Occupational Status, Gender and Work-Family Conflict

Vanessa Wanner Lang

and

Kei Nomaguchi

Department of Sociology

Bowling Green State University

March 5, 2016

Paper submitted to present at the 2016 annual meeting of the Population Association of American (PAA). This research is supported by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) (R24HD050959-01). Corresponding author: Vanessa Wanner Lang (vlang@bgsu.edu).

ABSTRACT

Using data from the 2008 National Study of Changing Work Force (*N* = 3,447), we examine how employed adults' work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC) vary across professional women, professional men, non-professional women, and non-professional men, with a specific focus on variations in demands and resources in work and family domains by occupational status and gender as explanatory factors. Results show that professional women and men report more WFC than their non-professional counterparts largely because of more job demands. In both occupational statuses, men work more hours but experience fewer perceived job demands than women. These factors offset each other and result in little gender difference in WFC within each occupational status. Women, regardless of occupational status, report more FWC. Non-professional men report lowest FWC because of fewer caregiving responsibilities than the other three groups. Professional class show slightly more gender similarity than non-professional class due to more dual-earner partnerships.

Work-family conflict—i.e., individuals' perception that work and family responsibilities interfere with each other—is a common source of stress, or stressor, that has negative health consequences among U.S. working age adults (Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009). Work-family conflict involves two directions: work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Much research has investigated factors that influence each direction of work-family conflict, although more research has focused on WFC than FWC (Bellavia & Frone, 2005; Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). Of the various approaches to WFC and FWC, a major perspective is the demand-resource model (Bakker & Demorouti, 2007; Voydanoff, 2005b), which posits that individuals feel greater WFC or FWC when they experience an imbalance between demands and resources in work and family domains.

Sociological research has emphasized that the levels of stressors people face in daily life, including WFC and FWC, are shaped by their locations within social statuses, such as occupational status and gender, in part because the levels of demands they carry and the levels of resources that are available to them differ by such social locations (Pearlin, 1989; Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009). Recent qualitative studies have emphasized that there are marked disparities in demands and resources in work and family domains by the intersection of occupational status and gender, comparing across professional men, professional women, non-professional men, and non-professional women (Damaske, 2011; Gerstel & Clawson, 2014; Williams, 2010). Surprisingly, however, little research has examined how levels of WFC and FWC vary across these groups. This is a critical gap in the literature because, as Williams (2010) noted, understanding differences in levels and sources of WFC and FWC by occupational status and gender is crucial to better inform policy makers that effective ways to support families in balancing work and family life could differ by social class and gender.

Using data from the 2008 National Study of Changing Workforce (NSCW), this paper examines how levels of WFC and FWC vary across four groups by occupational status and gender—professional women, professional men, non-professional women, and non-professional men. In doing so, we expect that differential levels of demands and resources in the family domain, such as caregiving responsibilities and perceived support, and those in the work domain, such as paid work hours, perceived demands, and job autonomy may explain any differences in the levels of WFC and FWC across the four groups. The findings of this study make important contributions to the literature by showing how disparities in demands and resources shape variations in challenges for balancing work and family responsibilities.

PRIOR RESEARCH

How do levels of WFC and FWC vary across professional women, professional men, non-professional women, and non-professional men? Although little research has examined variation in WFC and FWC by the intersection of occupational status and gender, many studies have investigated variation by occupational status *or* gender in WFC, and, to a lesser extent, FWC. As detailed below, each line of research suggests that variation in WFC and FWC by occupational status and gender is complex.

Disparities in WFC by occupational status have been debated. Some researchers focus on the role of job resources in influencing WFC. Job autonomy, scheduling flexibility, and earnings have been found to be related to less WFC (Voydanoff, 2005a). Because professional jobs are more likely than non-professional jobs to provide these resources, they argue that professional jobs are negatively related to WFC (Anderson, Coffey & Byerly, 2002; Bakker & Geutts, 2004; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999; Williams 2010). In contrast, other researchers have emphasized the role of demands in shaping WFC, especially long work

hours, job authority, perceived job demands. These researchers argue that because higher-status jobs have more job demands, they are related to more WFC, calling WFC "stress of higher status" (Schieman, Whitestone, & Van Gundy, 2006). Little research has examined differences in FWC by occupational status.

Gender differences, too, have been debated. Many researchers have hypothesized that women experience more WFC and FWC, because women have more demands at home (Voydanoff, 2004). At the same time, women are more likely than men to work fewer hours and more likely to use family-friendly benefits, which may offset gender differences in WFC (Nomaguchi, 2009). Empirical findings are mixed. Some studies found that women reported higher WFC (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Hill, 2005; Voydanoff, 2004) and FWC (Dilworth, 2004, Duxbury et el., 1994; Mennino et al., 2005; Grzywacz et al., 2002; Hill 2005; Keene and Reynolds, 2005; Voydanoff, 2005a) than men, but other studies found no gender difference in WFC (Milkie & Peltola, 1999; Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009; Schieman, Whitestone, & Van Gundy, 2006; Voydanoff, 1988) and FWC (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Winslow, 2005).

On the basis of a qualitative study of four occupations in the health care industry, Gerstel and Clawson (2014) argue that men and women in professional jobs are more likely than those with non-professional jobs to maintain the gendered division of work and family responsibilities. This is largely because professional jobs provide scheduling flexibility and women are much more likely than men to use it. Women in a professional job—registered nurses—enjoy control over schedule, reduce work hours, typically have husbands with a professional job, and do most of the family responsibilities. Men in a professional job—physicians—have to put in long work hours, be on-call a lot of time, earn a salary that is high enough to have their wives reduce work

hours to devote more time at home, and thus have fewer family responsibilities. In contrast, non-professional class men and women, despite more traditional attitudes toward gender, practice a more equal share of work and family responsibilities. Men in a non-professional job—EMTs—must share daily child care with their wives, because they need their wives' full financial contribution to family income and yet their wives' jobs, which tend to be non-professional jobs, tend not to provide scheduling flexibility. Nonprofessional men create flexibility in their work schedule by covering up one another's shift among co-workers, while they work longer hours than women, either professional or non-professional. Other researchers have made a similar argument of greater gender equality in the division of labor among non-professional class than professional-class (Usdansky, 2011). In all, according to this perspective, which focuses on job resources such as scheduling flexibility and earnings, professional women may experience the lowest level of WFC and the highest level of FWC, professional men may experience the highest level of WFC and the lowest level of FWC, and non-professional women and men may fall in between.

Yet, as mentioned earlier, other scholars emphasize that demands play a stronger role in shaping WFC and FWC than resources (Schieman, Whitestone, & Van Gundy, 2006). Professional women are more likely than their non-professional counterparts to shoulder more job demands, such as working longer hours and having more responsibilities (Jacob & Gerson, 2004; Williams, 2010). In fact, differences in the levels of job demands or caregiving demands are in part closely related to the levels of resources available in the workplace as well as in the family. The lack of job resources tends to push non-professional women out of the labor force when they have caregiving responsibilities (Budig & Hodges, 2010). As Damaske (2011) noted, lack of family-friendly benefits, such as paid leave, flexible work schedules, as well as lack of

psychological rewards, such as respect from others and sense of accomplishment, make non-professional women feel as if it is not worthy to devote their time in market work at the expense of violating the ideal motherhood or other caregiving responsibilities. Women's dropping out of the labor force results in a more gendered division of labor among the non-professional class than the professional class. Thus, non-professional men are more likely to have stay-at-home spouses than professional men. In contrast, professional men are more likely than their non-professional counterparts to share child care and housework in part because they are more likely in a dual-earner couple (Raley, Bianchi, & Wang, 2012). In all, the demand perspective suggests that non-professional women may experience the lowest level of WFC, whereas non-professional men may experience lowest levels of FWC. Professional men and women may fall in between with more similar levels of WFC and FWC to each other compared to their non-professional counterparts.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Given the current gap in literature examining the intersection of social class (i.e., occupational status) and gender and how is it associated with both WFC and FWC, the present study had two major goals. Our first goal was to examine how WFC and FWC varied across professional women, professional men, non-professional women, and non-professional men among employed U.S. adults. Our second goal was to examine whether differential levels of demands and resources in work and family would explain the differences in the levels of WFC and FWC across the four groups. Two perspectives lead us to the following two contrasting hypotheses. On the basis of job resource perspective, we expected that professional women may experience the lowest level of WFC and the highest level of FWC, professional men may experience the highest level of WFC and the lowest level of FWC, and nonprofessional women

and men may fall in between. Alternatively, on the basis of the demand perspective, we expected that non-professional women may experience the lowest level of WFC, whereas non-professional men may experience lowest levels of FWC. Professional men and women may fall in between with more similar levels of WFC and FWC to each other compared to their non-professional counterparts. All analyses controlled for several characteristics that are related to occupational status, gender, and WFC and FWC. These include age, race-ethnicity, and education (Schieman, Milkie, & Glavin, 2009).

METHODS

Sample

Data were drawn from the 2008 NCSW, a cross-sectional nationally representative sample of employed adults aged 18 or older and focuses on the experiences of work and family for Americans (Families and Work Institute, 2011). It was conducted by Harris Interactive using a questionnaire developed by the Family and Work Institute. The response rate was 54.6%. The total sample size was 3,502. For the present analysis, we excluded 55 respondents who had no information about occupation. The final analytic sample consisted of 826 professional women, 682 professional men, 989 non-professional women, and 950 non-professional men (N = 3,447). To adjust for employed adults in the general U.S. population, we used weighted data. The multiple imputation method outlined by Allison (2001) was used to deal with missing values.

Dependent Measures

Work-to-family conflict (WFC), measured by averaging five questions, asked respondents how frequently they experienced the following: (1) How often have you NOT had enough time for your family or other important people in your life because of your job? (2) How often have you NOT had the energy to do things with your family or other important people in your life

because of your job? (3) How often has work kept you from doing as good a job at home as you could? (4) How often have you NOT been in as good a mood as you would like to be at home because of your job? (5) How often has your job kept you from concentrating on important things in your family or personal life? The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1 = *Never*, 2 = *Rarely*, 3 = *Sometimes*, 4 = *Often*, 5 = *Very often*) with a mean of 2.503 (α = .86).

Family-to-work conflict (FWC) measured by averaging five questions, asked respondents how frequently they experienced the following: (1) How often have you NOT been in as good a mood as you would like to be at work because of your personal or family life?; (2) How often has your family or personal life kept you from doing as good a job at work as you could?; (3) In the past three months, how often has your family or personal life drained you of the energy you needed to do your job?; (4) How often has your family or personal life kept you from concentrating on your job?; (5) "How often have you not had enough time for your job because of your family or personal life? The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1 = *Never*, 2 = *Rarely*, 3 = *Sometimes*, 4 = *Often*, 5 = *Very often*) with a mean of 2.124 (α = .82).

Focal independent variables

The *intersection of occupation and gender* was measured with four dummy variables including professional women (17.69%), professional men (16.98%), non-professional women (29.24%) and non-professional men (36.09%). These were created by using the following two variables. Occupational status was measured by a dichotomous variable where professional-managerial jobs were assigned 1s and non-professional-managerial jobs were assigned 0s. Using the 1990 Census Occupational Classification System, we defined professional-managerial jobs as "Managerial and professional specialty occupations, including "executive, administrative, and managerial occupations", "management-related occupations", and "professional specialty

occupations." Gender was a dichotomous variable where women (46.93%) were assigned 1s and men (53.07%) were assigned 0s.

Independent Measures

Job demands. *Weekly hours of paid work* was measured as respondents' self-report of hours they usually worked each week for all paid jobs. The variable ranged from 1-115 with a mean of 41.302 hours. *Multiple job holding* was a dichotomous variable where those who reported that they had earned money from more than one job, line of work, or business were assigned 1s (18.21%) and others were 0s (81.79%). *Perceived job demands* was a scale created by averaging the following three questions: (1) How often have you felt overwhelmed by how much you had to do at work in the last three months?; (2) During a typical workweek, how often do you have to work on too many tasks at the same time?; (3) During a typical workweek, how often are you interrupted during the work day, making it difficult to get your work done? The variable ranged from 1-5 (1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*) with a mean of 3.25 (α = .79).

Job resources. *Job autonomy* was a scale created by averaging the following five questions: (1) I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job; (2) It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done; (3) I have a lot of say about what happens on my job; (4) My job requires that I be creative; (5) My job lets me use my skills and abilities. The variable ranged from 1-4 (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree) with a mean of 3.19 (α = .77). *Personal earnings* was previous year's annual earnings measured in thousands with a mean of 53.60 (approximately $54,000). *Scheduling flexibility* was measured using the question: "I have the schedule flexibility I need at work to manage my personal and family responsibilities" The variable from ranged 1-4 (1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*) with a mean of 3.28.

Self-employment was a dichotomous variable where those who reported themselves as self-employed or a business owner were assigned 1s (16.82%) and others were assigned 0s (83.18%).

Family demands and resources. *Presence of minor children* was a dichotomous variable where those who were living with at least one child were assigned 1s (44.14%) and others were assigned 0s (55.86%). *Providing elderly care* was a dichotomous variable where those who reported that currently providing "special attention or care for a relative or in-law 65 years old or older—helping with things that were difficult or impossible for them to do themselves" were assigned 1s (17.42%) and others were assigned 0s (82.58%). *Time spent on housework per day* was measured in minutes based on the question, "On average, on days when you're working, about how much time do you spend on home chores—things like cooking, cleaning, repairs, shopping, yard work, and keeping track of money and bills?" The variable ranged from 0-360 with a mean of 142.61. *Partnership type* was measured by three dummy variables including dual-earner partnership (53.59%), one-earner (breadwinner) partnership (13.62%), and single (32.78%) (reference). *Perceived family stress* was measured by the question, "Not thinking about work, how stressful has your personal and family life been in recent months?" The variable ranged from 1-5 (1 = *not stressful at all* to 5 = *extremely stressful*) with a mean of 2.505. *Perceived social support* was measured by the question, "How much do you agree with the following statement: I have the support I need from my family and friends when I have a personal problem?" The variable ranged from 1-4 (1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*) with a mean of 3.627.

Control Measures

Age was measured in years (18-66) with a mean of 41.438. *Race/ethnicity* was measured as four dummy variables including White (69.58%) (reference), Black (10.69%), Hispanic

(13.97%), and other race (5.77%). *Level of education* was measured as an ordered variable indicating the highest year of schooling ranging from 1 = less than high school to 8 = master's, doctoral, or professional degree with a mean of 4.065.

Analytic Strategy

We used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models to assess differences in WFC and FWC across the four groups by the intersection of occupational status and gender. For each dependent variable, we conducted eight models. In Model 1, we included the dummy variables for the intersection of occupation and gender, using professional women as the reference group. In supplemental analyses that were not shown, we rotated the reference category in order to examine differences in WFC or FWC across all groups. Model 2 added the control variables—age, race-ethnicity, and education to Model 1. Models 3 and 4 added objective (the presence of minor children, elderly care, time spent in housework, and partnership type) and subjective (perceived family stress and social support) measures of family demands and resources to Model 2 respectively in order to assess whether differential levels of demands and resources in the family domain explain differences in WFC or FWC by the intersection of occupational status and gender. Models 5, 6, and 7 added job resources and demands to Model 2 respectively to examine how these may explain differences in WFC or FWC by the intersection of occupation and gender. The final model included all the covariates in the analysis. Across models in both analyses, we focused on changes in coefficients for the dummy variables by occupation and gender when demands or resources in the job or family domains were included in the models.

RESULTS

Bivariate Analysis

In Table 1, we presented descriptive statistics for the full sample and means for all variables by the intersection of occupation and gender. Differences in means across all four groups were tested using *t*-tests. Several results are important to highlight. When comparing professional women and men to non-professional men and women, professionals report higher levels of WFC with professional women averaging slightly higher than professional men. In addition, there are no gender differences between non-professional men and women in levels of WFC. When considering FWC, women, regardless of occupational status, have a higher level of FWC than their male counterparts; and non-professional men have the lowest level of FWC. Levels of job and family demands and resources vary markedly across the four groups. For example, on average, non-professional men had the lowest levels of family demands among the four groups. Specifically, non-professional men were less likely than professional women and non-professional women to live with children or provide care for elderly and more likely to have a stay-at-home partner. Finally, perceived job demands were lower among the non-professional class especially non-professional men than the professional class.

Multivariate Results: WFC

Table 2 presents the results from OLS regression models that examined variation in WFC across the four groups. In Model 1, both non-professional men and women reported lower levels of WFC compared to professional women. There was little difference in WFC between professional men and professional women. Supplemental analyses showed that non-professional women reported lower levels of WFC than professional men. There were no significant differences between non-professional men and professional men. In Model 2, we added age,

race/ethnicity and education into the analysis. Age was negatively associated with WFC, such that older people experience less WFC on average than younger people. Higher levels of education were associated with significantly higher levels of WFC than lower levels of education. Adding these control variables did not change the patterns of differences in WFC across the four groups except that differences between non-professional women and professional men were no longer significant. It appears that differences in the levels of education explained the differences in WFC between the two groups.

Model 3, where objective measures of family demands and resources were included, shows that presence of children and providing elderly care were both significant and positively associated with WFC. By including these measures in the model, coefficients for non-professional men became nonsignificant. This suggests that nonprofessional men reported less WFC than professional women largely because of fewer caregiving responsibilities. In contrast, the coefficients for non-professional women changed little or even became slightly larger from Models 2 to 3. This is not surprising because there was little difference between the two groups in care giving responsibilities and non-professional women were more likely than professional women to have more demands such as being single mother and spending more time in housework (Table 1). In Model 4, we added subjective measures of family demands and resources (i.e., family stress and perceived social support) to Model 3. Family stress was positively associated with WFC, whereas perceived social support was negatively associated with WFC. Adding these measures, the absolute values of coefficients for non-professional women increased from b = -.103 to b = -.120. Recall that non-professional women were more likely than professional women to experience family stress and less likely to have social support

(Table 1). Thus, if these characteristics were held constant, non-professional women would have reported even less WFC than professional women.

Turning to job characteristics, in Model 5 we added job resources (i.e., job autonomy, scheduling flexibility, personal earnings, and self-employment) to Model 2. Both job autonomy and scheduling flexibility were significantly associated with less WFC on average. In addition, personal earnings was positively associated with WFC. Controlling for these characteristics, the coefficients for the occupation and gender groups changed little except that lower WFC for non-professional men than that for professional men became significant. If professional men did not have higher levels of job resources (i.e., job autonomy and scheduling flexibility) than non-professional men, they would have experienced higher levels of WFC than non-professional men.

In Model 6, we added objective measures of job demands (i.e., weekly hours of work and multiple jobs) to Model 2. The coefficient for professional men became significant and its sign was negative, suggesting that professional men would have significantly less WFC than professional women, when objective measures of job demands were held constant. Similarly, in supplemental analyses, the coefficient for non-professional men compared to non-professional women was negative and significant. These findings suggest that women in each occupational group would have reported more WFC than their male counterparts if they worked as many hours as their male counterparts did. In addition, differences between non-professional women and professional women were also explained by differences in work hours. Model 7 added perceived job demands to Model 6. When a subjective indicator of job demands as well as objective measures of job demands were controlled for, differences between professional men and women became nonsignificant. In addition, differences between non-professional men and

professional women became nonsignificant again. These results suggest that if work hours as well as perceived job demands were equal, there would be fewer differences in WFC across the four groups except that men with a non-professional job would report more WFC than men with a professional job. In the final model (Model 8) we included all of the covariates. The influence of family and job demands and resources offset each other and result in no differences among the gender and occupational groups.

Multivariate Results: FWC

Table 3 presents the results from OLS regression models that examined variation in FWC across the four groups. In Model 1, non-professional men reported less FWC than professional women, whereas professional men and non-professional women showed little difference from professional women in FWC. In supplemental analyses, we found that non-professional men also reported lower FWC than non-professional women, but differences in FWC between non-professional men and professional men were not significant. In Model 2, we added control variables (age, race/ethnicity, and education). The patterns of differences in FWC across the four groups changed little.

In Model 3, objective family demands/resources (i.e., presence of children, elderly care, housework, and partnership type) were added into the analysis. Having children living in the home and providing elderly care were associated with greater FWC and being in either a dual-earner or a one-earner household was related to less FWC compared to being a single, un-partnered-earner. When examining the coefficients across the four groups, the results indicated that the lower level of FWC among non-professional men compared to professional women and non-professional women was due to differences in family demands. Specifically, as shown in Table 1, non-professional men are less likely than other groups to live with children or provide

care for elderly and more likely to have a stay-at-home partner, all of which are related to less FWC, and when these characteristics were held constant, the lower level of FWC for non-professional men disappeared. In Model 4, subjective indicators of family demands/resources (i.e., family stress and social support) were added into the analysis. Family stress and social support were both significant, where higher levels of family stress was related to more FWC on average and high levels of social support was related to less FWC on average. Presence of children remained significant and both providing elderly care and partnership types lost significance. Adding subjective measures of family demands and resources made little difference in differences in FWC across the four groups compared to adding objective measures of family demands and resources.

In Model 5, job resources (i.e., job autonomy, scheduling flexibility, personal earnings, and self-employment) were added to Model 2. Scheduling flexibility was associated with less FWC and not being self-employed was associated with less FWC. These job resources, however, did not change the patterns of differences in FWC across the four groups. In Model 6, objective job demands (i.e., weekly hours of work and multiple) were added to Model 2. Similar to results found in the previous model (Model 5), the coefficients of the occupation-gender groups did not change much. In Model 7, the subjective measure of job demands (i.e., perceived job demands) was added to Model 6. Model 7 suggests that perceived job demands explained the differences. Perceived job demands were positively related to FWC and, as shown in Table 1, perceived job demands were lower among the non-professional class especially non-professional men than men in the professional class. When perceived job demands in addition to work hours were equal, there was little difference in FWC levels between non-professional men and professional women and men. In the final model (Model 8) all of the covariates were included, the influence

of family and job demands/resources offset each other and resulted in no differences among the gender and occupational groups.

DISCUSSION

Our first research goal was to examine how WFC and FWC varied across professional women, professional men, non-professional women, and non-professional men among employed U.S. adults. Our second goal was to understand if variations in demands and resources in the spheres of work and family explained the differences in WFC and FWC across groups. The present analysis suggests a few key important findings. First, as suggested by Gerstel and Clawson (2014), demands and resources in the job and family domains vary markedly across the four groups and these differences. Second, unlike Gerstel and Clawson (2014), differences in demands, more than differences in resources, are closely related to variations in WFC and FWC across the four groups. These patterns of findings are consistent with Schieman's (Shieman & Glavin, 2011) argument that demands tend to influence WFC. Third, unlike Gerstel and Clawson's research (2014), gender similarities are found slightly more among professional class than non-professional class in part due to higher prevalence of dual-earner partnerships.

Specifically, for WFC, overall, professional jobs, regardless of gender, are positively related to work-to-family conflict largely because of more work hours among women and more perceived job demands among men. In both occupations, men worked more hours but experienced fewer perceived job demands than women. These factors offset each other and resulted in no difference in WFC by gender in each occupational group. Non-professional men experienced less WFC than professional women because of fewer perceived job demands and fewer caregiving responsibilities.

With regard to FWC, women, regardless of occupational status, report more family-to-work conflict. Non-professional men reported the lowest family-to-work conflict, because of the presence of stay-at-home spouses and fewer caregiving responsibilities. Some studies have emphasized the rise of non-professional men's involvement in daily childcare responsibilities due to necessity (Gerstel & Clawson, 2014; Usdansky, 2011). These studies focus on resident fathers. Romantic partnerships—marriage and cohabitation—are more likely to break up among non-professionals than professionals and thus a sizable minority of non-professional fathers do not live with their children (Cherlin, 2010).

The present analysis has limitations that future research should address. First, we used cross-sectional data. It is possible that those who experienced high WFC or FWC might have dropped out of the labor force and thus they were not in our sample. Because non-professional women are more likely than professional women or men regardless of occupational status to drop out of the labor force due to facing more challenges in balancing work and family responsibilities (Budig & Hodges, 2010; Damaske, 2011), it is possible that our findings underestimate levels of WFC and FWC for non-professional women. Second, future research should explore how specific occupations operate with regard to the intersection of gender and occupation and work-family conflict outcomes. For example, among higher status occupations, future research should examine the difference between managerial occupations (e.g., administrators, managers) and professional specialty occupations (e.g., lawyers, teachers) based on gender. With regard to lower status occupations, future research should examine the difference between skilled work (e.g., carpenters, plumbers) and unskilled work (e.g., sales, service) based on gender. Among the higher status occupation comparison, as suggested by Williams (2010), perceptions of WFC and FWC may be higher for those in managerial

occupations due to stress involved in managing other employees compared to professional specialty occupations that are more autonomous. Particularly for lower status occupations, differences may be evident as a result of schedule flexibility. Unskilled workers may have less access to flexible work hours and may experience greater WFC and FWC compared to their skilled labor counterparts.

REFERENCES

Allison, P.D. (2001). *Missing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of management*, *28*(6), 787-810.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, *22*(3), 309-328.

Bakker, Arnold B. and Sabine A. E. Geurts. (2004). "Toward a Dual-Process Model of Work-Home Interference." *Work and Occupations* 31:345–66.

Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(3), 705–725.

Budig, Michelle J. and Melissa J. Hodges. 2010. "Differences in Disadvantage: Variation in the Motherhood Penalty across White Women's Earnings Distribution." *American Sociological Review* 75(5):705-728.

Cherlin, A. J. (2010). Demographic trends in the United States: A review of research in the 2000s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(3), 403-419.

Dilworth, J. E. L. (2004). Predictors of negative spillover from family to work. Journal of Family Issues, 25, 241-261.

Damaske, S. (2011). A "major career woman"? How women develop early expectations about work. *Gender & society*, *25*(4), 409-430.

Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, *76*(1), 60.

Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict a comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of family Issues*, *15*(3), 449-466.

Families and Work Institute. (2011). *National Study of the Changing Workforce. Guide to public-use files.*

Gerstel, N. & Clawson, D. (2014). Class advantage and the gender divide: Flexibility on the job and at home. *American Journal of Sociology,* 120, 395 – 431.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of management review*, *10*(1), 76–88.

Grzywacz, Joseph G., David M. Almeida, and Daniel A. McDonald (2002). "Work–Family Spillover and Daily Reports of Work and Family Stress in the Adult Labor Force." *Family Relations* 51.1: 28-36.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of occupational health psychology*,*5*(1), 111.

Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, *76*(4), 560.

Hill, E. J. (2005). Work-family facilitation and conflict, working fathers and mothers, work-family stressors and support. *Journal of Family issues*, *26*(6), 793-819.

Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2004). *The time divide*. Harvard University Press.

Keene, J. R., & Reynolds, J. R. (2005). The job costs of family demands gender differences in negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*(3), 275-299.

Mennino, S. F., Rubin, B. A., & Brayfield, A. (2005). Home-to-job and job-to-home spillover: The impact of company policies and workplace culture. *Sociological Quarterly*, 46, 107-135.

Milkie, M. A., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work-family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 476-490.

Nomaguchi, Kei M. 2012. "Marital Status, Gender, and Home-to-Job Conflict among Employed Parents." *Journal of Family Issues* 33: 271 – 294.

Nomaguchi, Kei M. (2009). "Change in Work-Family Conflict Among Employed Parents Between 1977 and 1997." *Journal of Marriage and Family 71*: 15 - 32.

Pearlin, L. I. (1989). The sociological study of stress. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 241-256.

Raley, Sara, Suzanne M. Bianchi, and Wendy Wang. 2012. "When Do Fathers Care? Mothers' Economic Contribution and Fathers' Involvement in Child Care." *American Journal of Sociology* 117: 1422-1459

Schieman, Scott and Paul Glavin. 2011. "Education and Work-Family Conflict: Explanations, Contingencies, and Mental Health Consequences." *Social Forces* 89(4):1341-1362.

Schieman, S., Milkie, M. A., & Glavin, P. (2009). When work interferes with life: The social distribution of work-nonwork interference and the influence of work related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review, 74*, 966-988.

Schieman, S., Whitestone, Y. K., & Van Gundy, K. (2006). The nature of work and the stress of higher status. *Journal of health and social behavior*, *47*(3), 242-257.

Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work–family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 6 15. Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *54*(3), 392-415.

Usdansky, Margaret L. 2011. "The Gender Equality Paradox: Social Class, Preferences and Couples' Division of Paid and Unpaid Labor." Journal of Family Theory & Review, 3:163-178.

Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work and family: A review and expanded conceptualization. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*.

Voydanoff, Patricia. (2004). The Effects of Work Demands and Resources on Work-to-Family Conflict and Facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 398-412.

Voydanoff, P. (2005a). Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict Direct and Indirect Relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(6), 707-726.

Voydanoff, P. (2005b). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work–family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 822-836.

Williams, Joan C. (2010). The odd disconnect: Our family-hostile public policy. K. Christensen & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Workplace flexibility: Realigning 20th century jobs for a 21st-century workplace*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press (pp. 196 – 219).

Winslow, Sarah (2005). "Work-family conflict, gender, and parenthood, 1977-1997."*Journal of Family Issues* 26.6: 727-755.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Means for All Variables in the Analysis by Occupation and Gender

	Full Sample			Professional Women	Professional Men		Non-Professional Women		Non-Professional Men	
	Percent/Mean	SD	Range							
Dependent Variables										
Work to Family Conflict	2.503	0.886	1-5	2.594	2.555	*	2.455	***[c]	2.474	***[fi]
Family to Work Conflict	2.124	0.716	1-5	2.161	2.122	*	2.159	[a]	2.077	***[ei]
Focal Independent Variables										
Professional Women	17.69%			----	----		----		----	
Professional Men	16.98%			----	----		----		----	
Non-professional Women	29.24%			----	----		----		----	
Non-professional Men	36.09%			----	----		----		----	
Family Demands/Resources										
Presence of Minor Children[1]	44.14%			0.456	0.452		0.475	[a]	0.401	***[fi]
No Minor Children	55.86%									
Providing Elderly Care	17.42%			0.186	0.177		0.195	[a]	0.149	***[fi]
Not Providing Elderly Care	82.58%									
Housework	142.613	92.770	0-360	151.553	123.552	***	167.462	***[c]	130.693	***[fi]
Single Earner[1]	32.78%			0.285	0.192	***	0.418	***[c]	0.341	***[fi]
Dual-Earner	53.59%			0.631	0.626		0.496	***[c]	0.478	***[f]
One-Earner	13.62%			0.084	0.182	***	0.086		0.180	***[i]
Family Stress	2.505	1.063	1-5	2.576	2.390	***	2.621	*[c]	2.429	***[i]
Social Support	3.627	0.697	1-4	3.718	3.719		3.615	***[c]	3.548	***[fi]
Job Resources										
Job Autonomy	3.193	0.678	1-4	3.348	3.436	***	3.077	***[c]	3.097	***[f]
Scheduling Flexibility	3.278	0.938	1-4	3.330	3.387	***	3.275	**[c]	3.199	***[fi]
Personal Earnings	53.601	67.28	0-1000	55.371	90.780	***	31.916	***[c]	52.961	*[fi]
Self-Employed[1]	16.82%			0.123	0.218	***	0.155	***[c]	0.176	***[fh]
Not Self-Employed	83.18%									
Job Demands										
Perceived Job Demands	3.249	1.076	1-5	3.541	3.511		3.142	***[c]	3.068	***[fi]
Weekly Hours of Work	41.302	13.69	1-115	41.409	46.484	***	37.085	***[c]	43.095	***[fi]
Multiple Jobs[1]	18.21%			0.204	0.204		0.172	***[c]	0.170	***[f]
Not Multiple Jobs	81.79%									
Controls										
Age	41.438	13.070	18-66	43.333	44.385	***	41.018	***[c]	39.488	***[fi]
Education	4.065	2.174	1-8							
White[1]	69.58%			0.710	0.830	***	0.630	***[c]	0.680	[fi]
Black	10.69%			0.090	0.043	***	0.154	***[b]	0.107	**[fi]
Hispanic	13.97%			0.154	0.080	***	0.158	[c]	0.146	
Other	5.77%			0.046	0.046		0.058	*[c]	0.067	***[f]

[1] Indicates reference category

Data are weighted.

Differences from professional women are significant at * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; and *** $p <. 001$ levels.

Differences from professional men are significant at [a] $p < .05$; [b] $p < .01$; and [c] $p <. 001$ levels.

Differences from professional men are significant at [d] $p < .05$; [e] $p < .01$; and [f] $p <. 001$ levels.

Differences from nonprofessional women are significant at [g] $p < .05$; [h] $p < .01$; and [i] $p <. 001$ levels.

Table 2. OLS Regression of Work-to-Family Conflict (WFC)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8	
	b	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Professional Men	-.039	.051	-.043	.051	-.045	.051	.001	.048	-.040	.048	-.123	.050 *	-.083	.046	-.027	.042
Non-professional Women	-.139	.046 **a	-.098	.048 *	-.103	.048 *	-.120	.045 **a	-.139	.045 **b	-.048	.047 e	.050	.043	-.041	.040
Non-professional Men	-.120	.044 **	-.096	.047 *	-.079	.047	-.062	.044	-.170	.044 ***d	-.147	.045 **	.019	.042 c	-.036	.039
Family Demands/Resources																
Presence of Minor Children					.234	.033 ***	.161	.031 ***							.158	.027 ***
Providing Elderly Care					.125	.040 **	.057	.038							.045	.033
Housework					.000	.000	.000	.000							.000	.000
Dual-Earner					-.004	.037	.057	.034							.022	.030
One-Earner					-.065	.051	.002	.048							.031	.041
Family Stress							.269	.014 ***							.198	.012 ***
Social Support							-.136	.021 ***							-.089	.019 ***
Job Resources																
Job Autonomy									-.078	.025 **					-.090	.022 ***
Scheduling Flexibility									-.330	.016 ***					-.215	.015 ***
Personal Earnings									.001	.000 *					.000	.000
Self-Employed									.037	.040					.000	.036
Job Demands																
Perceived Job Demands													.335	.013 ***	.248	.012 ***
Weekly Hours of Work											.016	.001 ***	.010	.001 ***	.009	.001 ***
Multiple Jobs											.049	.038	.033	.035	.024	.032
Controls																
Age			-.008	.001 ***	-.006	.001 ***	-.004	.001 ***	-.007	.001 ***	-.009	.001 ***	-.006	.001 ***	-.003	.001 *
Black			-.072	.050	-.082	.050	-.058	.047	-.062	.047	-.105	.049 *	-.057	.045	-.057	.041
Hispanic			-.011	.048	-.038	.048	.001	.046	-.010	.045	-.001	.046	-.043	.043	-.028	.040
Other			-.052	.066	-.014	.066	.003	.061	-.138	.061 *	-.012	.064	.039	.059	.001	.053
Education			.025	.008 **	.022	.008 **	.020	.008 **	.017	.008 *	.015	.008	.010	.007	.008	.007
Intercept	2.594	.036 ***	2.801	.076 ***	2.665	.083 ***	2.390	.122 ***	4.128	.105 ***	2.223	.083 ***	1.212	.086 ***	2.186	.133 ***
R^2	.004 **		0.02 ***		0.04 ***		0.16 ***		0.15 ***		0.08 ***		0.22 ***		0.38 ***	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Differences between nonprofessional women and professional men were significant at a < .05; b < .01 levels

Differences between nonprofessional men and professional men were significant at c < .05; d < .01 levels

Differences between nonprofessional women and nonprofessional men were significant at e < .01 level

Table 3. OLS Regression of Family-to-Work Conflict (FWC)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8	
	b	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Professional Men	-.039	.042	-.033	.042	-.024	.041	.025	.038	-.042	.042	-.050	.042	-.028	.040	.012	.037
Non-professional Women	-.002	.037 b	.004	.039 b	-.006	.039	-.020	.035	-.014	.040 c	.015	.040 c	.069	.038 ad	.021	.035
Non-professional Men	-.085	.036 *	-.089	.038 *	-.067	.038	-.040	.034	-.117	.038 **	-.100	.038 **	-.008	.037	.000	.034
Family Demands/Resources																
Presence of Minor Children					.193	.027 ***	.123	.024 ***							.120	.024 ***
Providing Elderly Care					.114	.032 ***	.047	.029							.035	.028
Housework					.000	.000	.000	.000							.000	.000
Dual-Earner					-.077	.030 **	-.024	.027							-.035	.026
One-Earner					-.103	.041 *	-.041	.037							-.028	.037
Family Stress							.278	.011 ***							.253	.011 ***
Social Support							-.071	.016 ***							-.053	.016 ***
Job Resources																
Job Autonomy									-.029	.021					.006	.019
Scheduling Flexibility									-.088	.014 ***					-.032	.013 *
Personal Earnings									.000	.000					.000	.000
Self-Employed									.154	.035 ***					.109	.031 ***
Job Demands																
Perceived Job Demands													.186	.012 ***	.124	.011 ***
Weekly Hours of Work											.004	.001 ***	.000	.001	.000	.001
Multiple Jobs											.056	.032	.047	.031	.014	.028
Controls																
Age			-.006	.001 ***	-.005	.001 ***	-.003	.001 **	-.007	.001 ***	-.007	.001 ***	-.005	.001 ***	-.003	.001 **
Black			-.022	.041	-.051	.041	-.010	.037	-.017	.040	-.030	.041	-.003	.039	.006	.036
Hispanic			.042	.037	.013	.037	.064	.033	.044	.036	.044	.037	.021	.035	.048	.033
Other			-.038	.055	-.021	.055	-.002	.049	-.060	.054	-.030	.055	-.002	.053	.015	.048
Education			.009	.007	.009	.007	.007	.006	.008	.007	.006	.007	.003	.006	.004	.006
Intercept	2.161	.029 ***	2.387	.062 ***	2.253	.068 ***	1.716	.095 ***	2.768	.090 ***	2.256	.070 ***	1.695	.075 ***	1.359	.117 ***
R^2	.003 *		.017 ***		.036 ***		.216 ***		.036 ***		.022 ***		.092 ***		.255 ***	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Differences between nonprofessional women and nonprofessional men were significant at a < .05; b < .01; c < .001 level

Differences between nonprofessional women and professional men were significant at d < .05.

There were no differences between professional and nonprofessional men at p < .05.