuring possible power relations and inequalities (e.g., gender, class, and race) that may play an important role. Given the emphasis of role theory on individuals’ internalization of social norms, as well as their desire to achieve a positive self-image by winning the acceptance of others through conformity to role expectations, human agency is limited (Wrong 1961). Opposition to social norms is not addressed, then, in terms of resistance on the part of the individual to power relations and inequalities, but in terms of deviance (Jackson 1998). This interpretation ignores both the resistive efforts of individuals and the social transformations that may come from them. Role theory’s perspective on human agency also minimizes the creative nature of individuals as they adapt to their circumstances on a daily basis. The dynamic interplay that occurs as individuals creatively manage their lives or create their own sense of purpose and meaning through their actions, against a background of social, economic, and familial forces, is effectively absent from role theory. Another trouble with role theory is that it fosters a segmented view of individuals’ behaviour: bracketing human activity into various roles creates the impression that life is partitioned into isolated segments that can be dealt with independently. This segmented view of individuals’ behaviour reflects the male-breadwinner/female homemaker model of work and family relations and, consequently, role theory is out of step with the experiences of dual-earner and single-parent families, “weaving” earning and caring roles (Garey 1999). In summary, role theory is inadequate in providing a framework that accurately
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9 Even in the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker model of work and family relations, earning and caring roles intersect in fundamental ways under capitalism. Fox and Luxton (2001) define family as the relationships that people create to do the work of social reproduction—production, reproduction, and consumption—in order to sustain life on a daily and generational basis. This definition makes clear that both paid employment and domestic labor are crucial to household survival. Luxton and Corman (2001) have explained why this is the case. Family subsistence requires a monetary source, so at least one family member must sell their capacity to work, their labor power, to an employer. On the job, their labor power is exerted in exchange for a wage or salary. At home, people
depicts the complex interplay between individuals’ actions, circumstances, and social, economic, and familial forces (Jackson 1998).

Likewise, the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface is limited, in that it does not consider the role of social structure therein. In recent years, it has become customary for researchers to evoke ecological systems theory as a way of contextualizing the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface (Bellavia and Frone 2005; e.g., Voydanoff 2007 & 2008). Ecological system theory, formulated Bronfenbrenner (1989, as cited in Voydanoff 2007 & 2008), views human development as situated within and, therefore, influenced by a complex system of relationships that span multiple levels of social reality. The ecological level that is closest to the individual is known as the “microsystem.” It consists of a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations that are experienced by an individual in a network of face-to-face relationships, occurring in domains of work, family, and community. The inter-linked system of microsystems in which an individual participates, such as work-family, work-community, family-community, and work-family-community, constitutes the “mesosystem.” Following the mesosystem in proximity to the individual is the “exosystem.” He/she does not directly participate in the exosystem, but it affects him/her indirectly via someone in her/his social network who does (e.g., the workplace of a spouse/partner). Finally, the micro-, meso-, and exosystems are embedded within the “macrosystem”—that is, the broader structural and cultural context. The macrosystem encompasses the structure of the economy and the workplace; family demographics and ideology; community structure and participation; and social categories, such as class, race and ethnicity, and gender. In effect, the macrosystem forms a “societal blueprint” for a given culture that delimits opportunity structures, resources and hazards, life-course options, patterns of social interaction, shared belief systems, and lifestyles.

(women) use those earnings, in combination with domestic labor, to obtain and produce the goods and services that constitute the means of subsistence for themselves and their families, such as meals, clean clothes, and emotional relations. Each day, the means of subsistence are produced and then consumed, reproducing labor power on a daily and intergenerational basis—to the benefit of employers.
Ecological systems theory clearly suggests that social structure shapes each of the lower levels of individuals’ surrounding environment, but it does not postulate the mechanisms by which this occurs. As a result, researchers have examined the work-family mesosystem in isolation of the macrosystem, even as they acknowledge the relevance of the latter (Bellavia and Frone 2005; e.g., Voydanoff 2007). Neblett (2007: 895), reviewing Voydanoff’s (2007) book, *Work, Family, and Community: Exploring the Interconnections*, explains why it is problematic to ignore socioeconomic status and other features of social structure in relation to the work-family interface:

Voydanoff notes that social class contributes to the type of employment and level of income individuals experience, race differentiates the labor market opportunities and cultural values, and gender provides men and women with different opportunities and constraints. Although Voydanoff acknowledges these influences, she states that the lack of research on the intersections between race, class, and gender within family, work, and community preclude the inclusion of these factors in the model. This exclusion raises questions about how well the model holds for people of different races and classes and for men compared to women. As race, class, and gender determine an individual’s social position in society, these factors will likely contribute to the demands and resources available to balance work and family while also experiencing productive role performance and positive well-being.

It is time to move beyond simply acknowledging that features of social structure matter for the work-family interface to understanding in what ways and why they do. To do this, ecological systems theory must be supplemented with a paradigm that specifies the mechanisms by which social structure influences levels of social reality that are closer to individuals.

### 3.2 Incorporating Insights from the Stress Process Model

The Stress Process Model, developed by Pearlin (1981; 1989; 1999), is characterized by a distinctly sociological emphasis on understanding how individuals’ locations in social structure affect their health and well-being. For this reason, it is a valuable source of guidance when it comes to identifying the particular ways in which socioeconomic status (or other features of social structure) shapes individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface. Before delineating
the involvement of social structure in the stress process, a brief presentation of its components is in order.

The stress process encompasses three domains: stressors, mediating or moderating resources, and stress outcomes (Pearlin 1981; 1989; 1999). Stressors refer to the experiential circumstances that engender stress. Pearlin distinguishes between two types of stressors: life events and the more lasting or repeated problems, conflicts, and threats that many people face in their daily lives, known as “chronic strains.” Chronic strains typically arise within and/or between the boundaries of major social roles by virtue of the fact that these roles, and the interpersonal relationships that they entail, are enduring and their incumbents attach considerable importance to them. Obviously, chronic strains are more relevant as stressors to the work-family interface than life events. Pearlin further distinguishes between primary and secondary stressors, based on the notion of that significant stressors rarely, if ever, occur singly (i.e., “stress proliferation”). Primary stressors are those that occur first in an individual’s experience and secondary stressors come about as a consequence of them. Secondary stressors are secondary only in causal order: they capable of producing stress that is even more intense than primary stressors. Primary stressors do not uniformly lead to secondary stressors, nor does either type of stressors uniformly affect stress outcomes; rather, the implications of both primary and secondary stressors depend on the meaning and importance that individuals attribute to them.

Mediating or moderating resources have the capacity to reduce or contain the intensity of stressors, inhibit the emergence of secondary stressors, and/or cushion the effects of stressors on stress outcomes (Pearlin 1981; 1989; 1999). Stress outcomes represent the converging consequences of the stress process, such as mental disorders. Sociological interest in such stress outcomes is unique, in that it is rooted in its mission to identify social conditions that have dysfunctional results for individuals. As Pearlin (1999: 410) explains: “…information about mental disorders helps to direct attention to those features of social organization and social
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10 Similarly, Voydanoff (2008) suggests that work and family demands and resources can combine additively in relation to work-family conflict, meaning that resources reduce work-family conflict without addressing the negative effects of demands. Alternatively, drawing on the job demand-control model of occupational stress theory, as well as family resilience theory, she suggest that work and family demands and resources can have interactive effects on work-family conflict. Specifically, resources may moderate or “buffer” the negative effects of demands on work-family conflict.
experience that are harmful to people; mental disorders serve as the litmus test by which we establish how social arrangements are functioning.” In assessing the stressfulness of social conditions, it is often necessary to consider multiple stress outcomes, as individuals may manifest stress in different ways.

Regarding the involvement of social structure in the stress process, Pearlin (1981; 1989; 1991) argues that its components largely arise from, and are influenced by, various structural arrangements in which individuals are embedded. The most pervasive of these structural arrangements are systems of stratification based on class, race and ethnicity, gender, and age. Class and so forth determine the kinds of stressors to which individuals are exposed; the meaning and importance that individuals attribute to stressors; the personal and social resources that individuals are able to mobilize in the face of stressors; and the emotional, behavioural, and physical disorders through which individuals manifest stress. Hence, patterns and regularities in stress outcomes among individuals who share similar social and economic characteristics and circumstances can be observed. Examination of the the socially-patterned distribution of the components of the stress process will reveal how individuals’ potentially stressful experiences, and the ways in which they are affected by them, may originate in the social orders of which they are a part.

Casting the prevailing model of the work-family interface in terms of the Stress Process Model, work and family demands represent primary stressors; work-family conflict and time pressure represent secondary stressors; work and family resources represent mediating or moderating resources; and job and family distress and depression represent stress outcomes. Unfortunately, the data used for the purposes of this dissertation lack decent measures of job and family distress and depression. For this reason, I focus on the work-family conflict and time pressure as (intermediate) consequences of the stress process as it pertains to the work-family interface. The Stress Process Model suggests that work-family conflict and time pressure will be unevenly distributed across socioeconomic groups due to inequalities in (1) job- and home-related demands; (2) job- and home-related resources; and (3) values governing individuals’ interpretations of job- and home-related demands, work-family conflict, and time pressure. Since the data used here do not include information that speaks to values, I focus on work and family conditions as the primary determinants of the socioeconomic distribution of work-family conflict
and time pressure. However, I take care to point out possible socioeconomic differences in values that may be relevant to work-family conflict and time pressure and, in that way, contribute to the uneven distribution of these dependent variables across socioeconomic groups.

4 Overview of the Dissertation

Following this introductory chapter are three empirical chapters that stand as independent papers, written in a scholarly-article format (i.e., consisting of introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and discussion and conclusion sections). Each paper is guided by distinct research questions in terms of the dependent variable considered and deals with a different focal measure of socioeconomic status and predictors—as outlined below. Even so, using this format leads to some repetition between the empirical chapters, as the dependent variables are related and therefore common literature is relevant. However, the significant advantage of using this format is that each empirical chapter can be more readily revised for future publication in an academic journal.

The first paper (Chapter 2) examines the association between occupation and work-to-family conflict, and the role of occupational inequalities in job-related demands and resources therein. Looking at Canadians aged 18 to 54 years who were employed by others in the past year, two competing hypotheses regarding the distribution of work-to-family conflict across occupational groups are evaluated. The “demands hypothesis” proposes that individuals in higher-status occupations as managers and professionals tend to be more exposed to job-related demands [i.e., long work hours (‘overwork’) and intense forms of job involvement ‘workaholism’)] than their counterparts in lower-status occupations (Burris 1986; Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004), which, in turn, elevate their exposure to work-to-family conflict. Consequently, the highest levels of work-to-family conflict should be observed among managers and professionals. In contrast, the “resource hypothesis” suggests that managers and professionals should have lower levels of work-to-family conflict than their counterparts in lower-status occupations, due to their more plentiful job-related resources (i.e., schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options) (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Deitch and

The second paper (Chapter 3) examines the association between education and family-to-work conflict, and the role of educational inequalities in home-related demands and resources therein. Looking at Canadians aged 18 to 54 who were either married/cohabiting or single parents, two hypotheses regarding the distribution of family-to-work conflict across educational groups are evaluated. The demands hypothesis proposes that individuals with at least a university degree tend to be more exposed to home-related demands (i.e., heavy parental investments in childrearing and spouse/partner’s work-to-family conflict) than their counterparts with less education (Bakker, Demerouti, and Dollard 2008; Hays 1996; Lareau 2003; Nomaguchi and Brown 2011; Young, Schieman, and Milkie 2014), which, in turn, elevates their exposure to family-to-work conflict. Consequently, individuals with at least a university degree should be more likely to report family-to-work conflict. The resource hypothesis similarly suggests that individuals with at least a university degree should be more likely to report family-to-work conflict—albeit for a different reason: they may have limited domestic networks due to their greater reliance on paid help and therefore less social support, compared to their counterparts with less education.

While the preceding papers focus on the unconditional effects of occupation on work-to-family conflict and education on family-to-work conflict (due to the absence of significant gender- and/or parenthood-moderated effects), the third paper (Chapter 4) examines how and why the intersecting statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood affect individuals’ perceptions of time pressure. Previous research demonstrates that well-educated and affluent people (Hamermesh & Lee 2003; Robinson & Godbey 1997; Roelburgh 2002), women (Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Milkie, Raley, and Bianchi 2009; Robinson and Godbey 1997; Stalker 2014; Tézli and Gauthier 2009), and parents (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Craig and Mullan 2010; Stalker 2014) tend to report relatively more time pressure. Further, Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and family among women executives suggests that occupation, gender, and parenthood may intersect such that mothers in managerial and professional occupations are at particular risk for time pressure, due to their competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas. Looking
at Canadians aged 18 to 54 years who were employed by others in the past year and either married/cohabiting or single parents, this paper examines the distribution of time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parental status and the underlying mechanisms.

A concluding chapter summarizes the general findings and contributions of this dissertation and also discusses its limitations, alongside suggestions for future research.
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Chapter 2
Occupation and Work-to-Family Conflict

5 Introduction

The rise of dual-earner and single-parent families in North America since the 1970s, and the concomitant decline of the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker family, mean that the majority of individuals can no longer rely upon a gendered division of labour within the household to coordinate earning and caring roles (Bianchi and Raley 2005; Byron 2005). Instead, they find themselves struggling to juggle the competing responsibilities of work and family. Pressures in both domains have recently ratcheted up. In the global economy, more workers are experiencing longer work hours, ‘24/7’ accessibility and work intensification because of information and communication technologies, non-standard forms of employment, and job insecurity (Blyton and Dastmalchian 2006; Chesley 2014; Crompton 2006; Duxbury and Higgins 2006; Presser 2005; Voydanoff 2007). In the home, there are spouses/partners’ high expectations for emotional fulfillment (Beaujot 2000; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 1995), “intensive mothering” (Hays 1996), new norms of fatherhood that emphasize men’s involvement with their children in addition to financial provision (Coltrane 1996; Furstenberg 1988; Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002), and (for some) eldercare. The challenges created by these pressures are worsened by the lag in the organization of paid work: employees are treated as though they have few personal interests or domestic obligations [i.e., Acker’s (1990) “universal worker” or Williams’ (2003) “ideal worker”]. In other words, there is a mismatch or lack of fit between the workplace, which continues to presuppose the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker family of the 1960s, and the current demographic reality of the workforce (Williams 2010).

The challenges created by this ‘earning-caring balancing act’ have spawned a burgeoning body of theory and research on the intersections of individuals’ work and family lives (Byron 2005). As these roles compete for individuals’ limited time and energy, the sense of conflict has emerged as a prevailing feature in the work-family interface (Schieman, Milkie, and Glavin 2009). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985: 77) define work-family conflict, also known as work-family interference, as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressure from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible. That is, participation in the work (family) role is
made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role.” Although work-family conflict is bidirectional, most research has examined work-to-family conflict (as opposed to family-to-work conflict) because it is more prevalent (Bellavia and Frone 2005). For example, 33% of Canadian employees report high levels of work-to-family conflict compared to 15% who report high levels of family-to-work conflict (Duxbury and Higgins 2012). Work-to-family conflict has deleterious consequences for health outcomes (Allen, Herst, Bruck, and Sutton 2000; Glavin, Schieman and Reid 2011), work outcomes (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, and Semmer 2011; Dorio, Bryant, and Allen 2008; Anderson, Coffey, and Byerly 2002; Aryee, Fields, and Luk 1999; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Collins 2001; Kirchmeyer and Cohen 1999; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, and Hildreth 1992), and family-related outcomes (Adams, King, and King 1996; Frone, Yardley, and Markel 1997; Swanson and Power 1999).

One limitation of work-family research is its focus on individuals of higher social status (e.g., Ammons and Kelly 2008; Greenhaus 2008; Hennessy 2009; Hertz 1999; Lambert 1999; Marks and Leslie 2000; Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004; Poppleton, Briner, and Kiefer 2008; Stebbins 2001; Stevens, Minnotte, and Kiger 2004; Swanberg 2005; Warren 2003; Weigt and Solomon 2008). The issues that define the field are most typical of managerial or professional occupations (especially among women); these studies are unable to speak to a wider range of occupational experiences (DiRenzo et al. 2011; Dodson and Bravo 2005). For example, a recent study of work-family research published in industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behaviour journals between 1980 and 2003 reveals that nearly 70% of work-family studies that reported sample characteristics focused on managers and/or professionals, whereas only 6% of these studies included employees in such lower-level occupations as production, operations, and labour (Casper et al. 2007). This is potentially problematic when we consider that approximately 68% of Canadian workers are non-professionals.  

To address this gap in the literature, I focus on a wider range of occupations and evaluate
the connection with work-to-family conflict (WFC). The majority of people in advanced,
industrial societies are dependent on employment—occupation is therefore a key mechanism in
stratification processes and central indicator of socioeconomic inequalities (Crompton 1993).
Occupation also provides a structural connection between levels of educational attainment and
income and signals social standing (Fujishiro, Xu, and Gong 2010; Shavers 2007).

According to Schieman, Milkie and Glavin (2009: 967), it is “…theoretically logical to
assert that systems of stratification—especially those associated with the work role—tend to
create work-nonwork interference…” Occupation may affect exposure to WFC in two ways.
Occupational status governs the nature and context of work. It follows that occupation affects
both the social distribution of job-related demands and resources, which are the primary
antecedents of WFC, and the segmentation/integration of the boundaries between work and
family. Few population-based studies have examined occupational differences in exposure to
WFC, and those that have done so have yielded mixed results (Schieman, Whitestone, and Van
Gundy 2006). In an effort to broaden the discussion of this question, as well as the scope of
evidence on the topic, the present study therefore addresses three questions: (1) Is WFC
distributed differently across occupational groups—and, if so, how? (2) Which work demands
and resources are associated with WFC? (3) Do any of these job-related demands and resources
contribute to an observed association between occupation and WFC? In framing the questions
this way, I also consider the extent to which job-related demands and resources are differentially
distributed across occupational groups. Taken together, these potentially interrelated pieces help
identify a portrait of WFC in the Canadian working population—and the occupation-based
reasons for them.

6 Literature Review

6.1 WFC and the Stress Process

As juggling earning and caring roles has become prevalent, WFC has emerged as a potent and
pervasive stressor in daily life (Schieman et al., 2009). Due to its enduring and repetitive nature,
WFC is a *chronic strain*, reflecting the social organization of obligations and expectations related to both work and family roles and the interpersonal relationships they entail (Pearlin 1989; 1999; Schieman et al. 2006). In the stress process model, WFC is a ‘secondary stressor’—that is, when it occurs, it does so as a consequence of work demands, which are primary stressors in the sense of temporal ordering and not necessarily in the intensity of their effects (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992; cf. Pearlin 1989; 1999). Work resources have the capacity to reduce or contain the intensity of work demands and WFC, inhibit the emergence of WFC, and/or cushion the effects of these primary and secondary stressors on well-being (Frone et al. 1992; cf. Pearlin 1989; 1999; Voydanoff 2008).

According to Pearlin (1989), social structure is integral to the stress process, as its components largely arise from, and are influenced by, various structural arrangements in which individuals are embedded. Socioeconomic position represents one of the most pervasive of these structural arrangements, particularly given its capacity to shape the kinds of stressors to which individuals are exposed; the personal and social resources that individuals are able to mobilize in the face of stressors; and the emotional, behavioural, and physical disorders through which they manifest stress (Pearlin 1999). For these reasons, patterns and regularities in exposure to stressors—such as WFC—among individuals who share similar social and economic characteristics and circumstances can be observed. It is from this lens that I evaluate the ways that occupation, as a central indicator of socioeconomic status, is likely to be influential.

### 6.2 Socioeconomic Inequalities in Health and their Implications for the Occupational Distribution of WFC

Socioeconomic inequalities in both physical and mental health are well-documented. Health differences can be observed throughout the socioeconomic gradient, with levels of mortality and morbidity from nearly every disease and condition progressively increasing with each decrement in position (Adler, Boyce, Chesney, Cohen, Folkman, Kahn, and Syme 1994; Adler and Ostrove 1999; Marmot, Ryff, Bumpass, Shipley, and Marks 1997; Robert and House 2003). This pattern in health suggests that researchers should evaluate psychosocial and lifestyle factors related to relative deprivation across the full socioeconomic spectrum (Robert and House 2003).
Differential exposure and vulnerability to stress are among the primary explanations of the association between socioeconomic status and poor health outcomes (Grzywacz, Almeida, Neupert, and Ettner 2004; Almeida, Neupert, Banks, and Serido 2005). Individuals in lower socioeconomic groups have relatively poor health because they face more physical, psychological, and social stressors (the “differential exposure” perspective) (Grzywacz et al. 2004; Schieman and Glavin 2011). They may also be more susceptible to the negative effects of the stressors because they have fewer or less effective coping resources—or their stressors are qualitatively more potent (the “differential vulnerability” perspective). Research confirms that individuals of lower socioeconomic status tend to be exposed to more chronic stressors than their counterparts with higher socioeconomic status (e.g., Turner and Llyod 1999; Turner, Wheaton and Llyod 1995). Moreover, the personal and social resources essential in the stress process are relatively less available to individuals of lower socioeconomic status (Mirowsky and Ross 2003).

Applying the ideas of the differential exposure and vulnerability perspectives, one might predict that individuals in lower-status occupations should tend to encounter more frequent WFC because of their greater exposure to job-related demands and their relative lack of job-related resources. However, evidence pertaining to the occupational distribution of WFC allows few confident conclusions. Relatively little is known about levels of WFC across the full range of occupations because many studies exclude this variable, compare broad groupings of higher versus lower status occupations (e.g., Bass and Grzywacz 2011; DiRenzo, Greenhaus and Weer 2011), or focus exclusively on one occupation.12 A number of studies have demonstrated higher levels of WFC among managers and professionals as compared to non-professionals (e.g.,

12 Among the occupations that have been studied in isolation in relation to the work-family interface are managers and/or professionals (e.g., Carrier 1995; Eaton and Baily 1999; Guillaume and Pochic 2009; Halrynjo and Lyng 2009; Hewlett 2007; Hilbert, Shaw, Johnson, and Andrey 2008; Hill, Mead, Dean, Hafen, Gadd, Palmer, and Ferris 2006; Lyness and Judiesch 2008; Martins, Eddleston, and Veiga 2002; Moen, Kelly, and Huang 2008; Stone 2007a; Stone and Lovejoy 2004), executives (e.g., Blair-Loy 2001 and 2003; Ezzedeen and Ritchey 2009), physicians and other medical professionals (e.g., Barnett and Gareis 2000; Barnett, Gareis, and Carr 2005; Clawson, Gerstel, and Crocker 2009; Gareis and Barnett 2002; Shows and Gerstel 2009), lawyers (Blair-Loy and DeHart 2003; Leiper 1998; Wallace 1997; Young and Wallace 2009); stockbrokers (Blair-Loy 2009), accountants (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, and Parasuraman 1997), scientists and/or engineers (e.g., Blackwell and Glover 2008; Post, DiTomaso, and Ferris 2009; Ranson n.d.; Watts 2009), teachers (Guedouzi 2006), IT workers (Armstrong, Riemenschneider, Allen, and Reid 2007; Quesenberry, Trauth, and Morgan 2006; Thomas and Ganster 1995), lower-wage workers (e.g., Backett-Milburn, Airey, McKie, and Hogg 2008; Lambert 1999; Swanberg 2005), and manual workers (Lautsch and Scully 2007).
On the one hand, the extensive literature on socioeconomic inequalities in health suggests that lower-status individuals should be more exposed to harmful stressors like WFC relative to their higher-status counterparts. By contrast, however, some evidence in the work-family literature has begun to question that claim. How can we reconcile these divergent views? Some scholars have sought to sharpen the evidence by integrating concepts from the Job Demands-Resources model as a guiding framework (e.g., Schieman and Glavin, 2011). For example, in the context of the differential exposure and vulnerability perspectives, two hypothetical scenarios emerge that help delineate predictions about the link between occupation and WFC—and these scenarios depend on a complex constellation of job-related demands and resources.

6.3 Work Conditions, Differential Exposure, and WFC

6.3.1 Job-Related Demands and Resources

According to the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992) and empirical evidence (e.g., Byron 2005), the primary antecedents of WFC are work conditions, which are typically conceptualized as “demands” and “resources.” Given that work and worker requirements vary between occupations, a logical inference is that constellations of job-related demands and resources do as well, contributing occupational differences in exposure to WFC (Dierdoff and Ellington 2008). In other words, work conditions form the linking mechanism between occupation and WFC—the question is: Which ones and how?

Following Voydanoff (2008: 39), a leading work-family scholar, demands are defined as “structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations, and norms to
which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or mental effort.” There are two types of demands: *time-based* and *strain-based* (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985). Time-based demands reflect the fact that time is a finite resource, meaning that time and involvement in one domain limits time and involvement in another through a process of resource drain. Hours spent doing paid work and non-standard work hours or schedules are typical time-based demands in the work domain (Byron 2005; Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer 2007; Voydanoff 2008).

Strain-based demands operate through negative psychological spillover in which psychological responses to poor conditions in one domain (e.g., negative emotional arousal, interpersonal withdrawal, energy depletion, and stress) carry over to attitudes and behaviour in the other domain (Voydanoff 2008). Common strain-based demands pertaining to the social organization of work are interpersonal conflict and job stress (e.g., role ambiguity, role overload, and psychological demands), involvement, noxiousness, routine (i.e., lack of task diversity), and insecurity (Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Schieman et al. 2009; Voydanoff 2008).

By contrast, Voydanoff (2008: 39) defines *resources* as “structural or psychological assets that may be used to facilitate role performance, reduce demands, or generate additional resources,” thereby reducing work-family conflict (also see Bakker and Demerouti (2007: 312-313). Scholars have identified several influential resources in the work domain as job authority, job autonomy, schedule flexibility, and social support from one’s supervisor and coworkers (Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Tausig 1999; Voydanoff 2008).

Drawing on the analytical framework outlined by Schieman and Glavin (2011), I propose and test two specific hypotheses related to job demands and resources (described below). Each of these hypotheses articulates scenarios for explaining any observed association between occupation and WFC.

---

13 Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified another category of antecedents, which have behaviour-based sources. However, they have proven to be difficult to operationalize, so they have been notably absent from the literature (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008).
6.3.2 The Demands Hypothesis

For reasons I will outline below, the demands hypothesis predicts a positive relationship between occupation and WFC, such that the highest levels of WFC are observed among individuals in higher-status occupations (i.e., managers and professionals). Specially, the demands hypothesis proposes that managers and professionals tend to be more exposed to job-related demands that, in turn, elevate their exposure to WFC. Among the most likely culprits for job-related demands include long hours (‘overwork’), job pressure, and highly-intensive forms of job involvement (‘workaholism’).

In order for these job-related demands to contribute to occupation-based differences in exposure to WFC, they must be unevenly distributed across occupations. In particular, we might expect that the time requirements and absorptiveness of work increase as one moves up the occupational ladder. For instance, there is evidence that managers and professionals work more hours, on average, than do non-professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Further, overwork—defined as working 50 hours or more per week—is relatively more common among managers and professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014). Managerial and professional occupations also tend to be more engrossing, making it difficult for individuals who occupy them to compartmentalize work and family (Burris 1986). Thus, in my analyses, I test the hypothesis that managers and professionals tend to report more WFC because of their overwork and greater workaholism.

In addition to long hours and intense job involvement, managerial and professional occupations may also be more stressful than other occupations, placing high psychological and emotional demands on their incumbents. The work of managers and professionals typically involves responsibilities for vital operations that shape the course and, ultimately, the success of the organization that employs them (Schieman 2002). These responsibilities are enacted through decision-making latitude and authority over the work of other employees. Additionally, managers and professionals spend a large proportion of their time at work interacting with their employers, clients, and co-workers (Beatty 1996). Intense levels of interaction with others, in general, increase the likelihood of interpersonal conflict (Schieman and Reid 2008). For these reasons, individuals in higher-status occupations might experience more work-role overload,
conflict, and ambiguity—job-related demands that are positively related to WFC (Voydanoff 1988).

The nature of managers’ and professionals’ work is typically such that some portion of it can be done outside of the workplace, with the aid of mobile computing and communication technologies, and the hours of business operation are elastic to accommodate different time zones (Chesley, Siibak, and Wajcman 2013). It follows that role-blurring demands may be more relevant to individuals in these occupations (Chesley 2005). Further, previous research links certain work characteristics that are usually attributed to individuals in higher-status occupations to greater role blurring. Glavin and Schieman (2012) demonstrate that individuals who are granted flexibility and control in their job (i.e., authority, schedule control, and decision-making latitude) experience more role blurring because these conditions tend to result in more porous work-family boundaries. Excessive work pressures also increase border permeability and role blurring, as workers may feel pressured to devote additional non-work time and energy to these pressures. Additionally, several studies have shown that work-role identification is positively associated with boundary permeability that enables role blurring, as individuals who identify strongly with the work role look for opportunities to express this work identity outside of the traditional work domain (Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate 2000; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell 2006; Winkel and Clayton 2010). Thus, managers and professionals are more likely to engage in role blurring activities, which in turn, increase the risk for WFC (Schieman and Young 2013).

The literature discussed above suggests a positive and linear association between occupation and WFC, and the demands hypothesis emphasizes job-related demands as the reason for higher levels of WFC among managers and professionals. However, it is also plausible that some job-related demands that generate WFC are more common among individuals in lower-status occupations. In this case, a non-linear pattern might be observed in which individuals in lower-status (i.e., sales and services; trades and transportation; and primary- and secondary-sector) occupations would report more WFC than their counterparts in middle-status (i.e., administrative) occupations, as would managers and professionals. Previous research points to two job-related demands that may contribute to WFC among individuals in lower-status occupations: non-standard work hours and schedules and job insecurity (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Davis, Goodman, Piretti, and Almeida 2008; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Fenwick and
Tausig 2004; Henly and Lambert 2005; Kinnunen and Mauno 1998; Perry-Jenkins 2005; Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg, Pierce, and Sayer 2007; Richter, Näswall, and Sverke 2010; Voydanoff 2005; Warren 2003 Williams 2010; Williams and Boushey 2010; Yildirim and Aycan 2008). Hence, I evaluate whether or not greater exposure to non-standard work hours and schedules and job insecurity contribute to higher levels of WFC among individuals in sales and services, trades and transportation, and resource extraction and manufacturing occupations.

6.3.3 The Resource Hypothesis

The resource hypothesis suggests that occupation is positively associated with job-related resources that tend to contribute to less exposure to WFC. For this reason, managers and professionals may report lower levels of WFC. Sociological research on work in relation to health and well-being yields the broad consensus that conditions that are characteristic of higher-status occupations are beneficial: professional, non-routine, autonomous jobs with greater authority and pay (Schieman et al. 2006; Tausig 1999). Specifically, besides high wages that enable “outsourcing” of domestic labour, managers and professionals benefit from a number of job perks that non-professionals do not, which ease combination of earning and caring roles. These job perks include steady, predictable, and mainly daytime hours of work, over which individuals can exert personal control; autonomy in when, where, and how work is performed; formal work-family supports\(^\text{14}\), including maternity, parental, and family leave, flexible work arrangements (e.g., telecommuting, flextime, compressed workweeks, reduced hours, and job-sharing), and childcare assistance (e.g., on-site facilities and referrals services); health insurance, vacation and sick pay; and job security (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Deitch and Huffman 2001; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Heymann 2000 and 2005; Perrons, McDowell, Fagan, Ray, and Ward 2001; Williams and Boushey 2010; Yildirim and Aycan 2008).

---

\(^{14}\) While formal work-family supports are more likely to be available to managers and professionals, and a large proportion of those who have these benefits make use of them, scholars suspect that many employees do not make use of them extensively or whatsoever (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Employees may be reluctant to take advantage of formal work-family supports for fear that they are informally stigmatized and, therefore, engender career-threatening penalties. Indeed, Jacobs and Gerson (2004) find that workplace cultures and supervisors that are supportive of family are negatively related to individuals’ perceptions of their own chances for career advancement.
In my analyses, I test the hypothesis that professionals and managers tend to report less WFC because of their greater schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options.

Based on the resource hypothesis, I should observe that schedule flexibility is negatively associated with WFC. However, recent scholarship has challenged the conceptualization of schedule flexibility and other job-related resources that characterize higher-status occupations as “resources,” finding, instead, that they behave more like job-related demands with respect to WFC (Schieman et al. 2006). Specifically, schedule control, job authority, non-routine work, and higher income tend to increase exposure to WFC by increasing work-family border permeability (Schieman et al. 2009). As a result, managers and professionals are relatively more exposed to WFC (Schieman and Reid 2009). This is referred to as the “stress of higher status” hypothesis because the supposedly-resourceful conditions in question come from achieved statuses like education or occupation (Schieman and Glavin, 2011). Collectively, these ideas and empirical findings reflect the cultural logic that organizes executive occupations, known as the “schema of work devotion” (Blair-Loy 2003: 7), which “…demands that one give an immense time commitment and strong emotional allegiance to one’s firm or career.” The schema of work devotion is both institutionalized in workplaces and internalized to some extent by individuals. Given the schema of work devotion, managers and professionals may engage in role blurring to meet expectations of significant investments of time, energy, and emotion in their careers. In turn, these processes may increase managers’ and professionals’ exposure to WFC.

Given the stress of higher status hypothesis, and contrary to the resource hypothesis, I may find that schedule flexibility increases exposure to WFC. If this is the case, higher levels of WFC may be observed among managers and professionals owing to the positive association between occupation and schedule flexibility.

6.3.4 A Note on the Potential Relevance of Gender and Parental Status

In both academic discourse and media coverage, work-family issues are typically understood as being particularly problematic for women in high-level managerial and professional occupations,
especially mothers (Williams 2010). Beyond their greater exposure to job- and family-related demands, this is attributed to contradictions between taken-for-granted expectations about what it means to be a “good” worker and a “good” mother (Hennessy 2009). Studies focusing on the moral dimensions of the work-family interface have analyzed the “cultural contradictions of contemporary motherhood” for middle-class women (Hays 1996) and the “competing devotions” of women executives to cultural schemas of work and family (Blair-Loy 2003). According to Hays (1996), good mothers in the middle class practice what she calls “intensive mothering.” It is a child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, laborious, and financially expensive ideology in which mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture and development of “sacred” children, whose needs take precedence over their own. Intensive mothering is inconsistent with individualistic, calculating, and competitive pursuit of personal gain in the labour market. In a similar vein, Blair-Loy (2003) argues that women executives are subject to two competing cultural schemas of devotion. The schema of work devotion defines the high-level career as a calling or vocation that deserves single-minded allegiance and gives meaning and purpose to life. The schema of family devotion assigns primary responsibility for housework and childrearing to women, who should derive fulfillment exclusively from the creativity and intimacy of practicing intensive mothering. The clash of these normative definitions of a good worker and mother create moral dilemmas and distress, in which executive women feel torn by two deeply compelling, yet incompatible, cultural models of right action.

Given the competing devotions of managerial and professional mothers to cultural schemas of work and family, all of my analyses will evaluate the ways that gender and parental status function as potential moderators of the hypothesized association between occupation and WFC. As I will describe in detail below, this involves testing whether or not gender and/or parental status condition the effects of occupation on WFC—and I consider gender and parental status both separately and together. It is plausible that the occupation-based distribution of WFC differs for: (1) women versus men; (2) parents versus non-parents; and (3) childless women versus mothers and childless men versus fathers.
Methodology

7.1 Data and Analytic Sample

This study uses confidential data from Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (GSS), conducted by telephone by Statistics Canada from June to October 2006. The target population includes all people aged 15 years and older, living in private households in one of Canada’s ten provinces. Eligible respondents were randomly selected using a random digit dialing method, and 68% of them ultimately participated in the GSS. For the purposes of this study, I focus on respondents who were aged 18 to 54 years at the time of the interview and mainly employed by others (i.e., not self-employed or unpaid family workers) in the past year. Respondents with these characteristics are selected because they likely have both earning and caring roles. Questions about job-related demands and resources were not asked of respondents who were mainly self-employed or unpaid family workers in the past year; these cases are excluded from the analytic sample. Respondents with missing values on any of the relevant variables for other reasons (i.e., refusal to respond or responses of “don’t know”) are also excluded from the analytic sample, yielding a final working sample of 9,615. All analyses are performed on data that are weighted with person and bootstrap weights provided by Statistics Canada, such that the sample can be considered representative of the target population and variance estimates can be considered reliable.

I specifically selected Cycle 20 of the GSS for my analyses because it is one of the few large-scale, nationally representative, and publicly available datasets in Canada that includes questions about the work-family interface. One drawback of the survey is that it is primarily

---

15 Although prime ages for employment and childbearing/rearing are 25 to 54 years, younger respondents are considered because earning and caring roles tend to occur relatively early among lower-status populations (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Tézli and Gauthier 2009).

16 Access to the confidential data used in this study is governed by Statistics Canada’s Research Data Centre (RDC) program. This program allows academic researchers with approved projects to access the data they have requested in secure facilities located on university campuses. Any statistical output produced therein can only be removed after being vetted by a local Statistics Canada employee, known as an Analyst, to ensure that it preserves respondent confidentiality.

Through use of RDC data, this research was supported by funds to the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Canadian
designed for monitoring changes in family life over time (e.g., departure from the parental home; family-formation and fertility intentions; marital/union status; births and adoptions; financial support agreements or arrangements for children and ex-spouse/partner; work history and maternity/parental leaves). While information is collected on aspects of respondents’ main activities and (paid) work, it is somewhat limited on work-role characteristics—including authority, autonomy, and job pressures.

7.2 Dependent Variable: WFC

Consistent with the prevailing definition of WFC as a form of inter-role conflict in which the responsibilities of the work and family roles are mutually incompatible, such that participation in one role is hampered by participation in the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985), the following two items are used to measure WFC: “In the past 12 months, how often have you come home from work too tired to do the chores that needed to be done?” and “In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to fulfill family responsibilities because of the amount of time you spent on your job? (Please include responsibilities concerning your spouse and child/ren, if it applies, as well as your own parents, siblings and other related persons.)”

Response choices are coded as (0) “never,” (1) “sometimes,” (2) “most of the time,” and (3) “all of the time.” Responses to these questions are averaged to create an index, with a higher score indicating more work-to-family conflict. The Spearman-Brown reliability estimate for the WFC Institute for Health Research (CIHR), the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI), and Statistics Canada. Although the research and analysis are based on data from Statistics Canada, the opinions expressed do not represent the views of Statistics Canada.

17 The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) module on Family and Changing Gender Roles for 2012 uses the same questions as measures of WFC. Further, using conceptualizations that are consistent with the current literature, Netemyer, Boles, and McMurray (1996: 410) developed and validated a short, self-report scale of WFC. Among the 5 items included in the WFC scale were two that echo the ones used here: “Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me” and “The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.” Voydanoff (2005), among other work-family scholars, has used questions regarding the frequency with which respondents’ jobs reduced their time and energy such that it limited their ability to complete home tasks in measuring WFC.
Table 2-1. Distribution of Responses to Work-to-Family Conflict Items and Index (n=9,615)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to fulfill family responsibilities because of the amount of time you spend on your job?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"In the past 12 months, how often have you come home from work too tired to do the chores that needed to be done?"

| (0) Never                                                             | 20.7|
| (1) Sometimes                                                         | 53.7|
| (2) Most of the time                                                  | 18.3|
| (3) All of the time                                                  | 7.3 |
| Total                                                                | 100.0|

Work-Family Conflict Index

| Mean                              | 1.487|
| Standard Deviation                | 1.037|
| Range                             | 0-4.5|
| Spearman-Brown Reliability Estimate | 0.606|
index is 0.606,\textsuperscript{18} and factor analysis reveals that the items making up this index load strongly on one underlying factor. Table 2-1 reports the distribution of responses to each WFC item and the WFC index.

\section*{7.3 Occupation}

Information on the National Occupational Classification for Statistics (NOC-S) 2001 is used to create seven occupational groups: “manager”; “professional”; “technical occupations;” “administrative occupations”; “sales and services occupations”; “trades, transportation and equipment operations and related occupations,” hereafter referred to as “trades/transportation occupations; and “occupations unique to primary industries, processing and manufacturing,” hereafter referred to as “primary- and secondary-sector occupations.” The seven occupational groups in the order they appear here are roughly hierarchically ordered in terms of a number of indicators of socioeconomic status, including authority; education/skill level; physicality, work setting and noxiousness; the employment relationships that they entail\textsuperscript{19}; income; and prestige (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1993; Wright 2000). Administrative occupations serve as the reference group in multivariate analyses because they are middle-status occupations.

\textsuperscript{18} The Spearman-Brown reliability estimate is reported here because it is a more accurate reflection of the true reliability of a two-item scale than the more commonly used Cronbach’s coefficient alpha or the suggested alternative, the Pearson correlation coefficient (Eisinga, Grotenhuis, and Pelzer 2013).

\textsuperscript{19} Among employees, two types of employment relationships can be distinguished, which overlap with industrial sectors (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992). Manual and primary-production occupations tend to be characterized by a labour contract, in which work and payment arrangements are closely regulated and there are no long-term provisions or fringe benefits. These employment relationships entail relatively short-term and specific exchanges of money for effort. Non-manual occupations, on the other hand, tend to be characterized by a service relationship. Employees in these occupations exercise delegated authority or specialized knowledge and expertise in the interests of their employers, so exchanges between them are more long term and diffuse. In effect, employers entice/reward the commitment of such employees through generous salaries, fringe benefits, and prospective elements of remuneration (e.g., salary increments on an established scale, assurances of job security, pension rights), and well-defined career opportunities. Of the difference between non-manual and manual/primary-production occupations with respect to the employment relationship, Evans (1996: 214) notes that “service-class employees are controlled by the ‘carrot’ of long-term benefits, and workers by the ‘stick’ of close regulation and the labour contract.”
7.4 Work Characteristics

7.4.1 Job-Related Demands

*Time-Based Demands.* Two variables measure time-based demands in the work domain: *overwork* and *non-standard work hours/schedules*. Information about overwork comes from a question about how many hours the respondent usually works at all jobs in a week. Responses to this question are coded as (0) less than 30 hours, (1) 30 to 39 hours, (2) 40 to 49 hours, and (3) 50 or more hours (‘overwork’) (Cha and Weeden 2014). In multivariate analyses, “less than 30 hours” serves as the reference category.

Information about non-standard work hours/schedules comes from the question, “Which of the following best describes the hours you usually work at your main job…A regular daytime schedule or shift? A regular evening shift? A regular night shift? A rotating shift (one that changes periodically from days to evenings or to nights? A split shift (one consisting of two or more distinct periods each day)? A compressed work week? On call or casual? An irregular schedule?” Non-standard work hours/schedules are coded as (0) no, corresponding to a regular daytime schedule or shift, and (1) yes, corresponding to all other response choices, after preliminary analyses revealed that distinctions among the latter are not predictive of WFC.

*Strain-Based Demands.* Two variables measure strain-based demands in the work domain: *job insecurity* and *workaholism*. Job insecurity (i.e., non-permanent employment) is identified from responses to the question, “Which of the following best describes your terms of employment in this [main] job…Regular employee with no contractual or anticipated termination date? Seasonal employee (your employment on this job is intermittent according to the season of the year)? Term employee (term of employment has a set termination date)? Casual or on-call employee?” In multivariate analyses, these response choices are represented by a series of dummy variables, for which the modal group—regular employee with no contractual or anticipated termination date—serves as the reference.

---

20 Two additional strain-based work demands were also considered in early analyses: multiple jobs and any work hours done at home (excluding overtime). However, they did not significantly affect WFC, and were therefore dropped from subsequent analyses.
Workaholism is identified from responses to the question, “Do you consider yourself a workaholic.” Respondents who answer “no” to this question receive a code of zero and those who answer “yes” receive a code of one.

7.4.2 Job-Related Resources

Three work resources are assessed: **schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options**. Respondents’ access to schedule flexibility is identified from responses to the question, “Do you have a flexible schedule that allows you to choose the time you begin and end your work day? Respondents who answer “no” to this question receive a code of zero and those who answer “yes” receive a code of one.

Whether respondents have the employer-provided option to work part-time is identified from the question, “Does your employer provide you with the option to work part-time?” Responses choices are (1) yes and (0) no. Similarly, whether respondents have the employer-provided option/s to take leave for familial or personal reasons is identified from four questions: “Does your employer provide you with the ability…to take leave, paid or unpaid, to care for your children? To take leave, paid or unpaid, for care of your spouse or partner? To take leave, paid or unpaid, for the care of other family members? To take extended leave without pay for personal reasons (e.g., being home with child/ren, caring for family member, doing personal projects)?” Response choices are (1) yes and (0) no, and they are added up to create an index representing the number of leave options available to respondents.

7.5 Socio-Demographic and Household Controls

Several control variables are included because these demographic characteristics are likely to influence the outcomes, occupation, work conditions, and the associations among them.

---

21 Personal income was also considered as a potential resource in early analyses, as it should enable individuals to purchase services like high-quality child care, housekeeping services, and restaurant meals that make combining work and family easier. However, it did not function as such in relation to WFC and confounded the association between occupation and WFC, so it was dropped from subsequent analyses.
7.5.1 Age

Age in years is coded continuously.

7.5.2 Sex

Women are coded as one and men are coded as zero.

7.5.3 Visible-Minority Status

Visible-minority status is identified from a variable derived by Statistics Canada from responses to questions about racial/cultural-group membership. As per the Census definition, non-visible minority includes single-origin White, single-origin Aboriginal, and multiple-origin White/Latin American, White/Arab, and White/West Asian. Conversely, visible minority includes single-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Japanese, and Korean. It also includes multiple-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Southeast Asian, Japanese, and Korean as well as multiple-origin Latin American, Arab, and West Asian with only non-White origins. In multivariate analyses, non-visible minority serves as the reference category.

7.5.4 Marital Status

For respondents who are living with a spouse/partner, marital status is coded as (0) married/cohabiting. For individuals who are not living with a spouse/partner, marital status is coded as (1) single. It is important to note that the “single” category includes never-married respondents, previously married respondents, and some married respondents who are not living with their spouses/partners (presumably due separation agreements, legal or otherwise).
7.5.5 Number of Children in the Household

The number of co-resident children is included in multivariate analyses as a measure of parenting demands, with the assumption that individuals’ investments of time and energy in childrearing increase with fertility.

7.5.6 Preschool-Aged Child/ren in the Household

Whether any preschool-aged children (i.e., children under the age of 5 years) reside in the household is coded as (1) yes and (0) no. This variable is included in multivariate analyses as a measure of parenting demands, given that younger children tend to be less self-sufficient in terms of physical care.

7.5.7 Province/Region of Residence

Province/region of residence is coded as (0) Ontario, (1) Quebec, (2) British Columbia, (3) Atlantic Provinces (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick), and (4) Prairie Provinces (i.e., Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta). In multivariate analyses, province/region of residence is represented by four dummy variables, for which Ontario serves as the reference category.

7.6 Plan of Analyses

After presenting the descriptive statistics for all measures (see Table 2-2), the analyses proceed in three parts. The first part examines distribution of work demands and resources across occupational groups, as the differential exposure perspective suggest that unequal distributions in this regard might translate into occupational differences in levels of WFC. This is done through ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic regression analyses in which each work condition is
Table 2-2. Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables (n= 9,615)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>WORK CONDITIONS (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family Conflict</td>
<td>Regular empl., no contractual or anticipated end date 86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Seasonal employee 4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Term employee 5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Casual or on-call employee 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4.5</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>Strain-Based Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Workaholic 32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>No 67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, Transport and Equipment Operators and Related Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations Unique to Primary Industries, Processing and Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CONDITIONS</th>
<th>(\text{DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Flexibility</td>
<td>Male 51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Female 48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option to Work Part-Time</td>
<td>Age 0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mean 10.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>Range 18-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Visible Minority 13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
<td>No 86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leave Options</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 2.092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation 1.361</td>
<td>Marital Status 61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range 0-4</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Work Hours</td>
<td>Unmarried (Never-married single, separated/divorced, widowed) 38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>Number of Children in the Household 0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>Standard Deviation 1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>Range 0-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>Any Preschool-Aged Child/ren in the Household 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
<td>No 85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedules</td>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Province/Region of Residence 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ontario 39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>Quebec 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100.0%</td>
<td>Prairie 17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>British Columbia 12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regressed on occupation while also controlling for socio-demographic and household characteristics (see Table 2-3).

The second part uses OLS regression to document baseline levels of WFC across occupational groups, net of socio-demographic and household characteristics. This step is designed to address the fundamental research question about the association between occupation and WFC (Model 1 in Table 2-4). The demands and resources hypotheses give rise to different predictions as to occupational distribution of exposure to WFC. The demands hypothesis suggests that managers and professionals will tend to have higher levels of WFC, owing to their greater exposure to job-related demands. In opposition, the resource hypothesis suggests that managers and professionals will tend to have lower levels of WFC, given their more plentiful job-related resources. The association between occupation and WFC documented here enables determination of the relevance of the demands and resource hypotheses.

I explicitly follow the progressive adjustment modeling strategy set forth by John Mirowsky (2013) in the latest version of the Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health. This is widely accepted strategy for documenting a basic association between two focal variables (e.g., occupation and WFC) and then, through a series of separate steps, entering different sets of theoretically determined variables (e.g., job-related demands) to assess how the initial estimates change. This form of progressive adjustment is intentionally distinct from a modeling strategy that simply enters all variables simultaneously in an initial model because it allows the researcher to evaluate how each specific variable (e.g., schedule flexibility) might be influential in the initial focal association. Stated in concrete terms, if the inclusion of any particular variable decreases or increases the size of the occupation-based differences, we can specifically pinpoint that variable as having a mediating or suppression effect. The third part of my analyses therefore attempts to explain baseline levels of WFC across occupational groups in terms of inequality in the distribution of job-related demands and resources (Models 2 through 6 in Table 2-4). At each step, I carefully evaluate the change in value and statistical significance of the regression coefficients that correspond to the occupational groups. This form of progressive adjustment dissects the particular contributions of job-related demands and resources in the association between occupation and WFC.
In models 2 and 3, I include time- and strain-based work demands, respectively, in order to evaluate the demands hypothesis that individuals in higher-status occupations have relatively more work demands, which contribute to greater exposure to WFC among them. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients that correspond to managers and/or professionals. Such results would indicate that the job-related demands added to the baseline model account for (or ‘explain’) at least part of the association between occupation and WFC. To reiterate the rational here: Individuals in those occupational groups would need to have reported higher levels of time- and strain-based demands, and those demands would need to have elevated the risk for exposure to WFC. Taken together, these job-related demands form the linking mechanism that helps explain why individuals in higher-status occupations might report more WFC.

Model 5 adds job-related resources to the baseline model in order to evaluate the resource and stress of higher status hypotheses. The resource hypothesis predicts that individuals in higher-status occupations have more job-related resources, which reduce their exposure to WFC. Empirical support for the resource hypothesis will be evident if I observe an increase in the regression coefficients corresponding to managers/professionals, meaning that individuals in these occupations would have an even greater degree of exposure to WFC than estimated in the baseline model were it not for their job-related resources. As a concrete example, managers/professionals should tend to report more schedule flexibility; this might suppress or mask what would otherwise be even higher levels of WFC. By contrast, the stress of higher status hypothesis predicts that some job-related resources associated with higher-status occupations, such as schedule flexibility, might function as a job-related demands by increasing work-family border permeability and, in that way, role-blurring activities among the individuals in these occupations. In turn, these dynamics might tend to elevate levels of WFC. Empirical support for the stress of higher status hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients corresponding to managers and/or professionals after adjusting for job-related resources, meaning that their greater exposure to WFC is partly or completely explained by their so-called “resources.” Essentially, this is the same prediction as the demands hypothesis—but it flips the conceptualization of ‘resources’ and challenges it.
From the perspective of workers in lower status occupations, the resource hypothesis has different implications: It predicts that they have fewer job-related resources, which increases their exposure to WFC. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients corresponding to trades/transportation and/or primary- or secondary-sector occupations; that is, greater exposure to WFC among individuals in these occupations is at least partly explained by their relative lack of access to job-related resources such as schedule flexibility.

The differential distribution of job-related demands and resources across the occupational categories will imply that any given demand or resource might not necessarily contribute in the same way or to the same extent to the baseline associations between occupational group and WFC. For this reason, after running each of the above models, I conducted extensive post-hoc analyses (not shown) in which I entered each job-related demand and resource individually into the baseline model. These additional steps allowed me to carefully determine and articulate the ways that each job-related demand and resource indirectly is associated with WFC—and how each might contribute to the relationship between occupation groups and WFC. It also allowed me to evaluate the extent of overlap or shared variance among these focal independent variables.

In the final model (6), I include all of the job-related demands and resources simultaneously to the baseline model to assess how occupational differences in exposure to WFC fare when these opposing conditions are collectively taken into account. Regression coefficients corresponding to occupational groups that remain statistically significant net of the demands and resources (as well as socio-demographic and household control variables) indicate the relevance of additional work conditions.

8 Results

8.1 Documenting Occupation-Based Differences in Job-Related Demands and Resources

Given that inequalities in job-related demands and resources are hypothesized to be the primary reasons for occupation-based patterns in WFC, it is necessary to demonstrate the distribution of
these work conditions across occupational groups. Table 2-3 presents the results of OLS and logistic regressions of work demands and resources on occupation, controlling for socio-demographic and household characteristics. F and $\chi^2$ tests of the statistical significance of occupation for predicting work conditions reveal that all work conditions are differentially distributed across occupational groups.\textsuperscript{22}

\textit{Job-related demands.} First and foremost, the occupational distribution of job-related demands is consistent with the demands hypothesis—and this is especially the case for work hours. The longest (average) hours are worked by managers, and they are most likely to experience overwork—that is, working 50 or more hours per week. Not surprisingly, then, managers are most likely to self-identify as workaholics. Individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations work the longest hours after managers, followed by professionals. Further, individuals in these three occupational groups are more likely to experience overwork than their counterparts in other occupational groups (except managers). While individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations are more likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to self-identify as workaholics, professionals are not significantly different from their counterparts in administrative occupations in this regard—in spite of their higher risk of overwork.\textsuperscript{23} Individuals in sales and services occupations work the shortest hours, followed by technicians, who are not significantly different

\textsuperscript{22} F tests are used when the work condition being predicted is an interval/continuous variable; (Wald) $\chi^2$ tests are used when the work condition being predicted is a dichotomous variable.

\textsuperscript{23} Using the same data, Keown (n.d.: 28) also finds a lower prevalence of workaholism among professionals, compared to other occupational groups. She notes that it is puzzling that managers would be workaholics and not professionals, given that they both tend to work long hours. However, she speculates that “Perhaps professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, accept working longer hours as an integral part of their professional role, whereas managers view these conditions as uncompensated but necessary conditions of their position.”
Table 2-3: OLS or Logistic Regression of Work Conditions on Occupation and Controls (n= 9.615)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekly Work Hours</th>
<th>Work Hours of 50 or more per week</th>
<th>Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedules</th>
<th>Seasonal Employee(^1)</th>
<th>Term Employee(^1)</th>
<th>Casual or On-Call Employee(^1)</th>
<th>Workaholic</th>
<th>Schedule Flexibility</th>
<th>Leave Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPATION</strong></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(e^b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>6.858***</td>
<td>6.296***</td>
<td>1.389**</td>
<td>0.237***</td>
<td>0.590*</td>
<td>0.139**</td>
<td>2.001***</td>
<td>2.111***</td>
<td>0.564***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2.416***</td>
<td>2.563***</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>0.492**</td>
<td>2.920***</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1.206**</td>
<td>1.415***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>1.939*</td>
<td>1.845***</td>
<td>1.911**</td>
<td>1.813***</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Occupations</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services Occupations</td>
<td>-1.151***</td>
<td>1.504***</td>
<td>4.728***</td>
<td>1.771**</td>
<td>0.469***</td>
<td>1.633**</td>
<td>1.295***</td>
<td>0.778***</td>
<td>2.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, Transport and Equipment Operators and Related</td>
<td>3.409***</td>
<td>2.358***</td>
<td>2.039***</td>
<td>4.763***</td>
<td>0.356***</td>
<td>2.032**</td>
<td>1.651***</td>
<td>0.348***</td>
<td>0.561***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Industries, Processing and Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.593***</td>
<td>2.346***</td>
<td>4.736***</td>
<td>4.706***</td>
<td>0.548*</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>1.257*</td>
<td>0.296***</td>
<td>0.495***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>38.393***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.259***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, marital status, number of children in the household, presence of any pre-school-aged children in the household, and province/region of residence.

* \(p < 0.10\); ** \(p < 0.05\); *** \(p < 0.01\) (two-tailed test)

\(^1\) Denotes insecure jobs
from their counterparts in administrative occupations in terms of work hours, and individuals in these occupational groups are at the lowest risk for overwork. While technicians are not significantly different from their counterparts in administrative occupations when it comes to self-identifying as workaholics, individuals in sales and services occupations are relatively more likely to self-identify as workaholics—in spite of their shorter weekly work hours and substantially lower risk of overwork. Thus, workaholism is not strictly a function of work hours, at least in the case of professionals and individuals in sales and services occupations.

Non-standard work hours/schedules are most prevalent at the bottom of the occupational gradient—that is, among individuals in sales and services occupations and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations, followed by individuals in trades/transportation occupations. Managers are among the least likely to have all types of non-permanent employment; otherwise, the occupational distribution of exposure to job insecurity differs by type. Specifically, individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations are the most likely to have seasonal employment, followed by technicians and individuals in sales and services occupations. After managers, professionals are the least likely to have seasonal employment. However, they are the most likely to have term employment, followed by technicians; all other occupational groups are less likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have term employment. Individuals in trades/transportation and individuals in sales and services occupations are the most likely to have casual or on-call employment; all other occupational groups (except managers) are not significantly different from their counterparts in administrative occupations in this regard.

Job-related resources. The occupational distribution of job-related resources is largely consistent with the resources hypothesis. Managers and professionals are the most likely to have schedule flexibility, while individuals in sales and services, trades/transportation, and primary- and secondary-sector occupations are the least likely to have this job-related resource. Managers, professionals, and (to lesser extent) technicians tend to have more leave options than their counterparts in administrative occupations, while individuals in sales and services, trades/transportation, and primary- and secondary-sector occupations tend to have relatively fewer. The distribution of part-time work options across occupations diverges from this pattern
somewhat. Individuals in sales and services occupations are the most likely to have part-time work options, followed by professionals. All other occupational groups are less likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have part-time work options.

8.2 Documenting Occupation-Based Differences in Levels of WFC and the Intervening Mechanisms

The first model in Table 2-4 shows the occupational distribution of WFC at baseline, adjusting for socio-demographic and household characteristics. Relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations, managers and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations experience the highest (and nearly equivalent) levels of WFC, followed by individuals in trades/transportation occupations, technicians, and professionals. Individuals in sales and services occupations are not significantly different from their counterparts in administrative occupations with respect to WFC. An important aspect of this pattern is consistent with both the demands and resources hypotheses. Specifically, managers as well as individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations report the most WFC of any occupational groups, as predicted by the demands and resources hypotheses, respectively. Otherwise, however, the observed occupation-based distribution of WFC is more consistent with the resources hypothesis than it is with the demands hypothesis. This is because individuals in trades/transportation occupations experience the second highest levels of WFC, compared to their counterparts in administrative occupations, while professionals and, less so, technicians experience the lowest levels of WFC.

Time-based demands. Model 2 adjusts for time-based work demands—that is, overwork and non-standard work hours/schedules. While non-standard work hours/schedules increase WFC, this effect is substantially dwarfed by overwork. The relationship between work hours and WFC increases monotonically: Compared to working less than 30 hours per week, working 30 to 39 hours increases WFC by 0.228 points; working 40 to 49 hours increases WFC by 0.304 points; and working 50 or more hours increases WFC by well over half a point. Thus,
Table 2-4. OLS Regression of Work-to-Family Conflict on Occupation, Work Conditions, and Controls (n = 9,615)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.171***</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.177***</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.096**</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.090**</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.110***</td>
<td>0.072*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>0.127***</td>
<td>0.117**</td>
<td>0.135***</td>
<td>0.125***</td>
<td>0.127***</td>
<td>0.127***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Occupations</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services Occupations</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, Transport and Equipment Operators and Related Occupations</td>
<td>0.153***</td>
<td>0.089*</td>
<td>0.119**</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations Unique to Primary Industries, Processing and Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.170***</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.156***</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.133**</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-Based Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Work Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strain-Based Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure (Non-Permanent) Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular employee with no contractual or anticipated end date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual or on-call employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.397***</td>
<td>0.344***</td>
<td>0.347***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.072***</td>
<td>-0.081***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option to Work Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.095***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.026**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.515***</td>
<td>1.194***</td>
<td>1.476***</td>
<td>1.221***</td>
<td>1.653***</td>
<td>1.362***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals who overwork tend to report the highest levels of WFC. More importantly, these
time-based work demands completely account for the elevated levels of WFC among managers,
professionals, and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations. Time-based
demands also go a long way toward accounting for the elevated levels of WFC among
individuals in trades/transportation occupations, but much less so among technicians. In separate
analyses (not shown) I discovered that the indirect effects of time-based work demands on WFC
through occupation are largely driven by overwork. As seen in Table 2-3, managers, individuals
in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations, and professionals work
more hours per week on average than their counterparts in administrative occupations. Further,
individuals in these occupational groups are relatively more likely to overwork. These facts alone
fully account for the WFC difference between managers and professionals on one hand, and their
counterparts in administrative occupations, on the other hand. They also largely account for the
WFC difference between individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations and their
counterparts in administrative occupations, with the rest being fully accounted for by the
former’s greater likelihood of working non-standard hours/schedules. While the WFC difference
between individuals in trades/transportation occupations and their counterparts in administrative
occupations persists net of time-based demands, it is diminished by nearly half. This owes to
both overwork among individuals in trades/transportation occupations and their greater
likelihood of working non-standard hours/schedules, although overwork is more decisive here.

While technicians are slightly more likely than their counterparts in administrative
occupations to overwork and work non-standard hours/schedules, they tend to work equivalent
hours per week. It is likely for this reason that time-based demands account for very little of the
WFC gap between technicians and their counterparts in administrative occupations.

Strain-based demands. The third model includes the strain-based work demands of
workaholism and job insecurity. As predicted, workers who self-identify as a ‘workaholic’ report
significantly higher levels of WFC. By contrast, however, it is noteworthy that job insecurity
appears to function as a job-related resource in the way it predicts lower levels of WFC. Casual
or on-call employment has a stronger negative association with WFC than seasonal or term
employment. It it may be that job insecurity in general, and casual or on-call employment in
particular, implies a greater degree of latitude in how individuals fit work arrangements around family life and, therefore, less WFC. Alternatively, it may be that non-permanent employment engenders lower levels of job involvement or organizational commitment, which are associated with less WFC.\textsuperscript{24} Taken together, these strain-based demands have different overall indirect effects on the regression coefficients that represent occupation-based differences. For example, they reduce the size of the regression coefficients for managers, professionals, and individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and sector-occupations—suggesting a pattern of ‘explanation’ for such differences. By contrast, they increase the size of the regression coefficient for technicians—suggesting a pattern of ‘suppression’ for occupation-based differences. More specifically, I observe that managers are less likely to have all types of job insecurity and more likely to self-identify as workaholics compared to workers in administrative occupations; by extension, these patterns partially explain managers’ elevated levels of WFC. While these patterns contribute to managers’ greater exposure to WFC, self-identified workaholism has a stronger influence than job insecurity.

In addition, professionals, individuals in trades/transportation occupations, and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations are more likely to have job insecurity than their counterparts in administrative occupations, without which they would experience even higher levels of WFC than those observed in the baseline model. However, these suppression effects for professionals, individuals in trades/transportation occupations, and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations are offset by the explanatory effects of their greater likelihood of self-identifying as workaholics compared to their counterparts in administrative occupations (even though, in the case of professionals, this difference is not significant).

Technicians are more likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have job insecurity, but they do not differ in self-identification as workaholics. If it were not for this ‘favorable’ combination of strain-based demands, technicians would experience even greater exposure to WFC than observed in the baseline model.

\textsuperscript{24} In the data at hand, workaholism is less common among individuals with job insecurity, providing some support, albeit limited, for this potential reason for the observed negative association between job insecurity and WFC.
To summarize the findings from this model, managers are relatively more likely to self-identify as workaholics and they are less likely to have job insecurity, which, contrary to expectations, acts as a resource vis-à-vis WFC. These patterns partly explain managers’ relatively higher levels of WFC. Professionals, technicians, individuals in trades/transportation occupations, and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations would experience even higher levels of WFC were it not for the greater prevalence of job insecurity among them (relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations). However, these beneficial effects are more than offset at the same time by the greater prevalence of workaholism among all of these occupational groups with the exception of technicians.

**Time- and strain-based demands.** In Model 4, I include time- and strain-based work demands together as a set and observe that their inclusion fully accounts for occupation-based differences in WFC—with one exception: the difference between technicians and administrative occupations. In general, this finding represents the considerable influence of overwork as a central determinant of WFC—and the ways that overwork is so clearly patterned across the occupation groups. Ultimately, technicians would tend to report nearly equivalent levels of WFC to those observed in the baseline model—in spite of their relatively ‘favorable’ constellation of job-related demands: They report fewer work hours, lower likelihood of non-standard hours, greater job insecurity (which, to reiterate, functions more like a job-related resource), and lower risk of self-identifying as a workaholic.

**Job-related resources.** In model 5, the inclusion of job-related resources indicates that schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options are associated with lower levels of WFC—although, it is noteworthy that the magnitude of their effects is small. The fact that schedule flexibility does indeed function as a resource in relation to WFC rules out the prediction of the stress of higher status hypothesis that managers and professionals will tend to report higher levels of WFC because certain job-related resources characteristic of higher-status occupations—such as schedule flexibility—actually function as demands in relation to WFC by increasing work-family border permeability.

Taken together, job-related demands have different overall indirect effects on the regression coefficients that represent occupation-based differences, which are consistent with the
resource hypothesis. For example, they increase the size of the regression coefficient for managers and professionals—suggesting a pattern of ‘suppression’ for these occupational differences. By contrast, they reduce the size of the regression coefficients for individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and sector-occupations—suggesting a pattern of ‘explanation’ for these occupational differences. More specifically, I observe that managers and professionals are more likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have schedule flexibility and they have a greater number of leave options. Professionals are also more likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have part-time work options. Without these resources, managers and professionals would experience even higher levels of WFC than those observed in the baseline model. In fact, managers would experience even higher levels of WFC than those indicated by this model if they did not also have relatively limited access to part-time work options (i.e., the suppression effects of managers’ relatively greater likelihood of having schedule flexibility and greater number of leave options is partially offset by the explanatory effects of their relatively lower likelihood of having part-time work options). Overall, then, part of the reason why managers tend to report higher levels of WFC is because of their limited access to part-time work options. In sum, managers would be better off—in terms of lower WFC—were it not for the fact that they do not have access to part-time work options. And yet, their greater schedule flexibility and leave options are overall assets.

I also observe that individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations are less likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations to have schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options. The relative lack of these job-related resources among individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations partially accounts for their elevated levels of WFC compared to their counterparts in administrative occupations.

**Job-related demands and resources.** In model 6, I include job-related demands and resources simultaneously to evaluate the net occupational differences in WFC. I observe that the only persistent occupational differences are among professionals and technicians who report more WFC their counterparts in administrative occupations. For professionals, this reflects the effectiveness of their job-related resources and job-insecurity (which, counterintuitively, corresponds to less WFC) in mitigating the effects of their overwork on WFC. The WFC gap between technicians and their counterparts in administrative occupations remains the same,
controlling for job-related demands and resources. Since none of the models is overly effective in accounting for the WFC gap between technicians and their counterparts in administrative occupations, it is likely that work conditions and other characteristics beyond those considered here are more relevant predictors of WFC among this occupational group. Otherwise, inequalities between occupational groups in job-related demands and resources fully account for elevated levels of WFC among managers, individuals in trades/transportation occupations, and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations (relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations).

8.3 Evaluating Gender and Parental Status Contingencies
Given the competing devotions of managerial and professional mothers to cultural schemas of work and family, gender and parental status were considered here as possible moderators of the associations between occupation and WFC. Specifically, two-way interaction terms between gender and occupation were created, as was a three-way interaction term between gender, parental status, and occupation (and a two-way interaction between gender and parental status). The gender*occupation and parental status*occupation interactions were added to the baseline model separately, along with the gender*parental status interactions. (Note that when parental status*occupation interactions were added to the baseline model, parental status was substituted for number of children in the household at the same time.) Neither the $R^2$-change accompanying the addition of the gender*occupation interactions to the baseline model, nor that accompanying the addition of parental status*occupation interactions, was statistically significantly. This means

25 Some readers might wonder if the relationship between either job-related demands or resources and levels of WFC differ across these occupation groups. In separate analyses (not shown), I performed extensive tests to assess this possibility. It seems plausible that workers in lower-status occupations might face more potent job-related demands, and they have less effective work resources, than their counterparts in higher-status occupations. This might result in occupation-contingent effects of these demands and resources on WFC. However, across all analyses, occupation did not moderate any of the relationships between job-related demands/resources and WFC. In other words, this diverse set of work conditions are similarly associated with WFC across occupational groups.

26 Parental status refers to the presence/absence of any child/ren in the household. The presence of any preschool-aged children was explored as an alternative to parental status, but it did not significantly moderate the effects of occupation on WFC—by itself or together with gender.
that the occupational distribution of WFC observed in the baseline model holds among men and women, on one hand, and among childless individuals and parents, on the other hand. Gender*occupation and parental status*occupation interactions were then added to the baseline model together, along with a gender*parental status interaction that is implied by the three-way interaction between gender*parental status*occupation, and the $R^2$ was noted. Next, the gender*parental status*occupation interactions were added to the preceding model. The $R^2$-change accompanying the addition of these three-way interactions was not statistically significant, meaning that the occupational distribution of WFC observed in the baseline model holds among childless men versus fathers and childless women vs. mothers. The implication of this finding is that managerial and professional women are not exceptionally vulnerable to WFC—in spite of contradictions between taken-for-granted expectations about what it means to be a “good” worker and a “good” mother among them.

9 Discussion and Conclusion

WFC has emerged as a potent and pervasive stressor in the daily lives of many Canadian employees (Duxbury and Higgins 2012). As such, it is important to understand the conditions that influence its levels. Occupation should be particularly relevant in this regard, as it determines the nature and context of work and, therefore, employees’ job-related demands and resources, which previous research has shown to be the primary determinants of WFC (e.g., Byron 2005). Yet rarely has occupation been considered in a meaningful way in relation to WFC—that is, across a wide range of occupational groups. The few studies that have included occupation as a predictor of WFC generally reveal that managers and professionals tend to report more WFC than non-professionals (e.g., DiRenzo, Greenhaus and Weer 2011; Duxbury and Higgins 2003; Edgell, Ammons, and Dahlim 2012; Schieman et al. 2006; Schieman and Glavin 2008). This pattern is surprising because it runs contrary to prominent theoretical arguments and empirical evidence in the sociological study of stress, social inequality, and mental health that suggest that managers and professionals should have a distinct advantage in two ways that relate directly to the socioeconomic gradient in well-being: (1) they should be less exposed to stressors (‘differential exposure’) and (2) they should be less vulnerable to the distressing effects of stress exposure due to their greater and more effective resources (‘differential vulnerability’).
(Schieman and Glavin 2011). I revisit this paradox with data from a nationally-representative sample of Canadian employees.

Three main contributions emerge from my analyses. First, the distribution of WFC across the full range of occupational groups is documented. Second, since inequalities between occupations in job-related demands and resources are thought to be the primary mechanism giving rise to the occupational distribution of WFC, they are explored and which job-related demands and resources vary significantly across occupations are identified. Third, the contributions of inequalities between occupations in job-related demands and resources to the occupational distribution of WFC (‘mediating effects’) are demonstrated.

Casting the differential exposure perspective in terms of the work-family interface, the demands hypothesis predicts that individuals in higher-status occupations (i.e., managers and professionals) tend to report more WFC due to their greater exposure to job-related demands. Conversely, the resource hypothesis, which is based on the differential vulnerability perspective, predicts that individuals in lower-status (i.e., sales and services, trades/transportation, primary- and secondary-sector) occupations tend to report more WFC due to their lesser job-related resources. My observations regarding the occupational distribution of WFC are consistent with both hypotheses in that managers and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations report the highest (and equivalent) levels of WFC (relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations). However, the rest of the occupational distribution of WFC is more consistent with the resource hypothesis, as individuals in trades/transportation occupations experience the second highest levels of WFC, followed by technicians, and lastly professionals. Individuals in sales and services occupations experience comparable levels of WFC to their counterparts in administrative occupations.

Occupational differences in time-based demands, particularly overwork, are found to be the driving force behind the association between occupation and WFC. Contrary to the predictions of demands hypothesis, however, overwork is common among individuals in both higher- and lower-status occupations. Managers, individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations, and professionals work more hours per week on average than their counterparts in administrative occupations. Further, individuals in these
occupational groups are relatively more likely to overwork. These facts alone full account for the WFC gap between managers and professionals on one hand, and their counterparts in administrative occupations, on the other hand. They also largely account for the WFC difference between individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations and their counterparts in administrative occupations, with the rest being fully accounted for by the greater likelihood of working non-standard hours/schedules among the former. While the WFC gap between individuals in trades/transportation occupations and their counterparts in administrative occupations persists net of time-based demands, it is reduced by nearly half. This owes to both overwork among individuals in trades/transportation occupations and their greater likelihood of working non-standard hours/schedules, although overwork is more decisive here. The remaining WFC gap between individuals in trades/transportation occupations and their counterparts in administrative occupations is fully accounted for by the greater prevalence of the strain-based demand of workaholism among the former.

Using American data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) covering the period of 1979 and 2009, Cha and Weeden (2014) have demonstrated that overwork has generally become more common over time in among managers, professionals, and non-professionals to a lesser extent, and the wage returns to overwork have also grown, particularly for managers and professionals. My findings regarding the role of overwork in the occupational distribution of WFC suggest that these trends are problematic for individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface and probably contribute to the ubiquity of WFC in the contemporary context.

Compared to managers and professionals, individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations are effectively ‘doubly disadvantaged’ because they have substantial time-based demands and, at the same time, they have a shortage of job-related resources. The relative dearth of job-related resources among these employees is consistent with the resource hypothesis and contributes to their higher levels of WFC, albeit not to the same extent as their time-based demands or, among individuals in trades/transportation occupations, their workaholism. Although managers are the most likely occupational group to have schedule flexibility—and, contrary to the predictions of the stress of higher status hypothesis, this job-related resource does indeed function as a such in relation to WFC—it tends to be insufficient when it comes to mitigating the higher levels of WFC induced by their overwork. However,
professionals’ schedule flexibility, part-time work and leave options, combined with their relatively greater likelihood of job insecurity (i.e., term employment)—which, counterintuitively, tends function as a resource by lowering WFC—do tend to effectively mitigate the higher levels of WFC induced by their overwork. Without this favorable constellation of job-related demands and resources, professionals would experience even higher levels of WFC.

Throughout my analyses, technicians are anomalous, in that they tend to have fairly favorable constellations of job-related demands and resources, yet they experience more WFC than their counterparts in administrative occupations (and professionals). Specifically, technicians work the shortest hours, on average, and they are the occupational group that is least likely to overwork (relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations), although they are a little more likely than their counterparts in administrative occupations (and managers) to work non-standard hours/schedules. Job insecurity (i.e. seasonal and term employment), which predicts lower levels of WFC, is also fairly common among technicians. Technicians tend to have more leave options than other occupational groups, with the exception of managers and professionals, but they are equivalent to administrative occupations and better off than trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations when it comes to schedule flexibility and part-time work options. Adjusting for these job-related demands and resources in multivariate analyses does little to account for technicians’ relatively elevated levels of WFC, suggesting that other determinants of WFC beyond those considered here are pertinent to this occupational group.

What other determinants of WFC might account for technicians’ relatively greater exposure to WFC? Examples of the jobs that make up this occupational group are medical laboratory technicians; dental hygienists and dental therapists; midwives and practitioners of natural healing; nurses’ aides, orderlies and patient services associations; employment counsellors; instructors and teachers of persons with disabilities; early childhood educators and assistants; library and archive technicians and assistants; film and video camera operators; and audio and video recording technicians. Since knowing one’s job provides meaningful contextual information regarding his/her work, from these examples, it can be deduced that technical occupations involve interdependence and coordination with others to accomplish work goals. They also frequently involve responsibility for others, such as patients, clients, and students.
Previous research has demonstrated that these work conditions increase work-family conflict and, for this reason, they may help to explain technicians’ relatively greater exposure to WFC (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008). Unfortunately, this possibility cannot be explored using the data at hand due to the absence of relevant variables.

Work-family issues are often thought to be particularly relevant to women in high-level managerial and professional occupations, especially mothers, because, beyond their greater exposure to job- and family-related demands, they are torn between two clashing normative definitions of what it means to be a good worker, on one hand, and a mother, on the other hand (Blair-Loy 2003; Hays 1996; Hennessy 2009; Williams 2010). For this reason, I explored the possibility that gender and/or parental status condition the association between occupation and WFC. Contrary to expectations, however, I find that the occupational distribution of WFC holds among women and men, parents and non-parents, and childless men versus fathers and childless women versus mothers. Thus, female managers and professionals with children are not exceptionally vulnerable to WFC.

Three limitations of this study are worth discussing. First, the use of cross-sectional data limits my capacity to make definitive statements about causal ordering among the focal associations (Schieman and Glavin 2011; Schieman and Young 2011). For example, it is possible that WFC creates conditions that cause some individuals to select into certain occupations. The same argument can be made about WFC in relation to certain work demands and resources, such as work hours and schedule flexibility (Schieman and Young 2010). Even so, there are sound theoretical reasons for suspecting that at least some, if not most, of the influence flows in the direction proposed in my analyses. Longitudinal research is needed to more accurately determine these interrelationships over time.

Measurement issues are also an important limitation. Only two items were available in the data to create the WFC scale. Scales with too few items may lack content and construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability, with single-item measures being particularly problematic in these regards (Hinkin 1995). However, the two items used to create the WFC scale loaded on a single factor and the Spearman-Brown reliability estimate was 0.606, suggesting that its construct validity and reliability are fairly good.
The data used here do not contain the full range of work conditions and other characteristics that may be determinants of WFC. Additional measures of work demands could also be considered, such as job pressures and receiving work-related contact outside of normal working hours, as could additional measures of work resources, such as authority, decision-making latitude, and supervisor or coworker support (Bellavia and Frone 2005). Another notable absence is values about the relative prioritization of work and family, which previous research has shown to influence perceptions of work-family conflict (Carlson and Kacmar 2000). The somewhat low $R^2$ values imply that work conditions and other characteristics beyond the ones considered here contribute to variation in WFC. It would be worthwhile for future research to investigate the extent to which these characteristics explain the association between occupation and WFC.

To conclude, my analyses shed light on the association between occupation and WFC. The findings presented here reveal that individuals in both higher- and lower-status groups experience the highest (and equivalent) levels of WFC: managers and individuals in primary- and secondary sector occupations (relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations). Individuals in trades/transportation occupations experience the second highest levels of WFC, followed by technicians, and lastly professionals. (Individuals in sales and services occupations experience equivalent levels of WFC to their counterparts in administrative occupations). This pattern is largely driven by the occupational distribution of time-based demands, particularly overwork. Managers’ and professionals’ greater tendency to overwork completely explains their higher levels of WFC, and the combination of overwork and non-standard work hours/schedules among individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations completely explains their higher levels of WFC. Time-based demands also explain much of the higher levels of WFC observed among individuals in trades/transportation occupations, with the balance being explained by their workaholism. The lack of job-related resources among individuals in trades/transportation and primary- and secondary-sector occupations also contributes to their higher levels of WFC. Managers benefit from schedule flexibility, but not sufficiently to overcome the negative consequences of overwork for their WFC. Professionals benefit from favorable constellations of job-related demands and resources that include schedule flexibility, part-time work and leave options, and job insecurity—without which they would experience even higher levels of WFC. Technicians’ elevated levels of WFC relative to their counterparts in
administrative occupations are not well accounted for by the job-related demands and resources considered here. Given knowledge of the jobs that make up the occupational group of “technicians,” I have suggested that the interdependence with and responsibility for others that their work entails may contribute to explanation of their greater exposure to WFC. It is hoped that future research will consider these explanations.
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Chapter 3
Education and Family-to-Work Conflict

Women, particularly wives and mothers of young children, have increasingly joined men in the paid labor market since the 1960s (Ranson 2005), and men have upped their participation in caring roles—particularly child care—in recent decades (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). Adequate fulfillment of domestic responsibilities has therefore become more challenging for both sexes, given the limitations of time and energy. At the same time, family obligations have grown, in light of social expectations for emotional fulfillment within marriage and an individualistic ethos more generally (Beaujot 2000; cf. Lesthaeghe and van de Kaa 1986), “intensive mothering” (Hays 1996), and new norms of fatherhood that emphasize men’s involvement with their children in addition to financial provision (Coltrane 1996; Furstenberg 1988; Gerson 1993; Townsend 2002). It is not surprising, then, that 58% of full-time workers in Canada report at least moderate levels of family interfering with work (Duxbury and Higgins 2012).

Work-family conflict has received considerable scholarly attention over the past several decades (Innstrand, Langballe, and Falkum 2010). This is defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which the pressures of work and family roles are mutually incompatible in some way, such that participation in one role is more difficult by virtue of participation in the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985). It has long been recognized that work-family conflict is bidirectional—that is, family can interfere with work or work can interfere with family (Bellavia and Frone 2005). However, family-to-work conflict has been relatively neglected by previous research, as it tends to be less prevalent than work-to-family conflict (Duxbury and Higgins 2013; Frone 2002; Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992; Voydanoff 2005). Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992) suggest that family-to-work conflict occurs less frequently than does work-to-family conflict because the boundaries between work and family are asymmetrically permeable, with work spilling over into the family domain more readily than the reverse. It may be easier to curtail family responsibilities because accountability is to loved ones; family responsibilities also tend to be more flexible (McElwain, Korabik, and Rosin 2005). Or it may be that individuals simply report less family-to-work conflict because the demands of family life are harder to
quantify due to the elasticity of the boundaries and responsibilities of family roles (Gutek, Searle, and Klepa 1991; Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham 1999). Nevertheless, family-to-work conflict has negative consequences for both personal and organizational well-being. Family-to-work conflict is associated with higher levels of anxiety, depression, and stress and poor physical health (Duxbury and Higgins 2003; Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1997; Hill 2005; Schieman, McBrier, and Van Gundy 2003). It also tends to hinder work-role performance by causing employees to waste time, lack concentration, rush through tasks, and realign schedules to handle opposing demands (Schieman et al. 2003). Family-to-work conflict may ultimately impair organizational effectiveness, then, by decreasing productivity at work (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elferin, and Semmer 2011) and by increasing absenteeism (Amstad et al. 2011; Kirchmeyer and Cohen 1999) and turnover (Amstad et al. 2011; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, and Luk 2001). For these reasons, it is worth investigating the determinants of family-to-work conflict.

Besides the relative neglect of family-to-work conflict (FWC) as a dimension of the work-family interface, a further limitation of work-family research is its tendency to focus on individuals of higher social status, particularly managers and professionals, whose occupations generally necessitate fairly high levels of educational achievement (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Burris 1986; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Greenhaus 2008; Hennessy 2009; Hertz 1999; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Lambert 1999; Marks and Leslie 2000; Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004; Poppleton, Briner, and Kiefer 2008; Schieman and Glavin 2011; Stebbins 2001; Stevens, Minnotte, and Kiger 2004; Swanberg 2005; Warren 2003; Weight and Solomon 2006). These studies are often less capable of speaking to a wider range of socioeconomic experiences, possibly obscuring important social gradients in work-family conflict that apply across the entire socioeconomic spectrum (Braveman, Cubbin, Egerter, Chideya, Marchi, Metzler, and Posner 2005). To address this gap in the literature, I assess the complete range of educational attainment and evaluate its connection with FWC. Education is the most fundamental component of socioeconomic status because it shapes future occupational opportunities and earnings potential (Adler and Newman 2002).

I examine the relationship between education and FWC for three reasons. First, family characteristics are the main determinants of FWC (Frone et al. 1992), and it is well-established that education influences the nature of family-related experiences (e.g., Fox 2009; Lareau 2003;
Williams 2010). Second, education influences the relative importance that individuals attribute to their work and family roles (Burris 1991; Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds, and Alldred 2003; Walker 1990), which may, in turn, affect their exposure to FWC (Carlson and Kacmar 2000). And third, occupation is largely a function of education, and occupation determines the nature of the boundaries between work and family and, in that way, shapes exposure to FWC. Few population-based studies have examined educational differences in exposure to FWC, and those that have done so have report mixed results (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Dillworth and Kingsbury, 2005 among boomers only; Nomaguchi 2011; Mennino et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005).

In an effort to expand knowledge about this question, the present study addresses three questions: (1) Is FWC distributed differently across educational groups—and, if so, how? (2) Which family-related demands and resources are associated with FWC? (3) Do any of these demands and resources contribute to an observed association between education and FWC? In framing the questions this way, I also consider the extent to which family-related demands and resources are differentially distributed across educational groups. Taken together, these interrelated factors might contribute to the social portrait of FWC in the Canadian working population.

10 Literature Review

10.1 Determinants of FWC

The interface between work and family is typically conceptualized from a demands-resources perspective that defines FWC (and its inverse, work-to-family conflict) as the sense of difficulty that individuals experience in combining earning and caring roles because the demands of these roles exceed the availability of resources to meet them (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985; Nomaguchi 2009; Voydanoff 2005 & 2009). Further, the prevailing model of the work-family interface and previous research indicate that the demands and resources that determine FWC primarily reside in the family domain (Frone 2003; Frone et al. 1992; Frone, Yardley, and Markel 1997).

Demands are “structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations, and norms to which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or
mental effort” (Voydanoff 2008: 39). There are two types of demands, both of which tend to increase FWC: time-based and strain-based (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985).27 Time-based demands reflect the fact that time is a finite resource, meaning that time and/or involvement in one domain effectively limits time and/or involvement in the other domain through a process of resource drain. Time spent doing housework and caring for children and/or elderly parents are typical time-based demands in the family domain (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer 2007; Voydanoff 2008). Strain-based demands operate through a process of negative psychological spillover, in which psychological responses to poor conditions in one domain (e.g., negative emotional arousal, interpersonal withdrawal, energy depletion, and stress) carry over to attitudes and behaviour in the other domain (Voydanoff 2008). Common strain-based demands pertaining to family social organization are marital conflict, spouse’s work-to-family conflict, children’s problems (e.g., disability, difficult temperament), concern about childcare, and caregiver strain (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Voydanoff 2008; Young, Schieman, and Milkie 2014).

By contrast, resources are “structural or psychological assets that may be used to facilitate role performance, reduce demands, or generate additional resources” (Voydanoff 2008: 39). Key resources in the family domain are instrumental and emotional social support from one’s spouse and/or other family members (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Voydanoff 2008). In addition, social integration in one’s local community is thought to function as a resource in relation to FWC (Voydanoff 2008).

Besides family-related demands and resources, previous research demonstrates that psychological involvement with one’s family predicts FWC (Adams, King, and King 1996; Bellavia and Frone 2005; Frone et al. 1992). This relationship may come about through increased work-family border permeability, such that home-related demands intrude into the earning role more among individuals who attribute relatively more importance to family as opposed to work (Pleck 1977). In effect, high levels of psychological involvement with one’s family may cause an

27 Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified another category of antecedents, which have behaviour-based sources. However, they have proven to be difficult to operationalize, so they have been notably absent from the literature (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008).
individual to be mentally preoccupied with that role while physically present in the earning role (Cardens, Major, and Bernas 2004).

10.2 Education and FWC

Given its enduring and repetitive nature, FWC is considered to be a chronic stressor, reflecting the social organization of obligations and expectations related to both family and work roles and the interpersonal relationships that they entail (Pearlin 1989, 1999; Schieman, McBrier, and Van Gundy 2003). As such, it falls within the sociological study of mental health, which is distinguished from other approaches by a focus on the implications of individuals’ embeddedness in structural arrangements, especially systems of stratification (Pearlin 1989, 1999). Theory and research consistently demonstrates socioeconomic and other status-based disparities in psychological distress and disorder (Turner and Lloyd 1999). The Stress Process Model (Pearlin 1989, 1999) offers the prevailing explanation for the relevance of social status to psychological distress and disorder: stressors—and the coping resources that mediate or moderate their impact—arise largely out of the conditions of life to which individuals are exposed, which are effectively delimited by their position/s in systems of stratification.

Lower-status individuals generally report greater symptoms of psychological distress and disorder (McLeod and Nonnemaker 1999). Two explanations are typically offered for these findings (Krause 1988). First, lower-status individuals may face more physical, psychological, and social stressors (the “differential exposure” perspective) (Grzywacz, Almeida, Neupert, and Ettner 2004; Schieman and Glavin 2011). Second, they may also be more susceptible to the negative effects of these stressors because they have fewer and/or less effective coping resources—or their stressors are qualitatively more potent (the “differential vulnerability” perspective) (Grzywacz et al. 2004; Schieman and Glavin 2011). Research confirms that individuals of lower socioeconomic status tend to be exposed to more chronic stressors than their counterparts with higher socioeconomic status (e.g., Turner and Lloyd 1999; Turner, Wheaton and Lloyd 1995). Moreover, the personal and social resources (e.g., mastery, social support) that are essential in the stress process are relatively less available to individuals of lower socioeconomic status (Mirowsky and Ross 2003).
Applying the ideas of the differential exposure and vulnerability perspectives, one might predict that individuals with lower levels of educational attainment should tend to encounter more frequent FWC because of their greater exposure to home-related demands and their relative lack of resources. However, the existing evidence pertaining to the educational distribution of FWC provides few consistent clues about this association. Ammons and Kelly (2008) find that early family formation and poor working conditions do indeed lead young adults with lower educational attainments to experience more challenges as they pursue their work goals and more years of FWC. In contrast, Mennino, Rubin, and Brayfield (2005) and Voydanoff (2005) and demonstrate that FWC is more common among the well-educated (see also Dillworth and Kingsbury, 2005 among boomers only; Nomaguchi 2011).

Why should we expect socioeconomic-based variation in FWC in the first place? On one hand, the extensive literature on socioeconomic inequalities in mental health suggests that lower-status individuals should be more exposed to harmful stressors like FWC, compared to their higher-status counterparts. By contrast, however, some evidence in the work-family literature challenges that claim. In the context of the differential exposure and vulnerability perspectives, two hypothetical scenarios emerge that help delineate predictions about the link between education and FWC—and these scenarios depend on a complex constellation of home-related demands and resources (cf. Schieman and Glavin 2008; Nomaguchi and Brown 2011).

10.2.1 The Demands Hypothesis

The demands hypothesis predicts a positive relationship between education and FWC, such that individuals with higher levels of education are more likely to experience FWC than their counterparts with lower levels of education. Specially, the demands hypothesis proposes that individuals with at least a university degree tend to be more exposed to home-related demands that, in turn, elevate their exposure to FWC. Among the most likely culprits are time- and strain-based demands related to the use of a labour-intensive, emotionally-absorbing parenting method (Hays 1996; Lareau 2003; Nomaguchi and Brown 2011) as well as spouse/partner’s work-to-family conflict (Bakker, Demerouti, and Dollard 2008; Young, Schieman, and Milkie 2014)
In order for home-related demands to contribute to education-based differences in exposure to FWC, they must be unevenly distributed across educational groups. In particular, we might expect parental investments to increase as one moves up the educational gradient. Socioeconomic status implies distinct cultural logics of childrearing, with the one that is enacted by middle-class parents being far more intensive of their time, energy, and emotion than the one that is enacted by working-class and poor parents (Lareau 2003). Specifically, middle-class parents adhere to a form of childrearing known as “concerted cultivation” (Lareau 2003). With concerted cultivation, children’s leisure time is structured by a hectic schedule of organized activities that contribute to their personal development. Parents are highly involved in their children’s leisure time, in that they orchestrate, chaperone, and oversee their organized activities. In the home, middle-class parents focus on eliciting their children’s feelings, opinions, and thoughts, and improving their vocabulary and negotiating skills through steady streams of dialogue. Even discipline of children in middle-class families takes the form of verbal reasoning. In children’s interactions with institutions, such as schools, middle-class parents act as mediators, directly intervening to manage their children’s complaints and/or to secure personalized treatment for their children.

Formidable economic constraints amplify challenges for working-class and poor parents to provide sustenance and shelter and to manage the domestic chores that sustain daily life (Lareau 2003). It is not surprising, then, that they do not consider the concerted cultivation of children to be an essential aspect of good parenting. Instead, working-class and poor parents adhere to a form of childrearing, known as “accomplishment of natural growth,” in which children are largely autonomous (Lareau 2003). Under accomplishment of natural growth, children experience long stretches of leisure time, over which they have nearly complete control. Typically, working-class and poor children just “hang out” and play with kin. In the home, language use is minimal, with silence being punctuated by parent-issued directives that children generally follow, likely for fear of physical discipline. In children’s interactions with institutions, working-class and poor parents expect educators and other professionals who work with children to take a leadership role, out of respect for their expertise and authority. This deference also reflects an underlying element of hostility toward these professionals, with power to enforce the
dominant childrearing standards (i.e., concerted cultivation) by “turning-in” parents who do not conform to them.

The thesis that socioeconomic status is positively associated with more intensive forms of childrearing is supported by studies of time-use among parents. For example, Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney (2008) find that the amount of time that American parents spend with their children increases with levels of education and income—a pattern that holds in the other fourteen countries that they examined. They also find that the amount of time that parents spend on household production and leisure decreases with their levels of education and income (see also Kimmel and Connelly 2007). Taken together, these findings suggest that higher-status parents place more value on time spent with their children and, therefore, they protect it from the encroachment of time spent on work by reducing time spent on household production and leisure. Importantly, Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg (2004) provide evidence that the positive effect of socioeconomic status on maternal time with children stems from distinct norms about parenting, rather than differences in the availability of time. They find that the negative effect of less education on mothers’ time with children is similar in Italy, Norway, and Canada, despite substantial cross-national differences in levels of economic support and services for families. They also find that highly educated mothers in Norway and Germany spend more time with children than do less educated mothers, despite family policies designed to equalize resources among families. Additional evidence that socioeconomic status fosters distinct parenting norms derives from time-diary studies, which demonstrate that highly-educated mothers not only spend more time with children, they do more enriching activities with them, such as reading as opposed to watching television (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Sayer et al. 2004).

Besides the greater inputs of time that come with higher levels of parental investment in childrearing among well-educated parents, there may be more parenting stress. Nelson (2010: 174) argues that “parenting out of control” among the professional-middle class, characterized by “constant oversight, belief in children’s boundless potential, intimacy with children, claims of trust, and delayed launching,” engenders more anxiety about children’s well-being. Further, highly child-centered daily routines may isolate well-educated parents from the adult world, leading to feelings of being trapped in the parenting role [a phenomenon called “role captivity” by Pearlin (1989)]. Nomaguchi and Brown’s (2011) study of the association between education
and parenting strains (and rewards) among mothers of young children demonstrates that those who have at least a college degree experience more role captivity but less parenting anxiety than their peers with lower levels of education.

Spouse’s work-to-family conflict can also be expected to increase with education, given the tendency for educational homogamy in the selection of marriage partners (Hou and Myles 2007). Previous research demonstrates that levels of work-to-family conflict are higher among individuals with more education and managerial or professional occupations (DiRenzo, Greenhaus and Weer 2011; Duxbury and Higgins 2003; Edgell, Ammons, and Dahlim 2012; Mennino et al. 2005; Schieman et al. 2006; Schieman and Glavin 2008 & 2011; Voydanoff 2005). In relation to FWC, spouse’s work-to-family conflict has been conceptualized as a form of ‘crossover stress’ that occurs when the experiences of one individual influence the social and psychological experiences of their significant other (Young et al. 2014). There are several plausible mechanisms through which spouse’s work-to-family conflict may increase one’s own FWC, as summarized by Young and her colleagues (2014: 2):

Some scholars hypothesize that an individual’s exposure to work-related stressors elicits support and empathy from the other spouse, who in turn becomes emotionally burdened by the person’s stress (Westman 2001; Wethington 2000). Other research suggests that spouses’ conflicting job demands foster work-to-family conflict that results in family-related problems like spousal disputes and problems with children, which may compromise the well-being of the other spouse (Bakker, Demerouti, and Dollard 2008; Matthews et al. 2006; Stevens, Kiger, and Riley 2006).

The data used in this study does not include a measure of spouse’s work-to-family conflict. I therefore use spousal overwork as a proxy. This is justifiable because spousal overwork is most prevalent among highly educated, managerial and professional workers (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004), and socioeconomic status-based inequalities in work hours are often the driving force behind the social distribution of work-to-family conflict (see Chapter 2).

The literature discussed above leads me to hypothesize that there will be a positive and linear association between education and FWC. In addition, the demands hypothesis emphasizes home-related demands as the reason for greater exposure to FWC among individuals with more education. However, it is also plausible that some home-related demands that generate FWC are more common among individuals with lower levels of education. In this case, a non-linear
pattern might be observed in which individuals with lower levels of education (i.e., some post-secondary schooling or a high school diploma or less) would be more likely than their counterparts with middle-levels of education (i.e., a college diploma) to report FWC, as would individuals with at least a university degree. Previous research points to three home-related demands that may contribute to FWC among individuals with lower levels of education: single parenthood (Ciabattari 2007; Nomaguchi 2012), marital problems (Aryee, Fields, and Luk 1999; Dakin and Wampler 2008; Fox and Dwyer 1999; Grzywacz and Marks 2000), childcare issues (Buffardi and Erdwins 1997; Fox and Dwyer 1999; Goff, Mount, and Jamison 1990), and caregiver strain (Duxbury, Higgins, and Schroeder 2009; Glavin and Peters 2014; Marks 1998).

Women with lower levels of education, occupational attainment, and income have higher rates of divorce and out-of-wedlock births, meaning that they are more likely to be raising children alone (Ciabattari 2007). Further, financial stresses are associated with decreased marital satisfaction and stability (Kerkmann, Lee, Lown, and Allgood, 2000). Lower-status individuals also have less money with which to purchase many of the services that their higher-status counterparts use to adequately care for their children, parents and other elderly relatives, and family members who are fragile or ill (or to equalize the gender division of housework), so they spend more time caring for kin (Heymann 2000 and 2005). Even if lower-status individuals could afford to use such services, they are often off-schedule with the 9-to-5, Monday-through-Friday public timetable, as they are likely to work non-standard hours and schedules (Henly and Lyons 2000; Roy, Tubbs, and Burton 2004). Accordingly, caregiving arrangements in working-class and poor families often take the form of a “patchwork,” consisting of fragmented and inexpensive strategies that are implemented by various kin and kith (Dodson and Bravo 2005; Henly and Lambert 2005; Henly and Lyons 2000; Hunts and Avery 1998; Scott, London, and Hurst 2005). Such arrangements are far more likely to unravel than formal programs, leaving working parents in the lurch (Henly and Lyons 2000; Hofferth 1999; Scott et al., 2005; Usdanksy and Wolf 2008). Members of working-class and poor families also have heightened needs for attentive care because they get sick more often, and they have more chronic conditions, than

28 Although poor families may be eligible for child- and eldercare subsidies, oftentimes they do not apply for them because either they do not know that they are eligible or they consider making the necessary arrangements to be a hassle (Shlay, Weinraub, Harmon, and Tran 2004).
their middle-class counterparts (Burton, Lein, and Kolak 2005; Heymann 2000 and 2005). Learning challenges are also more prevalent among children from working-class and poor families (Dodson and Bravo 2005; Heymann 2000).

Collectively, these ideas lead me to evaluate whether or not greater exposure to the strain-based demands of single parenthood, dissatisfaction with childcare, and a household member with a health condition (‘caregiver strain’) contribute to a higher likelihood of experiencing FWC among individuals with some post-secondary education or a high school diploma or less.

10.2.2 The Resource Hypothesis

The resource hypothesis suggests that education is negatively associated with home-related resources that tend to contribute to less exposure to FWC. For this reason, individuals with higher levels of education may be more likely to experience FWC than their less educated counterparts. While individuals with higher levels of education tend to earn a higher income that should enable them to purchase services like high-quality childcare, housekeeping services, and restaurant meals to ease work- and family-role combination, individuals with lower levels of education may in fact be relatively privileged when it comes to domestic networks and the social support that inheres in them. Receiving instrumental support from one’s spouse or other family members, such as assistance with childcare or household chores, has been found to reduce FWC (Adams et al. 1996; Ciabattari 2007; Frone et al. 1997; Fu and Shaffer 2001), as has receiving emotional support (Adams et al. 1996; Bernas and Major 2000; Grzywacz and Marks 2000).

(White) middle-class families are normatively nuclear and ‘self-reliant,’ but extended families—consisting of both kin and kith—have a long history in low-income communities, especially in minority communities (Ciabattari 2007; Coontz 1992; Hansen 2005). As

---

29 The importance of extended-family networks as survival strategies formed in response to a long history of oppression and social, psychological, and economic marginalization is a long-standing theme in the literature on family organization (Brewster and Padavic 2002; Roschelle 1997). Ethnographies documenting high rates of participation in such networks among African Americans (e.g., Stack 1974), immigrants (e.g., Kibria 1993),...
Ciabattari (2007: 36) points out: “…in recent years, the ability of these [inter-generational and inter-household] networks of exchange to provide assistance has diminished as household resources have become more scarce and norms of reciprocity more difficult to maintain.” However, even within these financial constraints, evidence of assistance persists, particularly with respect to childcare (Ciabattari 2007).

In terms of the work-family interface, an important form of social support that inheres in domestic networks is childcare. Childcare facilitates parental (maternal) employment, but it is also important because it provides a window into the availability and helpfulness of domestic networks more broadly (Brandon 2000; Hunter, Pearson, Ialongo, and Kellam 1998). Research on the childcare arrangements of employed parents supports the notion that socioeconomic status and reliance on relatives, friends, and neighbours are inversely related. A consistent finding is that lower-income parents disproportionately use informal childcare arrangements, typically provided in the child’s home or in the home of a relative, friend, or neighbour (Hansen 2005; Henly and Lyons 2000; Wolfe and Scrivner 2004). These parents turn to kin and kith for childcare, as opposed to the marketplace, because they are inexpensive, with flexibility in how and when payments are made, and accommodating of non-standard work hours and schedules (Brayfield and Hofferth 1995; Bromer and Henly 2009; Hunts and Avery 1998; Kuhlthau and Mason 1996). Lower-income parents may also prefer such arrangements. In contrast, higher-income parents disproportionately use formal childcare arrangements, including daycare centres and nurseries, licensed in-home childcare providers, and nannies (Dowsett, Huston, Imes, and Gennetian 2008; Hansen 2005; Hofferth 1999). The relationship of participants in “networks of care” for children to parents may be indicative of the extent to which they benefit from social support networks.
support more generally in family life (Hansen 2005). Domínguez and Watkins (2003: 113) explain that

Social support is most often associated with ‘strong’ ties, which tend to be made of kin, neighbors, and intimate friends. These ties generally provide individuals emotional and expressive support as well as certain kinds of instrumental help like rides, small loans, or a place to stay in case of emergency...They can also ensure that basic needs are met, assist in child rearing, and provide tools for improving employment situations.

Given the socioeconomic gradient in childcare arrangements, then, there is reason to suspect that poorly-educated parents have more strong ties and, therefore, more social support in family life than do well-educated parents.

Based on the ideas embedded in the resource hypothesis, I predict that education will be positively associated with FWC. However, there may be several issues in domestic networks consisting of kin and kith, instead of paid help, that problematize their conceptualization as ‘resources’ in relation to FWC for individuals with lower levels of education. First, extended families operate on the principle of reciprocity, meaning that, in accepting social support, the receiver agrees to return the favour when the giver is in a similar position (Nelson 2002). Second, informal childcare arrangements tend to be lower in quality and stability than formal childcare arrangements, meaning that they may engender stress and even disrupt the employment of the working-class and poor parents who rely on them (Gordon, Kaestner, and Korenman 2008; Henly and Lyons 2000; Kossek, Pichler, Meece, and Barratt 2008; Scott, London, and Hurst 2005; Wolfe and Scrivner 2004). Contrary to the resource hypothesis, then, I may find that social support, as measured by the numbers of emotionally close relatives and friends and the geographic proximity of most relatives and friends, actually increases exposure to FWC. If this is the case, individuals with high levels of education may be less likely to experience FWC than their less educated counterparts because of the positive association between education and social support.

10.2.3 The Potential Relevance of Gender and Parental Status

There are reasons to suspect that the association between education and FWC is contingent upon gender and/or parental status. The relative prioritization of work and family roles has long been
thought to affect the likelihood of experiencing FWC versus work-to-family conflict by determining the direction of work-family border permeability (Frone et al. 1992; Pleck 1977). As Frone and his colleagues explain (1992: 723-724):

Boundaries between work and family are asymmetrically permeable to the extent that the intrusion of demands from one domain into the other occurs with unequal frequency. For example, if work demands and responsibilities are more likely to interfere with home life than vice versa, work and family boundaries are asymmetrically permeable with family boundaries being more permeable than work boundaries (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992: 723-724).

Pleck (1977) was the first to suggest gender differences in the pattern of work-family boundary permeability, such that women experience more FWC conflict than men, while men experience more work-to-family conflict than women. The gendered division of domestic labour among heterosexual couples as well as traditional ideologies about men’s and women’s responsibilities have been identified as contributing factors (Hill, Jacob, Shannon, Brennan, Blanchard, and Martinengo 2008). Specifically, the amount of work-family conflict that an individual experiences increases in proportion to the amount of time spent on work and/or family roles, such that the more time spent fulfilling responsibilities arising their family (work) roles the more FWC (work-to-family conflict) they will experience (McElwain et al. 2005). Social norms that assign women primary responsibility for handling family issues, even when it interferes with their paid work, and men primary responsibility for financial provision to men, even when paid work interferes with their family, also contribute to the gendered pattern of work-family boundary permeability (McElwain et al. 2005).

Socioeconomic status may interact with gender in affecting the direction of work-family border permeability and, in that way, the likelihood of experiencing FWC versus work-to-family conflict. Specifically, the relative prioritization of work and family among women may depend on their socioeconomic status. Walker (1990) examines how class conditions women’s values about work and family, and finds that they draw from a common value system: work and motherhood are important paths to the development of individual identity for both working class and professional women. However, differences in jobs lead to differences in the actualization of values in their lives. Walker demonstrates that commitments to work and family often competed, and women experienced pulls in both directions; however, professional women were sometimes
unable to resolve their dilemmas in favor of one direction. By contrast, working class women tended to have more emotional distance from their work because their jobs lacked prestige and were occasional unpleasant. Nor did their jobs demand strong commitments. Thus, they tended to orient their lives more around their families.

In a different study, Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds, and Alldred (2003) analyze beliefs about how mothering should be combined with paid work, and about the division of labour with partners, among partnered mothers. They also document class differences in the relative prioritization of work and family roles. Specifically, they find that middle-class mothers tended more towards the ‘primary worker’ position in their values, while most of the working-class mothers held a ‘primary mother’ position. In yet another study that considers the impact of class on the prioritizing of family and work, Burris (1991) finds that professional/managerial women tend to enjoy structural advantages in both the workplace and home that allow smoother “custom” combinations of work and family and a higher prioritizing of work roles (i.e., modified work schedules; generous maternity leaves and dependent sick leaves; permission to bring children to work when necessary; part-time work options; paid child care and housekeeping help). Work is more likely to intrude upon family life than vice versa, in part for structural reasons, such as the greater absorptiveness of their jobs and availability of adequate child care, and in part because of feminist ideology and/ psychological temperament and work-related ambition. In contrast, working-class women are often negotiating difficult patterns of work and family due to structural disadvantage (i.e., limited family income, inadequate child care, inflexible jobs, night shifts). This structural disadvantage, coupled with psychological reasons and husbands’ lower levels of participation in household and child care tasks, contribute to the tendency of working-class women to prioritize family roles, which often intrude upon work.

Socioeconomic status may also interact with parental status in affecting the likelihood of experiencing FWC because, as outlined above, parental investments in childrearing differ by socioeconomic status. Gender may further condition the relationship between socioeconomic status and parental status as it pertains to FWC. Although gender roles have been changing, in that women are doing more paid work and less housework (although not less childcare), and men are doing more housework and childcare, than in decades past (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, and Robinson 2000; Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006), essentialist beliefs about men’s and
women’s roles vis-à-vis work and family continue to be a dominant cultural ideology, even among people who endorse gender egalitarianism (Cha and Weeden 2014; Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011). Consequently, women retain ultimate responsibility for all aspects of children’s lives (McMahon 1995; Walzer 1998).

In both academic discourse and media coverage, work-family issues are typically understood as being particularly problematic for women in high-level managerial and professional occupations, especially mothers (Williams 2010). Beyond their greater exposure to job- and home-related demands, this is attributed to contradictions between taken-for-granted expectations about what it means to be a “good” worker and a “good” mother among them (Hennessy 2009). Studies focusing on the moral dimensions of the work-family interface have analyzed the “cultural contradictions of contemporary motherhood” for middle-class women (Hays 1996) and the “competing devotions” of women executives to cultural schemas of work and family (Blair-Loy 2003). According to Hays (1996), good mothers in the middle class practice what she calls “intensive mothering.” It is a child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, laborious, and financially expensive ideology in which mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture and development of “sacred” children, whose needs take precedence over their own. Intensive mothering is inconsistent with individualistic, calculating, and competitive pursuit of personal gain in the labour market. In a similar vein, Blair-Loy (2003) argues that women executives are subject to two competing cultural schemas of devotion. The schema of work devotion defines the high-level career as a calling or vocation that deserves single-minded allegiance and gives meaning and purpose to life. The schema of family devotion assigns primary responsibility for housework and childrearing to women, who should derive fulfillment exclusively from the creativity and intimacy of practicing intensive mothering. The clash of these normative definitions of a good worker and mother create moral dilemmas and distress, in which executive women feel torn between two deeply compelling, yet incompatible, cultural models of right action.  

Although middle-class cultural ideals of motherhood, reflecting traditional expectations of full-time, stay-at-home mothering, are hegemonic, alternatives may be embraced by marginalized groups that are more consistent with their historical and present-day social conditions (Glenn 1994; Johnston and Swanson 2006). Dubois and Ruiz (as cited in Segura 1994) argue that the notion of separate spheres rests on the experiences of white, leisured women.
Given socioeconomic differences in the relative prioritization of work and family roles among women, and the competing devotions of managerial and professional mothers to cultural schemas of work and family, my analyses evaluate the ways that gender and parental status function as moderators of the hypothesized association between education and FWC. As I will describe in detail below, this involves testing whether or not gender and/or parental status condition the effects of education on FWC—and I consider gender and parental status both separately and together. It is plausible that nature and form of the education-based distribution of FWC differs for: (1) women versus men; (2) parents versus non-parents; and (3) childless women versus mothers and childless men versus fathers.

In addition, in an extensive series of analyses, I assess the possibility that gender functions as a potential moderator of the associations between home-related demands and resources and FWC. My rationale is that home-related demands and resources may take different forms and/or meanings for men and women. For example, gender specialization in household tasks—in which women tend do ‘female’ tasks that are unrelenting, repetitive, and routine, such as shopping, cooking, cleaning and laundry, and child care, while men do ‘male’ tasks that are infrequent, irregular, and non-routine, such as taking out the trash, household repairs, mowing the lawn, and gardening—allows men much more flexibility than women when it comes to domestic labour (Milkie and Peltola 1999; Thompson and Walker 1989). Further, men’s household tasks tend to be more challenging and creative than the menial, dirty, and repetitive tasks performed by women (Milkie and Peltola 1999). The latter may contribute to feelings of role overload. In addition, women are usually charged with coordinating all instrumental and expressive aspects of family life due to their family ties, which are stronger, more frequent, and less-contingent on circumstances than men’s (Milkie and Peltola 1999). Meal planning, making and implementing and lacks immediate relevance to less privileged women, including working-class, immigrant, and racial/ethnic-minority women, who have long traditions of working in the formal and informal economic sectors to support their families. When financial security cannot be taken for granted, economic provision through work may be viewed as an important and valued aspect of motherhood, rather than being in opposition to it (Collins 1994; Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds, and Alldred 2003; Ferree 1987; Garey 1999). If lower-class women hold more integrative values with respect to earning and caring roles, they may perceive less work-family conflict (in both directions) than middle-class women.
decisions about childcare and family activities, and maintaining contact with extended family are mentally preoccupying for women and may distract them even when they are supposed to be engaged in their paid work (Cha and Weeden 2014; DeVault 1991; Milkie and Peltola 1999). Women also tend to have greater responsibility for children and other family members as well as for the smooth functioning of the home (McMahon 1995; Milkie and Peltola 1999; Walzer 1998). Consequently, their paid work is more likely to be interrupted than men’s by a child’s illness and/or a major household appliance in need of repair (Milkie and Peltola 1999). Since men typically do more paid work, while women do more housework and childcare, most employed, married women have husbands who work full-time, whereas many men have wives who do not work or who work only part-time (Milkie and Peltola 1999). Hence, married men are more likely than married women to have a spouse who is both willing and able to deal with everyday home and family issues, thereby limiting FWC (Milkie and Peltola 1999). Spousal work hours may also have different implications for FWC by gender, as husbands generally do not adjust their home time in response to their wives employment (Cha 2010; Milkie and Peltola 1999).

11 Methodology

11.1 Data and Analytic Sample

This study uses confidential data from Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (GSS), conducted by telephone by Statistics Canada from June to October 2006. The target population includes all people aged 15 years and older, living in private households in one of Canada’s ten provinces. Eligible respondents were randomly selected using a random digit dialing method, and 68% of them ultimately participated in the GSS. For the purposes of this study, I focus on respondents who were aged 18 to 54 years at the time of the interview and either married/cohabiting or single parents. Respondents with these characteristics are selected because they likely have both earning and caring roles. Further, FWC tends to increase as one’s family obligations expand.

31 Although prime ages for employment and childbearing/rearing are 25 to 54 years, younger respondents are considered because earning and caring roles tend to occur relatively early among lower-status populations (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Tézli and Gauthier 2009).
through marriage/cohabitation and parenthood (McElwain et al. 2005). Respondents with missing values (i.e., refusal to respond or responses of “don’t know”) on any of the relevant variables, with the exception of personal income, are excluded from the analytic sample, yielding a final working sample of 6,106. To address missing values on personal income, multiple imputation with five iterations is used for all analyses involving that variable. All analyses are performed on data that are weighted with person and bootstrap weights provided by Statistics Canada, such that the sample can be considered representative of the target population and variance estimates can be considered reliable.

I specifically selected Cycle 20 of the GSS for my analyses because it is one of the few large-scale, nationally representative, and publicly available datasets in Canada that includes questions about the work-family interface. Since the survey is primarily designed for monitoring changes in family life over time, it includes many home-related variables that are relevant to FWC. Unfortunately, it does not include measures of time spent on housework and/or childcare, as such information is instead collected as part of GSS cycles pertaining specifically to time use.

11.2 Dependent Variable: FWC

Consistent with the prevailing definition of WFC as a form of inter-role conflict in which the responsibilities of the work and family roles are mutually incompatible, such that participation in one role is hampered by participation in the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985), the

32 Access to the confidential data used in this study is governed by Statistics Canada’s Research Data Centre (RDC) program. This program allows academic researchers with approved projects to access the data they have requested in secure facilities located on university campuses. Any statistical output produced therein can only be removed after being vetted by a local Statistics Canada employee, known as an Analyst, to ensure that it preserves respondent confidentiality.

Through use of RDC data, this research was supported by funds to the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI), and Statistics Canada. Although the research and analysis are based on data from Statistics Canada, the opinions expressed do not represent the views of Statistics Canada.
following two items are used to measure FWC: “In the past 12 months, how often have you arrived at work too tired to function well because of the household work you had done?” and “In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to concentrate or fulfill your work responsibilities because of your family responsibilities?” These same items are used in the 2012 International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) module on *Family and Changing Gender Roles*, as well as previous research on FWC (e.g., Voydanoff 2005). The response choices are: “never,” “sometimes,” “most of the time,” and “all of the time.” When these response choices are coded from 0 (= “never”) to 3 (= “all of the time”) and then averaged, the resulting index is severely positively skewed. For this reason, I decided to dichotomize FWC such that responses of never to both questions correspond to a value of 0 while the responses of sometimes, most of the time, and all of the time to at least one question corresponds to a value of 1. In Table 3-1, I report the distribution of responses to the FWC items and the dichotomized version.

11.3 Education

Information on highest level of educational attainment is used to create five educational groups: post-graduate or advanced degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.A., M.Sc., M.D.); university degree; college, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate (hereafter referred to as “college diploma”); some post-secondary education; and high school diploma or less. The lowest level of educational attainment—high school diploma or less—serves as the reference group in analyses.

11.4 Family Characteristics

11.4.1 Home-Related Demands

*Time-Based Demands.* Four variables measure time-based demands in the family domain: number of children in the household; age of the youngest child/ren in the household; any help provided to an adult relative/s in the past month; and any help provided to a friend/s in the past month. Since the GSS does not contain direct information on the amount of time spent caring for children, I follow the convention in work-family research of using the number of
Table 3-1. Distribution of Responses to Family-to-Work Conflict Items and Index (n=6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often have you arrived at work too tired to function because of the household work you had done?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to concentrate or fulfill your work responsibilities because of your family responsibilities?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family-to-Work Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least sometimes</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
children in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household as a proxy. The number of co-resident birth, adopted, and/or step-children of any age and marital status ranges from zero to a cap of ten or more. Age of the youngest child in the household is coded as (1) less than 3 years, (2) 3-5 years, (3) 6-8 years, (4) 9 to 11 years, (5) 12 to 14 years, (6) 15 to 17 years, and (0) 18 years and older. In multivariate analyses, this variable is represented by a series of dummy variables, for which 18 years and older serves as the reference category.

Whether any help was provided to an adult relative/s or friend/s in the past month is determined from responses to a series of questions: “In the past month, did you help anyone...by doing domestic work, home maintenance or outdoor work? By providing transportation or running errands? By helping with childcare? By teaching, coaching or giving practical advice? By providing emotional support? By helping in some other way?” Responses of “no” to all of these questions correspond to a code of zero—that is, coded as “not providing any help.” By contrast, I coded responses of “yes” to at least one of these questions as 1—that is, “providing some help.” I then used responses to the question: “Who did you help—Were they a relative? A friend?” in order to determine to whom the help was provided and, therefore, whether a code of zero or one is warranted on each variable:

Strain-Based Demands. Four variables are used to measure strain-based demands in the family domain: single parenthood, spousal overwork, dissatisfaction with one’s (main) childcare program/arrangement, and household member/s with a health condition/s. Information on the presence of a child or children in the household is combined with information on marital status to distinguish single parents. Spousal overwork is determined from information on spouse/partner’s usual weekly work hours, with 50 or more work hours per week being considered ‘overwork’ (Cha and Weeden 2014). Spousal overwork is coded as (1) yes and (0) no. Dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program is identified from responses to two questions: “Is there anything you would change with the child-care program?” and “If you could choose, would you prefer to use another type of child-care for your child (children)?” A response of “yes” to either of these questions is coded as one, and a response of “no” to both of these questions is coded as zero.
The presence of a household member/s with a health condition/s is identified from responses to the question: “Does any other [household] member have any difficulty hearing, seeing, communicating, walking, climbing stairs, bending, learning or doing similar activities?” Response choices of “yes” and “no” are coded as one and zero, respectively.

11.4.2 Home-Related Resources

Social support from family, friends, and local community is measured with five variables: number of emotionally close relatives and friends, (geographic) proximity of most relatives and friends, and sense of belonging to one’s local community. The number of relatives and friends to whom respondents feel emotionally close is identified from responses to the questions, respectively: “How many relatives do you have who you feel at ease with, can talk to about what is on your mind, and call on if you needed help?” and “How many friends do you have who you feel at ease with, can talk to about what is on your mind, and call on if you needed help?” Whether most of respondents’ relatives and friends live nearby is identified from responses to two questions, respectively: “Do most of your relatives live in the same city or region as you?” and “Do most of your friends live in the same region as you?” Responses to these questions are coded as (1) yes and (0) no. Sense of belonging to one’s local community is identified from responses to the question: “How would you describe your sense of belonging to your local community?” Response choices are “very strong,” “somewhat strong,” “somewhat weak,” “very weak,” and “no opinion.” Since preliminary analyses revealed that only the distinction between very strong and all others is relevant to FWC, sense of belonging is coded dichotomously.

In addition to social support, personal income is considered as a home-related resource. It refers to respondents’ best estimates of their total personal income before deductions from all sources in the past year.
11.5 Socio-Demographic Controls

Several control variables are included because these demographic characteristics are likely to influence the outcomes, occupation, work conditions, and the associations among them.

11.5.1 Age

Age in years is coded continuously.

11.5.2 Sex

Women are coded as one and men are coded as zero.

11.5.3 Visible-Minority Status

Visible-minority status is identified from a variable derived by Statistics Canada from responses to questions about racial/cultural-group membership. As per the Census definition, non-visible minority includes single-origin White, single-origin Aboriginal, and multiple-origin White/Latin American, White/Arab, and White/West Asian. Conversely, visible minority includes single-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Japanese, and Korean. It also includes multiple-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Southeast Asian, Japanese, and Korean as well as multiple-origin Latin American, Arab, and West Asian with only non-White origins. In multivariate analyses, non-visible minority serves as the reference category.

11.5.4 Province/Region of Residence

Province/region of residence is coded as (0) Ontario, (1) Quebec, (2) British Columbia, (3) Atlantic Provinces (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and
New Brunswick), and (4) Prairie Provinces (i.e., Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta). In multivariate analyses, province/region of residence is represented by four dummy variables, for which Ontario serves as the reference category.

11.5.5 Student Status

Student status is identified from a derived variable pertaining to the main activity of respondents in the past 12 months. Those who reported that they are currently attending school are coded as 1, while all other responses are coded 0.

11.6 Plan of Analyses

After presenting the descriptive statistics for all measures (see Table 3-2), the analyses proceed in three parts. The first part examines distribution of home-related demands and resources across educational groups, as the differential exposure and vulnerability perspectives suggest that unequal distributions in this regard might translate into educational differences in the likelihood of experiencing FWC. This is done using ordinary least squares (OLS) or logistic regression techniques (as appropriate) in which each family characteristic is regressed on education while also controlling for socio-demographic characteristics (see Tables 3 through 5).

The second part uses logistic regression to document the baseline odds of FWC across educational groups, net of socio-demographic characteristics. This step is designed to address the fundamental research question about the association between education and FWC (Model 1 in Table 3-6). The demands and resources hypotheses yield equivalent predictions as to the educational distribution of exposure to FWC—albeit for different reasons. Individuals with at least a university degree will tend to have a greater likelihood of experiencing FWC, owing to (a) their greater exposure to home-related demands (i.e., higher parental investments in childrearing and spousal overwork) and/or (b) their lesser home-related resources (i.e., social support from family, friends, and the local community).
Table 3-2. Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables (n=6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)</th>
<th>FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strain-Based Demands</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least sometimes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>No (n = 4,215 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or advanced degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-secondary education</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMLY CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in the Household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of the Youngest Child in the Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8 years</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 11 years</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 14 years</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 17 years</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years and older</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>6.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided Any Help to Relatives/s in Past Month</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided Any Help to Friend/s in Past Month</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes childless respondents (n = 4,215 )

**Socio-Demographic Characteristics**

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Region of Residence</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visible Minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Minority</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the implications of the demands and resources hypotheses are the same with respect to the association between education and FWC, subsequent analyses focus on determining the relevance of the different mechanisms suggested by these hypotheses as giving rise to that focal association. I explicitly follow the progressive adjustment modeling strategy set forth by John Mirowsky (2013) in the latest version of the *Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health*. This is widely accepted strategy for documenting a basic association between two focal variables (e.g., education and FWC) and then, through a series of separate steps, entering different sets of theoretically determined variables (e.g., home-related demands) to assess how the initial estimates change. This form of progressive adjustment is intentionally distinct from a modeling strategy that simply enters all variables simultaneously in an initial model because it allows the researcher to evaluate how each specific variable (e.g., age of the youngest child in the household) might be influential in the initial focal association. Stated in concrete terms, if the inclusion of any particular variable decreases or increases the size of the education-based differences, we can specifically pinpoint that variable as having a mediating or suppression effect. The third part of my analyses therefore attempts to explain the baseline likelihoods of FWC across educational groups in terms of inequality in the distribution of home-related demands and resources (Models 2 through 6 in Table 3-6). At each step, I carefully evaluate the change in value and statistical significance of the odds ratios that correspond to the educational groups. This form of progressive adjustment dissects the particular contributions of home-related demands and resources in the association between education and FWC.

In models 2 through 4, I include time- and strain-based family demands, respectively, in order to evaluate the demands hypothesis that individuals with at least a university degree have relatively more family demands, which contribute to greater exposure to FWC among them. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the odds ratios corresponding to individuals with at least a university degree. Such results would indicate that the home-related demands added to the baseline model account for (or ‘explain’) at least part of the association between education and FWC. To reiterate the rational here: Individuals in those educational groups would need to have reported higher levels of time- and strain-based family demands, and those demands would need to have elevated the risk for exposure to FWC. Taken
together, these home-related demands form the linking mechanism that helps explain why individuals with at least a university degree might report more FWC.

Model 5 adds home-related resources to the baseline model in order to evaluate the resource hypothesis. The resource hypothesis predicts that individuals with at least a university degree have fewer family resources, and that fact increases their exposure to FWC. Empirical support for the resource hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the odds ratios corresponding to individuals with at least a university degree after adjusting for home-related resources. This means that their greater exposure to FWC is partly or completely explained by their lack of resources.

From the perspective of individuals with lower levels of education (i.e., some post-secondary education or a high school diploma or less), the resource hypothesis has different implications: It predicts that they have more home-related resources, which decrease their exposure to FWC. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe an increase in the odds ratios corresponding to some post-secondary education (since a high school diploma or less is the reference group), meaning that they would have even greater exposure to FWC if it were not for their home-related resources.

The differential distribution of home-related demands and resources across the educational groups will imply that any given demand or resource might not necessarily contribute in the same way or to the same extent to the baseline associations between education and FWC. For this reason, after testing each of the above models, I conduct extensive post-hoc analyses (not shown) in which I enter each home-related demand and resource individually into the baseline model. These additional steps allow me to carefully determine and articulate the ways that each home-related demand and resource is indirectly associated with FWC—and how each might contribute to the relationship between educational groups and FWC. It also allows me to evaluate the extent of overlap or shared variance among these focal independent variables.

In the final model (6), I add all of the home-related demands and resources simultaneously to the baseline model to assess how educational differences in exposure to FWC fare when these family characteristics are collectively taken into account. Odds ratios corresponding to educational groups that remain statistically significant net of the demands and
resources (as well as socio-demographic controls) indicate the relevance of additional family characteristics beyond those considered here.

12 Results

12.1 Documenting Education-Based Differences in Family-Related Demands and Resources

Given that inequalities in home-related demands and resources are hypothesized to be the primary reasons for education-based patterns in FWC, it is necessary to demonstrate the distribution of these family characteristics across educational groups. Tables 3 through 5 present the results of OLS and logistic regressions of home-related demands and resources on education, controlling for socio-demographic and household characteristics. F and \( \chi^2 \) tests of the statistical significance of education for predicting family characteristics reveal that many family characteristics are differentially distributed across educational groups, with the exception of four: the number of children in the household, spousal overwork, the number of emotionally-close relatives, and sense of belonging to the local community.\(^{33}\)

**Family-related demands.** First and foremost, the educational distribution of home-related demands is partially consistent with the demands hypothesis—with this being the case especially for time-based demands (see Table 3-3). The age of the youngest child in the household decreases with level of education, as does the likelihood of providing help to relatives in the past month (except in the case of individuals with a post-graduate or advanced degree, who are not significantly different from individuals with a high school diploma or less in this regard) and the likelihood of providing help to friends in the past month. Regarding strain-based demands, the likelihoods of using childcare and being dissatisfied with one’s childcare arrangement/program both increase with levels of education; otherwise, however, the distribution of strain-based demands diverges from the pattern suggested by the demands hypothesis (see Table 3-4).

---

\(^{33}\) F tests are used when the work condition being predicted is an interval/continuous variable; (Wald) \( \chi^2 \) tests are used when the work condition being predicted is a dichotomous variable.
Table 3-3. OLS or Logistic Regression of Time-Based Family Demands on Education and Controls (n = 6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Number of Children in the Household</th>
<th>Age of the Youngest Child in the Household*</th>
<th>Provided Any Help to a Relative/s in Past Month</th>
<th>Provided Any Help to a Friend/s in Past Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or advanced degree</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-3.770***</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>2.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-2.756***</td>
<td>1.284***</td>
<td>1.592***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-secondary education</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-1.103***</td>
<td>1.256***</td>
<td>1.441***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.635**</td>
<td>1.196*</td>
<td>1.459***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.604***</td>
<td>-18.390***</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, province/region of residence, and student status.

* p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01 (two-tailed test)
* Excludes childless respondents (n = 4,215)
Table 3-4. OLS or Logistic Regression of Strain-Based Family Demands on Education and Controls (n = 6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Parenthood</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Overworks</th>
<th>Would Change Something about Childcare Arrangement/Program</th>
<th>Household Member with a Health Condition/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e^b )</td>
<td>( e^b )</td>
<td>( e^b )</td>
<td>( e^b )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or advanced degree</td>
<td>0.529***</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>3.061***</td>
<td>1.663***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>0.519***</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>2.287***</td>
<td>1.486***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate</td>
<td>0.763**</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>1.852***</td>
<td>1.344**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-secondary education</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.676*</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, province/region of residence, and student status.

* * p < 0.10; ** * p < 0.05; *** * p < 0.01 (two-tailed test)
Specifically, single parenthood is less common among individuals with a college diploma or more. Individuals with a university degree or higher are also less likely than their less educated counterparts to have a household member/s with a health condition/s.

*Family-related resources.* Again, the educational distribution of family-related resources is only partially consistent with the resources hypothesis (see Table 3-5). Personal income tends to increase with level of education, as does the number of emotionally close friends. However, the likelihood of having most relatives live nearby tends to decrease with level of education. Further, individuals with a university degree or more are less likely to have friends living nearby than their counterparts with lower levels of education.

### 12.2 Documenting Education-Based Differences in the Likelihood of Experiencing FWC and the Intervening Mechanisms

The first model in Table 3-6 shows the educational distribution of FWC at baseline, adjusting for socio-demographic characteristics. Relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less, individuals with a college diploma are most likely to experience FWC, followed closely by individuals with a university degree. This pattern is broadly consistent with the demands and resources hypotheses, in that two groups of individuals with completed post-secondary education are more likely to experience WFC than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. However, one would expect individuals with a college diploma to have a lower relative likelihood of reporting FWC than individuals a higher level of educational attainment—that is, a university degree—based on the demands and resources hypotheses. Further, individuals with the highest level of educational attainment—a post-graduate or advanced degree—are not significantly different from their counterparts with a high school diploma or less when it comes to FWC—a finding that diverges from the pattern suggested by the demands hypothesis.

(Individuals with some post-secondary education are also not significantly different from their counterparts with a high school diploma or less in terms of FWC, but this is not surprising, given that incomplete post-secondary education implies a high school diploma as the highest level of educational attainment.)
### Table 3-5. OLS or Logistic Regression of Family Resources on Education and Controls (n = 6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Personal Income</th>
<th>Number of Emotionally-Close Relatives</th>
<th>Number of Emotionally-Close Friends</th>
<th>Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</th>
<th>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</th>
<th>Very Strong Sense of Belonging to the Local Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or advanced degree</td>
<td>36764.07***</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1.482***</td>
<td>0.343***</td>
<td>0.627***</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>22960.70***</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.934***</td>
<td>0.514***</td>
<td>0.637***</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate</td>
<td>8439.11***</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.376**</td>
<td>0.654***</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>1.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-secondary education</td>
<td>8157.21***</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.663***</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>33726.66***</td>
<td>7.357***</td>
<td>5.337***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, province/region of residence, and student status.

* p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01 (two-tailed test)
Table 3-6. Logistic Regression of Family-to-Work Conflict on Education, Family Conditions, and Controls (n = 6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate or advanced degree</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>1.201**</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1.238**</td>
<td>1.196*</td>
<td>1.180*</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, trade, technical, or vocational diploma/certificate</td>
<td>1.299***</td>
<td>1.231**</td>
<td>1.296***</td>
<td>1.252***</td>
<td>1.314**</td>
<td>1.262***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-secondary education</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or less</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>1.237***</td>
<td>1.230***</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.745*</td>
<td>0.664**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS**

**Time-Based Demands**

| Number of children in the household | 1.062 | 1.104** | 1.113** |

**Age of the Youngest Child in the Household**

| Less than 3 years | 1.684*** | 1.291*  | 1.270*  |
| 3 to 5 years      | 1.489*** | 1.063   | 1.058   |
| 6 to 8 years      | 1.658*** | 1.288   | 1.266   |
| 9 to 11 years     | 1.253*   | 1.063   | 1.060   |
| 12 to 14 years    | 1.287*   | 1.195   | 1.194   |
| 15 to 17 years    | 1.385**  | 1.261   | 1.284*  |
| 18 years and older| RG      | RG      | RG      |

| Provided Any Help to Relatives/s in Past Month |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Yes                                                | 1.317*** | 1.289***| 1.280***|
| No                                                 | RG      | RG      | RG      |

| Provided Any Help to Friend/s in Past Month         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Yes                                                | 1.199*** | 1.164** | 1.205***|
| No                                                 | RG      | RG      | RG      |

**Strain-Based Demands**

| Marital/Parental Status                             |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Single Parent                                       | 1.381*** | 1.295** | 1.253** |
| Married/Cohabiting (Childless or parents)           | RG      | RG      | RG      |

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, province/region of residence, and student status.

* p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01 (two-tailed test)
Table 3-6 (cont’d). Logistic Regression of Family-to-Work Conflict on Education, Family Characteristics and Controls (n = 6,106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse/Partner Overworks (50 or More Hours per Week)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse/Partner Overworks X Woman</strong></td>
<td>1.524*</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would Change Something about Childcare Program/Arrangement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.572***</td>
<td>2.182***</td>
<td>2.124***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.394***</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not use childcare</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Member with a Health Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.789***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income (per $10,000)</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income (per $10,000) X Woman</strong></td>
<td>1.057***</td>
<td>1.060***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Emotionally-Close Relatives</strong></td>
<td>0.987*</td>
<td>0.986*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Emotionally-Close Friends</strong></td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.171**</td>
<td>1.131*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.809*</td>
<td>0.790**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent X Woman</strong></td>
<td>1.462**</td>
<td>1.440**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Belonging to Local Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.811**</td>
<td>0.799**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat strong to very weak</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all models control for sex, age, visible-minority status, province/region of residence, and student status.

* $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed test)
**Time-based family demands.** Model 2 adjusts for time-based family demands—that is, number of children in the household, age of the youngest child in the household, and provision of help to a relative/s and/or friend/s in the past month. The number of children in the household does not significantly affect the likelihood of experiencing FWC, but having a co-resident child under the age of 18 years increases it, with children under the age of 9 years being particularly problematic for elevated levels of FWC. The provision of help to relatives or friends in the past month increases the likelihood of experiencing FWC, but help to relatives has a stronger effect in this regard. More importantly, these time-based family demands completely account for the elevated likelihood of experiencing FWC among individuals with a university degree. As seen in Table 3-3, individuals with a university degree tend to have younger children and they are more likely to have provided help to relatives and/or friends than their less educated counterparts. Although individuals with a college diploma also tend to have younger children and they are more likely to have provided help to relatives and friends in the past month than their counterparts with lower levels of education (but not compared to their counterparts with higher levels of education), these time-based family demands account for only a small portion of their elevated likelihood of experiencing FWC.

**Strain-based family demands.** The third model includes the strain-based family demands of single parenthood, spousal overwork, dissatisfaction with childcare arrangement/program, and household member with a health condition/s. As predicted, single parenthood increases the likelihood of experiencing FWC, as does having a household member with a health condition. Using childcare, regardless of whether or not it is satisfactory, increases the likelihood of experiencing FWC. However, dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program increases the likelihood of experiencing FWC to a greater extent than does satisfaction with it. Spousal overwork increases the likelihood of experiencing FWC for women only. Taken together, these strain-based family demands have different overall indirect effects on the odds ratios that represent occupation-based differences. For example, they increase the size of odds ratio for individuals with a university degree—suggesting a pattern of ‘suppression’ for occupation-based differences. By contrast, they slightly reduce the size of the odds ratio for individuals with a college diploma—suggesting a pattern of explanation for such differences. More specifically, I observe that individuals with a university degree are less likely to have two
strain-based demands than their counterparts with lower levels of education: single parenthood and a household member with a health condition. If it were not for the relative lack of these strain-based demands among individuals with a university degree, their likelihood of experiencing FWC would be even higher than that observed in the baseline model. However, these suppression effects among individuals with a university degree are partially offset by their greater likelihood of using childcare and being dissatisfied with it.

Individuals with a college diploma are more likely to be married parents than they are to be single parents, and they are less likely to have a household member with a health condition, than their counterparts with lower levels of education. As for individuals with a university degree, if it were not for the relative dearth of these strain-based demands among individuals with a college diploma, their likelihood of experiencing FWC would be even higher than that observed in the baseline model. Yet these suppression effects among individuals with a college diploma are more than offset by their greater likelihood of using childcare and being dissatisfied with it.

*Time- and strain-based family demands.* In Model 4, I include time- and strain-based family demands together as a set and observe that their inclusion partially accounts for education-based differences in the likelihood of experiencing FWC. This finding reflects the considerable influence of time-based family demands (i.e., age of the youngest child in the household and provision of help to relatives or friends) and dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program as central determinants of FWC and their education-based distribution. Individuals with a university degree and individuals with a college diploma are less likely than their counterparts with lower levels of education to have two strain-based demands (i.e., single parenthood and a household member with a health condition) that tend to increase the likelihood of experiencing FWC. In spite of this fact, individuals with a university degree and individuals with a college diploma would have lower likelihoods of experiencing FWC if it were not for their greater time-based demands and dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program.

*Family resources.* In Model 5, the inclusion of family resources indicates that the number of emotionally close relatives and very strong sense of belonging to the local community are associated with lower likelihoods of experiencing FWC. The number of emotionally close
friends does not significantly affect FWC. Counterintuitively, personal income is positively associated with FWC among women only, but the magnitude of its effect is small. Also counter to predictions regarding social support, having most relatives living nearby is associated with a higher likelihood of experiencing FWC. It may be the case that having most relatives living nearby increases family obligations to provide various forms of assistance and/or visit and attend gatherings. While the number of emotionally close friends does not significantly affect FWC, having most friends living nearby does—albeit differently for men and women. Having most friends living nearby functions as a resource among men, decreasing the likelihood that they experience FWC, but it actually increases the likelihood that women experience FWC quite substantially. Friendship obviously has different implications for men and women, but it is not clear why this might be the case.

Taken together, family resources have different overall indirect effects on the odds ratios that represent education-based differences. For example, they decrease the size of the odds ratio for individuals with a university degree—suggesting a pattern of explanation for these educational differences. By contrast, they increase the size of the odds ratio for individuals with a college diploma—suggesting a pattern of suppression for these educational differences. More specifically, I observe that individuals with a university degree or college diploma are less likely to have their relatives living nearby and, in the case of individuals with a university degree, they are also less likely to have their friends living nearby than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. Without the beneficial effects of these constellations of family ‘resources,’ individuals with a university degree or college diploma would have even higher likelihoods of experiencing FWC than those observed in the baseline model. However, individuals with a university degree and individuals with a college diploma tend to have higher personal incomes than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less, and personal income is positively associated with FWC, at least among women. The income gap between individuals with a university degree and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less is more than three times greater than that between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. For this reason, the net indirect effects of family resources on education-based differences in the likelihood of experiencing FWC are explanatory for
individuals with a university degree, whereas they have suppression effects among individuals with a college diploma.

*Family-related demands and resources.* In model 6, I include family-related demands and resources simultaneously to evaluate the net educational differences in FWC. I observe that the only persistent educational differences are among individuals with a college diploma, who are more likely to experience FWC than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. Since none of the models is overly effective in accounting for this FWC gap, it is likely that family characteristics beyond those considered here are more relevant predictors of FWC among individuals with a college diploma. The FWC gap between individuals with a university degree and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less is completely explained by the former’s relatively greater time-based demands, dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program, and higher income—in spite of their relatively favorable constellation of strain-based demands (i.e., lower likelihoods of single parenthood and having a household member with a health condition) and ‘resources’ (i.e., more friends and lower likelihoods of having relatives and friends living nearby).

12.3 Evaluating Gender and Parental Status Contingencies
Given socioeconomic differences in the relative prioritization of work and family roles among women, and the competing devotions of managerial and professional mothers to cultural schemas of work and family, gender and parental status were considered here as possible

---

34 Some readers might wonder if the relationship between either family-related demands or resources and the likelihood of experiencing FWC across educational groups. In separate analyses (not shown), I performed extensive tests to assess this possibility. It seems plausible that individuals with higher levels of education might face more potent family-related demands, and they may have less effective family resources, than their counterparts with lower levels of education. This might result in education-contingent effects of these demands and resources on FWC. However, across all analyses, education did not moderate any of the relationships between family-related demands/resources and FWC. In other words, this diverse set of family characteristics is similarly associated with FWC across educational groups.

35 Parental status refers to the presence/absence of any child/ren in the household. The presence of any pre-school aged children in the household was explored as an alternative to parental status. However, it did not significantly moderate the effects of education on FWC—either alone or with gender.
moderators of the associations between education and FWC. Specifically, two-way interaction terms between gender and education were created, as was a three-way interaction term between gender, parental status, and education (and a two-way interaction between gender and parental status). The gender*education and parental status*education interactions were added to the baseline model separately, along with the gender*parental status interactions. (Note that when parental status*education interactions were added to the baseline model, parental status was included in the model at the same time.) Neither the addition of gender*education interactions, nor the addition of parental status*education interactions, significantly improved model fit over the baseline model using the likelihood ratio test. This means that the educational distribution of FWC observed in the baseline model holds among men and women, on one hand, and among childless individuals and parents, on the other hand. Gender*education and parental status*education interactions were then added to the baseline model together, along with a gender*parental status interaction that is implied by the three-way interaction between gender*parental status*education, and the log likelihood was noted. Next, the gender*parental status*education interactions were added to the preceding model. The log likelihood accompanying the addition of these three-way interactions did not represent a significant improvement in model fit over the preceding model, meaning that the educational distribution of FWC observed in the baseline model holds among childless men versus fathers and childless women vs. mothers. The implications of these findings are dual. Well-educated women are no less vulnerable to exposure to FWC than their less-well-educated counterparts—in spite of their tendency to prioritize work over family (Burris 1991; Duncan et al. 2003; Walker 1990). Nor are well-educated mothers exceptionally vulnerable to FWC—in spite of contradictions between taken-for-granted expectations about what it means to be a “good” worker and a “good” mother among them (Blair-Loy 2003). The main effect for gender reveals that women are more likely to experience FWC than men, and this association holds regardless of socioeconomic status and parental status.

13 Discussion and Conclusion

FWC has emerged as potent and pervasive stressor in the daily lives of many Canadian employees with family responsibilities, yet it has been relatively neglected by previous research
in comparison to the other direction: work-to-family conflict. As such, it is important to understand the conditions that influence exposure to FWC. Education should be particularly relevant in this regard, as it influences the character of family life and, therefore, individuals’ home-related demands and resources, which previous research has shown to be the primary determinants of FWC (e.g., Byron 2005). Education also influences the relative importance that individuals attribute to their work and family roles, which may, in turn, affect their exposure to the factors that increase the risk of FWC. Yet few studies have considered education (or other dimensions of socioeconomic status) in relation to FWC. The ones that have included education as a predictor of FWC generally reveal that well-educated men and women tend to be more likely to report FWC (Dillworth and Kingsbury, 2005 among boomers only; Nomaguchi 2011; Mennino et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005). This pattern is surprising because it runs contrary to prominent theoretical arguments and empirical evidence in the sociological study of stress, social inequality, and mental health that suggest that well-educated individuals should have a distinct advantage in two ways that relate directly to the socioeconomic gradient in well-being: (1) they should be less exposed to stressors (‘differential exposure’) and (2) they should be less vulnerable to the distressing effects of stress exposure due to their greater and more effective resources (‘differential vulnerability’) (Schieman and Glavin 2011). I evaluate this paradox with data from a nationally representative sample of Canadian employees.

Three main contributions emerge from my analyses. First, I document the distribution of FWC across levels of education. Second, since inequalities between educational groups in home-related demands and resources are thought to be the primary mechanism giving rise to the educational distribution of FWC, I identify the ways that home-related demands and resources vary significantly across educational groups. Third, the contributions of inequalities in home-related demands and resources to the educational distribution of FWC are demonstrated.

Casting the differential exposure perspective in terms of the work-family interface, the demands hypothesis predicts that well-educated individuals tend to be more likely to report FWC due to their greater exposure to home-related demands. The resource hypothesis, which is based on the differential vulnerability perspective, similarly predicts that well-educated individuals tend to be more likely to report FWC—albeit for a different reason: their lesser home-related resources. My observations regarding the educational distribution of FWC are somewhat
consistent with these hypotheses, in that individuals with a university degree or college diploma are *more* likely to report FWC than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. However, one would expect the relative likelihood of individuals with a university degree reporting FWC to be greater than that of individuals with a college diploma, but that is not the case here. Further, one would expect individuals with the highest level of education—a postgraduate or advanced degree—to be the most likely group to report FWC, relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less, but, in fact, these educational groups are equivalent when it comes to the likelihood of reporting FWC. (Individuals with some post-secondary education are also equivalent to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less in this regard.)

Educational differences in time-based family demands are found to play a critical role in the association between education and FWC. Consistent with the predictions of the demands hypothesis, individuals with a university degree or college diploma tend to have younger children, and they are more likely to have provided help to relatives and/or friends in the past month, than their less educated counterparts. These facts alone fully account for the FWC gap between individuals with a university degree and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. They also partially account for the FWC gap between individuals with a college degree and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. Individuals with a university degree or college diploma are also more likely to use child care and, when they do, to be dissatisfied with it than their counterparts with less education, which contribute—albeit marginally—to their relatively greater likelihoods of reporting FWC. Otherwise, individuals with a university degree or college diploma tend to be less likely to have strain-based demands than their counterparts with less education—that is, single parenthood and a household member/s with a health condition. If it were not for this fact, individuals with a university degree or college diploma would be even more likely to report FWC, relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less.

Contrary to the predictions of the resource hypothesis, well-educated individuals are better off in some ways than their counterparts with less education when it comes to home-related resources, and worse off in other ways. Specifically, individuals with a university degree or college diploma tend to have higher incomes and greater numbers of emotionally close friends.
than their counterparts with less education. However, they are less likely to have most relatives and friends living nearby. Interestingly, the latter fact tends to work in the favor of individuals with a university degree or college diploma because having most relatives living nearby increases the likelihood of reporting FWC, probably because it engenders more family obligations (e.g., helping in various ways, visiting and attending gatherings), as does having most friends living nearby among women. Thus, if it were not for their lower likelihoods of having most relatives and friends living nearby, individuals with a university degree or college would be even more likely to report FWC (relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less) than suggested by the baseline model. In the case of individuals with a university degree, the beneficial effects of their lower likelihoods of having most relatives and friends living nearby on FWC are wiped out by the counterintuitive, detrimental effects of higher incomes on FWC among women.

Ultimately, only the educational gap between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less remains after adjusting for home-related demands and resources in multivariate analyses. This suggests that other determinants of FWC beyond those considered here are pertinent to individuals with a college diploma. Since the present study used all available measures of relevant family characteristics, occupation and job-related demands and resources were explored as possibilities. While work hours and workaholism were found to significantly increase the likelihood of experiencing FWC, they did little in the way of accounting for the education gap between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma.

FWC is often thought to be particularly relevant to both lower-status women and mothers in high-level managerial and professional occupations. In the case of lower-status women, this is because their opportunities for personal fulfillment through paid work are limited, given the nature of their jobs, leading them to prioritize family over work. In the case of mothers in high-level managerial and professional occupations, this is because, beyond their greater exposure to job- and family-related demands, they are torn between two clashing normative definitions of what it means to be a good worker, on one hand, and a mother, on the other hand (Blair-Loy 2003; Hays 1996; Hennessy 2009; Williams 2010). For these reasons, I explored the possibility that gender and/or parental status condition the association between education and FWC.
Contrary to expectations, however, I find that the educational distribution of FWC holds among women and men, parents and non-parents, and childless men versus fathers and childless women versus mothers. Thus, neither lower-status women, nor female managers and professionals with children are particularly vulnerable to FWC. An important caveat in interpreting these results pertains to selection bias. Research consistently demonstrates that the probability of paid employment increases with education and work experience. Higher-status women are more likely to remain in continuous employment and, when they disrupt their labour force participation around childbirth, they return to work sooner than do lower-status women (Crompton 2006; Crompton and Lyonette 2007; McRae 1993). There is also evidence that lower-status women often quit employment, at least temporarily, when they experience high levels of work-family conflict (Ciabattari 2007; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Glass 1988; Williams and Boushey 2010). When it comes to less well educated women, then, I may be primarily observing those who are least exposed to FWC. Similarly, given their human capital and marital homogamy with respect to education, well-educated women are in a better position than their less-well-educated counterparts to leave work conditions that produce FWC, either by exiting the workforce altogether or dropping down in the occupational hierarchy to a less demanding job. For this reason, I may be underestimating the positive effects of education and parental status on FWC among women.

The present analysis has limitations that it is hoped future research will address. First, the use of cross-sectional data—due to the absence of longitudinal data related to the work-family interface in Canada at the time this research began—means that causal directions are empirically unclear (Schieman and Glavin 2011; Schieman and Young 2011). Second, only two items are available in the data to measure FWC. Scales that are based on too few items may lack content and construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability, with single-item measures being particularly problematic in these regards (Hinkin 1995). However, the two items used to measure FWC load on a single factor and the Spearman-Brown reliability estimate is 0.682, suggesting that its construct validity and reliability are fairly good. Third, the data used here do not contain the full range of family characteristics and other characteristics that are likely to be important determinants of FWC, including time spent on housework and childcare (Baltes and Heydens-Gahir 2003; Frone et al. 1992); frequency of eating out and use of laundry, housecleaning, or nanny services; marital issues (Aryee, Fields, and Luk 1999; Dakin and Wampler 2008; Fox and Dwyer 1999; Grzywacz and Marks 2000), and children’s problems (Voydanoff 2005). Another notable absence is values about
the relative prioritization of work and family, which previous research has shown to influence perceptions of work-family conflict (Carlson and Kacmar 2000). It would be worthwhile for future research to investigate the extent to which these characteristics account for the association between education and FWC.

To conclude, my findings suggest that education corresponds to distinct family contexts and, therefore, inequalities in home-related demands and resources—with implications for exposure to FWC. Individuals with a university degree or college diploma are more likely to report FWC than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. (Individuals with a post-graduate or advanced degree and individuals with some post-secondary education are equivalent to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less in this regard.) In the case of individuals with a university degree, this pattern is completely explained by their greater time-based family demands: young children in the household and provision of help to relatives and/or friends. The FWC gap between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less is also partially explained by their greater time-based family demands, in addition to their greater use of childcare and, when they do use childcare, their greater tendency to be dissatisfied with it. Otherwise, individuals with a university degree or college diploma are less likely to have strain-based family demands—namely, single parenthood and a household member with a health condition—without which they would be even more likely to experience FWC, relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. Individuals with a university degree or college diploma tend to have higher incomes, which, counterintuitively, tend to increase FWC among women. This ‘resource’ also contributes to their higher likelihoods of reporting FWC, relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. With respect to other home-related resources, individuals with a university degree or college diploma are less likely to have social support in the form of most relatives and/or friends living nearby. Surprisingly, this works in their favor when it comes to FWC because these home-based resources tend to increase FWC. If it were not for the fact that they are less likely to have most relatives and friends living nearby, individuals with a university degree or college diploma would be even more likely to report FWC. Ultimately, the greater time-based demands, use of childcare and dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program, and income of individuals with a university degree or college diploma outweigh the beneficial effects of their lack of other strain-based demands and home-related ‘resources.’
The higher likelihood that individuals with a college degree report FWC, relative to their counterparts with a high school diploma or less, is not well accounted for by the home-related demands and resources considered here. It is therefore hoped that future research will further explore the association between education and FWC, with an eye to time spent on housework and childcare, marital issues, children’s problems, and/or values about the relative prioritization of work and family as likely intervening mechanisms.
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Chapter 4
Time Pressure: Are Occupation, Gender, and Parenthood Primary Determinants?

14 Introduction

Although debate surrounds the question of whether or not work time has increased and, concomitantly, leisure time has decreased in the United States since the 1970s, it is well-established that Americans are burdened by heightened *perceptions* of time pressure (e.g. Robinson and Godbey 1997). Similarly, 40% of Canadian workers report high levels of time pressure (Duxbury and Higgins 2012). Following Szollos (2009: 339), time pressure is defined as implying “both a cognitive awareness of not having enough time and the emotional experience of hectic pace, harriedness, and rushing, accompanied by apprehension and frustration.”

Whether time pressure is an objective or subjective phenomenon, it has real consequences for individuals’ well-being. Hochschild (1997) has argued that workers may choose to escape the pressures of home through commitment to work because time pressure makes them feel less of an emotional connection to their children and spouses/partners. Further, individuals tend to feel shortchanged with respect to family life—that they have too little time in general and quality time in particular for their intimate relationships with their children and spouse/partners (Milkie, Mattingly, Nomaguchi, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004; Nomaguchi, Milkie, and Bianchi 2005; Roxburgh 2006). In addition to undermining the quality of family relationships, time pressure negatively affects health. Individuals who report that they ‘often’ or ‘always’ feel rushed experience more stress and burn out, and they are more likely to rate themselves lower in terms of life satisfaction and happiness and higher in depression, than their counterparts who do not report feeling rushed (Roxburgh 2004 & 2006).

The work-family interface figures prominently in time pressure, as both work and family represent “greedy institutions,” as Coser (1974) puts it, that demand total attention and commitment (Kleiner 2014). In effect, the primary social roles of “earning and caring” (Beaujot 2000) create demands on personal resource such as time (Dugan, Matthews, and Barnes-Farrell 2012; Roxburgh 2006). Hence, the fact that more adults are now balancing both of these roles in the context of dual-earner families—at the same time as the expectations of employees and
parents have increased—has been cited in explanation of the rise in time pressure (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Even so, time pressure has rarely been studied as an outcome of the work-family interface, compared to work-family conflict. Some scholars have conflated work-family conflict and time pressure, thereby contributing to conceptual confusion and obscuring unique patterns of antecedents (e.g., Beaufort and Andersen 2007; Tézli and Gauthier 2009). By way of clarification, it is useful to define these concepts. Work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict that is “experienced when pressures arising in one role are incompatible with pressures arising in another role...when participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in another role” (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985: 77). Time pressure, also known as role overload, refers to “having too much to do and not enough time in which to do it. Role overload means feeling rushed and time crunched, feeling physically and emotionally exhausted and drained, and not having enough time for oneself” (Duxbury, Lyons, and Higgins 2008: 125). It occurs when the collective responsibilities of multiple roles are perceived to be so great that time resources are insufficient to adequately fulfill them to the satisfaction of self and others (Duxbury et al. 2008).

Work-family conflict and time pressure are distinct but related concepts. Work-family conflict occurs when demands related to one role inhibit one’s ability to meet the demands of the other role, whereas time pressure occurs when one has altogether too many role demands relative to the time available to meet them (Duxbury et al. 2008; Hecht 2001). It follows that work-family conflict is bi-directional (i.e., work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict), and its antecedents lie in either the work domain or the family domain (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992). Time pressure encompasses the totality of temporal stresses that individuals face in fulfilling the responsibilities of both earning and caring roles, meaning that its antecedents lie in both the work and family domains (Duxbury et al. 2008).

In view of evidence that time pressure compromises well-being, it is important to develop an understanding of its distribution in the population, including the work and family conditions that give rise to it. This study focuses on the role of three social determinants of time pressure: occupation, gender, and parental status. Although few studies have considered time pressure as an outcome of the work-family interface, previous research on time use and perceptions of time
demonstrates that the well-educated and affluent members of society are among the most time pressured (e.g. Hamermesh & Lee 2003; Robinson & Godbey 1997; Roxburgh 2002). Further, longer work hours have been associated with greater feelings of time pressure (e.g., Beaufort and Andersen 2007; Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Hamermesh and Lee 2003; Roxburgh 2002). Given that occupation provides a structural link between levels of educational attainment and income (Shavers 2007), and long work hours are relatively more common among individuals in higher-status occupations (i.e., managers and professionals) (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004), these findings speak to the potential relevance of occupation to time pressure. In addition, women (Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Milkie, Raley, and Bianchi 2009; Robinson and Godbey 1997; Stalker 2014; Tézli and Gauthier 2009) and parents, especially when young children are involved (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Craig and Mullan 2010; Stalker 2014), have been found to be particularly at risk for time pressure. One prominent possibility that is explored in this study is that occupational effects on time pressure are contingent on gender and parental status, such that mothers in managerial and professional occupations tend to experience the highest levels of time pressure. Managerial and professional occupations may be particularly demanding for women, especially mothers, who typically assume the majority of childcare and housework, as well as planning and scheduling meals, doctor/dentist’s visits, leisure activities, parties and get-togethers, and the emotion work of family life (DeVault 1991; Milkie and Peltola 1999; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). This is because managerial and professional occupations remain anchored in the long-held assumption that their incumbents are male and, therefore, they have a stay-at-home spouse available to take care of domestic labour and offer emotional support, enabling them to pursue their careers without distraction (Leiper 1998; Williams, Blair-Loy, Berdahl 2013). Further, well-educated, managerial and professional women tend to practice what Hays (1996) terms “intensive mothering”—a child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, laborious, and financially expensive ideology in which mothers are primarily responsible for the development of children, whose needs take precedence over their own. Consequently, they spend more time with their children and do more enriching activities with them, such as reading as opposed to watching television (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Craig 2006; Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney 2008; Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg., Jr. 2004).
I found only one study that considered the combined influence of occupation, gender, and parental status on time pressure, and it revealed heightened ‘time crunch’ among women lawyers in Toronto and London, Ontario, as compared to the general population, particularly when they take primary responsibility for the care of young children (Leiper 1998). Other studies have considered the gender-contingent and/or parenthood-contingent effects of education on time pressure. Roxburgh (2002) finds gender differences in the distribution of time pressure across levels of education among full-time workers in Ohio. Specifically, affluent, well-educated men are substantially less time pressured than their female counterparts, while among individuals with average or below average education, men and women are highly and equally time pressured. Similarly, in a study of time pressure among parents of children aged 2 to 7 years in Nordic countries (excluding Iceland), Gunnarsdottir, Petzold, and Povlsen (2014) find educational differences in time pressure among mothers only, with highly educated mothers reporting more time pressure than their less educated counterparts.

While previous research speaks to the relevance of occupation in relation to time pressure, and possible gender and parental status conditions on its effects in this regard, no studies have looked at these issues specifically—certainly not using nationally-representative data for a North American country. Further, since neither occupation, nor other measures of socioeconomic position (i.e., education and income) have been the focal determinant/s of time use or perceptions of time in previous research, the mechanisms through which the occupational distribution of time pressure by gender and parental status arises is unclear. I evaluate these issues by asking three research questions: (1) Is time pressure distributed differently across occupational groups stratified by gender and parental status—and, if so, how? (2) Which work and family conditions are associated with time pressure? (3) Do work and family conditions contribute to any observed associations among occupation, gender, and parental status in interaction, on one hand, and time pressure, on the other hand? In framing the questions this way, I also consider the extent to which work and family conditions are differently distributed across occupation, gender, and parenthood and groups defined by the interaction of these statuses. Taken together, these potentially interrelated pieces help identify a portrait of time pressure among the Canadian working population with family responsibilities—and the gender- and parenthood-contingent occupational reasons for them.
15 Temporal Trends in Time Pressure

Given the necessity of paid employment for personal and familial subsistence in capitalist societies, work time largely determines how much time is available for other activities. For this reason, studies pertaining to temporal trends in time pressure have often begun with the question: Are people in Western, industrialized countries working more than ever? This question has generated considerable debate. In *The Overworked American*, Schor (1991) contends that contemporary Americans are working more than their predecessors at any time since World War II. Conversely, Robinson and Godbey (1997) argue that Americans have more—not less—leisure time than they did forty or so years ago, based on time-diary data. Parental time with children has not suffered with these shifts in work/leisure time (Bianchi 2000; Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Gauthier, Smeeding, Furstenberg 2004; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004; Zick and Bryant 1996). Jacobs and Gerson’s (2004) findings qualify the debate over work/leisure time. They demonstrate that the length of the average workweek has remained fairly stable in the United States since the 1970s, and that the observable rise in leisure time owes to declines in housework rather than paid work. While the average workweek may not have increased, they do find a modest but growing bifurcation of working time among workers. The time squeeze created by spending more hours on paid work is concentrated among highly-educated managers and professionals, whereas non-professionals spend fewer hours than they prefer at paid work.

The debate over empirical trends in work/leisure time notwithstanding, most people feel as if they are constantly pressured for time (Robinson and Godbey 1997). A distinction should be made between objective and subjective time pressure. Objective time pressure pertains to actual time use, whereas subjective time pressure pertains to personal experiences of time. As Moens (2007: 73-74) explains about subjective time pressure:

From this point of view the experience of time, and time use, is not necessarily the same for everyone, but dependent on cultural and structural circumstances and the experience of those circumstances…the relation between time use and the feeling of time pressure is not equal for everyone. Some authors suggest even that time pressure is especially a discourse, independent of any actual behaviour…
Indeed, Robinson and Godbey (1997) find that Americans are burdened by heightened *perceptions* of time pressure, even though they apparently have more leisure time than did their predecessors. These scholars attribute the discrepancy between inflated estimates of time spent on work and family, on one hand, and time-diary data, on the other hand, to what they call “time deepening” (or what is more commonly known as multitasking): doing more, doing it faster, and doing it simultaneously. As Hawkins and Hill (1998: 262) explain about time deepening:

> Simply put, we cram more diverse activities into less clock time. We answer e-mail while we do the laundry and listen for the baby. We talk on the cell phone while we drive away from the fast food restaurant and gobble down a hamburger. Due to the frenetic pace of life, so well chronicled by Hochschild, we feel rushed, and our perception of work time is elongated. Hence, we think we have less free time than we really do.

Corresponding to the distinction between objective and subjective time pressure, two explanations for the rise in time pressure have been proposed (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). The structural explanation focuses on individuals’ primary social roles of earning and caring, suggesting that more people feel time pressured because they are now balancing both of these roles in the context of dual-earner families and, simultaneously, expectations of employees and parents have increased (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). On the other hand, the cultural explanation posits little association between objective time use and subjective levels of time pressure, considering it, instead, to be a self-deceptive or illusory phenomenon (Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Szollos 2009). Cultural discourses that value action-packed lives and high levels of consumption are held responsible for rising perceptions of time pressure (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). The high value of time among managers and professionals—a growing segment of the population—may also be implicated in rising perceptions of time pressure (DeVoe and Pfeffer 2011).

The definition of time pressure that is used in this study encompasses both objective and subjective dimensions. Hence, the structural and cultural explanations for the rise in time pressure are used as a guiding framework for conceptualizing the distribution of time pressure across occupations and the mechanisms that give rise to them. Parallel explanations focusing on gender differences in time availability and the meaning of time are then similarly used for conceptualizing the gender- and parenthood-based distribution of time pressure and the underlying mechanisms. Finally, Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative study of career and family
among women executives is used to conceptualize how and why gender and parental status condition the occupational distribution of time pressure.

16 The Occupational Distribution of Time Pressure

16.1 Empirical Evidence

Jacobs and Gerson (2004) attribute the discrepant findings regarding temporal trends in work/leisure time to the development of a two-tiered labour market, characterized by poorly-paid part-time jobs at one end of the spectrum and well-paid managerial and professional jobs that demand long work hours at the other end of the spectrum. They find that well-paid managers and professionals work longer hours and want to reduce their hours, while lower-income non-professionals work shorter hours and want to work longer hours. This argument implies that time pressure is more common among managers and professionals. Indeed, Robinson and Godbey (1997) report that time crunch is more common among the well-educated and affluent.

Similarly, Roxburgh (2002) finds that time pressures increase as income increases. Education and income are integrally related to occupation and, therefore, these findings suggest that managers and professionals—who generally have higher levels of education and income—experience more time pressure than non-professionals.

I was able to locate one quantitative study of time pressure that considered occupation as a determinant. Contrary to the expectation that managers and professionals are more time pressured than non-professionals, Beaujot and Andersen (2007) find no occupational differences in “time crunch.” However, this finding should not be interpreted as solid evidence of the absence of an occupational gradient in time pressure because, in the study that generated it, occupation is included in the multivariate analysis after the inclusion of time spent on paid and unpaid work and simultaneously with work schedule and time spent on child- and eldercare.
16.2 The Structural Explanation for Time Pressure: Earning and Caring Roles

The structural explanation for the rise in time pressure views time pressure as a real issue, arising, at the macro level, with the increase in the labour force participation of women, especially mothers of young children, since the 1970s and the concomitant growth of dual-earner and single-parent families (Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Sayer 2007; van der Lippe 2007). These economic and demographic changes, combined with men’s greater involvement in housework and childrearing (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006), mean that the majority are adults are spending time engaged in both earning and caring roles. An escalation of the demands on individuals’ time has also occurred in the work and family domains, as the expectations of employees and parents have increased (Mattingly and Sayer 2006).

The organization of work continues to be predicated upon the outdated assumption of separate spheres (i.e. workers have someone at home to tend to personal and family matters), and most employers expect employees to prioritize work duties over family responsibilities (Acker 1990; Sayer 2007; Williams 2001). International competition and corporate downsizing have increased the pace and insecurity of employment and, in that way, elevated work hours and intensity (Duxbury, Lyons, and Higgins 2008; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). A new culture has also developed in many professional organizations, in which time spent at work is seen as a gauge of organizational commitment and career devotion (van der Lippe and Peters 2007). Non-standard work hours and schedules have become more common with the growth of low-wage service jobs, creating coordination challenges when it comes to syncing job and family schedules and individual needs for rest (Sayer 2007). Expectations that parents devote copious amounts of time (and money) to “cultivating” their children’s mental and physical development have also taken root (Coltrane 1996; Hays 1996; Milkie, Mattingly, Nomaguchi, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004; Nelson 2010; Roxburgh 2012; Townsend 2002). As a result, even though the average time investments of mothers in childrearing have remained stable, and fathers’ have increased, since 1965 (Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004), one half of American parents feel that they do not spend enough time with their children (Milkie et al. 2004). Given that time is a finite resource, these new developments in work and family life contribute to feelings of time pressure.
At the micro level, the structural explanation for time pressure directs our attention to the primary social roles of worker, spouse/partner, and/or parent (Dugan et al. 2012; Kleiner 2014; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). In addition to providing opportunities for maximizing well-being (e.g., self-esteem) and providing access to social resources (e.g., instrumental and emotional support), these roles create demands on personal resources like time (Roxburgh 2006). For this reason, paid employment is associated with time pressure, with full-time workers being more likely to report time pressure than their counterparts who work fewer hours (Beaujot and Andersen 2007; Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Hamermesh and Lee 2003; Roxburgh 2002). Parents are also more time pressured than non-parents, with young children worsening the situation (Beaujot and Andersen 2007; Craig and Mullan 2010; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Robinson and Godbey 1997; Stalker 2014; Zukewich 2003). Thus, the structural explanation suggests that we look for the specific mechanisms of time pressure among work and family conditions.

16.2.1 Work, Family, and Time Pressure

Time pressure can be considered a mediator of the work-family interface, in that it converts the everyday, routine performance of social roles into diminished well-being (Roxburgh 2004; Voydanoff 2008). As such, it likely shares antecedents with other mediators of the work-family interface (i.e., work-family conflict). The work and family conditions that determine the nature of the work-family interface are typically conceptualized as “demands” and “resources.” Voydanoff (2008: 39) asserts that demands are defined as “structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations, and norms to which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or mental effort.” There are two types of demands: time-based and strain-based (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985). Time-based demands reflect the fact that time is a finite resource, meaning that time and involvement in one domain limits time and involvement in another through a process of resource drain. Hours spent doing paid work and non-standard work

---

36 Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified another category of antecedents, which have behaviour-based sources. However, they have proven to be difficult to operationalize, so they have been notably absent from the literature (Dierdorff and Ellington 2008).
hours or schedules are typical time-based demands in the work domain, while time spent doing housework and caring for children and/or elderly parents are typical time-based demands in the family domain (Byron 2005; Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer 2007; Voydanoff 2008).

Strain-based demands operate through negative psychological spillover in which psychological responses to poor conditions in the work or family domain (e.g., negative emotional arousal, interpersonal withdrawal, energy depletion, and stress) carry over to attitudes and behaviour in the other domain (Voydanoff 2008). Through the reactions they provoke, strain-based demands may influence the subjective aspects of time pressure. Common strain-based demands pertaining to the social organization of work are interpersonal conflict and job stress (e.g., role ambiguity, role overload, and psychological demands), involvement, noxiousness, routine (i.e., lack of task diversity), and insecurity (Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Schieman et al. 2009; Voydanoff 2008). By contrast, typical strain-based demands pertaining to family social organization are marital conflict, children’s problems (e.g., disability, difficult temperament), concerns about childcare, and caregiver strain (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Voydanoff 2008; Young, Schieman, and Milkie 2014).

Voydanoff (2008: 39) defines resources as “structural or psychological assets that may be used to facilitate role performance, reduce demands, or generate additional resources,” thereby reducing time pressure (also see Bakker and Demerouti 2007: 312-313). Scholars have identified several influential resources in the work domain as job authority, job autonomy, schedule flexibility, and social support from one’s supervisor and coworkers (Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Tausig 1999; Voydanoff 2008). Key resources in the family domain are instrumental and emotional social support from one’s spouse and/or other family members (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007; Voydanoff 2008). In addition, social integration in one’s local community may function as a resource in relation to time pressure to the extent that it implies greater social support from neighbours (Voydanoff 2008).

Occupation influences the occupancy of earning and caring roles, and the ways that individuals experience these roles, in fundamental ways (Roxburgh 2002). It follows that constellations of work and family demands and resources will differ across occupations, thereby contributing to the occupational distribution of time pressure.
16.2.2 Occupation and Job-Related Demands and Resources

Previous research demonstrates that work conditions are among the most important determinants of time pressure (Tézli and Gauthier 2008). A number of demand-related circumstances in the workplace have been found to increase time pressure, including: long work hours, job pressure, non-standard work hours/schedules, and intensive forms of job involvement (Beaujot and Andersen 2007; Bellavia and Frone 2005; Kemeny 2002; Roxburgh 2002, 2004, 2006; Tézli and Gauthier 2008). Managers and professionals tend to be more exposed to all of these job-related demands than non-professionals, with the exception of non-standard work hours/schedules. In turn, managers and professionals may experience more time pressure. I refer to this as the “work demands hypothesis” (Schieman and Glavin 2011).

In order for these job-related demands to contribute to occupation-based differences in time pressure, they must be unevenly distributed across occupations. In particular, we might expect that the time requirements and absorptiveness of work increase as one moves up the occupational ladder. For instance, there is evidence that managers and professionals work more hours, on average, than do non-professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Further, overwork—defined as working 50 hours or more per week—is relatively more common among managers and professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014; Moen, Lam, Ammons, and Kelly 2013). Managerial and professional occupations also tend to be more engrossing, making it difficult for individuals who occupy them to compartmentalize work and family (Burris 1986; Moen et al. 2013). Thus, in my analyses, I test the hypothesis that managers and professionals tend to report more time pressure because of their overwork and greater workaholism.

In addition to long hours and intense forms of job involvement, managerial and professional occupations may also be more stressful than other occupations, placing high psychological and emotional demands on their incumbents. The work of managers and professionals typically involves responsibilities for vital operations that shape the course and, ultimately, the success of the organization that employs them (Schieman 2002). These responsibilities are enacted through decision-making latitude and authority over the work of other employees. Additionally, managers and professionals spend a large proportion of their time
at work interacting with their employers, clients, and co-workers (Beatty 1996). Intense levels of interaction with others, in general, increase the likelihood of interpersonal conflict (Schieman and Reid 2008). For these reasons, individuals in higher-status occupations tend to experience elevated levels of work-role overload, conflict, and ambiguity—job pressures that may elevate perceptions of time pressure (Voydanoff 1988).

The nature of managers’ and professionals’ work is typically such that some portion of it can be done outside of the workplace, with the aid of mobile computing and communication technologies, and the hours of business operation are elastic to accommodate different time zones (Chesley, Siibak, and Wajcman 2013; Moen et al. 2013). This is increasingly common, as “work extensification” (i.e., overflowing workloads) has come to characterize managerial and professional occupations (Moen, Lam, Ammons, and Kelly 2013). It follows that role blurring may be more relevant to individuals in these occupations (Chesley 2005). Further, previous research links certain work characteristics that are usually attributed to individuals in higher-status occupations to greater role blurring. Glavin and Schieman (2012) demonstrate that individuals who are granted flexibility and control in their job (i.e., authority, schedule control, and decision-making latitude) experience more role blurring because these conditions tend to result in more porous work-family boundaries. Excessive work pressures also increase border permeability and role blurring, as workers may feel compelled to devote additional non-work time and energy to them. Additionally, several studies have shown that work-role identification is positively associated with boundary permeability that enables role blurring, as individuals who identify strongly with the work look for opportunities to express this work identity outside of the traditional work domain (Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate 2000; Olson-Buchanan and Boswell 2006; Winkel and Clayton 2010). Thus, managers and professionals are more likely to engage in role blurring activities (Schieman and Young 2013), which may, in turn, increase their risk for time pressure through multitasking.

Although managers and professionals are exposed to more job-related demands than non-professionals, they may also benefit from more job-related resources—higher incomes and work-family supports, such as schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options. Ultimately, these factors should lessen time pressure. For this reason, managers and professionals might encounter less time pressure. I refer to this as the “work resource
hypothesis.” To some degree, time and income are substitutable. As Garhammer (2007: 33) explains: “[W]hoever experiences a scarcity of time and disposes of sufficient money can buy personal services (eating out, cleaning services) and win time.” Formal work-family supports, including maternity, parental, and family leave, flexible work arrangements (e.g., telecommuting, flextime, compressed workweeks, reduced hours, and job-sharing), and childcare assistance (e.g., on-site facilities and referrals services) may minimize time pressure by easing the earning- and caring-role combination (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Deitch and Huffman 2001; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Heymann 2000 & 2005; Perrons, McDowell, Fagan, Ray, and Ward 2007; Starrels 1992; Warren 2003). However, recent scholarship has observed that higher income, schedule flexibility, and other job-related resources that characterize higher-status occupations sometimes behave more like job-related demands when it comes to predicting work-family conflict (Schieman, Whitestone, and Van Gundy 2006). Specifically, some evidence suggests that schedule control, job authority, non-routine work, and higher income tend to increase exposure to time pressure by increasing work-family border permeability (Schieman 2013; Schieman, Milkie, and Glavin 2009). As a result, managers and professionals are relatively more exposed to work-family conflict (Schieman and Reid 2009). This is referred to as the “stress of higher status” hypothesis because the supposedly-resourceful conditions in question come from achieved statuses like education or occupation (Schieman and Glavin, 2011). It is not that these factors do not generally produce better overall well-being, but rather that they would yield even more benefits were it not for their links to greater pressure, interpersonal conflict, and stress in the work-family interface.

Collectively, these ideas and empirical findings reflect the cultural logic that organizes executive occupations, known as the “schema of work devotion” (Blair-Loy 2003: 7), which “…demands that one give an immense time commitment and strong emotional allegiance to one’s firm or career.” The schema of work devotion is both institutionalized in workplaces and

37 While formal work-family supports are more likely to be available to managers and professionals, and a large proportion of those who have these benefits make use of them, scholars suspect that many employees do not make use of them extensively or whatsoever (Jacobs and Gerson 2004). Employees may be reluctant to take advantage of formal work-family supports for fear that they are informally stigmatized and, therefore, engender career-threatening penalties. Indeed, Jacobs and Gerson (2004) find that workplace cultures and supervisors that are supportive of family are negatively related to individuals’ perceptions of their own chances for career advancement.
internalized to some extent by individuals. Given the schema of work devotion, managers and professionals may engage in role blurring to meet expectations of significant investments of time, energy, and emotion in their careers. In turn, these processes may increase managers’ and professionals’ exposure to work-family conflict—and perhaps their exposure to time pressure as well. Aligning with the stress of higher status hypothesis, Benoît-Paul and Grey (2006) demonstrate that respondents with a flexible work schedule are more time pressured (as cited in Beaujot and Andersen 2007).

In line with the stress of higher status hypothesis, and contrary to the work resource hypothesis, I may find that income and schedule flexibility increase exposure to time pressure. If this is the case, higher levels of time pressure may be observed among managers and professionals owing to the positive association between occupation and certain job-related ‘resources.’

The stress of higher status hypothesis does not disregard the possibility that non-professionals might be more exposed to other job-related demands. For example, prior research shows that non-standard work hours/schedules tend to increase time pressure (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Davis, Goodman, Piretti, and Almeida 2008; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Fenwick & Tausig 2004; Henly and Lambert 2006; Kinnunen and Mauno 1998; Perry-Jenkins 2005; Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg, Pierce, and Sayer 2007; Richter, Näswall, and Sverke 2010; Voydanoff 2005; Warren 2003 Williams 2010; Williams and Boushey 2010; Yildirim & Aycan 2008). Moreover, it is well-documented that evening, night, weekend, and rotating shifts are common in blue-collar occupations (e.g., operators, fabricators, and labourers) and in low-level service occupations, particularly in the protective-, retail- and food-service industries (Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg, Pierce, and Sayer 2007). Non-standard work hours/schedules make it difficult for individuals in lower-status occupations to establish stable routines for their families and, in that way, they may contribute to time pressure (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Shields 2002). Hence, I evaluate whether or not greater exposure to non-standard work hours contribute to higher levels of time pressure among non-professionals.

The non-standard work hours and schedules of lower-status occupations are also linked to poor compensation practices (Henly and Lambert 2006). Part-time, temporary, and contingent
workers are often poorly paid and excluded from employee protection and opportunities, such as unions, health insurance, pensions, and work-family supports. In addition, lower-status occupations imply limited personal control over work hours and schedules (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Lautsch and Scully 2007). Typically, management who decides how many hours and when employees will work, rather than employees making these decisions on the basis of what is best for them and their families. If higher incomes and schedule flexibility tend to lessen time pressure, the lack of these job-related resources among individuals in lower-status occupations may increase their exposure to time pressure. If, instead, these job-related resources tend to increase time pressure, as suggested by the stress of higher status hypothesis, the lack of these resources among individuals in lower-status occupations may actually be beneficial in terms of lowering exposure to time pressure (relative to higher-status occupations).

16.2.3 Occupation and Home-Related Demands and Resources

Time spent providing care to children is a key family-related demand that increases time pressure. Parents, particularly mothers, face more time strain (and related stress) than individuals who do not have children (Tézli and Gauthier 2009). Variations in parents’ stress levels appear to be mainly related to the age, rather than the number, of children living in the household (Tézli and Gauthier 2009; Gunthorpe and Lyons 2004). While having young children in the household increases levels of time strain, the magnitude of the pressures declines as children get older.

Socioeconomic status is positively related to more time-intensive forms of childrearing and, given that time spent on childcare is an important determinant of time pressure, it suggests that managers and professionals will experience more time pressure than non-professionals (Hays 1996; Lareau 2003). I refer to this as the “family demands hypothesis.”

Class implies distinct cultural logics of childrearing. The one enacted by middle-class parents is more intensive of their time, energy, and emotion than the one enacted by working-class and poor parents (Lareau 2003). Specifically, middle-class parents tend to adhere to a form of childrearing known as “concerted cultivation” (Lareau 2003). Under concerted cultivation, children’s leisure time is structured by a hectic schedule of organized activities that contribute to
their personal development. Parents are highly involved in their children’s leisure time, in that they orchestrate, chaperone, and oversee their organized activities. In the home, middle-class parents focus on eliciting their children’s feelings, opinions, and thoughts, and improving their vocabulary and negotiating skills through steady streams of dialogue. Even discipline of children in middle-class families takes the form of verbal reasoning. In children’s interactions with institutions, such as schools, middle-class parents act as mediators, directly intervening to manage their children’s complaints and/or to secure personalized treatment for their children.

Formidable economic constraints make it a major task for working-class and poor parents to provide sustenance and shelter and to carry out the domestic chores that sustain daily life (Lareau 2003). It is not surprising, then, that they do not consider the concerted cultivation of children to be an essential aspect of good parenting. Instead, working-class and poor parents adhere to a form of childrearing, known as “accomplishment of natural growth,” in which children are largely autonomous (Lareau 2003). In the context of the accomplishment of natural growth, children experience long stretches of leisure time, over which they have nearly complete control. Typically, working-class and poor children just “hang out” and play with kin. In the home, language use is minimal, with silence being punctuated by parent-issued directives that children generally follow, likely for fear of physical discipline. In children’s interactions with institutions, working-class and poor parents expect educators and other professionals who work with children to take a leadership role, out of respect for their expertise and authority. This deference also reflects an underlying element of hostility toward these professionals, with power to enforce the dominant childrearing standards (i.e., concerted cultivation) by “turning-in” parents who do not conform to them.

The notion that class is positively related to more intensive forms of childrearing is supported by studies of time-use among parents. For example, Guryan, Hurst, and Kearney (2008) find that, in the United States, the amount of time that parents spend with children increases with their levels of education and income—a pattern that holds in the other fourteen countries that they examined. They also find that the amount of time that parents spend on household production and leisure decreases with levels of education and income (see also Kimmel and Connelly 2007). Taken together, these findings suggest that well-to-do parents place
more value on time spent with children and, therefore, they protect it from the encroachment of time spent on work by reducing time spent on household production and leisure.

It is not just the time that parents spend caring for children that affects time pressure, but also satisfaction with the care that children receive from non-parents (Roxburgh 2002). Childcare satisfaction is important for managing parenthood because failure to obtain it is a major source of stress. Men and women who indicate that there are things they would like to change about their current daycare arrangements are much more likely to be time pressured than their counterparts who indicate that there is nothing they would change about their current daycare arrangements (Roxburgh 2002). Contrary to the family demands hypothesis, non-professionals may be less likely than managers and professionals to be satisfied with their childcare arrangements/programs and, therefore, they may in fact experience more time pressure than managers and professionals.

While higher-income parents disproportionately use formal childcare arrangements, including daycare centres and nurseries, licensed in-home childcare providers, and nannies, lower-income parents disproportionately use informal childcare arrangements, typically provided in the child’s home or in the home of a relative, friend, or neighbor (Dowsett, Huston, Imes, and Gennetian 2008; Hansen 2005; Hofferth 1999; Hansen 2005; Henly and Lyons 2000; Wolfe and Scrivner 2004). Lower-income parents turn to kin and kith for childcare, as opposed to the marketplace, because they are inexpensive, with flexibility in how and when payments are made, and accommodating of non-standard work hours and schedules (Brayfield and Hofferth 1995; Bromer and Henly 2009; Hunts and Avery 1998; Kuhlthau and Mason 1996). Informal childcare arrangements tend to be lower in quality and stability than formal childcare arrangements, meaning that they may engender stress and even disrupt the employment of the working-class and poor parents who rely on them (Gordon, Kaestner, and Korenman 2008; Healy and Lyons 2000; Hofferth 1999; Kossek, Pichler, Meece, and Barratt 2008; Scott, London, and Hurst 2005; Usdanksy and Wolf 2008; Wolfe and Scrivner 2004).

The relationship of participants in “networks of care” for children to parents may be indicative of the extent to which they benefit from social support more generally in family life (Hansen 2005). As Domínguez and Watkins (2003: 113) explain:
Social support is most often associated with ‘strong’ ties, which tend to be made of kin, neighbors, and intimate friends. These ties generally provide individuals emotional and expressive support as well as certain kinds of instrumental help like rides, small loans, or a place to stay in case of emergency...They can also ensure that basic needs are met, assist in child rearing, and provide tools for improving employment situations.

Given the socioeconomic gradient in childcare arrangements, then, there is reason to suspect that non-professionals have more strong ties and, therefore, more social support in family life than do managers and professionals. Further, white, middle-class families are normatively nuclear and self-reliant, whereas extended families have a long history in low-income communities, especially in communities of colour (Ciabattari 2007; Coontz 1992; Hansen 2005; Stack 1974).

There is, however, a drawback to embeddedness in domestic networks consisting of kin and kith, instead of paid help, that problematizes its conceptualization as resources for working-class and poor parents in terms of time pressure. Extended families operate on the principle of reciprocity, meaning that, in accepting social support, the receiver agrees to return the favour when the giver is in a similar position (Nelson 2002). Having responsibility for the care and well-being of someone outside of the home has also been found to increase time pressure (Beaujot and Andersen 2007; Roxburgh 2002).

16.3 The Cultural Explanation for Time Pressure: Busyness, Excessive Consumption, and the Higher Value of Time

While the structural explanation views time pressure as a ubiquitous, objective reality rooted in the time demands associated with earning and caring roles, the cultural explanation views time

---

38 The importance of extended-family networks as survival strategies formed in response to a long history of oppression and social, psychological, and economic marginalization is a long-standing theme in the literature on family organization (Brewster and Padavic 2002; Roschelle 1997). Ethnographies documenting high rates of participation in such networks among African Americans (e.g., Stack 1974), immigrants (e.g., Kibria 1993), and low-income whites (e.g., Hansen 2005) have brought this theme to life. However, some recent quantitative research has failed to find racial/ethnic differences in participation in extended-family networks, net of controls for demographic and socio-economic characteristics (e.g., Roschelle 1997). While it has found class differences in this regard, they are also contrary to the ethnographic record: higher socioeconomic status increases the likelihood of participating in extended-family networks. It may be, as Roschelle (1997: 186) points out, that those who are least in need of help have the most extensive social-support networks.
pressure as a subjective reality—particularly common among members of the middle class—that reflects cultural discourses that laud both busyness and working-to-spend (Szollos 2009). In addition, time is thought to have a higher value among the (financially) prosperous. Although the data used in this study do not allow for measurement of the values that are implicated in the cultural explanation for time pressure, it is nevertheless important to consider this explanation because its particular relevance to higher-status individuals speaks to an occupational distribution of time pressure. Specifically, the cultural explanation suggests that levels of time pressure will be higher among managers and professionals, compared to non-professionals, because they tend to valorize busyness, they are more likely to engage in work-to-spend patterns, and they value their time more highly.

At the turn of the 20th century, the conspicuous consumption of leisure indicated an upper-class social position (Gershuny 2005; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Today, it is conspicuous devotion to time-intensive productive activities that signifies high social status. Put differently, busyness is now a “badge of honour” and individuals’ representations of their states of busyness play an important role in establishing their positions in the social order of stratification (Gershuny 2005). In Gershuny’s words (2005: 289), it follows that “…the growth in busy feelings may in part reflect an increasingly positive view of ‘busyness’ that results from its association with the increasingly busy lifestyle of the most privileged groups in developed societies.” Individuals may seek out and relish a hectic lifestyle, as it has become a status symbol, and then boast about their time pressure (Szollos 2009).

In addition to cultural discourses that value busyness, individuals are enmeshed in a work-to-spend culture, with long work hours fueling the time- and money-demanding quest to experience the latest product or service (Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Schor 1998). Schor (1998) attributes this work-to-spend culture to the competitive aspect of spending. While conspicuous consumption is not new, the reference group that defines our lifestyle aspirations has shifted from neighbours, who generally have similar earnings to our own, to a community of colleagues and coworkers, friends, celebrities and other public figures, whose earnings often significantly surpass our own. The accelerating pace of product and service innovation, as well as the relentless ratcheting up of standards, also contributes to the work-to-spend culture. Schor argues that the well-to-do are more likely to engage in a work-to-spend cycle because they tend to have
disproportionately upscaled needs. According to Linder (1970), consuming more means speeding up the consumption process by consuming faster, consuming higher-quality versions of a product or service, or simultaneously consuming multiple products and/or services. Such an acceleration of consumption leads to a frantic pace of life.

DeVoe and Pfeffer (2011) argue that the economic value or worth of an individual’s time influences his/her perceptions of time pressure. Individuals heuristically use the customary association between value and scarcity to assume that if something is more valuable, it would also be presumed to be more scarce. It follows that, since managers and professionals generally earn higher incomes than non-professionals, they would consider their time to be more valuable and, therefore, perceive more time pressure. In a similar vein, Hamermesh and Lee (2003) argue that, given that time is a finite resource, the greater abundance of goods and experiences that are available for purchase with greater financial wealth leads to a greater sense of time pressure by increasing the opportunity cost of time—both in terms of the price of time not spent working and the expanding options available for people during their free time. Analyzing data time-stress data from five Western countries, these scholars find that additional earnings lead to greater time pressure—even when holding hours of market and household work constant. Hamermesh and Lee interpret this finding as evidence that complaints about busy lifestyles and lack of time are generally a feature of well-off couples who have a lot of income and not enough time to spend it (see also Gleick 1999).

17 The Gender Distribution of Time Pressure

Women tend to enjoy less and lower quality leisure time and, consequently, more time pressure than men (Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Sayer 2005). Parenthood tends to exacerbate the gender gap in leisure time (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Sayer 2005), as the transition to parenthood tends to move heterosexual couples toward a more gendered division of paid and unpaid work (Fox 2009). Specifically, parenthood curtails adult-only free time (i.e., free time unaccompanied by children) to a much greater extent for women than it does men (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003). Further, women with preschool-aged children have a smaller amount of free time and it is poorer in quality than other women, whereas
preschool-aged children do not affect men’s experiences of free time (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003). Overall, given women’s, and particularly mothers’, relative dearth of leisure time in both quantity and quality, it is not surprising that previous research demonstrates that women have heightened perceptions of time pressure relative to men (Robinson and Godbey 1998; Stalker 2014; Tézli and Gauthier 2009).

There are two possible explanations for women’s relatively heightened perceptions of time pressure—represented by the “time availability” and “gender” perspectives (Nomaguchi, Milkie, and Bianchi 2005). Overlapping the structural explanation for the historical rise in time pressure, the time availability perspective on gender differences in time pressure focuses on (objective) time allocations to earning and caring roles (Nomaguchi et al. 2005). In contrast, and paralleling the cultural explanation for the historical rise in time pressure, the gender perspective focuses on the (subjective) meanings associated with earning and caring roles—above and beyond time allocations (Nomaguchi et al. 2005).

17.1 Gender Differences in Time Availability

The time availability perspective suggests the absence of gender differences in time pressure because men and women spend the same amount of time on earning and caring roles in combination. As women have increased their labour force participation, they have shed some housework hours—while maintaining the hours they devote to childrearing—and men have bulked up their contributions to housework and, more so, childcare (Bianchi 2011; Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, and Robinson 2000; Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). However, the gendered division of labour within households persists, with men spending more time on paid work and women spending more time on domestic labour (Bianchi et al. 2006). Current research therefore indicates that men and women have total workloads (i.e., the amount of time spent on both paid and unpaid work) that are roughly equivalent—even when they are parents (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006). If men and women spend equal amounts of total time on paid and unpaid work, no gender differences in time pressure should be found when these time allocations are controlled in multivariate analyses. Unfortunately, the data used in this study do not allow for measurement of time spent on housework and childcare (although the latter can be approximated
from the number of children in the household and the presence of any preschool-aged child/ren in the household). As a result, it is not possible for me to determine whether gender differences in time pressure hold net of time allocations to paid and unpaid work.

17.2 Gender Differences in the Meaning and Value of Earning and Caring Roles

The gender perspective suggests that women have more time pressure than men because the normative expectations associated with being a wife and/or mother are far more demanding than those associated with being a husband and/or father. First, gender specialization in household tasks—in which women tend to do ‘female’ tasks that are unrelenting, repetitive, and routine, such as shopping, cooking, cleaning and laundry, and child care, while men do ‘male’ tasks that are infrequent, irregular, and non-routine, such as taking out the trash, household repairs, mowing the lawn, and gardening—allows men much more flexibility than women when it comes to domestic labour (Milkie and Peltola 1999; Thompson and Walker 1989). Besides requiring daily attention, ‘female’ tasks often have to be done at specific times, whereas ‘male’ tasks can be done when convenient (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Further, men’s household tasks tend to be more challenging and creative than the menial, dirty, and repetitive tasks performed by women (Milkie and Peltola 1999). The latter may contribute to feelings of role overload.

Second, in spite of their increased labour force participation, women have retained ultimate responsibility for orchestrating family life—particularly with respect to childrearing and household management—and ensuring the well-being of its members, due to the persistence of traditional gender ideologies (McMahon 1995; Mederer 1993; Milkie and Peltola 1999; Walzer 1998). For this reason, women typically spend substantial amounts of ‘invisible’ time, and do considerable amounts of mental work, on coordinating and managing both children’s lives (e.g., making arrangements for childcare, school, extracurricular activities, carpooling, doctor’s appointments, and/or social activities) and household tasks (DeVault 1991; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Nomaguchi 2009). Given women’s ultimate responsibility for children and ensuring the smooth functioning of the household, they more likely than men to have their time interrupted by child- and household-related emergencies (e.g., illness or a major appliance in need of repair).
(Milkie and Peltola 1999; Nomaguchi 2009). Women are also the ones who deal with the expressive aspects of family life due to their family ties, which are stronger, more frequent, and less-contingent on circumstances than men’s (Milkie and Peltola 1999). These responsibilities, which are not captured by conventional measures of time spent on childcare and/or housework or the particular tasks that are accomplished by men and women, likely contribute to women’s greater perceptions of time pressure, relative to men.

Third, the cultural and social pressures of “intensive mothering” compel women to invest heavily in childrearing, guided by the principle that they are the ideal caregivers and should be constantly present and all-giving to children’s needs and wants (Hays 1996; Milkie, Mattingly, Nomaguchi, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004; Milkie, Raley, and Bianchi 2009). Intensive mothering norms contribute to feelings among women that the time they spend with children is never sufficient—in spite of its quantity (Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Although maternal time with children in the United States is as high, or higher, than during the 1960s Baby Boom when mothers allocated fewer hours to paid work (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006), most women still report that they do not spend enough time with their children (Nomaguchi, Milkie, and Bianchi 2005; Milkie et al. 2004) or they want to slower, higher-quality time with their children (Roxburgh 2006). Further, women’s maternal time strains are associated with more depression (Roxburgh 2012) and lower levels of life satisfaction (Nomaguchi et al. 2005). Ultimately, the normative requirements of intensive mothering and its association with feelings of time deficiency vis-à-vis children may contribute to women’s relatively heightened perceptions of time pressure more generally. If this is indeed the case, I should find that gender conditions (moderates) the effects of parenthood on time pressure, such that parenthood increases time pressure to a greater extent among women as compared to men.

Fourth and finally, women tend to have more fragmented and concentrated patterns of time use than men—that is, numerous episodes of shorter duration in which more activities are performed—due to their multitasking and the frequent role changes it implies (Stalker 2014). As Offer and Schneider (2011: 810) explain: “Multitasking, the simultaneous performance of several tasks or the rapid alternation between them, allows individuals to squeeze in more tasks and get more things done within a limited amount of time.” This is one of the ways that women have attempted to meet their significant domestic obligations, given their earning roles.
Indeed, Offer and Schneider (2011) demonstrate that mothers spend ten hours more a week multitasking than fathers, with these additional hours mainly being related to housework and childcare. Bianchi and her colleagues (2006) demonstrate that, from a historical perspective, women have maintained their time with children as they have taken on paid work by not only doing less housework, but also by multitasking. They also find that there has been a significant increase over time in parental leisure time being spent together with children—that is, a combination of free time with childcare—suggesting that parents are making more efforts to include their children in their own leisure activities to maintain time with them. Women’s leisure time is more likely than men’s to be intertwined with caregiving and disrupted by the exigencies of family needs and demands (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Consequently, women’s leisure time tends to be more fragmented and lower in quality, and thus generally less relaxing and refreshing. For these reasons, previous research demonstrates that leisure time does not decrease women’s perceptions of time pressure to the same extent as it does men’s (Mattingly and Bianchi 2003)—or at all (Mattingly and Sayer 2006).

18 The Occupational Distribution of Time Pressure—Contingent on Gender and Parental Status

In both academic discourse and media coverage, time pressure is understood as being particularly severe for women in high-level managerial and professional occupations, especially mothers (Williams 2010; Blair-Loy 2003). Beyond their greater exposure to job- and home-related demands, this is attributed to contradictions between taken-for-granted expectations about what it means to be a “good” worker and a “good” mother among them (Hennessy 2009). Blair-Loy (2003) argues that women executives are subject to two competing cultural schemas of devotion. Managerial and professional occupations are organized around the schema of work devotion, which is a relic of the time when men predominated in high-status occupations and the male-breadwinner/female-homemaker model predominated in society (Blair-Loy 2003). This schema requires that managers and professionals make immense time, energy, and emotional commitments to their careers. In effect, the schema of work devotion defines these careers as a calling or vocation that demands single-minded allegiance and gives meaning and purpose to
life. This definition is embedded in most firms’ policies, practices, and workplace culture, such that that employers and clients expect that managers and professionals will be so dedicated to their jobs that they will not spend significant amounts of time, energy, or emotion on other obligations. It is also subjective and partially internalized—that is, it shapes personal aspirations, identities, and desires—motivating managers and professionals to fulfill the expectations of their employers and clients. Further, coercion may play a role, insofar as “face time” at work is used to screen for valuable, yet hard-to-observe characteristics, such as dedication and ambition (Landers, Rebitzer, and Taylor 1997). The global nature of today’s economy also reinforces the schema of work devotion, in that increased competition has encouraged “organizational anorexia,” putting greater workloads on fewer employees, and extended hours of business that serve other time zones (Duxbury and Higgins 2006). Thus, managerial and professional occupations do not easily accommodate caring roles and, since women have ultimate responsibility for children and household management, these occupations are particularly problematic for them.

At the same time, women executives are subject to the schema of family devotion, which assigns them primary responsibility for childrearing and housework and expects that they derive fulfillment exclusively from the creativity and intimacy of practicing intensive mothering (Blair-Loy 2003). Intensive mothering sets high standards for maternal childcare: the “best” childrearing methods are child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, laborious, and financially expensive (Hays 1996). Combined with the concerted cultivation practiced by middle-class parents—whereby they are heavily involved in structuring and orchestrating children’s leisure time, engage in a steady dialogue with children, and mediate their children’s interactions with institutions to secure personalized treatment for them (Lareau 2003)—the schema of family devotion implies that mothers in managerial and professional occupations have a particularly heavy load when it comes to their caring roles. Indeed, previous research demonstrates that highly-educated mothers not only spend more time with children, they do more enriching activities with them, such as reading as opposed to watching television (Craig 2006; Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg 2004). Importantly, Sayer, Gauthier, and Furstenberg (2004) provide evidence that the positive effect of socioeconomic status on maternal time with children stems from distinct norms about parenting,
rather than differences in the availability of time. They find that the negative effect of less education on mothers’ time with children is similar in Italy, Norway, and Canada, despite substantial cross-national differences in levels of economic support and services for families. They also find that highly-educated mothers in Norway and Germany spend more time with children than do less-educated mothers, despite family policies designed to equalize resources among families.

According to Blair-Loy (2003), the clash of the normative definitions of a good worker and mother among executive women create moral dilemmas and distress, in which they feel torn between two deeply compelling, yet incompatible, cultural models of right action (Blair-Loy 2003). Since both schemas of devotion carry expectations that women dedicate themselves completely to their respective projects (i.e., work or motherhood), and time is a scarce commodity, they may also engender heightened perceptions of time pressure among mothers in managerial and professional occupations. To test this hypothesis, I include interaction terms involving occupation, gender, and parental status in multivariate models predicting time pressure. Further, using work-family conflict as a proxy for competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas, I evaluate its contribution to time pressure among mothers in managerial and professional occupations.

19 Methodology

19.1 Data and Analytic Sample

This study uses confidential data from Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (GSS), conducted by telephone by Statistics Canada from June to October 2006. The target population includes all people aged 15 years and older, living in private households in one of Canada’s ten provinces. Eligible respondents were randomly selected using a random digit dialing method, and 68% of them ultimately participated in the GSS. For the purposes of this study, I focus on respondents who were aged 18 to 54 years at the time of the interview, mainly employed by others (i.e., not self-employed or unpaid family workers) in the past year, and either married/cohabiting or single parents. Respondents with these characteristics are selected because they are likely to have both
Questions about job-related demands and resources were not asked of respondents who were mainly self-employed or unpaid family workers in the past year; these cases are excluded from the analytic sample. Respondents with missing values (i.e., refusal to respond or responses of “don’t know”) on any of the relevant variables, with the exception of personal income, are excluded from the analytic sample, yielding a final working sample of 6,617. To address missing values on personal income, multiple imputation with five iterations is used for all analyses involving that variable. All analyses are performed on data that are weighted with person and bootstrap weights provided by Statistics Canada, such that the sample can be considered representative of the target population and variance estimates can be considered reliable.

I specifically selected Cycle 20 of the GSS for my analyses because it is one of the few large-scale, nationally representative, and publicly available datasets in Canada that includes questions about time pressure, work and family conditions, and the work-family interface. One feature of the survey that is both a benefit and drawback in the context of this study is that it is primarily designed for monitoring changes in family life over time (e.g., departure from the parental home; family-formation and fertility intentions; marital/union status; births and adoptions; financial support agreements or arrangements for children and ex-spouse/partner; work history and maternity/parental leaves). For this reason, it includes many home-related variables that are relevant to time pressure. However, while information is collected on aspects

39 Although prime ages for employment and childbearing/rearing are 25 to 54 years, younger respondents are considered because earning and caring roles tend to occur relatively early among lower-status populations (Ammons and Kelly 2008; Tézli and Gauthier 2009).

40 Access to the confidential data used in this study is governed by Statistics Canada’s Research Data Centre (RDC) program. This program allows academic researchers with approved projects to access the data they have requested in secure facilities located on university campuses. Any statistical output produced therein can only be removed after being vetted by a local Statistics Canada employee, known as an Analyst, to ensure that it preserves respondent confidentiality.

Through use of RDC data, this research was supported by funds to the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI), and Statistics Canada. Although the research and analysis are based on data from Statistics Canada, the opinions expressed do not represent the views of Statistics Canada.
of respondents’ main activities and (paid) work, the survey is somewhat limited with respect to information on work-role characteristics—including authority, autonomy, and job pressures. Also, the cycle of the GSS that is used in this study does not include measures of time spent on housework and/or childcare, as such information is instead collected as part of other cycles pertaining specifically to time use. Data from the most recent cycle of the GSS on time pressure—Cycle 24, conducted in 2010—were not used here because questions pertaining to time pressure require yes/no answers, rather than indicating the frequency of feelings within a specified period of time, and they lack internal logic and consistency when used together to create a scale (Tézli and Gauthier 2009). Also, fewer measures of job- and home-related demands beyond those pertaining specifically to time use are available in that cycle.

19.2 Outcomes

19.2.1 Time Pressure

Time pressure is identified from responses to four questions: “In the past 12 months…How often did you feel that you had not accomplished what you had set out to do during the day? How often did you feel under stress trying to accomplish more than you can handle? How often did you feel you did not have time for fun? How often did you feel under stress because you did not have enough time?” Response choices are (0) “never,” (1) “sometimes,” (2) “most of the time,” and (3) “all of the time.” An index is created by taking an average of responses to these questions, with higher scores indicating greater time shortage (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.761). Table 4-1 reports the distribution of responses to each time-pressure item by gender and parental status.

41 Similar items have been used by Roxburgh (2002) to measure time pressure.
Table 4-1. Distribution of Responses to Time Pressure Items and Index by Gender and Parental Status (Percentages, unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Childless (n = 1,337)</th>
<th>Men Fathers (n = 1,747)</th>
<th>Women Childless (n=1,251)</th>
<th>Women Mothers (n = 2,282)</th>
<th>Total (n = 6,617)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often did you feel that you did not accomplish what you set out to do during the day?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often did you feel under stress trying to accomplish more than you can handle?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often did you feel that you did not have time for fun?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the past 12 months, how often did you feel under stress because you did not have enough time?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Never</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sometimes</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Most of the time</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) All of the time</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.559</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>2.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronbach's Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.3 Focal Predictors

19.3.1 Occupation

Information on the National Occupational Classification for Statistics (NOC-S) 2001 is used to create three occupational groups: “manager”; “professional”; “non-professional.” This simple coding scheme for occupation is used for two reasons. First, the central hypothesis that is examined here regarding the interacting effects of occupation, gender, and parenthood on time pressure pertains to mothers in higher-status occupations, making the distinction between managerial and professional occupations, on one hand, and all other (‘non-professional’) occupations, on the other hand, the crucial one. Second, it is necessary to collapse non-professional occupations into one category because otherwise there is not a sufficient number of respondents in certain male-dominated occupational sub-groups (e.g., “trades, transportation and equipment operations and related occupations” and “occupations unique to primary industries, processing and manufacturing”) to investigate gender- and parenthood-contingent effects on time pressure, especially when the moderating effects of these variables on the relationship between work and family conditions and time pressure (i.e., four-way interaction terms) are considered.

19.3.2 Gender

Female is coded as one and male is coded as zero.

19.3.3 Parental Status

Parental status, as used in this study, refers to the presence/absence of resident birth, adopted, and/or step-children of any age and marital status living in the household on a regular basis. Respondents who currently have no co-resident children are considered to be “childless,” although they may well have a child/ren living elsewhere (e.g., with a former spouse/partner or, if grown, on their own).
19.4 Work Conditions

19.4.1 Job-Related Demands

*Time-Based Demands.* Two variables measure time-based demands in the work domain: **work hours** and **non-standard work hours/schedules.** Information about work hours comes from a question about how many hours the respondent usually works at all jobs in a week. Responses to this question are coded as (0) less than 30 hours, (1) 30 to 39 hours, (2) 40 to 49 hours, and (3) 50 or more hours (‘overwork’) (Cha and Weeden 2014). In multivariate analyses, “less than 30 hours” serves as the reference category.

Information about non-standard work hours/schedules comes from the question, “Which of the following best describes the hours you usually work at your main job…A regular daytime schedule or shift? A regular evening shift? A regular night shift? A rotating shift (one that changes periodically from days to evenings or to nights? A split shift (one consisting of two or more distinct periods each day)? A compressed work week? On call or casual? An irregular schedule?” Non-standard work hours/schedules are coded as (0) regular daytime schedule/shift or compressed workweek, (1) regular evening or night shift, and (3) other non-standard work hours/schedule, after preliminary analyses revealed that distinctions among the latter are not predictive of time pressure. In multivariate analyses, non-standard work hours/schedules is represented by a two dummy variables, for which regular daytime schedule/shift or compressed workweek serves as the reference category.

*Strain-Based Demands.* Workaholism measures strain-based demands in the work domain. Workaholism is identified from responses to the question, “Do you consider yourself a workaholic.” Respondents who answer “no” to this question receive a code of zero and those who answer “yes” receive a code of one.

---

42 Three additional strain-based work demands were also considered in early analyses: job insecurity, multiple jobs, and any work hours done at home (excluding overtime). However, they did not significantly affect time pressure, and were therefore dropped from subsequent analyses.
19.4.2 Job-Related Resources

Three work resources are assessed: **income**, **schedule flexibility**, **part-time work options**, and **number of leave options**. Income refers to respondents’ best estimates of their total personal income before deductions from all sources in the past year. Respondents’ access to schedule flexibility is identified from responses to the question, “Do you have a flexible schedule that allows you to choose the time you begin and end your work day? Respondents who answer “no” to this question receive a code of zero and those who answer “yes” receive a code of one.

Whether respondents have the employer-provided option to work part-time is identified from the question, “Does your employer provide you with the option to work part-time?” Responses choices are (1) yes and (0) no. Similarly, whether respondents have the employer-provided option/s to take leave for familial or personal reasons is identified from four questions: “Does your employer provide you with the ability…to take leave, paid or unpaid, to care for your children? To take leave, paid or unpaid, for care of your spouse or partner? To take leave, paid or unpaid, for the care of other family members? To take extended leave without pay for personal reasons (e.g., being home with child/ren, caring for family member, doing personal projects)?” Response choices are (1) yes and (0) no, and they are added up to create an index representing the number of leave options available to respondents.

19.5 Family Conditions

19.5.1 Home-Related Demands

*Time-Based Demands.* Four variables measure time-based demands in the family domain: **number of children in the household; presence of a preschool-aged child/ren in the household; any help provided to an adult relative/s in the past month; and any help provided to a friend/s in the past month.** Since the GSS does not contain direct information on the amount of time spent caring for children, I follow the convention in work-family research of using the number of children in the household and the age of the youngest child in the household as a proxy. The number of co-resident birth, adopted, and/or step-children of any age and marital status ranges from zero to a cap of ten or more. The presence of a preschool-aged child/ren is determined from information on the age of the youngest child in the household. This variable is
coded as zero, if there is no child/ren under the age of 5, and one, if there is at least one child under the age of 5.

Whether any help was provided to an adult relative/s or friend/s in the past month is determined from responses to a series of questions: “In the past month, did you help anyone...by doing domestic work, home maintenance or outdoor work? By providing transportation or running errands? By helping with child care? By teaching, coaching or giving practical advice? By providing emotional support? By helping in some other way?” Responses of “no” to all of these questions correspond to a code of zero (i.e., not providing any help), and responses of “yes” to at least one of these questions correspond to a code of zero (i.e., providing some help). Responses to the question, “Who did you help—Were they a relative? A friend?,” are then used to determine to whom help was provided and, therefore, whether a code of zero or one is warranted on each variable.

Strain-Based Demands. Four variables are used to measure strain-based demands in the family domain: single parenthood, dissatisfaction with one’s (main) childcare arrangement/program, and household member/s with a health condition/s. Information on the presence of a child/ren in the household is combined with information on marital status to distinguish single parents. Spousal overwork is determined from information on spouse/partner’s usual weekly work hours, with 50 or more work hours per week being considered ‘overwork’ (Cha and Weeden 2014). Spousal overwork is coded as (1) yes and (0) no. Dissatisfaction with one’s childcare arrangement/program is identified from responses to two questions: “Is there anything you would change with the child-care program?” and “If you could choose, would you prefer to use another type of child-care for your child/ren?” A response of “yes” to either of these questions is coded as one, and a response of “no” to both of these questions is coded as zero.

The presence of a household member/s with a health condition/s is identified from responses to the question: “Does any other [household] member have any difficulty hearing,

---

43 Spouse/partner’s work hours, particularly overwork, was initially considered as another strain-based family demand. However, preliminary analyses revealed that it is not predictive of time pressure, so it is dropped from subsequent analyses.
seeing, communicating, walking, climbing stairs, bending, learning or doing similar activities?”
Response choices of “yes” and “no” are coded as one and zero, respectively.

19.5.2 Home-Related Resources

Social support from family, friends, and local community from five variables: **number of emotionally-close relatives and friends, (geographic) proximity of most relatives and friends, and sense of belonging to one’s local community.** The number of relatives and friends to whom respondents feel emotionally close is identified from responses to the questions, respectively: “How many relatives do you have who you feel at ease with, can talk to about what is on your mind, and call on if you needed help?” and “How many friends do you have who you feel at ease with, can talk to about what is on your mind, and call on if you needed help?” Whether most of respondents’ relatives and friends live nearby is identified from responses to two questions, respectively: “Do most of your relatives live in the same city or region as you?” and “Do most of your friends live in the same region as you?” Responses to these questions are coded as (1) yes and (0) no. Sense of belonging to one’s local community is identified from responses to the question: “How would you describe your sense of belonging to your local community?” Response choices are “very strong,” “somewhat strong,” “somewhat weak,” “very weak,” and “no opinion.” Since preliminary analyses revealed that only the distinction between very strong and all others is relevant to time pressure, sense of belonging is coded dichotomously.

19.6 Work-Family Conflict

*Work-to-Family Conflict.* Consistent with the prevailing definition of work-family conflict as a form of inter-role conflict in which the responsibilities of the work and family roles are mutually incompatible, such that participation in one role is hampered by participation in the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell 1985), the following two items are used to measure work-to-family conflict: “In the past 12 months, how often have you come home from work too tired to do the chores that needed to be done?” and “In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to fulfill family responsibilities because of the amount of time you spent on your job? (Please
include responsibilities concerning your spouse and child/ren, if it applies, as well as your own parents, siblings and other related persons.)”44 Response choices are coded as (0) “never,” (1) “sometimes,” (2) “most of the time,” and (3) “all of the time.” Responses to these questions are averaged to create an index, with a higher score indicating more work-to-family conflict. The Spearman-Brown reliability estimate for the work-to-family conflict index is 0.600,45 and factor analysis reveals that the items making up this index load strongly on one underlying factor.

**Family-to-Work Conflict.** Two items are used to measure family-to-work conflict: “In the past 12 months, how often have you arrived at work too tired to function well because of the household work you had done?” and “In the past 12 months, how often has it been difficult to concentrate or fulfill your work responsibilities because of your family responsibilities?”46 Response choices are “never,” “sometimes,” “most of the time,” and “all of the time.” When these response choices are coded from zero (corresponding to never) to three (corresponding to all of the time) and then averaged, the resulting index has a heavy positive skew. Responses to these questions are averaged to create an index, with a higher score indicating more family-to-work conflict. The Spearman-Brown reliability estimate for the family-to-work conflict index is 0.694, and factor analysis reveals that the items making up this index load strongly on one underlying factor.

---

44 The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) module on Family and Changing Gender Roles for 2012 uses the same questions as measures of work-to-family conflict. Further, using conceptualizations that are consistent with the current literature, Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996: 410) developed and validated a short, self-report scale of work-to-family conflict. Among the 5 items included in the work-to-family conflict scale were two that echo the ones used here: “Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me” and “The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.” Voydanoff (2005), among other work-family scholars, has used questions regarding the frequency with which respondents’ jobs reduced their time and energy such that it limited their ability to complete home tasks in measuring work-to-family conflict.

45 The Spearman-Brown reliability estimate is reported here because it is a more accurate reflection of the true reliability of a two-item scale than the more commonly used Cronbach’s coefficient alpha or the suggested alternative, the Pearson correlation coefficient (Eisinga, Grotenhuis, and Pelzer 2013).

46 The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) module on Family and Changing Gender Roles for 2012 uses the same questions as measures of family-to-work conflict. These items are also similar to those used in other research on family-to-work conflict (e.g., Voydanoff 2005).
19.7 Socio-Demographic Controls

Several control variables are included because these demographic characteristics are likely to influence the outcome, occupation, work and family conditions, and the associations among them.

19.7.1 Age

Age in years is coded continuously.

19.7.2 Visible-Minority Status

Visible-minority status is identified from a variable derived by Statistics Canada from responses to questions about racial/cultural-group membership. As per the Census definition, non-visible minority includes single-origin White, single-origin Aboriginal, and multiple-origin White/Latin American, White/Arab, and White/West Asian. Conversely, visible minority includes single-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Southeast Asian, Arab, West Asian, Japanese, and Korean. It also includes multiple-origin Chinese, South Asian, Black, Filipino, Southeast Asian, Japanese, and Korean as well as multiple-origin Latin American, Arab, and West Asian with only non-White origins. In multivariate analyses, non-visible minority serves as the reference category.

19.7.3 Province/Region of Residence

Province/region of residence is coded as (0) Ontario, (1) Quebec, (2) British Columbia, (3) Atlantic Provinces (i.e., Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick), and (4) Prairie Provinces (i.e., Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta). In multivariate analyses, province/region of residence is represented by four dummy variables, for which Ontario serves as the reference category.
19.7.4 Education

Education is identified from information on the highest level of education attained by respondents at the time of the interview. It is coded as (1) “post-graduate or advanced degree,” (2) “university degree,” and (3) “less than a university degree.” In multivariate analyses, education is represented by two dummy variables, for which the modal group of less than a university degree serves as the reference.

19.8 Plan of Analyses

After presenting the descriptive statistics for all measures by gender and parental status (see Table 4-2), the analyses proceed in three parts. The first part examines distribution of job- and home-based demands and resources as well as work-family conflict across occupation, gender, and parenthood and—where appropriate—across groups defined by these statuses in interaction. This is important because the demands and resources perspective suggests that unequal distributions of work and family conditions in these regards might translate to occupation-, gender-, and parenthood-based differences—additively or interactively—in levels of time pressure. This is done using ordinary least squares (OLS) or logistic regression techniques (as appropriate) in which each work and family condition and each direction of work-family conflict is regressed on occupation, gender, and parental status while also controlling for socio-demographic characteristics (see Tables 3 through 5). Interaction terms involving occupation and gender, occupation and parental status, gender and parental status, and occupation, gender, and parental status are included in these models only when they are statistically significant (or implied by a higher-order interaction term/s that is/are statistically significant).

The second part uses OLS regression to document baseline levels of time pressure across groups defined by the interacting statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood, net of socio-demographic characteristics. This step is designed to address the fundamental research question

47 Comparing the $R^2$ corresponding to a model for time pressure that includes the main effects of occupation, gender, and parental status and two-way interactions involving occupation and gender, occupation and parental status, and gender and parental status (plus socio-demographic controls) to the $R^2$ corresponding to the preceding model for time pressure with the addition of three-way interaction effects of occupation, gender, and parenthood on
about the association between occupation, gender, and parenthood in interaction and time pressure (Model 1 in Table 4-6). Specifically, Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and motherhood among women executives suggests that they are at particular risk for time pressure, given their competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas. The association between the interacting statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood, on one hand, and time pressure, on the other hand, that is documented here enables me to determine whether this is indeed the case using population data.

Subsequent analyses focus on determining the relevance of the different mechanisms suggested by the demands and resources perceptive, as well as by Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and motherhood among women executives, as giving rise to that focal association. I explicitly follow the progressive adjustment modeling strategy set forth by John Mirowsky (2013) in the latest version of the Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health. This is widely accepted strategy for documenting a basic association between two focal variables—or, in this case, between occupation, gender, and parenthood in interaction and time pressure—and then, through a series of separate steps, entering different sets of theoretically determined variables (e.g., work-family conflict) to assess how the initial estimates change. This form of progressive adjustment is intentionally distinct from a modeling strategy that simply enters all variables simultaneously in an initial model because it allows the researcher to evaluate how each specific variable (e.g., work hours) might be influential in the initial focal association. Stated in concrete terms, if the inclusion of any particular variable decreases or increases the size sdof the occupation*gender*parenthood-based differences in time pressure, we can specifically pinpoint that variable as having a mediating or suppression effect. The third part of my analyses therefore attempts to explain the baseline likelihoods of time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood in terms of inequality in the distribution of work and family demands and resources and work-family conflict (Models 2 - 10 in Table 4-6). At each step, I carefully evaluate the change in value and statistical significance of the regression coefficients.

time pressure reveals that gender- and parental status-contingent effects of occupation on time pressure are significant at the p<0.001 level. For this reason, the latter model is retained as the baseline and subsequent models build on it by adding intervening mechanisms: job- and home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict.
Table 4-2. Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables by Gender and Parental Status
(Percentages, unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childless (n = 1,337)</td>
<td>Fathers (n = 1,747)</td>
<td>Childless (n=1,251)</td>
<td>Mothers (n = 2,282)</td>
<td>(n = 6,617)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.559</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>2.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Occupations</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, Transport and</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations Unique to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Industries,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK CONDITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Work Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>42.370</td>
<td>44.162</td>
<td>39.078</td>
<td>36.187</td>
<td>40.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Work Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Daytime</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule/Shift or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Evening or</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Shift</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotating Shift</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Schedule</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$38,686.42</td>
<td>$62,832.70</td>
<td>$32,406.50</td>
<td>$39,083.20</td>
<td>$45,860.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$27,042.62</td>
<td>$40,782.52</td>
<td>$25,660.81</td>
<td>$40,942.61</td>
<td>$38,527.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>63.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option to Work Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leave Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-2 (cont’d). Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables by Gender and Parental Status
(Percentages, unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childless (n = 1,337)</td>
<td>Fathers (n = 1,747)</td>
<td>Childless (n = 1,251)</td>
<td>Mothers (n = 2,282)</td>
<td>Total (n = 6,617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-Based Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in the Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Preschool-Aged Child/ren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Provided to Relative/s in the Past Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Provided to Friend/s in the Past Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strain-Based Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Change Something about Childcare Program/Arrangement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable (Does not use childcare)</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Household Member/s with Health Condition/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Emotionally-Close Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td>5.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.934</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>4.826</td>
<td>4.817</td>
<td>4.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Emotionally-Close Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.360</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>5.280</td>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>4.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.506</td>
<td>4.279</td>
<td>4.309</td>
<td>3.748</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging to the Local Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Strong to Very Weak</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-2 (cont’d). Descriptive Statistics for All Study Variables by Gender and Parental Status
(Percentages, unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>(n = 1,337)</td>
<td>(n = 1,747)</td>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>(n = 1,251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.520</td>
<td>41.170</td>
<td>32.240</td>
<td>40.400</td>
<td>37.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate or Advanced Degree</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a University Degree</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/Region of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that correspond to the occupation*gender*parenthood groups. This form of progressive adjustment dissects the particular contributions of job- and home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict in the association between occupation, gender, and parenthood in interaction and time pressure.

In models 2 and 4, I include job- or home-related demands, respectively, in order to evaluate the work and family demands hypotheses that individuals in higher-status occupations have relatively more of each of these types of demands, which contributes to greater exposure to time pressure among them. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients that correspond to managers and/or professionals. Such results would indicate that the job- or home-related demands added to the baseline model account for (or ‘explain’) at least part of the association between occupation, gender, and parenthood in interaction and time. To reiterate the rational here: Managers and professionals would need to have reported higher levels of job- or home-based demands, and those demands would need to have elevated the risk for exposure to time pressure. Taken together, job- and home-related demands form the linking mechanisms that helps explain why individuals in higher-status occupations might report more time pressure.

Models 3 and 5 add job- or home-related resources, respectively, to the baseline model in order to evaluate the work resource and stress of higher status hypotheses as well as the family resource hypothesis. The work resource hypothesis predicts that individuals in higher-status occupations have more job-related resources, which reduce their exposure to time pressure. Empirical support for the resource hypothesis will be evident if I observe an increase in the regression coefficients corresponding to managers/professionals, meaning that individuals in these occupations would have an even greater degree of exposure to time pressure than estimated in the baseline model were it not for their job-related resources. As a concrete example, managers/professionals should tend to report more schedule flexibility; this might suppress or mask what would otherwise be even higher levels of time pressure. By contrast, the stress of higher status hypothesis predicts that some job-related resources associated with higher-status occupations, such as schedule flexibility, might function as a job-related demands by increasing work-family border permeability and, in that way, role-blurring activities among the individuals.
in these occupations. In turn, these dynamics might tend to elevate levels of time pressure. Empirical support for the stress of higher status hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients corresponding to managers and/or professionals after adjusting for job-related resources, meaning that their greater exposure to time pressure is partly or completely explained by their so-called “resources.” Essentially, this is the same prediction as the demands hypothesis—but it flips the conceptualization of ‘resources’ and challenges it.

The family resource hypothesis predicts that individuals in higher-status occupations have less social support, which increases their exposure to time pressure. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients corresponding to managers and/or professionals after adjusting for home-related resources; that is, greater exposure to time pressure among individuals in these occupations is at least partly explained by their relative lack of social support.

The differential distribution of job- and home-related demands and resources across occupations will imply that any given demand or resource might not necessarily contribute in the same way or to the same extent to the baseline associations between occupational groups stratified by gender and parental status and time pressure. For this reason, after running each of the above models, I conducted extensive post-hoc analyses (not shown) in which I entered each job- and home-related demand and resource individually into the baseline model. These additional steps allowed me to carefully determine and articulate the ways that each job- and home-related demand and resource is indirectly associated with time pressure—and how each might contribute to the relationship between groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood and time pressure. It also allowed me to evaluate the extent of overlap or shared variance among these focal independent variables.

In Model 6, I add all of the job- and home-related demands and resources simultaneously to the baseline model to assess how differences in exposure to time pressure between groups defined by occupation, gender, and parental status fare when these opposing conditions are collectively taken into account. Regression coefficients corresponding to groups that remain statistically significant net of the demands and resources (as well as socio-demographic and household control variables) indicate the relevance of additional work and family conditions.
Models 7 through 9 add work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, separately and then together, to the baseline model in order to evaluate the hypothesis that mothers in managerial and professional occupations are more exposed to time pressure due to their competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas. Empirical support for this hypothesis will be evident if I observe a decrease in the regression coefficients corresponding to mothers in managerial and/or professional occupations, compared to the baseline model.

Finally, in model 10, I add all of the job- and home-related demands and resources, as well as work-family conflict, simultaneously to the baseline model to assess how differences in exposure to time pressure between groups defined by occupation, gender, and parental status fare when these work and family conditions are collectively taken into account. Regression coefficients corresponding to groups that remain statistically significant net of job- and family-related demands and resources and work-family conflict (as well as socio-demographic and household control variables) indicate the relevance of additional work and family conditions.

20 Results

20.1 Occupation, Gender, and Parenthood-Based Differences in Demands, Resources and Work-Family Conflict

Given that inequalities in work and family conditions and work-family conflict are thought to be the primary reasons for differences in time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood, it is necessary to demonstrate the distribution of work and family conditions and work-family conflict by these statuses. Tables 4-3 through 4-5 present the results of OLS and logistic regressions of work and family conditions on occupation, gender, and parenthood and, where applicable, interactions of these statuses, controlling for socio-demographic characteristics. Tests of the statistical significance of the additive and interactive effects of occupation, gender, and parenthood on work and family conditions reveal that all work and family conditions are differentially distributed across groups defined by these statuses, with the exception of sense of belonging to the local community.
Job-Related Demands. First and foremost, in Table 4-3a, the occupational distribution of work hours, overwork, and workaholism is consistent with previous research showing that these job-related demands tend to increase with the status of one’s occupation (Burris 1986; Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Moen et al. 2013). Specifically, managers work longer hours on a weekly basis than non-professionals. Further, both male and female managers are more likely to overwork than male non-professionals, although female managers have a lower relative likelihood of doing so than male managers. Professionals are not significantly different from non-professionals in work hours, but male professionals are more likely to overwork than their non-professional counterparts. Interestingly, parents in managerial occupations are almost as likely to overwork as their childless counterparts, relative to childless non-professionals. However, parents in professional occupations are much less likely to overwork than their childless counterparts, relative to childless non-professionals. The distribution of work hours by gender and parental status are also consistent with previous research showing that women, and mothers in particular, tend to work fewer hours than (childless) men. Fathers work less than one hour more per week than childless men. Both female and (less so) male managers are more likely than male non-professionals to self-identify as workaholics, while professionals are not significantly different from male non-professionals in this regard. Relative to childless non-professionals, childless managers and professionals are more likely, and professionals with children are less likely, to self-identify as workaholics. Managers with children are not significantly different from childless non-professionals in this regard.

Looking at non-standard work hours/schedules, female professionals are more likely to work regular evening or night shifts and other non-standard work hours/schedules than male non-professionals, while female non-professionals and male professionals are less likely to do so. This counterintuitive finding likely reflects pink-collar, professional occupations like nursing, which often require their incumbents to work non-standard work hours/schedules. Male managers are less likely to work non-standard hours/schedules than male non-professionals, while female managers are not significantly different from male non-professionals in this regard.
Table 4-3a. OLS or Logistic Regression of Job-Related Demands on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedules</th>
<th>Weekly Work Hours</th>
<th>Overwork</th>
<th>Overwork</th>
<th>Regular Evening or Night Shift</th>
<th>Other Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedule</th>
<th>Workaholic</th>
<th>Workaholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>e</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>5.300***</td>
<td>2.653***</td>
<td>1.977**</td>
<td>0.455*</td>
<td>0.613**</td>
<td>1.363**</td>
<td>1.591*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1.215***</td>
<td>1.641**</td>
<td>0.221***</td>
<td>0.437***</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1.434**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-3.415***</td>
<td>0.299***</td>
<td>0.341***</td>
<td>0.735**</td>
<td>0.860*</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.798*</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.623***</td>
<td>0.736***</td>
<td>0.878*</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Manager</td>
<td>1.962***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>1.728**</td>
<td>1.728**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Professional</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>3.426***</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.688*</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.929**</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Parent</td>
<td>0.677*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.688*</td>
<td>0.617**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>-4.244***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.677*</td>
<td>0.617**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.929**</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.688*</td>
<td>0.617**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.270***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R Square</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Job-Related Resources.** In Table 4-3b, it can be observed that work resources tend to follow privileged statuses. Specifically, childless managers and professionals earn more on average than childless non-professionals, and managers with children earn significantly more again. Fathers earn more than childless men, while childless women and, more so, mothers earn less. Also, relative to male non-professionals, male managers and professionals are more likely to have schedule flexibility than either their female counterparts or female non-professionals. Fortunately, parents are more likely to have schedule flexibility than childless individuals, and they also tend to have more leave options. Managers and professionals have more leave options than non-professionals, and women have fewer leave options than men. The distribution of part-time work options diverges from the pattern whereby work resources tend to follow privileged statuses—at least with respect to gender. In particular, female professionals and non-professionals both have greater likelihoods of having part-time work options than male non-professionals (as well as male managers and professionals). Similarly, childless women and, less so, mothers are more likely to have part-time work options than childless men (and fathers).

**Home-Related Demands.** In Table 4-4a, it can be seen that both managers and professionals are less likely to be single parents than non-professionals, and women are more likely to be single parents than men. The number of children in the household and the presence of any preschool-aged children are jointly affected by occupation and gender. Specifically, male managers and professionals tend to have more children than male non-professionals, while female managers tend to have fewer children. Female professionals are not significantly different from male non-professionals in this regard, although female non-professionals tend to have more children. While female managers tend to have fewer children in the household, relative to male non-professionals, they are more likely to have a preschool-aged child/ren than either male managers or female non-professionals. Male and female professionals are not significantly different from male non-professionals in the likelihood of having a preschool-aged child/ren. Contrary to the notion that lower-status individuals are more likely to be dissatisfied with childcare than their higher-status counterparts because they often have informal and fragmented arrangements that are prone to break down, professionals are in fact more likely to be dissatisfied with their childcare arrangement/program than non-professionals (or managers). It may be that managers and professionals have higher standards or expectations for the care of their children.
Table 4-3b. OLS or Logistic Regression of Job-Related Resources on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Personal Income</th>
<th>Personal Income</th>
<th>Schedule Flexibility</th>
<th>Part-Time Work Options</th>
<th>Part-Time Work Options</th>
<th>Number of Leave Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$e^b$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>13389.286***</td>
<td>23990.758***</td>
<td>3.766***</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.556***</td>
<td>0.151**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10570.380***</td>
<td>10765.349***</td>
<td>2.347***</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>1.428***</td>
<td>0.160***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1756.181***</td>
<td>-9151.776***</td>
<td>1.197**</td>
<td>2.567***</td>
<td>1.858***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5939.137***</td>
<td>13108.256***</td>
<td>1.122*</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation * Gender</td>
<td>Female Manager</td>
<td>0.451***</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Professional</td>
<td>0.309***</td>
<td>2.092***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation * Parental Status</td>
<td>Manager, Parent</td>
<td>14637.919***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, Parent</td>
<td>500.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Parental Status</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>-12950.903***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.637***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</td>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.423***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>53925.939***</td>
<td>49545.903***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.423***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-4a. OLS or Logistic Regression of Home-Related Demands on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Children in the Household</th>
<th>Preschool-Aged Child/ren in the Household</th>
<th>Provided Help to a Relative/s in Past Month</th>
<th>Provided Help to a Friend/s in Past Month</th>
<th>Single Parent</th>
<th>Would Change Something about Childcare Arrangement/Program</th>
<th>Household Member/s with a Health Condition/s</th>
<th>Household Member/s with a Health Condition/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
<td>e^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.307***</td>
<td>0.672***</td>
<td>2.097***</td>
<td>2.129***</td>
<td>0.828*</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.107*</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>0.807**</td>
<td>1.382***</td>
<td>0.473***</td>
<td>0.748*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.089***</td>
<td>0.559***</td>
<td>1.601***</td>
<td>1.482***</td>
<td>1.194**</td>
<td>1.672***</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1.294***</td>
<td>0.660***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Manager</td>
<td>-0.419***</td>
<td>1.531***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Professional</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Parent</td>
<td>0.626*</td>
<td>0.415**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Parent</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.971**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.715***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td>2.939***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Mother</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>1.455***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e.g., it should be educational and facilitate their development) than non-professionals and, therefore, they are more prone to dissatisfaction with their childcare arrangement/program. Not surprisingly, given women’s ultimate responsibility for children, they are more likely to be dissatisfied with their childcare arrangement/program than men.

In a similar vein, the effects of occupation on the likelihood of having provided help to a relative/s are moderated by parental status. Relative to childless non-professionals, childless managers and parents in non-professional occupations are more likely, and parents in managerial occupations are less likely, to have provided help to a relative/s. It may be that the job-related demands of managerial occupations are so great that, when combined with parenthood, they limit the time and energy left over to provide help to relative/s. Individuals in professional occupations—whether or not they are parents—are not significantly different from childless non-professionals in the likelihood of having provided help to a relative/s. In keeping with traditional gender roles, women are more likely to have provided help to a relative/s than men.

The effects of occupation on the likelihood of having provided help to a friend/s in the past month are conditioned by both gender and parenthood. Specifically, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations, mothers in managerial occupations are the most likely group to have provided help to a friend/s, followed by childless men in managerial occupations and then childless women in non-professional occupations. Fathers and childless women in managerial occupations and fathers in non-professional occupations are less likely to have provided help to a friend/s. Professionals—regardless of gender and parental status—are not significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations when it comes to the likelihood of having provided help to a friend/s.

Previous research shows that members of working-class and poor families also have heightened needs for attentive care because they get sick more often, and they have more chronic conditions, than their middle-class counterparts (Burton, Lein, and Kolak 2005; Heymann 2000 and 2005). Consistent with these findings, childless professionals are less likely to have a household member/s with a health condition/s than childless non-professionals (or managers). However, professionals with children are more likely to have a household member with a health condition than childless non-professionals. Non-professionals with children are also more likely
to have a household member with a health condition than their childless counterparts. (Managers, regardless of parental status, are not significantly different from childless non-professionals in this regard.)

*Home-Related Resources.* Managers tend to have more emotionally-close relatives than non-professionals, while professionals are not significantly different from non-professionals in this regard (see Table 4-4b). This is contrary to qualitative evidence that (white) middle-class families are normatively nuclear. Surprisingly, given women’s traditional role in kin keeping, they are not significantly different from men in the number of emotionally-close relatives. However, parents tend to have more emotionally-close relatives than childless individuals, speaking to the way that parenthood increases family embeddedness and, in the process, social capital. The number of emotionally-close friends is not significantly affected by either occupation or gender, but parents tend to have fewer emotionally-close friends, perhaps because their leisure time is largely occupied with childcare and children’s activities. Professionals are less likely than non-professionals to have most of their relatives living nearby, while managers are not significantly different from non-professionals in this regard. Women and parents are also more likely to have most to their relatives living nearby than men and childless individuals, respectively. Managers and professionals to a lesser extent are less likely to have most of their friends living nearby than non-professionals. Childless women are also less likely to have most of their friends living nearby than childless men, but mothers are more likely than childless men to have most of their friends living nearby. Fathers are not significantly different from their childless counterparts in this regard.

*Work-Family Conflict.* In Table 4-5, it can be seen that the effects of occupation on work-to-family conflict are moderated by both gender and parenthood. Specifically, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations, mothers in managerial occupations tend to report the highest levels of work-to-family conflict, followed by their childless men in managerial occupations and then childless women in non-professional occupations. Fathers in managerial occupations actually experience less work-to-family conflict, as do childless women in managerial occupations. Professionals—regardless of gender and parental status—are not significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations when it comes to work-to-family conflict, nor are mothers and fathers in non-professional occupations.
Table 4-4b. OLS or Logistic Regression of Home-Related Resources on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Emotionally-Close Relatives</th>
<th>Number of Emotionally-Close Friends</th>
<th>Most Relatives Live Nearby</th>
<th>Most Friends Live Nearby</th>
<th>Very Strong Sense of Belonging to One’s Local Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.775***</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.805*</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.749***</td>
<td>0.764**</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>1.142**</td>
<td>0.659***</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>0.734***</td>
<td>-0.640***</td>
<td>1.257***</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>4.659***</td>
<td>4.883***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.843***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R Square</strong></td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-5. OLS Regression of Work-Family Conflict on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-to-Family Conflict</th>
<th>Family-to-Work Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female (Manager)</td>
<td>0.178***</td>
<td>0.098***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent (Non-Professional, Father)</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.184***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female Manager</td>
<td>-0.558**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female Professional</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Parent (Father)</td>
<td>-0.335*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Parent (Father)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td>0.624**</td>
<td>0.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Mother</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>1.395***</td>
<td>0.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R Square</strong></td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast to work-to-family conflict, occupation does not significantly affect family-to-work conflict. However, parents and less so women tend to report higher levels of family-to-work conflict than childless individuals and men, respectively.

20.2 Interaction Effects of Occupation, Gender, and Parental Status on Time Pressure and Intervening Mechanisms

The first model in Table 4-6 shows the baseline distribution of time pressure across the interacting statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood, adjusting for socio-demographic characteristics (see also Figure 4-1). Consistent with the hypothesis that mothers in higher-status occupations are at particular risk of time pressure, due to their competing devotions to

![Figure 4-1. Time Pressure by Occupation, Gender, and Parental Status](image)

Note: Predicted values shown in Figure 4-1 are derived from Model 1 of Table 4-6. The equation is solved using the modal response group on the control variables—age 35 to 44 years, non-visible minority, and Ontario—with the exception of education, for which university degree is used. Solid-coloured bars represent statistically-significant associations.
Table 4-6. OLS Regression of Time Pressure on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, Work and Family Conditions, and Controls

(n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.758*</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.774*</td>
<td>0.677*</td>
<td>0.750*</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.786**</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.338*</td>
<td>0.477*</td>
<td>0.680*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female (Manager)</td>
<td>0.531**</td>
<td>0.571***</td>
<td>0.569***</td>
<td>0.500***</td>
<td>0.509***</td>
<td>0.520***</td>
<td>0.363***</td>
<td>0.484***</td>
<td>0.368***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent (Non-Professional, Father)</td>
<td>0.339***</td>
<td>0.313***</td>
<td>0.429***</td>
<td>0.460***</td>
<td>0.346***</td>
<td>0.409**</td>
<td>0.354***</td>
<td>0.209***</td>
<td>0.279***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation * Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female Manager</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>-0.568</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>-0.411</td>
<td>-0.446</td>
<td>-0.497</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Childless) Female Professional</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation * Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Parent (Father)</td>
<td>-0.542</td>
<td>-0.563</td>
<td>-0.559</td>
<td>-0.495</td>
<td>-0.543</td>
<td>-0.497</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Parent (Father)</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.225*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td>0.992**</td>
<td>0.858*</td>
<td>0.987**</td>
<td>0.921*</td>
<td>1.026*</td>
<td>0.836*</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.952**</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Mother</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORK CONDITIONS**

**Time-Based Demands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Work Hours</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>0.224*</td>
<td>0.595***</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>0.644***</td>
<td>0.269**</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Work Hours/Schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Daytime Schedule/Shift or Compressed Work Week</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Evening or Night Shift</td>
<td>0.269**</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Standard Schedule/Shift</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
<td>0.135*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strain-Based Demands**

| Workaholic | Yes | 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***| 0.915***|
| No | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG |

**Resources**

| Personal Income (per $10,000) | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** | 0.000*** |
| Schedule Flexibility |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Yes | -0.091 | -0.102* | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  | -0.024  |
| No | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG |

**Option to Work Part-Time**

| Yes | -0.132** | -0.115** | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* | -0.086* |
| No | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG | RG |
Table 4-6 (Cont’d). OLS Regression of Time Pressure on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, Work and Family Conditions, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Leave Options</strong></td>
<td>-0.089***</td>
<td>-0.054**</td>
<td>-0.040**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY CONDITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Based Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in the Household</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>0.135***</td>
<td>0.105***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Preschool-Aged Child/ren in the Household</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Provided to Relative/s in the Past Month</td>
<td>0.208***</td>
<td>0.222***</td>
<td>0.130***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Provided to Friend/s in the Past Month</td>
<td>0.219***</td>
<td>0.258***</td>
<td>0.180***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain-Based Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td>0.377***</td>
<td>0.269**</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Change Something about Childcare Program/Arrangement</td>
<td>0.086***</td>
<td>0.744***</td>
<td>0.390***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Household Member/s with Health Condition/s</td>
<td>0.345***</td>
<td>0.293***</td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Emotionally Close Relatives</td>
<td>-0.019***</td>
<td>-0.021***</td>
<td>-0.013**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Emotionally Close Friends</td>
<td>-0.016*</td>
<td>-0.019**</td>
<td>-0.013**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Relatives Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Friends Live in the Same City or Region as Respondent</td>
<td>-0.168**</td>
<td>-0.173**</td>
<td>-0.142**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging to the Local Community</td>
<td>-0.296***</td>
<td>-0.350***</td>
<td>-0.136**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Strong to Very Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family Conflict</td>
<td>0.947***</td>
<td>0.768***</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-Work Conflict</td>
<td>0.980***</td>
<td>0.545***</td>
<td>0.515***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.991***</td>
<td>2.356***</td>
<td>3.094***</td>
<td>2.373***</td>
<td>3.330***</td>
<td>2.345***</td>
<td>1.671***</td>
<td>2.549***</td>
<td>1.674***</td>
<td>1.586***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intensive work and family schemas (Blair-Loy 2003), I find that mothers in managerial occupations report levels of time pressure that are higher by nearly one full point than childless men in non-professional occupations. Surprisingly, mothers in professional occupations are not significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations when it comes to levels of time pressure. However, three other groups do experience significantly higher levels of time pressure than childless men in non-professional mothers—albeit less than mothers in managerial occupations (in descending order): childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. Aligning with previous research, these findings suggest that managerial occupations, being female, and parenthood each engender more time pressure than do non-professional occupations, being male, and childlessness, respectively. Thus, occupation, gender, and parenthood have both additive and multiplicative effects on time pressure.

### 20.2.1 Job-Related Demands and Resources

**Time- and Strain-Based Work Demands.** Model 2 adjusts for the time-based work demands of non-standard work hours/schedules as well the strain-based work demand of workaholism. Working at least 40 hours per week increases time pressure, with ‘overwork’—defined as 50 or more hours per week—being particularly problematic in this regard. Non-standard work hours/schedules also increase time pressure, compared with regular daytime schedules or compressed workweeks, with the positive effects of regular evening or night shifts on time pressure being greater than those of other non-standard work hours/schedules. Self-identifying as a ‘workaholic’ increases time pressure substantially—the magnitude of this variable’s effects on time pressure exceeds those of both time-based work demands.

Taken together, these job-related demands partially account for the relatively high levels of time pressure observed among mothers in managerial occupations. Workaholism is the driving force behind these explanatory effects: that is, the fact that women in managerial occupations—regardless of parental status—are more likely to self-identify as workaholics than men in non-professional occupations (see Table 4-3a) is one reason that they tend to report relatively high
levels of time pressure. Work hours actually have minor suppression effects on time pressure among mothers in managerial occupations that are obscured by the explanatory effects of workaholism. As seen in Table 4-3a, although managers tend to work longer hours on a weekly basis than non-professionals, mothers tend to work fewer hours than childless men. If it were not for their fewer work hours, mothers in managerial occupations would tend to report even higher levels of time pressure than those observed in the baseline model.

Job-related demands—work hours, in particular—also fully account for the relatively high levels of time pressure observed among childless men in managerial occupations and they partially account for the relatively high levels of time pressure observed among fathers in non-professional occupations. Managers tend to work longer hours on a weekly basis, regardless of gender and parental status, and they are more likely to overwork than non-professionals. This fact completely explains why childless men in managerial occupations are observed to report higher levels of time pressure than their counterparts in non-professional occupations in the baseline model. Fathers also tend to work longer hours on a weekly basis than childless men—albeit only slightly more. This fact partially explain why fathers in non-professional occupations are observed to report higher levels of time pressure than their childless counterparts in the baseline model, but it is somewhat offset by the counteracting suppression effects of their lower likelihoods of working non-standard work hours/schedules as parents.

Job-related demands have suppression effects on the regression coefficients corresponding to childless women in managerial occupations as well as childless women and mothers in non-professional occupations. All three of these groups of women would tend to report even higher levels of time pressure were it not for the fact the they tend to work shorter hours on a weekly basis, relative to childless men.

Work Resources. In model 3, the substitution of job-related resources for job-related demands indicates that part-time work options and number of leave options are associated with lower levels of time pressure—although it is noteworthy that the magnitude of their effects is fairly small. However, Table 4-7 reveals that the effects of number of leave options on time pressure are conditional upon occupation, gender, and parenthood. Specifically, each additional leave option decreases time pressure among mothers in managerial occupations by more than
Table 4-7. OLS Regression of Time Pressure on Occupation, Gender, Parental Status, Leave Options, Occupation X Gender X Parental Status X Leave Options, Work and Family Conditions, and Controls (n = 6,617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Parental Status</th>
<th>Occupation * Gender</th>
<th>Occupation * Parental Status</th>
<th>Gender * Parental Status</th>
<th>Occupational * Gender * Parental Status</th>
<th>Work Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Manager, Female</td>
<td>Manager, Parent</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Manager, Mother</td>
<td>Number of Leave Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.509**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>-1.708**</td>
<td>-1.468**</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>Professional, Female</td>
<td>Professional, Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.348</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.864**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.672***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Square 0.356
one point, as compared to childless men in non-professional occupations. Number of leave options also has a stronger, negative effect on time pressure among childless men in managerial occupations and fathers in professional occupations relative to their counterparts in non-professional occupations—albeit not nearly as strong as that among mothers in managerial occupations. Number of leave options also decreases time pressure among childless women and fathers in professional occupations. Conversely, number of leave options increases time pressure among childless women in professional occupations and, much less so, among mothers, fathers, and childless men in professional occupations. Taking the interactive effects of number of leave options*occupation*gender*parenthood into consideration reveals suppression effects on the regression coefficients corresponding to mothers and childless men and women in managerial occupations as well as fathers in professional occupations (net of work and family demands and resources, work-family conflict, and socio-demographic controls). Specifically, mothers in managerial occupations would report more than two points more time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations were it not for their greater number of leave options, related to their parental status and, less so, their occupation. Similarly, childless men in managerial occupations would report one-and-a-half points more time pressure, and childless men in professional occupations would report almost one point more time pressure, than their counterparts in non-professional occupations were it not for their greater number of leave options, related to their occupation. In contrast, childless women in managerial occupations would experience nearly two points less time pressure than their male counterparts in non-professional occupations were it not for their greater number of leave options, related to their occupation—which, counterintuitively, increase time pressure among them.

Returning to Model 3 in Table 4-6, consistent with the stress of higher status hypothesis, income has a positive effect on time pressure, but the magnitude of its effect is negligible. Schedule flexibility does not significantly affect time pressure. Both part-time work options and leave options have suppression effects on the regression coefficient corresponding to mothers in managerial occupations. This owes to the fact that women and mothers in particular are more likely to have part-time options than (childless) men. Also, a greater number of leave options are typically available to managers and parents.
Together, part-time work options and number of leave options also have overall suppression effects on the regression coefficients corresponding to childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. In other words, individuals in these groups would tend to report even higher levels of time pressure than those observed in the baseline model, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations, were it not for the facts that men and managers have more leave options than women and non-professionals, respectively, in the case of childless men in managerial occupations; the fact that women in non-professional occupations are more likely to have part-time work options than their male counterparts, in the case of childless women in non-professional occupations; and the fact that parents have more leave options than childless individuals, in the case of fathers in non-professional occupations.

20.2.2 Home-Related Demands and Resources

*Time- and Strain-Based Family Demands.* Model 4 adjusts the baseline model for the time-based family demands of number of children in the household, presence of a preschool-aged child/ren in the household, and provision of help to relative/s and/or friend/s in the past month as well for the strain-based family demands of single parenthood, dissatisfaction with childcare arrangement/program, and household member/s with a health condition/s. In keeping with their conceptualization as ‘demands,’ all of these family conditions increase time pressure, with the exception of presence of a preschool-aged child/ren in the household. Taken together, home-related demands have overall explanatory effects on the regression coefficient corresponding to mothers in managerial occupations. The higher levels of time pressure observed among mothers in managerial occupations in the baseline model, compared to childless men in non-professional occupations, are partially explained by their greater likelihoods of having provided help to a relative/s and friend/s in the past month, related to their gender in the case of the former predictor and their combination of occupation, gender, and parenthood in the case of the latter predictor; their greater likelihood of being dissatisfied with their childcare arrangement/program, related to their gender; and their greater likelihood of having a household member/s with a health condition/s related to the combination of their gender and parental status. These explanatory
effects are partially offset by the suppression effects of number of children in the household on
the regression coefficient for mothers in managerial occupations. This means that, were it not for
the fact that women in managerial occupations tend to have fewer children, mothers in
managerial occupations would experience even higher levels of time pressure than those
observed in the baseline model, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations.

Home-related demands also have explanatory effects on the regression coefficients
corresponding to childless men in managerial occupations and childless women in non-
professional occupations. This owes to the fact that managers are more likely than non-
professionals to have helped a relative/s and friends/s in the past month, in the case of childless
men in managerial occupations, and to the fact that women are more likely than men to have
helped a relative/s and friend/s in the past month, in the case of childless women in non-
professional occupations.

In contrast, home-related demands have overall suppression effects on the regression
coefficient corresponding to fathers in non-professional occupations. This means that fathers in
non-professional occupations would experience even higher levels of time pressure than those
observed in the baseline model were it not for the fact that men are much less likely than women
to be single parents. These suppression effects are partially counteracted by the explanatory
effects of the greater likelihoods that fathers in non-professional occupations to have provided
help to a relative/s in the past month (as parents).

*Family Resources.* In model 5, the inclusion of family resources indicates that the
numbers of emotionally-close relatives and friends, having most friends living nearby, and a very
strong sense of belonging to the local community are associated with less time pressure. (Having
most relatives living nearby does not significantly affect time pressure.) Taken together, these
family resources have suppression effects on the regression coefficient corresponding to mothers
in managerial occupations. Were it not for their greater number of emotionally-close relatives,
related to their occupation and gender, mothers in managerial occupations would experience
even higher levels of time pressure than those observed in the baseline model, relative to
childless men in non-professional occupations. Family resources also have slight suppression
effects on the regression coefficient corresponding to fathers in non-professional occupations.
Fathers in non-professional occupations would report even higher levels of time pressure than those observed in the baseline model, relative to their childless counterparts, were it not for their greater number of close relatives, related to their parenthood. However, these suppression effects among fathers in non-professional occupations are partially offset by their lesser number of close friends, related to their parental status.

In contrast, family resources have overall explanatory effects on the regression coefficients corresponding to childless women in non-professional occupations and, much less so, childless men in managerial occupations. In the case of childless women in non-professional occupations, this owes to their lesser number of close relatives, related to their childlessness, and their lower likelihood of having most of their friends live nearby as childless women, regardless of occupation. In the case of childless men in managerial occupations, these suppression effects reflect their greater numbers of close relatives, related to their occupation, and friends, related to their childlessness. These suppression effects are mostly offset by the explanatory effects of not having most friends living nearby among childless men in managerial occupations, related to their occupation.

20.2.3 Job- and Home-Related Demands and Resources

In Model 6, I include job- and home-related demands and resources simultaneously to evaluate net differences in time pressure across the interacting statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood. I observe that the regression coefficient corresponding to mothers in managerial occupations is diminished over the baseline model. Mothers in managerial occupations are more likely than childless men in non-professional occupations to (1) self-identify as workaholics, (2) have provided help to a relative/s and/or friend/s in the past month, (3) be dissatisfied with their childcare arrangement/program, and (4) have a household member/s with a health condition/s. The greater endowments of mothers in managerial occupations with these job- and home-related demands partially explain why they tend to report higher levels of time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations. Importantly, the deleterious effects of these work and family demands on time pressure among mothers in managerial occupations outweigh the beneficial effects of their lesser weekly work hours, greater part-time work and leave options,
and fewer children. Yet, if it were not for these work and family ‘resources,’ mothers in managerial occupations would tend to report even higher levels of time pressure than observed in the baseline model, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations.

Similarly, the regression coefficient corresponding to childless women in non-professional occupations is partially explained by job- and home-related demands and resources. This reflects their greater family demands and lesser family resources. Specifically, childless women in non-professional occupations are more likely to have helped a relative/s and friend/s in the past month, they have fewer emotionally-close relatives, and they are less likely to have friends living nearby than their male counterparts. For these reasons, childless women in non-professional occupations tend to report relatively high levels of time pressure. However, the deleterious effects of their greater family demands and lesser family resources on time pressure among childless women in non-professional occupations is partially offset by the beneficial effects of their shorter work hours and greater access to part-time work options.

Interestingly, the regression coefficient corresponding to childless men in managerial occupations is no longer significant in this model, meaning that the higher levels of time pressure observed in the baseline model among childless men in managerial occupations (relative to their non-professional counterparts) is completely explained by their job-related demands and resources. This finding is largely driven by the fact that managers tend to work longer hours on a weekly basis, regardless of gender and parental status, and they are more likely to overwork than non-professionals. The facts that childless men in managerial occupations are more likely to have provided help to a relative/s and friend/s in the past month and they are less likely to have friends living nearby are other reasons—albeit less important ones—that they tend to report relatively higher levels of time pressure. Although childless men in managerial occupations also have more leave options—with stronger, negative effects on time pressure—and more emotionally-close relatives, the beneficial effects of these work and family resources on time pressure are not sufficient to overcome the deleterious effects of their longer work hours and overwork, greater likelihoods of having provided help to relative/s and friend/s, and lower likelihood of having most friends living nearby. Consequently, the overall contribution of job- and home-related demands and resources to the high levels of time pressure observed among
childless men in managerial occupations, relative to their non-professional counterparts, is an explanatory one.

In contrast, the regression coefficient corresponding to fathers in non-professional occupations is enhanced over the baseline model, after taking work demands and resources into account. Fathers in non-professional occupations would tend to report even higher levels of time pressure than those observed in the baseline model were it not for their lower likelihoods of non-standard work hours/schedules and single parenthood and their greater number of leave options. However, these suppression effects are partially offset by their longer work hours and greater likelihoods of having provided help to a relative/s in the past month.

20.2.4 Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict

Given that job- and home-related demands and resources cannot fully account for the interactive effects of occupation, gender, and parenthood on time pressure, Models 7 and 8 include work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, respectively. Each direction of work-family conflict is added to the baseline model by itself because, while the magnitude of their effects on time pressure is nearly equivalent, they make different contributions to explanation of variance in time pressure (as indicated by the improvement in $R^2$) and the association between occupation*gender*parenthood and time pressure.

Looking first at the $R^2$ values corresponding to Models 7 and 8, it can be observed that work-to-family conflict is by far the single most important determinant of time pressure included in this study, followed by family-to-work conflict. Model 10 includes all job- and home-related demands. Here, it can be observed that, while the regression coefficients corresponding to work-to-family and family-to-work conflict are reduced, their strong, positive effects on time pressure persist net of job- and family-related demands and resources. This means that work-to-family and family-to-work conflict capture unique dimensions of the experience of multiple-role combination beyond work and family conditions.

More importantly, looking at the regression coefficients corresponding to mothers in managerial occupations, it can be observed that their higher levels of time pressure, relative to
childless men in non-professional occupations, are completely explained by their greater levels of work-to-family conflict (see Table 4-5). While family-to-work also contributes to the relatively high levels of time pressure observed among mothers in managerial occupations, it does not completely explain them, as does work-to-family conflict. This suggests that it is the work domain that is the ultimate source of time pressure for mothers in managerial occupations; it is the experience of work interfering with family life that largely determines their elevated perceptions of time pressure. Interestingly, the same can be said of childless men in managerial occupations. In this group, however, the influence of work-to-family conflict is likely conflated with long work hours and overwork, since work hours are positively associated with work-to-family conflict (see Chapter 2) and both weekly work hours and the likelihood of overwork are higher among men than women.

Looking at Model 9, the regression coefficients corresponding to childless women and fathers in non-professional occupations are reduced over the baseline model net of work-family conflict. This reflects the facts that childless women in non-professional occupations tend to experience more work-to-family conflict as well as more family-to-work conflict (as women), and fathers in non-professional occupations tend to experience more family-to-work conflict (as fathers). However, even after taking job- and home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict into account in Model 10, childless women and fathers in non-professional occupations tend to report higher levels of time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations. This means that the positive (increasing) effects of womanhood and parenthood on time pressure among non-professionals is explained by predictors beyond work and family demands and resources and work-family conflict.

21 Discussion and Conclusion

Time pressure is central to the work-family interface, in the sense that, if it were not for the fact that time is finite, reconciling earning and caring roles would not amount to a zero-sum game. Time pressure is also central to the work-family interface in the sense that the bounds of time would not be so apparent were it not for the fact that the majority of men and women in North America are now simultaneously engaging in earning and caring roles. Yet time pressure has
rarely been studied as an outcome of the work-family interface, compared to the flagship concept of work-family conflict, even though it similarly has deleterious consequences for personal health and well-being (Milkie et al. 2004; Nomaguchi et al. 2005; Roxburgh 2004 & 2006). The present study addresses this gap in knowledge by examining how and why three key social statuses—occupation, gender, and parenthood—interactively affect the distribution of time pressure in the population. In so doing, the present study makes three main contributions to the work-family literature. First, I document the distribution of time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood in combination. Second, since inequalities between these groups in home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict are thought to be the primary mechanism giving rise to the interactions among occupation, gender, and parenthood and their link to time pressure, I identify the ways that job- and home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict vary significantly across occupation, gender, and parental status (additively and interactively). Third, the contributions of inequalities in job- and home-related demands and resources and work-family conflict to the occupation-, gender-, and parenthood-based distribution of time pressure are demonstrated.

Two explanations for the emergence of time pressure as a contemporary phenomenon, along with two parallel explanations for women’s heightened perceptions of time pressure relative to men and Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and family among women executives, are used as a guiding framework for conceptualizing the distribution of time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parental status and the underlying mechanisms. The structural explanation for the rise in perceptions of time focuses on objective time use, arguing that the increased prevalence of time pressure owes to the fact that most individuals are now combining work and family roles, in the context of heightened work expectations and parenting standards. To the extent that work and home conditions are unequally dispersed across occupations, then, they may contribute to the occupation-, gender-, and parenthood-based distribution of time pressure. Four hypotheses are considered in this regard. The work and family demands hypotheses suggest that managers and professionals are more exposure to time pressure than non-professionals, due to their greater job- and home-related demands (i.e., long work hours and workaholism and heavy investments in parenting), respectively. Similarly, the family resource hypothesis suggests that managers and professionals are more exposed to time pressure
than non-presences, but it is instead attributed to their lesser social support. In contrast, the work resource hypothesis suggests that managers and professionals are less exposed to time pressure than non-professionals, due to their greater work resources (i.e., higher incomes, schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options). While the time availability perspective suggests no gender differences in perceptions of time pressure due to men’s and women’s roughly equal total workloads of paid and unpaid work, the gender perspective suggests that women are more exposed to time pressure than men because they are subject to rigorous social expectations regarding their caring roles as wives and mothers. Combining the vulnerabilities engendered by occupation, gender, and parenthood, Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and family among women executives suggests that mothers in higher-status occupations as managers and professionals are at particular risk of time pressure, due to their competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas.

Consistent with the hypothesis derived from Blair-Loy’s work, I find that time pressure is particularly problematic for mothers in managerial occupations. (Mothers in professional occupations are not significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations in this regard.) These women experience the highest levels of time pressure relative to childless men in non-professional occupations, followed by childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. Aligning with previous research, these findings suggest that managerial occupations, being female, and parenthood each engender more time pressure than do non-professional occupations, being male, and childlessness, respectively—and the combination of these statuses multiples their deleterious effects on time pressure.

Overall, mothers in managerial occupations do not have particularly unfavorable constellation of work and family conditions. They tend to work shorter hours, they have more part-time work and leave options and emotionally-close relatives, and fewer children than childless men in non-professional occupations. If it were not for these facts, mothers in managerial occupations would experience even higher levels of time pressure. Yet they are more likely to self-identify as workaholics, provide help to a relative/s and friend/s, and express dissatisfaction with their childcare arrangement/program, and have a household member/s with a health condition than childless men in non-professional occupations. When this constellation of
work and family conditions is taken into account, the level of time pressure observed among mothers in managerial occupations is reduced by only 15%. However, I find that higher levels of work-to-family conflict among mothers in managerial occupations completely account for their relatively elevated levels of time pressure. This is consistent with the notion from Blair-Loy’s work that women executives have competing devotions to intensive schemas of work and family that each define their respective roles (i.e., worker or mother) as necessitating single-minded dedication. From my findings, it seems that the social expectations associated with the earning and caring roles play a greater role in time pressure among mothers in managerial occupations than actual work and family conditions. Further, I find that family-to-work conflict accounts for very little of the relatively elevated level of time pressure observed among mothers in managerial occupations. Taken together with my finding for work-to-family conflict vis-à-vis time pressure among these women, this finding suggests that it is primarily social expectations regarding the earning role that are problematic for perceptions of time pressure among mothers in managerial occupations.

Beyond mothers in managerial occupations, three other groups of workers experience higher levels of time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations: childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. Long work hours and overwork among childless men in managerial occupations completely account for their relatively elevated level of time pressure—even offsetting the beneficial effects of their greater numbers of leave options and emotionally-close relatives. Childless women in non-professional occupations tend to have unfavorable constellations of work and family conditions, which partially accounts for their relatively elevated levels of time pressure. Specifically, while they have shorter work hours and greater access to part-time work options that their male counterparts, they are more likely to provide help to a relative/s and friend/s, they have fewer emotionally-close relatives, and they are less likely to have most of their friends living nearby. Further, childless women in non-professional occupations tend to report relatively more work-family conflict in both directions. In contrast, fathers in non-professional occupations tend to have favorable constellations of work and family conditions. Although they tend to work longer hours and they are more likely to provide help to a relative/s than their childless counterparts, they have more leave options and they are less likely
to work non-standard hours/schedules and to be single parents. If it were not for this favorable constellation of work and family conditions, fathers in non-professional occupations would experience even higher levels of time pressure. However, fathers in non-professional occupations also tend to report more family-to-work conflict, which partially accounts for their relatively elevated levels of time pressure. Net of work and family conditions and work-family conflict, the only differences in time pressure across groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood that persist involve childless women and fathers in non-professional occupations. This means that predictors beyond the work and family conditions and work-family conflict considered here are relevant to the deleterious effects of womanhood and parenthood on time pressure among non-professionals.

Several limitations of this study should be briefly discussed. First, non-professionals may not experience time pressure in the same way/s as managers and professionals. While non-professionals work shorter hours than do managers and professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004), they are much more likely to work non-standard hours and schedules (Perry-Jenkins et al. 2007), which are often at odds with the rhythms of family and public life. For this reason, an additional conceptualization of time pressure beyond simply not having enough time may be required to accurately capture occupational differences.

Looking at the inverse concept to time pressure—time wealth—Reisch (2001) has identified a number of components, including the chronometric dimension (i.e., having the right amount of time to carry out activities), the chronologic dimension (i.e., having the right time of the day, week, or season according to one’s personal, natural, and social rhythms), the personal time autonomy/sovereignty dimensions (i.e., control over working time and its content), and the synchronization dimension (i.e., time that fits with the time rhythms of family, friends, and the institutions of society). Time wealth, then, is premised on having sufficient and “quality” non-work time (Warren 2003). A related component of time wealth, and one that links to all of the components identified by Reisch, is that non-work time should be available in substantial blocks that can be planned in advance. Irregular or scattered leisure time is not experienced fully as such and, as workers are less able to plan it in advance, they are less able to make arrangements for this time to be spent with family and/or friends. All of these components of time wealth are likely to be related to occupation (Warren 2003).
Given what we know about the work hours and schedules of managers and professionals versus non-professionals, the present study of occupational influences on time pressure may be limited in that it focuses on the chronometric dimension of time. It would be beneficial, then, for future research to consider the synchronization dimension as well.

Second, the use of cross-sectional data limits my capacity to make definitive statements about causal ordering among the focal associations (Schieman and Glavin 2011; Schieman and Young 2011). For example, it is possible that time pressure creates conditions that cause some individuals to select into certain occupations. The same argument can be made about time pressure in relation to certain job- and home-related demands and resources, such as work hours, providing help to a relative/s and/or friend/s, and sense of belonging to the local community. Even so, there are sound theoretical reasons for suspecting that at least some, if not most, of the influence flows in the direction proposed in my analyses. Longitudinal research is needed to more accurately determine these interrelationships over time.

Measurement issues are also an important limitation. The data used here do not contain the full range of work and family conditions that may be antecedents of time pressure. Notably absent are time spent on housework and childcare as well as values about busyness and consumption. Additional measures of job- and home-related demands could also be considered, including job pressures, receiving work-related contact outside of normal working hours, and volunteer activities, as could additional measures of job- and home-related resources, such as job authority, supervisor and/or co-work support, paid help with domestic labour, spouse/partner’s contribution to the household, and support for work obligations (Bellavia and Frone 2005; Schieman and Young 2011). The somewhat low $R^2$ values imply that work, family, and other characteristics beyond the ones considered here contribute to variation in time pressure. It would be worthwhile for future research to investigate the extent to which these characteristics explain the joint influences of occupation, gender, and parenthood on time pressure.

To conclude, my analyses shed light on the association between occupation, gender, and parenthood, on one hand, and time pressure, on the other hand. The findings presented here reveal that mothers in managerial occupations experience the highest levels of time pressure, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations, followed by childless men in
managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. (No other groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood are significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations in this regard.) That mothers in managerial occupations report the most time pressure, and work-to-family conflict completely explains their greater exposure in this regard, is entirely consistent with Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and family among women executives, in which she delineates the competing schemas of work and family devotion with which they struggle. Further, work and family conditions and family-to-work conflict do little in the way of accounting for the relatively elevated levels of time pressure reported by mothers in managerial occupations. This suggests that it is the lofty social expectations associated with paid work (i.e., the schema of work devotion) among these women, rather than actual work and family conditions or social expectations associated with motherhood (i.e., the schema of family devotion), that primarily engenders their high levels of time pressure.

Childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations also experience higher levels of time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations—albeit much less than mothers in managerial occupations. In the case of childless men in managerial occupations, their relatively elevated levels of time pressure are completely explained by their longer work hours and greater likelihood of overwork. Unfavorable constellations of work and family conditions, as well as more work-family conflict (both directions) partially account for the relatively elevated levels of time pressure observed among childless women in non-professional occupations. Childless men in non-professional occupations tend to have favorable constellations of work and family conditions—without which they would experience even higher levels of time pressure. However, they report more work-family conflict, which partially accounts for their relatively elevated levels of time pressure. Overall, the deleterious effects of womanhood and parenthood on time pressure among non-professionals persist net of work and family conditions and work-family conflict, suggesting the relevance of determinants beyond those considered here.
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Chapter 5
Conclusion

As more people are now combining earning and caring roles, work-family issues have come to the fore of both scholarly and public interest. Further, combining earning and caring roles is perhaps more challenging than ever before, as the expectations of both employees and parents have ratcheted up in recent decades. Hence, work-family conflict and time pressure are now pervasive social problems, with potentially serious consequences for individuals’ health and well-being.

Much of what we know about the work-family interface comes from research conducted on samples that are homogeneous with respect to socioeconomic status—typically consisting of managers or professionals, particularly women in these occupations (Bianchi and Milkie 2010; Innstrand, Langballe, and Falkum 2010; Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004). When less homogeneous samples are used, socioeconomic diversity is often controlled statistically and then disregarded (Perry-Jenkins and Turner 2004). Thus, there is a paucity of research that explicitly explores the association between socioeconomic status, on one hand, and work-family conflict and time pressure, on the other hand. This is a significant oversight in the work-family literature because socioeconomic status determines the nature and context of work as well as the circumstances of family life. It follows that socioeconomic status affects the social distribution of job- and home-related demands and resources, which are the primary antecedents of work-family conflict and time pressure (Byron 2005), and, in that way, exposure to work-family conflict and time pressure.

The dissertation at hand is motivated by this important gap in the extant work-family literature. Specifically, using the Stress Process Model (Pearlin 1989 & 1999; Pearlin et al. 1981) as an overarching framework, it has sought to understand how socioeconomic status shapes individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface in Canada through three empirical papers (Chapters 2 through 4). Using confidential data from Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (2006), each chapter assesses and unpacks the association between a focal dimension of socioeconomic status (i.e., occupation or education) and one work-family outcome: work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict, or time pressure. Chapter 2 looks at occupation in
relation to work-to-family conflict, with occupation being chosen as the focal dimension of socioeconomic status here because it also captures job characteristics and working conditions (Shavers 2007). Chapter 3 looks at education in relation to family-to-work conflict, with education being chosen as the focal dimension of socioeconomic status here because it is particularly likely to capture aspects of lifestyle and behavior (Shavers 2007). Chapter 4 considers the influence of occupation—conditional upon gender and parenthood—on time pressure (net of education). The main findings of these chapters are delineated below.

22 Occupation and Work-to-Family Conflict

Occupation has rarely been considered in a meaningful way vis-à-vis work-to-family conflict—that is, across a wide range of occupational groups—in spite of the fact that is should be particularly relevant in this regard, as it determines employees’ job-related demands and resources, which are the primary determinants of work-to-family conflict (Byron 2005). The few studies that have included occupation as a predictor of work-to-family conflict generally reveal that managers and professionals tend to report more work-to-family conflict than non-professionals (e.g., DiRenzo, Greenhaus and Weer 2011; Duxbury and Higgins 2003; Edgell, Ammons, and Dahlin 2012; Schieman et al. 2006; Schieman and Glavin 2008). This pattern is surprising because it runs contrary to prominent theoretical arguments and empirical evidence in the sociological study of stress, social inequality, and mental health that suggest that higher-status individuals should have a distinct advantage in two ways that relate directly to the socioeconomic gradient in well-being: (1) they should be less exposed to stressors (‘differential exposure’) and (2) they should be less vulnerable to the distressing effects of stress exposure due to their greater and more effective resources (‘differential vulnerability’) (Schieman and Glavin 2011). In the first empirical paper (Chapter 2), I look into this paradox, using data from a nationally-representative sample of Canadian workers aged 18 to 54 years who were employed by others in the past year.

Two competing hypotheses regarding the distribution of work-to-family conflict across occupational groups are evaluated. The demands hypothesis proposes that individuals in higher-status occupations as managers and professionals tend to be more exposed to job-related
demands [i.e., long work hours (‘overwork’) and intense forms of job involvement ‘workaholism’)] than their counterparts in lower-status occupations, which, in turn, elevate their exposure to work-to-family conflict. Consequently, the highest levels of work-to-family conflict should be observed among managers and professionals. In contrast, the resource hypothesis suggests that managers and professionals should have lower levels of work-to-family conflict than their counterparts in lower-status occupations, due to their more plentiful job-related resources (i.e., schedule flexibility, part-time work options, and leave options).

The main findings of this paper are fourfold. First, managers and individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations report the highest—and equivalent—levels of work-to-family conflict, relative to their counterparts in administrative occupations. These are groups at the top and bottom of the occupational gradient, respectively. Individuals in trades/transportation occupations report the second high levels of work-to-family conflict, followed by technicians, and lastly professionals. (Individuals in sales and services occupations report comparable levels of work-to-family conflict to their counterparts in administrative occupations.) Second, this pattern is largely driven by the occupational distribution of time-based demands, particularly ‘overwork’ (defined as working 50 or more hours per week). Managers’ and professionals’ greater tendency to overwork is well-known and completely explains their higher levels of work-to-family conflict. Surprisingly, overwork is also fairly common among individuals in lower-status occupations in trades/transportation and the primary- and secondary-sectors—possibly as a means of earning a sufficient income, given a low wage rate. This fact—combined with their greater likelihood of working non-standard hours/schedules—completely explains the higher levels of work-to-family conflict reported by individuals in primary- and secondary-sector occupations. These time-based demands also explain much of the higher levels of work-to-family conflict reported by individuals in trades/transportation occupations, with the balance being explained by their greater tendency to self-identify as ‘workaholics.’ Thus, contrary to the demands hypothesis, individuals at both the top and bottom of the occupational gradient tend to be more exposed to job-related demands (particularly time-based ones), leading to an occupational distribution of work-to-family conflict that is curvilinear.

Third, consistent with the resource hypothesis, managers are more likely to benefit from schedule flexibility, and professionals are more likely to benefit from schedule flexibility, part-
time work and leave options, than their counterparts in lower-status occupations. In the case of professionals, these job-related resources (along with job insecurity, which, counterintuitively, tends to decrease work-to-family conflict) completely offset the negative consequences of their overwork for work-to-family conflict. However, in the case of managers, schedule flexibility does not. Also consistent with the resource hypothesis, the lack of job-related resources among individuals in lower-status occupations in trades/transportation and the primary- and secondary-sectors contributes to their higher levels of work-to-family conflict.

Fourth, technicians’ tendency to report higher levels of work-to-family conflict than their counterparts in administrative occupations is not well accounted for by the job-related demands and resources considered here. Given knowledge of the jobs that make up the occupational group of “technicians,” I have suggested that the interdependence with and responsibility for others that their work entails may contribute to explanation of their greater exposure to work-to-family conflict.

23 Education and Family-to-Work Conflict

Family-to-work conflict has been relatively neglected by previous research, compared to work-to-family conflict, so even less is known about the impact of socioeconomic status on this work-family outcome. Education should be particularly relevant to family-to-work conflict, as it influences the character of family life and, therefore, individuals’ home-related demands and resources, which are the primary determinants of family-to-work conflict (e.g., Byron 2005). Education also influences the relative importance that individuals attribute to their work and family roles, which may, in turn, affect their exposure to the factors that increase the risk of family-to-work conflict. As with occupation in relation to work-to-family conflict, the few studies that have considered education in relation to family-to-work conflict reveal that well-educated individuals tend to report more family-to-work conflict (Dillworth and Kingsbury, 2005 among boomers only; Nomaguchi 2011; Mennino et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005). Again, this pattern runs contrary to the well-established socioeconomic gradient in health and well-being, whereby higher-status individuals are at a distinct advantage in these regards due to both their lesser exposure to stressors and their lesser vulnerability to the stressors to which they are
exposed due to their greater and more effective resources. In the second empirical paper (Chapter 3), I return to this paradox, using data from a nationally-representative sample of Canadian workers aged 18 to 54 years who were either married/cohabiting or single parents.

Two hypotheses regarding the distribution of family-to-work conflict across educational groups are evaluated. The demands hypothesis proposes that individuals with at least a university degree tend to be more exposed to home-related demands (i.e., heavy parental investments in childrearing and spouse/partner’s work-to-family conflict) than their counterparts with less education, which, in turn, elevates their exposure to family-to-work conflict. Consequently, individuals with at least a university degree should be more likely to report family-to-work conflict. The resource hypothesis similarly suggests that individuals with at least a university degree should be more likely to report family-to-work conflict—albeit for a different reason: they may have limited domestic networks due to their greater reliance on paid help and, therefore, less social support, compared to their counterparts with less education.

This chapter has four main findings. First, consistent with previous research on the topic, individuals with higher levels of education (although not individuals with the highest level of education) are more likely to report family-to-work conflict than their counterparts with less education. Specifically, individuals with a university degree or college diploma are more likely to report family-to-work conflict than their counterparts with a high school diploma or less. (Individuals with a post-graduate or advanced degree and individuals with some post-secondary education are equivalent to their counterparts with a high school diploma in this regard.) Second, in the case of individuals with a university degree, this pattern is completely explained by their greater time-based family demands: young children in the household and provision of help to relatives or friends. The family-to-work conflict gap between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less is also partially explained by their greater use childcare and, when they do use childcare, their greater tendency to be dissatisfied with it. Otherwise, individuals with a university degree or college diploma are less likely to have strain-based family demands—namely, single parenthood and a household member with a health condition. Third, consistent with the resource hypothesis, individuals with a university degree or college diploma are less likely to have social support in the form of most relatives and friends living nearby. Counterintuitively, this works in their favor because
these home-based resources actually tend to increase family-to-work conflict—likely because they bring more obligations to get together with relatives and friends and to do so more frequently. However, individuals with a university degree or college diploma tend to have higher incomes, which increase the likelihood of reporting family-to-work conflict among women. This “resource” contributes to their higher likelihoods of reporting family-to-work conflict. Fourth, ultimately, the family-to-work conflict gap between individuals with a college diploma and their counterparts with a high school diploma or less is not fully explained by educational inequalities in home- and job-related demands and resources (or job-related ones either), suggesting the relevance of determinants of family-to-work conflict beyond those considered here.

24 Time Pressure: Are Occupation, Gender, and Parenthood Primary Determinants?

While debate surrounds the question of whether or not working time has increased and, concomitantly, leisure time has decreased since the 1970s, it is well-established that perceptions of time pressure are quite rampant (e.g., Robinson and Godbey 1997). Time pressure is central to the work-family interface, in the sense that, if it were not for the fact that time is finite, reconciling earning and caring roles would not amount to a zero-sum game. Further, the bounds of time would not be so apparent were it not for the fact that the majority of men and women are now simultaneously engaging in earning and caring roles. Even so, time pressure has been less studied than either (objective) time use or work-family conflict. Previous research suggests that three statuses in particular tend to increase exposure to time pressure. Well-educated and affluent people (Hamermesh & Lee 2003; Robinson & Godbey 1997; Roxburgh 2002), women (Gimenez-Nadal and Sevilla-Sanz 2011; Mattingly and Bianchi 2003; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Milkie, Raley, and Bianchi 2009; Robinson and Godbey 1997; Stalker 2014; Tézli and Gauthier 2009), and parents (Robinson and Godbey 1997; Craig and Mullan 2010; Stalker 2014) report relatively more time pressure. Further, Blair-Loy’s (2003) qualitative research on career and family among women executives suggests that occupation, gender, and parenthood may intersect such that mothers in managerial and professional occupations are at particular risk for time pressure, due to their competing devotions to intensive work and family schemas. The third empirical chapter of this dissertation (Chapter 4) examines how and why the (interacting)
statuses of occupation, gender, and parenthood affect individuals’ perceptions of time pressure, using data from a nationally-representative sample of Canadian workers aged 18 to 54 years who were employed by others in the past year and either married/cohabiting or single parents. 49

The main findings of this chapter are dual. First, mothers in managerial occupations report the highest levels of time pressure, relative to childless men in non-professional occupations. Work and family conditions and family-to-work conflict do little in the way of accounting for this finding. However, high levels of work-to-family conflict among mothers in managerial occupations completely explain why they are the most time pressured group. Together, these findings resonate with Blair-Loy’s qualitative research on career and family among women executives. Further, they suggest that it is the lofty social expectations associated with paid work (i.e., the schema of work devotion) among these women, rather than actual work and family conditions or social expectations associated with motherhood (i.e., the schema of family devotion), that primarily engenders their high levels of time pressure. Second, besides mothers in managerial occupations, three other groups report more time pressure than childless men in non-professional occupations: childless men in managerial occupations, childless women in non-professional occupations, and fathers in non-professional occupations. (No other groups defined by occupation, gender, and parenthood are significantly different from childless men in non-professional occupations in this regard.) In the case childless men in managerial occupations, their relatively elevated levels of time pressure are completely explained by their longer work hours and greater likelihood of overwork. Childless women in non-professional occupations report more time pressure in part because they have fewer family resources and more work-family conflict in both directions. Fathers in non-professional occupations report more time pressure partly because they tend to work longer hours, they are more likely to help relatives, they have fewer emotionally-close friends, and they have more family-to-work conflict. Overall, the deleterious effects of womanhood and parenthood on time pressure among non-professionals remain net of work and family conditions and work-family conflict, suggesting the relevance of determinants beyond those considered here.

49 Note that the other empirical papers (Chapters 2 and 3) focused on the unconditional effects of occupation on work-to-family conflict and education on family-to-work conflict, respectively, due to the absence of significant gender- and/or parenthood-moderated effects.
25 Summary of Empirical Chapters

Collectively, these papers confirm the necessity of moving beyond the tendency in work-family research to either ignore socioeconomic diversity by limiting samples to one occupational group or simply control for it statistically in more heterogeneous samples. Socioeconomic status is more informatively viewed as a context that determines individuals’ work and family conditions (and values) and, in that way, their exposure to work-family conflict and time pressure.

My findings are largely consistent with (limited) previous research on socioeconomic status in relation to work-family conflict and time pressure, which demonstrates that higher-status individuals in terms of education, occupation, and/or income are more exposed to these work-family outcomes than their lower-status counterparts. Only in the case of work-to-family conflict do my findings diverge somewhat from this pattern, as individuals in both the highest and lowest occupational groups (i.e., managerial and primary- and secondary-sector occupations) have the greatest and identical exposure to this work-family outcome. Further, I find that the socioeconomic distribution of work-family conflict is invariant across gender and parental status (or, alternatively, the presence of any preschool-aged children in the household). However, gender and parenthood jointly condition the occupational distribution of time pressure, such that mothers in managerial occupations have the greatest exposure (followed by childless men in managerial occupations).  

Job- and home-related demands and resources consistently affect work-family conflict and time pressure across socioeconomic groups, with the exception of leave options in relation to time pressure. However, constellations of job- and home-related demands and resources tend to differ between socioeconomic groups, largely accounting for the observed socioeconomic

\[50\]

How do I account for these divergent findings between work-family outcomes? In the case of work-to-family conflict, it is at least partly a matter of how the two samples are defined. When less restrictive criteria are used for defining the analytical sample (i.e., respondents are not required to be married/cohabiting or single parents), as in the case of work-to-family conflict, the effects of occupation on this work-family outcome are not conditioned by either gender or parenthood (or both). Another possible explanation is that gender differences in perceptions of time pressure are well-established (e.g., Robinson and Godbey 1998; Stalker 2014; Tézli and Gauthier 2009), whereas findings pertaining to the association between gender and each direction of work-family conflict have been highly inconsistent (Bellavia and Frone 2005; e.g., Duxbury and Higgins 1991; Milkie and Peltola 1999; Schieman, Milkie, and Glavin 2009; Voydanoff 2004).
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distributions of work-family conflict and time pressure. It follows that one-size-fits all
government and workplace policies and programs intended to ease earning- and caring-role
combination will inevitably fall short. In order to be effective, these policies and programs must
instead be designed with an understanding of the unique circumstances that give rise to work-
family issues among higher- and lower-status individuals. For example, restructuring work
organizations to provide more flexibility in the hours and manner in which employees work may
mean reducing the emphasis on face time for professionals, allowing them to take full advantage
of their schedule flexibility. In contrast, it may mean providing more leave options for non-
professionals.

26 Limitations

Several limitations of this dissertation deserve mention (or reiteration). First, the use of cross-
sectional data—due to the absence of longitudinal data related to the work-family interface in
Canada at the time the dissertation was begun—means that causal directions are empirically
unclear (Schieman and Glavin 2011; Schieman and Young 2010). For example, it is possible that
work-to-family conflict creates conditions that cause some individuals to select into certain
occupations. The same argument can be made about certain job-related demands and resources, such
as work hours and schedule flexibility (Schieman and Young 2010). Even so, there are sound
theoretical reasons for suspecting that at least some—if not most—of the influence flows in the
direction proposed in my analyses. Ultimately, longitudinal research is needed to more
accurately determine these interrelationships over time.

Second, only two items are available in Cycle 20 of the GSS to measure each direction of
work-family conflict. Although the same items are used in the 2012 International Social Survey
Programme (ISSP) module on Family and Changing Gender Roles, scales that are based on too
few items may lack content and construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability,
with single-item measures being particularly problematic in these regards (Hinkin 1995). However,
the items used to measure each direction of work-family conflict load on a single factor and the
corresponding Spearman-Brown reliability estimates are fairly high, suggesting that their construct
validity and reliability are fairly good.
Third, non-professionals may not experience time pressure in the same way/s as managers and professionals. While non-professionals work shorter hours than do managers and professionals (Cha and Weeden 2014; Jacobs and Gerson 2004), they are much more likely to work non-standard hours and schedules (Perry-Jenkins et al. 2007), which are often at odds with the rhythms of family and public life. This suggests that an additional conceptualization of time pressure beyond simply not having enough time may be required to accurately capture occupational differences in time pressure. Since time pressure as measured here reflects *time shortage*, occupational differences in time pressure may in fact be over- or underestimated.

Fourth, the data used here do not contain the full range of work and family conditions that previous research suggests to be determinants of work-family conflict and/or time pressure. Notable in their absence are the following measures of job-related demands and resources: authority, decision-making latitude, job pressures, receiving work-related contact outside of normal working hours, and supervisor or coworker support (Bellavia and Frone 2005). Also notable in their absence are the following measures of home-related demands and resources: time spent on housework, child- and eldercare; marital issues; children’s problems; frequency of eating out; and use of laundry, housecleaning, and nanny services (Aryee, Fields, and Luk 1999; Baltes and Heydens-Gahir 2003; Dakin and Wampler 2008; Fox and Dwyer 1999; Frone, Russell and Cooper 1992; Grzywacz and Marks 2000; Voydanoff 2005). In addition to these work and family conditions, the data used here lack measures of values pertaining to the relative prioritization of work and family, which previous research has shown to influence perceptions of work-family conflict (Carlson and Kacmar 2000). They also lack measures of values pertaining to busyness and consumption and appraisals of time’s worth, which scholars speculate affect perceptions of time pressure (DeVoe and Pfeffer 2011; Gershuny 2005; Hamermesh and Lee 2003; Linder 1970; Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Schor 1998; Szollos 2009). All told, the absence of these variables may limit knowledge of the mechanisms underlying the observed socioeconomic distributions of work-family conflict and time pressure that can be gleaned from Cycle 20 of the GSS and, in that way, the dissertation at hand.

Fifth, the analytic samples used in this dissertation (as in most work-family studies) are limited to respondents who were employed in the past year because questions about work-family conflict and time pressure are only pertinent to them (Bellavia and Frone 2005). Yet exclusion of
those who are unemployed or otherwise out of the labour market engenders the possibility that the observed socioeconomic distributions of work-family conflict and time pressure reflect sample-selection bias. Research consistently demonstrates that the probability of paid employment increases with education and work experience, particularly for women. Higher-status women are more likely to remain in continuous employment and, when they disrupt their labour force participation around childbirth, they return to work sooner than do lower-status women (Crompton 2006; Crompton and Lyonette 2007; McRae 1993). There is also evidence that lower-status women often quit employment, at least temporarily, when they experience high levels of work-family conflict (Ciabattari 2007; Dodson and Bravo 2005; Glass 1988; Williams and Boushey 2010). When it comes to currently-employed non-professional women, then, researchers may primarily observe those who experience low levels of work-family conflict and time pressure. Schieman, Whitestone, and Van Gundy (2006) make a similar argument—albeit about professional women. They suggest that professional women are in a better position than non-professional women to leave work conditions that produce work-to-family conflict, either by exiting the workforce altogether or dropping down in the occupational hierarchy to a less demanding job (see Becker and Moen 1999). It follows that the positive effects of either a higher or lower socioeconomic position (or both) on work-family conflict and time pressure may be underestimated here, especially for women.

27 Directions for Future Research

The Stress Process Model (Pearlin 1989 & 1999; Pearlin et al. 1981) provides much-needed theoretical and empirical motivation for moving social statuses to the forefront of work-family research. While this model has been fruitfully employed as an overarching framework here for studying socioeconomic status in relation to work-family conflict and time pressure, there is ample room for future research to further explore its implications. Specifically, according to the Stress Process Model, the various structural arrangements in which individuals are embedded influence the meaning and importance that they attribute to stressors and, therefore, their reverberations throughout the stress process. It is values—what is defined as socially good, desirable, prized or something to be eschewed—that ultimately determine the meaning and
importance that individuals attribute to stressors. Since individuals in a given socioeconomic position largely share life conditions, they tend to develop and occupy a similar “habitus”—that is, “…a system of dispositions shared by all individuals who are products of the same conditionings” (Bourdieu 1987: 762, as cited in Crompton 1993: 172; Breen and Rottman 1995).

It follows that values related to the work-family interface may differ by socioeconomic position, contributing to the uneven distribution of work-family conflict and time pressure across groups defined by this status.

In the second and third empirical papers, I have identified values that are likely to both affect work-family conflict and/or time pressure and differ between socioeconomic groups. With respect to work-family conflict, values regarding the relative prioritization of earning and caring roles affect the permeability of work-family boundaries and, in that way, the levels of work-to-family vs. family-to-work conflict. Individuals who value family more highly than work tend to perceive more work-to-family conflict, whereas individuals who value work more highly than family tend perceive more family-to-work conflict (Carlson and Kacmar 2000). There is evidence that values regarding the relative prioritization of earning and caring roles differ by class—at least among women. Professional women tend to orient their lives more around work, whereas their working-class counterparts tend to orient their lives more around family (Walker 1990; see also Burris 1991 and Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds, and Alldred 2003). These class differences in values may contribute to the socioeconomic distribution of work-family conflict.

Values regarding busyness and consumption, and appraisals of time’s worth, may also affect perceptions of time pressure and differ between socioeconomic groups. While the conspicuous consumption of leisure once indicated an upper-class social position, today, it is conspicuous devotion to time-intensive productive activities that signifies high social status (Gershuny 2005; Mattingly and Sayer 2006). Thus, busyness has become a status symbol, leading individuals to boast about their time pressure (Szollos 2009). Individuals are also enmeshed in a work-to-spend culture, with long work hours fueling the time- and money-demanding quest to experience the latest product or service (Mattingly and Sayer 2006; Schor 1998). The well-to-do are more likely to engage in a work-to-spend cycle because they tend to have disproportionately upscaled needs (Schor 1998). Higher-status individuals also perceive time to be more economically valuable than their lower-status counterparts, which increases their
perceptions of time pressure (DeVoe and Pfeffer 2011). Given their higher incomes, this is due to the customary association between value and scarcity and the higher opportunity cost of their time—both in terms of the price of time not spent working and the expanding options available for people during their free time (DeVoe and Pfeffer 2011; Gleick 1999; Hamermesh and Lee 2003).

Unfortunately, the data used in this dissertation do not include measures of values. It is therefore hoped that future research will explore the values discussed above as possible intervening mechanisms in the association between socioeconomic status, on one hand, and work-family conflict and time pressure, on the other hand.

In the context of both the prevailing conceptual model of the work-family interface (Frone, Russell, and Cooper 1992) and the Stress Process Model, work-family conflict and time pressure are secondary stressors, in that they come about as a consequence of job- and home-based demands (i.e., primary stressors) and resources. That is to say that work-family conflict and time pressure are not ultimate stress outcomes (i.e., job and family distress and depression). Given the absence of personal well-being measures in the data used here, this dissertation cannot speak to the consequences of the socioeconomic distributions of work-family conflict and time pressure for job and family distress and depression. Future research should investigate this causal chain, and also consider whether socioeconomic status conditions (or moderates) the effects of work-family conflict and time pressure on personal well-being. Given the socioeconomic differences in values outlined above, there is reason to suspect that the associations between work-family conflict and time pressure, on one hand, and personal well-being, on the other hand, will differ across socioeconomic groups. For example, in light of the positive view of busyness and the work-to-spend culture, both of which are particularly associated with privileged members of society, it can be expected that managers and professionals report more time pressure than non-professionals. However, time pressure is unlikely to have a strong, negative effect on their personal well-being, insofar as busyness is lauded. Indeed, Roxburgh (2004) finds that income moderates the positive relationship between time pressure and depression, such that time pressure is less depressing among the affluent than it is among the less affluent (see also Duxbury and Higgins 2001).
Finally, using longitudinal data, it would be worthwhile for future research to investigate how socioeconomic status influences individuals’ strategies for dealing with work-family issues as they arise over the life course, their successfulness in this regard, and the consequences of their chosen strategies for career, family functioning, and personal well-being. Previous research on these matters—which has focused almost exclusively on professional dual-earner couples—reveals that the strategies they implement in the face of work-family issues are typically gendered, involving women adapting to shifting family circumstances (e.g., motherhood) by changing their priorities and/or career paths: (1) choosing more flexible jobs (typically without opportunities for upward mobility); (2) cycling in and out of the workforce and/or in and out of part-time jobs; (3) being less willing to travel or relocate for work; and (4) generally working fewer hours than men (Rusconi, Moen, and Kaduk 2013; see Becker and Moen 1999; Crompton 2006; Moen and Roehling 2005). Women’s tendency to scale back or exit the workforce, typically when childrearing demands are high, has meant lower wages, pensions, and social security benefits; fewer assets; and greater risks of economic insecurity, particularly in the event of separation/divorce or widowhood (Rusconi et al. 2013). Given the overwhelming focus of previous research on professional couples, it remains unclear whether non-professional couples also implement gendered strategies in the face of work-family issues and, if they do, whether they do so with the same frequency and whether they are the same ones. As Damaske (2011: 11) explains:

Middle-class women have greater financial resources at home, incentives to continue working, and better access to child care, yet also face increased time demands at work and spouses working very long hours. Working-class women may work fewer hours and have spouses who are more available, but they may have fewer resources for child care, less flexibility, and less interesting employment opportunities.

These socioeconomic differences suggest that they women may cope differently with work-family issues. Indeed, Damaske’s small study (n=80) of women in New York City reveals that middle-class women were much more likely to work continuously, whereas working-class women were much more likely to follow interrupted work trajectories. (Middle- and working-class women were equally likely to “pull back” from work, that is, stop working altogether or work only part-time—albeit for different reasons.) Future research should use longitudinal, nationally-representative data from a large sample to confirm these socioeconomic differences in
women’s strategies for dealing with work-family issues. In addition, the successfulness of these strategies and their consequences for work outcomes (e.g., income and career advancement), family functioning, and personal well-being should be considered.
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