Making Changes or Feeling Like You Can:
Parents' Time and Control over Work Time in a Changing Workplace

Rachelle Hill
Eric Tranby
Erin Kelly
Phyllis Moen

University of Minnesota
March 2010

Direct correspondence to the first author at hill0896@umn.edu. This research was conducted as part of the Work, Family and Health Network, which is funded by a cooperative agreement through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (Grant # U01HD051217, U01HD051218, U01HD051256, U01HD051276), National Institute on Aging (Grant # U01AG027669), Office of Behavioral and Science Sciences Research, and National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (Grant # U010H008788). The contents of this publication are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of these institutes and offices. Special acknowledgement goes to Extramural Staff Science Collaborator, Rosalind Berkowitz King, Ph.D. (NICHD) and Lynne Casper, Ph.D. for design of the original Workplace, Family, Health and Well-Being Network Initiative. Persons interested in learning more about the Network should go to http://www.kpchr.org/workplacenetwork. We are grateful to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (#2002-6-8) and the Institute for Advanced Studies, University of Minnesota for additional support. Finally, we sincerely thank the employees who participated in this research and the managers who facilitated the study.

ABSTRACT

Though research is prolific on work-family conflict, there is little research demonstrating how employers impact time-use patterns and can effectively support working parents. This study uses data from a natural experiment to investigate the relationships between a culture change initiative (Results Only Work Environment – ROWE), work-time control, time at work and with children, work-time behaviors like telecommuting and telecommuting variability, and work-family conflict among working parents. Using longitudinal data from 215 working parents in a white-collar workplace, we examine the effect of workplace changes in time spent at work and with children as well as investigate which is more important, work-time behaviors like telecommuting or perceived control over work time for work-family conflict. We find that ROWE does not influence time-use but increases the likelihood of telecommuting and increases subjective perceptions of work-time control. Only perceived control over work time is significantly predictive of reduced work-family conflict for working parents.

WORD COUNT: 150

Introduction

Parents experience a great deal of stress and strain attempting to combine employment with the demands of parenting as they deal with inflexible workplaces (e.g., Moen and Roehling 2005; Williams 2000) and their own high expectations for parental involvement (Hays 1996; Townsend 2002). Such demands have garnered attention by researchers examining the amount of time parents spend with children and the impact that potential reductions in time with children have on child outcomes. Though many work-family policies and programs like telecommuting or flextime instituted by employers are intended to ease the strain for working parents and other employees with conflicting home demands (e.g. workers caring for elderly parents) and potentially increase time parents spend with children, internal barriers and constraints may make using them impractical for most workers (Kelly and Moen 2007). There is also little research that actually documents the impact of work-family policies on time spent with children though many have argued that families and children will benefit with greater access to work-family policies (e.g. Gornick and Meyers 2003).

Moving beyond the availability and usage of the more common work-family policies, we examine a culture change initiative that encourages employees to redefine the cultural expectations of work and consider its impact on parents' time use patterns and work-family conflict. The Results Only Work Environment (ROWE) initiative was rolled out at the headquarters of Best Buy, a Fortune 500 company in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area in 2006. Using data from a natural experiment, we compare employed parents working under traditional cultural expectations about work time and work location with those encouraged to redefine work time and workplace expectations as part of this initiative. Our analyses allow us to examine the importance of ROWE for parents' time with children and on the job, in addition to the behaviors and perceptions of work-time control and the relative importance of each for work-family conflict.

Our study examines an innovative workplace initiative at a time when most work-family policies are limited in scope and availability and seem to do little to ease the strain for working parents. We extend prior work and theorizing on the effects of work-family policies and investigate the impact of this initiative on time at work and with children. We contrast changes in perceived and behavioral work-time control to consider whether making changes or feeling like you can has the largest impact on work-family conflict. Participation in the Results Only Work Environment (ROWE) is not related to changes in work-time patterns or time spent with children. However, we do find that ROWE increases parents' perceptions of work-time control, telecommuting and telecommuting variability. We also find that

parents' perceptions of work-time control have the largest impact on various measures of work-family conflict.

Prior Research

Work-family conflict has generated a great deal of scholarly and popular media attention over the past few decades as maternal employment has risen (U.S. Department of Labor 2007) and the mismatch between work hours and family needs has grown (Clarkberg and Moen 2001; Jacobs and Gerson 2001; Reynolds 2004; Schor 1991). However, few studies or employers have identified workplace strategies that ease the strain for those experiencing the most dramatic work-family conflict: full-time employed parents (Kelly et al 2008). Instead, policies that are available to employees in the United States and elsewhere are often limited in scope and availability (Glass and Estes 1997; Gornick and Meyer 2003). Traditional policies may be difficult to use (such as unpaid leaves), do little to actually ease the strain, or are often available only to the most privileged in an organization.

When traditional flexibility policies are available, relatively few people take advantage of them. Coworkers and supervisors assume that using such policies implies lower commitment and therefore often results in fewer workplace rewards (Kelly and Moen 2007). Some have argued that more than policies are necessary to reduce the strain caused by work and family demands and instead a cultural and structural shift is necessary (Bailyn 1993; Kelly and Moen 2007; Moen and Roehling 2005). We investigate one such culture change initiative, the Results Only Work Environment (ROWE), that attempts to change the assumptions regarding the timing of work, the location of work, and productivity using a sample of employed parents at the headquarters of Best Buy located in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area.

However, most employees work in workplaces where concerns about work-family conflict and the challenge of investing adequate time at work and with children are commonplace. In response, researchers have argued for more accessible and effective work-family policies to increase time spent with children and reduce work-family conflict. Though some studies have examined the impact of workplace policies on work-family conflict (see Kelly et al. 2008 for a summary) and work-family conflict for families and children (Allen and Armstrong 2006; Allen et al. 2000 Carr 2002; Crouter, Bumpass, Head, and McHale 2001; Duxbury and Higgins 2003; Hart and Kelley 2006), few have considered the impact of policies on time spent with children (see Drago 2009 for exception). In light of this we ask, how will an innovative workplace initiative impact parent's time spent at work and with children?

Though it is unclear how workplace policies influence time-use, time-use researchers have investigated how time with children has changed from the 1960's to the early 2000's by gender, marital,

and employment status. Despite growing maternal employment and the number of dual income families (U.S. Department of Labor 2007), Bianchi, Robinson and Milkie (2006) found in their examination of working parent's time use patterns that there is less difference in time spent with children by employment status than expected. Contrary to expected outcomes, the authors found that mothers and married fathers are spending more time with children than they were in the 1960s. However, when comparing time use patterns within each decade employment status does impact time spent with children. Full-time employed mothers spend less time with their children than do not employed mothers (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004) and children of single mothers fare even worse without the time investment from their fathers (Harris and Ryan 2004). Similar studies support these findings (Bianchi and Mattingly 2004; Booth et al. 2002; Gauthier, Smeeding, and Furstenberg 2004; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004). Due to the importance of employment status for time spent with children, it is possible that greater control over their work time through a workplace initiative like ROWE will increase employed parents time spent with children.

Regardless of the increased time parents spend with children now in comparison to the 1960's, parents continue to feel that they do not spend sufficient time with their children (Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Hochschild 2001) and desire workplace policies that make integrating work and family life easier. But, which workplace policies are most beneficial for parents? It is unclear from prior research if working parents benefit most from the ability to change behaviors or changing their perception of work-time control. Will working parents report lower levels of work-family conflict by choosing to telecommute or otherwise changing their working patterns? Or, will simply feeling greater control over when and where they work predict lower levels of work-family conflict? In other words, are working parents relieved of work-family conflicts only when they change how work and family responsibilities are managed in practical ways or does feeling more work-time control itself bring benefits?

Prior research has shown that, for broader samples of white-collar workers, perceptions of work-time control have a strong impact on work-family balance (Hill et al. 2001; Kelly, Moen, and Tranby 2010; Moen, Kelly, and Huang 2008; Thomas and Ganster 1995). Increasing perceptions of work-time control may grant workers the opportunity to creatively manage issues as they arise and know that they can make adjustments as needed. For working parents this may be particularly useful. Children's schedules are subject to a variety of uncontrollable circumstances and may change with illness, inclement weather causing school closings, or the availability of daycare providers and family members, to name a few. The perception of control may not actually change the work behaviors of working

parents but still allow them to make alternative arrangements or feel able to respond in such situations, thereby decreasing feelings of strain.

Others have argued that using flexible work arrangements can serve to reduce conflict or better manage home and work demands by changing behaviors such as shifting work schedules as needed or working from home (Becker and Moen 1999; Hill et al. 2006; Singley and Hynes 2005). Increasing availability and usage of telecommuting may be one such change that allows working parents to care for younger children when outside care may fall through, make working parents more available to monitor older children who may not need formal child care, and manage other household responsibilities (e.g. meeting a repair person) that cause stress for workers unable to depend on others for such tasks. That is, behavioral changes stemming from work-family policies reduce work-family conflict because they are concrete responses to real issues workers face rather than potential concerns that may not materialize.

There are, to be sure, a great many studies on work-family conflict and policies to reduce this strain. However, the research we describe below extends this work by examining the impact of an innovative time-based workplace change on the time working parents spend with children and on the job and investigating the importance of work-time control perception versus actual behavior changes for parents' experience of work-family conflict. Prior research has not examined the effect of workplace changes on time use for parents and the relative impact of perceptions and behaviors on work-family conflict experienced by working parents. Moreover, as a longitudinal natural experiment that monitored teams undergoing the culture change initiative, the study is a unique and beneficial opportunity to expand our knowledge of work-family conflict and possible strategies for easing the stain between work and family (Kelly and Moen 2007; Moen, Kelly and Chermack 2009).

The ROWE Initiative

ROWE was rolled out at the headquarters of a large high-performance corporation, Best Buy, located near Minnesota's Twin Cities. Prior to the implementation of ROWE, Best Buy, like most corporations, equated productivity in the workplace with time spent at one's desk or in meetings. The ROWE initiative claims to reorient the organization towards measurable results while deemphasizing where and when work is completed and the amount of time spent completing tasks. ROWE differs from the more common flexible work arrangements in several important ways. First, ROWE attempts to shift the culture so that the norm is flexibility regarding when, where, and to some extent how employees do their work. Second, ROWE directly targets employees' control over when and where they work as well as how they work. Third, ROWE is understood as a collective enterprise to change the organizational culture rather than an individual option (Moen, Kelly and Chermack 2009; Kelly and Moen 2007).

The ROWE "migration" at Best Buy was implemented through four participatory training events. Before these training events started, managers participated in a leadership orientation lasting about 1.5 hours. Employees and their managers then attended the four training sessions lasting approximately five hours total, scheduled over approximately 8-12 weeks. The first session oriented employees to the ROWE philosophy and the process of change in their team. This was followed by a second session that critically examined the current organizational culture, the way it affected work practices and interactions, and developed a vision of the desired future state for the team. For example, in this session, employees role played by sharing comments that arise from the current culture (e.g. "Just getting in?" "Your kid is sick again?") and practiced responding to them in ways that do not reinforce the old expectations about time norms (e.g. "Is there something you need?"). In the third session, employees were also prompted to clarify the outcomes (the "results") they are tasked with and to identify "low-value" work activities that do not contribute to the team's performance. Employees were encouraged to identify strategies for meeting business goals that would simultaneously give employees more control over their work time. A final session brought together employees from multiple teams to brainstorm about any problems they had encountered and to publicize new practices that were working well.

A Natural Experiment

In the study period, Best Buy implemented ROWE within specific departments of the corporate headquarters while others maintained their previous business practices. Our research team investigated, but did not control, ROWE implementation, thereby creating the opportunity for a 'natural experiment.' Specifically, we collected data both before and after the organizational change (ROWE) was rolled out to employees in different departments, permitting us to use employees in the later adopting divisions as a comparison group. As part of the Flexible Work and Well-Being study (Moen, Kelly, and Chermack 2009), we investigate both employees undergoing the ROWE innovation as well as the comparison group of employees continuing to work in the usual ways. Unlike a true experiment, we were not able to randomize departments or teams to the two conditions. Rather, the decision to participate in ROWE was made by executives (vice-presidents or directors, in conjunction with other senior managers) and then entire teams either participated in the ROWE initiative or did not. The departments and teams that transitioned to ROWE included employees in a wide variety of occupations within this white-collar workplace.

We use evidence from our longitudinal survey to compare the experiences of employees who were also parents of children in departments beginning ROWE with those in departments that

continued to operate under the status quo management practices of the organization. Two waves of data were collected. The first, baseline, wave of the survey was completed in the month before ROWE sessions began and the second wave of the data collection occurred six months after a department's first ROWE session and about three months after they completed the ROWE training sessions. Comparison groups were surveyed at parallel times. The survey sample was drawn from non-contingent employees working in nine business units at the Best Buy corporate headquarters. Wave 1 of the survey had an 80% response rate and 92% of those who completed the first survey also completed Wave 2. Response rates were similar between the treatment and control groups, with a Wave 1 response rate of 78% and a 93% retention rate for the treatment group and a Wave 1 response rate of 81% and a retention rate of 90% for the control group.

We believe that our research design does allow for stronger casual claims then can made using traditional associational methods or with cross-sectional datasets. However, we are aware that there are a number of issues that would make the comparison group a less than ideal reflection of the counterfactual and, hence, threaten our causal claims. We detail how we deal with each of these issues in Kelly, Moen, and Tranby (2010).

Sample and Methods

We limited the sample for the following analyses to residential parents (i.e. those living with a child under the age of 18) for a subsample of 215 employees. 131 residential parents were in departments undergoing ROWE, while 99 residential parents were in comparison departments. Employees were coded as part of the ROWE group if they reported (in the wave 2 survey) attending any of the ROWE training sessions and they were assigned to a team or department that participated in the initiative during the study period. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables in Wave 1 and Wave 2 for the full sample, the ROWE sample, and the comparison sample. Detailed information on the scales used in the analysis, including the source of that scale, the variables used to create the scale, and various measures of fit, are available upon request. These participants are, on average, 36 years old. The parents in this sample are likely to have young children, with 64% reporting that their youngest child is under 6 years old. 94% of this sample is married and the majority of residential parents are part of a dual-earner couple, with 87% reporting that their spouse is employed full-time.

Our dependent variables include two variables measuring time use at work and at home. In particular, we measure hours worked with a question asking "How many hours a week do you usually work at your Best Buy job? Please include all hours worked at all locations." The mean hours reported is

47.87 hours per week in the first wave and 48.65 hours per week in the second wave in this white-collar, largely-salaried sample. Similarly, we measure hours spent in childcare with a question asking "On average, how many hours do you spend per week where caring for the child(ren) you live with is your main activity?". The mean hours spent per week caring for children in the first wave is 33.59 hours and 35.79 hours per week in the second wave. Though time diary data is likely to be a more accurate measure of time use (e.g. Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006; Juster, Ono, and Stafford 2003; Robinson 1997) especially when comparing time totals by gender (Lee and Waite 2005), stylized survey measures can be used appropriately when considering time use patterns relative to others (South and Spitze 1994). Due to the limitations of stylized survey measures, we focus on relative changes by individuals across time, are careful not to make broad reaching claims from our analysis of the stylized time use measures, or use these measures in extension analyses.

We expand our analyses of parent's experience of ROWE by including other measures of work-time as dependent variables in our analysis. The perceived work-time control scale is modified from Thomas and Ganster (1995) and has categories ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates low work-time control and 5 indicates high work-time control. Our measure includes one item related to where the work occurs. In this white-collar setting, there is a close relationship between control over the timing of work, the amount of work performed, and the location of that work, but this may not be the case in other settings. The analyses were robust to other specifications that omitted the question about control over work location. In addition to perceived control over work time, we also include behavioral measures of control over work time. In particular, we measure the frequency of telecommuting with a question that asks "Do you ever choose to work at home or at another location? (Do not include business travel or off-site meetings)". We measure the variability in parents telecommuting schedule that asks if their pattern of working on and off campus varies a lot, varies some, does not varies much, or never changes.

Our second set of dependent variables includes several established measures of the work-family interface. The work-to-family conflict scale was developed and validated by Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996). It is a five-item scale with scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with a higher score indicating more work interference with family or personal life. See also Appendix A. We analyze negative spillover from work to family life with a scale that includes four items ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (all the time). Work-family conflict and negative work-family spillover are similar constructs but negative work-family spillover emphasizes emotional transmission of stress (i.e. bringing worries home) and energy depletion rather than time strains or conflicts. Two additional

measures capture perceived fit between the demands or needs faced by an employee and the resources available to the employee (Moen, Kelly and Huang 2008; Voydanoff 2004). The work-schedule fit scale measures employees' assessment of how well their work schedules are working for themselves and their families. It is a two-item scale developed by Barnett, Gareis and Brennan (1999) with answer categories ranging from 1 (extremely poorly) to 7 (extremely well) where a higher score indicates greater fit. A time adequacy scale assesses employees' subjective sense of having enough time to pursue a variety of personal and family activities. Response possibilities range from 0 ("not at all adequate") to 10 ("almost always adequate"). This scale was modified from Van Horn, Bellis, and Snyder (2001).

Our analyses consider the impact of ROWE net of other predictors of parents' time-use patterns, work demands, and work family conflict. These include gender role ideology (Treas and Widmer 2000), work demands related to the occupation role, and job control related to how one accomplishes one's work (Karasek 1979; Karasek and Theorell 1990; Batt and Valcour 2003). These parents are unlikely to hold traditional ideals about gender roles, somewhat disagreeing, on average, with the statement "it is much better for everyone involved if the man earns the money and the woman takes care of the home and children". Work demands among residential parents are high, with 53% having a managerial position, the vast majority being salaried, and reporting high levels of jobs demands. We measure psychological job demands using a scale based on Karasek's work (1979) and additional items developed by Belkic, Landsbergis, Schnall, and Baker (2004) and Siegrist, Starke, Chandola, Godin, Marmot, Niedhammer, and Peter (2004). Job control includes measures developed by Karasek (1985) of decision authority or autonomy over what happens on the job and how work is performed.

There are some baseline differences between the residential parents in the ROWE and comparison groups, with ROWE participants reporting higher levels of work-time control, telecommuting, and negative work-family spillover. There are greater numbers of parents with young children, more full-time dual earner couples, and more salaried employees in the ROWE group as well. Models control and adjust for these baseline differences.

In our analysis, we use ordinary least squares regression and logistic regression (depending on the dependent variable) with a lagged dependent-variable strategy to investigate the effects of ROWE on parent's work-time control, time use patterns with children and at work, direct measures of work-time, and experiences of work-family conflict in Wave 2. We included the lagged (Wave 1) measure of the dependent variable in order to account for Wave 1 differences in the dependent variables, for

persistent heterogeneity and serial correlation between waves, and to describe the effects of changes in the work environment between waves.

Our first set of analyses uses a set of nested regressions to investigate the effects of ROWE on perceived work-time control among working parents, while controlling for their work-time control in Wave 1 and other covariates that might influence the relationship between ROWE and perceived work-time control. In these nested models, we first include demographic predictors of perceived work time control to see the role that gender, age, spousal work arrangements, age of children, and gender role ideology play in influencing perceived work-time control. We next include job demands and control to the model in order to determine what role work roles, such as managerial status, job demands, and decision authority play in altering the effect of the demographic predictors and in what way these variables influence perceived work-time control. Finally, we include ROWE participation status to see how ROWE influences the other variables and the effect of ROWE on perceived work-time control

We next turn to a set of nested regressions to investigate if ROWE is related to changes in time spent working or caring for children. Again, we include hours spent in Wave 1 and other covariates that might influence the relationship between ROWE and time-spent. Next, we include our ROWE measures. Finally, , we include measures of change in perceived work-time control in order to determine if it is ROWE, perceived work-time control, or none of the above that affect hours spent working and with children.

We then turn to an investigation of whether ROWE influences the rate at which a parent telecommutes and variability in their telecommuting schedule. We analyze these variables in a set of nested regressions to investigate the effects of ROWE on telecommuting among working parents, while controlling for their telecommuting behaviors in Wave 1, their work-time control at Wave 1, and other covariates that might influence the relationship between ROWE and our dependent variables.

We then turn to several measures of parents' work-family conflict, including a work-family conflict scale, a negative work-to-family spillover scale, a measure of work-schedule fit, and a time adequacy scale in the next step. We again analyze these variables in a set of nested regressions to investigate the effects of ROWE on work-family conflict among working parents, while controlling for their work-time control and behaviors in Wave 1 and other covariates that might influence the relationship between ROWE and our dependent variables. Importantly, we include measures of change in the work-time variables (both perceptions of control and behaviors that imply control) in order to determine if it is ROWE, perceived work-time control, or direct measures of work-time control, or none of the above, which affect working parent's feelings of work-family conflict.

Findings

Table 2 contains results from regressions estimating the impact of ROWE on parents' perceived work-time control. Model 1 includes demographic variables, Model 2 adds job demand and control variables, while model 3 adds ROWE. Parents with higher levels of perceived work-time control in Wave 1 and those ages 30-39 have higher levels of perceived work time control than respondents with lower baseline levels of work-time control and younger parents. Parents who are also managers have lower levels of perceived work-time control than employees without supervisor responsibilities; this is likely because managing others' work requires some time with them and thus constrains their schedules and telecommuting. The most important finding from this table is that ROWE significantly increases perceived work-time control among working parents, even while accounting for the wave 1 level of work-time control and demographic and work characteristics. In particular, participation in the ROWE initiative increases work-time control in Wave 2 by, on average, about a third a standard deviation when accounting for baseline levels of work-time control.

Table 3 contains results from regressions estimating the impact of ROWE and perceived work-time control on hours spent working and hours spent in childcare. As shown in Models 1 and 2, hours of work in wave 2 among parents is not influenced by personal or work characteristics, but instead, is primarily shaped by hours of work at baseline, suggesting a continuity in working hours. Importantly, ROWE participation is not associated with a change in the hours of work. Model 3 shows that an increase in work-time control among ROWE parents is associated with a decrease in the hours of work. This interaction reveals that when ROWE increases employees' sense of control over work time, their hours of work are more likely to decrease. Employees who gain more work-time control between survey waves but are not in ROWE do not change their work hours. For working parents who are employed in this high-performance and high-stress organization, a decrease in work hours may be appreciated. Models 4 through 6 contain results from regressions estimating hours parents spend caring for their children. Neither ROWE nor perceived work-time control are associated with changes in hours spent in childcare. Mothers spend significantly more hours in childcare than fathers, as do parents in their 30s, likely because they are more likely to have younger children. Parents whose spouses do not work full-time spend less time in childcare as do parents who are managers. Because ROWE does not directly impact hours of work (except by changing perceived work-time control) or hours spent in childcare, we do not investigate the impact of these time use dependent variables on our measures of work-family conflict.

Table 4, Models 1 through 3 contain results from logistic regressions estimating the impact of ROWE and perceived work-time control on the probability of telecommuting. Results are reported as odds ratios to ease interpretation. Model 2 demonstrates that being in the ROWE group significantly increases the likelihood of telecommuting, with ROWE participants being almost 15 times more likely to telecommute in the second wave than those in the comparison group. Model 3 adds change in perceived work-time control between waves as a potential mediating variable of the effects of work and baseline perceived work-time control as a control variable. Perceived work-time control change does not increase the probability of telecommuting nor does it significantly mediate the effect of ROWE. In other words, ROWE has a direct effect on the telecommuting behaviors of parents.

Models 4 through 6 in Table 4 report results from regressions estimating the impact of ROWE and perceived work-time control on variability in working parents' telecommuting schedule. Model 5 demonstrates that being in the ROWE group significantly increases variability in telecommuting schedules. A flexible telecommuting schedule may be just as, or more, important than telecommuting because a more flexible telecommuting schedule may make it easier to adjust to changing family needs, whereas a routinized telecommuting schedule could create its own rigidities. Model 6 again adds change in perceived work-time control between waves as a potential mediating variable of the effects of work and baseline perceived work-time control as a control variable. Changes in perceived work-time control in the ROWE group increases variability in telecommuting schedules, but only partially mediates the effect of ROWE. Therefore, we conclude that ROWE directly predicts increases in perceived work-time control, the probability of telecommuting, and variability in the schedule of telecommuting, with no strong meditational causal pathways between these dependent variables.

We next turn to estimating the impact of ROWE and our three measures of work-time control on work-family conflict (Table 5). Our first measure of work-family conflict is a work-family conflict scale (Models 1 and 2). ROWE significantly decreases work-family conflict among working parents by wave 2, accounting for levels of wave 1 work-family conflict and demographic and work characteristics. When we add perceived work-time control measures to the model, ROWE becomes non-significant, suggesting that ROWE works largely through its effect on perceived work-time control, with changes in work-time control completely mediating the effect of ROWE on work-family conflict. When added to the model, the behavioral work-time control items (telecommuting and variability in telecommuting schedule) have no effect on this measure of work-family conflict.

Models 3 through 6 in Table 5 contains similar nested regressions estimating the impact of ROWE and work-time control on negative work family spillover and time adequacy among working

parents, finding that ROWE has no direct impact on negative work-family spillover or parents' sense of time adequacy. Note that including perceived work-time control change in the model significantly reduces negative work family spillover and significantly increases time adequacy. Thus, ROWE indirectly reduces negative family spillover and increases time adequacy by increasing perceived work-time control. Again, the behavioral work-time control items have no effect on these measures of work-family conflict.

Models 7 and 8 in Table 5 contain the results for a measure of work-schedule fit. ROWE significantly increases work-schedule fit among working parents by wave 2. Thesee direct effects of ROWE are mediated by both perceived work-time control and variability in telecommuting schedule. In other words, having higher levels of perceived work-time control and having direct control over when you telecommute or not increased respondent's sense of work-schedule fit and these effects completely mediate the effect of ROWE. While the work-family interface is primarily influenced by ROWE and perceived and behavioral work-time control, other factors also influence it. , Looking at the whole model we show psychosocial l demands on the job are consistently related to high work-family "misfit" (see Moen, Kelly and R. Huang 2008), having a child under age 6 decreases parents' sense of time adequacy, and hourly employees , along with those with higher levels of decision authority, report more work schedule fit.

Discussion and Conclusions

Our findings demonstrate the impact of a culture change initiative that challenges traditional norms about the timing and location of work (ROWE) on work-time control and work-family conflict for working parents. We find that ROWE does not directly influence the number of hours parents spend working or caring for children. More importantly, we find that ROWE increases the likelihood that working parents l not only perceive greater control over their work time but also are more likely to engage in behaviors like telecommuting, indicating they are actually using greater work-time control to change when and where they work. However, for this group of working parents it is not telecommuting behaviors that have the greatest impact on work-family conflict. Rather, parents' perceived work-time control is the strongest and most consistent predictor of reducing work-family conflict and increasing work-schedule fit. Though working parents may not implement consistent behavioral changes to manage the demands of parenting and working, the possibility of doing so as children's needs change or sudden emergencies arise reduces the strain that working parent's experience.

The limitations of this study include our relatively small sample size, which does not allow us to explore interesting questions related to ROWE, gender, and age of child. Moreover, it is well known that

stylized survey measures of time use can be inaccurate, hence our focus only changes in measures across time and do not use these measures in the second part of our analysis. Additional limitations include the fact that we have data from parents who are employees in one large, white-collar organization in the Midwest and were not able to randomize groups to the ROWE initiative or the status quo management practices. Certainly, future research is needed to replicate the workplace innovation and investigate its effects in other settings with a more diverse employee population, different types of work, and different managerial practices at baseline. Because of the six-month time frame of the study, there are also important questions about the sustainability of the effects found here and the institutionalization of employees' control over work time within this organization and across organizational fields. Unfortunately, we were not able to conduct additional follow-up work, so our data do not allow us to investigate these questions.

Our research is particularly important considering the discussion in both the scholarly literature and popular media calling for greater availability of polices like telecommuting and flextime. Our results demonstrate that for this Fortune 500 Company simply having such policies available may not reduce feelings of work-family conflict among working parents. Instead, a workplace culture that helps employees feel they have control over their work time may be a necessary component to alleviate work-family strains among working parents.

References

Allen, Tammy D. and Jeremy Armstrong. 2006. "Further Examination of the Link Between Work-Family Conflict and Physical Health: The Role of Health-Related Behaviors." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(9):1204-1221.

Allen, Tammy D., David E. L. Herst, Carly S. Bruck and Martha Sutton. 2000. "Consequences Associated with Work-to-Family Conflict: A review and agenda for future research." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5(2):278-308.

Bailyn, Lotte. 1993. *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate World*. New York: Free Press.

Becker, Penny E. and Phyllis Moen. 1999. "Scaling Back: Dual-Earner Couples' Work-Family Strategies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(4):995-1007.

Bianchi, Suzanne M. and Marybeth J. Mattingly. 2004. "Time, Work, and Family in the United States." *Advances in Life Course Research* 8:95-118.

Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson and Melissa A. Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Booth, Cathryn L., K. A. Clarke-Stewart, Deborah L. Vandell, Kathleen McCartney and Margaret T. Owen. 2002. "Child-Care Usage and Mother-Infant "Quality Time"." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(1):16-26.

Carr, Deborah. 2002. "The Psychological Consequences of Work-Family Trade-Offs for Three Cohorts of Men and Women." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65(2):103-124.

Clarkberg, Marin, and Phyllis Moen. 2001. “Understanding the Time-Squeeze: Married Couples' Preferred and Actual Work-Hour Strategies.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(7):1115-1136.

Crouter, Ann C., Matthew F. Bumpus, Melissa R. Head, and Susan M. McHale. 2001. “Implications of Overwork and Overload for the Quality of Men's Family Relationships.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63:404-416.

Drago, Robert. 2009. "What Would They Do? Childcare under Parental Leave and Reduced Hours Options.".

Duxbury, Linda and Chris Higgins. 2003. *Work-Life Conflict in the New Millennium in Canada: A Status Report.* Canada: Healthy Communities Division, Health Canada.

Gauthier, Anne H., Timothy M. Smeeding and Frank F. Furstenberg Jr. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less Time in Children? Trends in Selected Industrialized Countries." *Population and Development Review* 30(4):647-671.

Glass, Jennifer L. 2004. "Blessing or Curse? Work-Family Policies and Mother's Wage Growth Over Time." *Work and Occupations* 31(3):367.

Glass, Jennifer L. and Sarah B. Estes. 1997. "The Family Responsive Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:289-313.

Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families that Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Harris, Kathleen M. and Suzanne Ryan. 2004. "Father Involvement and the Diversity of Family Context." Pp. 474 in *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement*, edited by R.D. Day and M.E. Lamb. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Pub.

Hart, Margaret S., and Michelle L. Kelley. 2006. “Fathers' and Mothers' Work and Family Issues as Related to Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior of Children Attending Day Care.” *Journal of Family Issues* 27:252-270.

Hays, Sharon. 1996. *The cultural contradictions of motherhood.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hill, E. J., Alan J. Hawkins, Maria S. Ferris and M. Weitzman. 2001. "Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance." *Family Relations*:49-58.

Hill, E. J., Nicole T. Mead, Lukas R. Dean, Dawn M. Hafen, Robyn Gadd, Alexis A. Palmer and Maria S. Ferris. 2006. "Researching the 60-Hour Dual-Earner Workweek: An Alternative to the "Opt-Out Revolution"." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(9):1184-1203.

Hochschild, Arlie R. 2001. *The time bind : when work becomes home and home becomes work.* 2nd ed. New York: Holt Paperbacks.

Jacobs, Jerry A., and Kathleen Gerson. 2004. *The time divide : work, family, and gender inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Juster, F. T., Hiromi Ono and Frank P. Stafford. 2003. "An Assessment of Alternative Measures of Time Use." *Sociological Methodology* 33:19-54.

Kelly, Erin L., and Alexandra Kalev. 2006. “Managing flexible work arrangements in US organizations: formalized discretion or 'a right to ask'.” *Socioecon Rev* 4:379-416.

Kelly, Erin L., Ellen Kossek, Leslie B. Hammer, Mary Durham, Jeremy Bray, Kelly Chermack, Lauren A. Murphy, and Dan Kaskubar. 2008. “Getting There from Here: Research on the Effects of Work–Family Initiatives on Work–Family Conflict and Business Outcomes.” *The Academy of Management Annals* 2:305-349.

Kelly, Erin L. and Phyllis Moen. 2007. "Rethinking the Clockwork of Work: Why Schedule Control May Pay Off at Work and at Home." *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 9(4):487.

Moen, Phyllis, Erin L. Kelly, and Kelly Chermack. 2009. “Learning from a Natural Experiment: Studying a Corporate Work Time Initiative.” Pp. 97-131 in *Work-Life Policies that make a Real Difference for*

Individuals, Families, and Organizations, edited by A. C. Crouter and A. Booth. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Moen, Phyllis, Erin Kelly, and Reiping Huang. 2008. ""Fit" inside the Work-Family Black Box: An Ecology of the Life Course, Cycles of Control Reframing." *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology* 81(3):411-433.

Kelly, Erin L., Phyllis Moen and Eric Tranby. 2010. "Control Over Work Time and Work-Family Conflict: Evidence from a Natural Experiment in a White-Collar Workplace." Flexible Work and Well-Being Study Working Paper..

Lee, Yun-Suk and Linda J. Waite. 2005. "Husbands' and Wives' Time Spent on Housework: A Comparison of Measures." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(2):328-336.

Moen, Phyllis, Erin L. Kelly and Kelly Chermack. 2009. "Learning from a Natural Experiment: Studying a Corporate Work Time Initiative."in *Work-Life Policies that make a Real Difference for Individuals, Families, and Organizations*, edited by A.C. Crouter and A. Booth. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Moen, Phyllis and Patricia Roehling. 2005. *The Career Mystique: Cracks in the American Dream.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Reynolds, Jeremy. 2004. "When Too Much Is Not Enough: Actual and Preferred Work Hours in the United States and Abroad." *Sociological Forum* 19(1):89-120.

Robinson, John P. 1997. *Time for life : the surprising ways Americans use their time.* University Park: University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press.

Sayer, Liana C., Suzanne M. Bianchi and John P. Robinson. 2004. "Are Parents Investing Less in Children? Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time with Children." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(1):1-43.

Schor, Juliet. 1991. *The overworked American: the unexpected decline of leisure.* New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.

Singley, Susan G. and Kathryn Hynes. 2005. "Transitions to Parenthood: Work-Family Policies, Gender, and the Couple Context." *Gender & Society* 19(3):376-397.

South, Scott J. and Glenna D. Spitze. 1994. "Housework in Marital and Nonmarital Households." *American Sociological Review* 59(3):327-347.

Thomas, Linda T. and Daniel C. Ganster. 1995. "Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80(1):6-15.

Townsend, Nicholas W. 2002. *The package deal : marriage, work, and fatherhood in men's lives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Treas, Judith and Eric D. Widmer. 2000. "Married Women's Employment over the Life Course: Attitudes in Cross- National Perspective." *Social Forces* 78:1409-1436.

U.S. Department of Labor. 2007. *Women in the Labor Force: A Databook.* Washington, DC: US Department of Labor.

Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending gender : why family and work conflict and what to do about it.* Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Dependent and Independent Variables in Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Wave 1							Wave 2						
	Full Sample		ROWE		Non-ROWE			Full Sample		ROWE		Non-ROWE		
Variable:	Mean or %	S.D.	Mean or %	S.D.	Mean or %	S.D.	Δ R-N	Mean or %	S.D.	Mean or %	S.D.	Mean or %	S.D.	Δ R-N
Time Use Dependent Variables														
Weekly Hours of Work	47.869	(6.165)	47.438	(6.228)	48.458	(6.062)	-1.019	48.645	(7.129)	48.122	(7.352)	49.321	(6.809)	-1.199
Weekly Hours of Childcare	33.585	(28.157)	36.762	(29.222)	29.459	(26.288)	7.303 *	35.787	(26.643)	40.655	(28.995)	29.238	(21.592)	11.417 **
Work-Time Dependent Variables														
Work-Time Control	3.440	(0.732)	3.559	(0.718)	3.283	(0.725)	0.276 **	3.609	(0.808)	3.791	(0.774)	3.366	(0.791)	0.426 ***
Change in Work-Time Control	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.170	(0.708)	0.234	(0.768)	0.084	(0.612)	0.149 *
Telecommuting	71.3%	--	77.9%	--	62.6%	--	15.2% *	79.8%	--	94.5%	--	60.4%	--	34.1% ***
Change in Telecommuting	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8.5%	--	16.5%	--	-2.1%	--	18.6% **
Telecommuting Variability	1.935	(0.906)	2.000	(0.877)	1.848	(0.941)	0.152	2.179	(0.956)	2.575	(0.895)	1.656	(0.765)	0.919 ***
Change in Telecommuting Variability	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.229	(1.114)	0.551	(1.166)	-0.198	(0.878)	0.749 ***
Work-Family Conflict Dependent Variables														
Work-Family Conflict	3.423	(0.869)	3.452	(0.915)	3.384	(0.808)	0.068	3.163	(0.934)	3.074	(0.954)	3.281	(0.899)	-0.207
Negative Work-Family Spillover	3.004	(0.622)	3.112	(0.627)	2.860	(0.589)	0.252 **	2.892	(0.656)	2.925	(0.672)	2.849	(0.636)	0.075
Work-Schedule Fit	5.150	(1.276)	5.107	(1.316)	5.207	(1.225)	-0.100	5.326	(1.292)	5.484	(1.331)	5.115	(1.213)	0.370 *
Time Adequacy	4.279	(1.724)	4.159	(1.682)	4.438	(1.773)	-0.279	4.574	(1.740)	4.584	(1.749)	4.560	(1.738)	0.023
Personal and Family Characteristics														
Females	47.5%	--	50.8%	--	43.2%	--	7.6%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Age														
Age 20-29	13.5%	--	11.5%	--	16.2%	--	-4.7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Age 30-39	60.0%	--	59.5%	--	60.6%	--	-1.1%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Age 40-60	26.5%	--	29.0%	--	23.2%	--	5.8%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youngest Child Under 6	63.9%	--	69.5%	--	56.6%	--	12.9% *							
Spouse Employed Less Than Full-Time	13.0%	--	8.4%	--	19.2%	--	-10.8% *							
Gender Role Ideology	1.681	(0.729)	1.616	(0.700)	1.765	(0.761)	-0.149							
Job Characteristics														
Exempt	5.7%	--	2.3%	--	10.1%	--	-7.8% *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Job Level														
Non-Supervising Employee	47.0%	--	45.0%	--	49.5%	--	-4.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Manager	30.0%	--	28.2%	--	32.3%	--	-4.1%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Senior Manager and up	23.0%	--	26.7%	--	18.2%	--	8.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Job Demands	3.020	(0.502)	3.045	(0.515)	2.988	(0.484)	0.057	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Decision Authority	2.946	(0.556)	2.943	(0.555)	2.949	(0.560)	-0.007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: Sample Restricted to Parents

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

Total N=230, Non-ROWE N=99, ROWE N=131

Table 2. Multivariate Predictors of Perceived Work Time Control at Wave 2 for Parents

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable:	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Work-Time Control in Wave 1	0.625 ***	(0.063)	0.626 ***	(0.071)	0.583 ***	(0.072)
Women	0.100	(0.098)	0.073	(0.100)	0.065	(0.099)
Age 20-29 (Reference)						
Age 30-39	0.226	(0.138)	0.283 *	(0.140)	0.273 *	(0.138)
Age 40-60	0.130	(0.157)	0.220	(0.162)	0.172	(0.161)
Youngest Child Under 6	0.061	(0.107)	0.059	(0.107)	0.007	(0.108)
Spouse Employed Less Than Full-Time	0.034	(0.143)	0.048	(0.144)	0.118	(0.144)
Gender Role Ideology	0.038	(0.067)	0.025	(0.067)	0.033	(0.066)
Exempt			-0.105	(0.210)	-0.007	(0.211)
Non-Supervising Employee (Reference)						
Manager			-0.237 *	(0.116)	-0.208 *	(0.115)
Senior Manager and up			-0.151	(0.137)	-0.152	(0.135)
Job Demands			-0.153	(0.100)	-0.174	(0.099)
Decision Authority			0.108	(0.090)	0.139	(0.089)
ROWE					0.258 **	(0.098)
Constant	1.133 ***	(0.277)	1.365 **	(0.451)	1.353 **	(0.444)
N	215		215		215	
R-squared	0.350		0.378		0.399	

Note: Sample Restricted to Parents

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

Table 3. OLS Regressions Estimating Time Use at Work and Caring For Children at Wave 2 for Parents

	Hours of Work						Hours of Childcare					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Variable:	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Wave 1 Measure	0.814 ***	(0.072)	0.810 ***	(0.075)	0.768 ***	(0.074)	0.418 ***	(0.058)	0.407 ***	(0.059)	0.412 ***	(0.059)
Women	-0.666	(0.728)	-0.656	(0.731)	-0.364	(0.715)	10.748 **	(3.468)	10.702 **	(3.455)	10.812 **	(3.469)
Age 20-29 (Reference)												
Age 30-39	0.077	(0.998)	0.080	(1.001)	0.384	(0.983)	9.901 *	(4.918)	9.611	(4.903)	10.863 *	(4.943)
Age 40-60	1.869	(1.150)	1.905	(1.162)	2.083	(1.135)	1.213	(5.746)	0.338	(5.754)	0.934	(5.747)
Youngest Child Under 6	1.037	(0.787)	1.065	(0.797)	0.985	(0.774)	5.640	(3.797)	4.620	(3.842)	4.634	(3.835)
Spouse Employed Less Than Full-Time	-1.987	(1.058)	-2.021	(1.069)	-1.811	(1.052)	-11.979 *	(4.808)	-10.760 *	(4.858)	-11.243 *	(4.892)
Gender Role Ideology	0.043	(0.492)	0.037	(0.494)	-0.008	(0.481)	0.643	(2.334)	0.933	(2.333)	1.130	(2.339)
Exempt	0.122	(1.496)	0.052	(1.526)	0.485	(1.494)	1.056	(8.083)	3.063	(8.161)	3.137	(8.202)
Non-Supervising Employee (Reference)												
Manager	0.498	(0.842)	0.498	(0.844)	0.584	(0.857)	-8.627 *	(3.902)	-8.455 *	(3.889)	-10.131 *	(4.036)
Senior Manager and up	1.033	(0.982)	1.072	(0.997)	1.430	(1.019)	-5.339	(4.492)	-5.941	(4.493)	-7.582	(4.718)
Job Demands	0.603	(0.793)	0.634	(0.805)	0.361	(0.786)	2.767	(3.479)	2.429	(3.473)	2.006	(3.547)
Decision Authority	0.603	(0.606)	0.594	(0.608)	1.219	(0.639)	-5.142	(3.039)	-4.732	(3.040)	-5.156	(3.279)
ROWE			-0.180	(0.720)	0.634	(0.733)			5.111	(3.380)	6.375	(3.617)
Work-Time Control (wave 1)					-1.540 **	(0.568)					-0.064	(2.724)
Work-Time Control Change					0.212	(0.844)					0.554	(4.045)
ROWE X Work-Time Control Change					-2.131 *	(0.988)					-6.316	(4.862)
Constant	4.829	(3.870)	5.042	(3.971)	10.642 *	(4.275)	17.207	(15.447)	14.939	(15.462)	17.106	16.746
N	205		205		205		185		185		185	
R-squared	0.589		0.589		0.618		0.430		0.437		0.450	

Note: Sample Restricted to Parents

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

Table 4. Logistic and OLS Regressions Estimating Work Time Behaviors at Wave 2 for Parents

	Telecommuting (Logistic Regression)						Telecommuting Variability (OLS Regression)					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Variable:	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Wave 1 Measure	6.154 ***	(2.503)	6.114 ***	(2.835)	6.094 ***	(2.976)	0.307 ***	(0.075)	0.276 ***	(0.067)	0.290 ***	(0.063)
Women	1.809	(0.760)	1.751	(0.855)	1.727	(0.871)	0.136	(0.141)	0.091	(0.126)	0.050	(0.118)
Age 20-29 (Reference)												
Age 30-39	1.285	(0.703)	1.240	(0.754)	0.992	(0.621)	0.280	(0.197)	0.230	(0.176)	0.124	(0.166)
Age 40-60	1.749	(1.105)	1.202	(0.874)	1.033	(0.769)	0.304	(0.229)	0.107	(0.206)	0.060	(0.193)
Youngest Child Under 6	1.534	(0.646)	1.126	(0.526)	1.103	(0.533)	0.100	(0.153)	-0.084	(0.138)	-0.081	(0.129)
Spouse Employed Less Than Full-Time	0.409	(0.226)	0.702	(0.424)	0.647	(0.394)	-0.256	(0.203)	-0.026	(0.183)	-0.054	(0.172)
Gender Role Ideology	1.501	(0.449)	1.640	(0.555)	1.600	(0.555)	-0.044	(0.095)	-0.015	(0.084)	-0.019	(0.079)
Exempt	1.321	(1.168)	3.017	(2.825)	3.038	(2.906)	-0.175	(0.296)	0.122	(0.266)	0.072	(0.251)
Non-Supervising Employee (Reference)												
Manager	1.009	(0.491)	0.997	(0.527)	1.150	(0.656)	-0.161	(0.164)	-0.101	(0.146)	-0.009	(0.140)
Senior Manager and up	1.381	(0.777)	1.090	(0.680)	1.112	(0.730)	0.104	(0.188)	0.030	(0.167)	0.099	(0.162)
Job Demands	0.732	(0.302)	0.555	(0.270)	0.619	(0.312)	-0.099	(0.140)	-0.147	(0.125)	-0.060	(0.118)
Decision Authority	1.348	(0.457)	1.835	(0.715)	1.647	(0.688)	-0.034	(0.121)	0.023	(0.108)	-0.055	(0.108)
ROWE			14.856 ***	(7.753)	13.245 ***	(7.277)			0.895 ***	(0.122)	0.719 ***	(0.121)
Work-Time Control (wave 1)					1.397	(0.545)					0.216 *	(0.093)
Work-Time Control Change					1.711	(0.739)					0.196	(0.138)
ROWE X Work-Time Control Change					2.060	(1.501)					0.374 *	(0.165)
Constant	0.322	(0.553)	0.120	(0.244)	0.046	(0.108)	1.744 **	(0.597)	1.396 **	(0.533)	0.674	(0.541)
N	214		214		214		214		214		214	
R-squared	--		--		--		0.124		0.310		0.409	
Goodness of Fit	244.43	198 *df*	219.15	198 *df*	217.33	198 *df*	--		--		--	
% Correctly Classified	81.31%		85.51%		85.98%		--		--		--	

Note: Sample Restricted to Parents

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

Table 5. OLS Regressions Estimating Various Work-Family Conflict Measures at Wave 2 for Parents

	Work-Family Conflict Scale				Negative Work to Family Spillover Scale				Time Adequacy Scale				Work Schedule Fit Scale			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8	
Variable:	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Wave 1 Measure	0.572 ***	(0.066)	0.491 ***	(0.065)	0.635 ***	(0.061)	0.604 ***	(0.061)	0.679 ***	(0.053)	0.619 ***	(0.053)	0.456 ***	(0.062)	0.451 ***	(0.061)
Women	-0.020	(0.107)	0.037	(0.097)	0.124	(0.076)	0.154 *	(0.074)	-0.023	(0.190)	-0.098	(0.183)	0.030	(0.161)	-0.006	(0.139)
Age 20-29 (Reference)																
Age 30-39	-0.189	(0.151)	-0.047	(0.136)	0.001	(0.106)	0.068	(0.102)	0.223	(0.266)	0.014	(0.253)	0.251	(0.224)	-0.016	(0.191)
Age 40-60	-0.246	(0.176)	-0.155	(0.158)	0.040	(0.124)	0.079	(0.119)	-0.067	(0.312)	-0.163	(0.294)	0.122	(0.262)	-0.019	(0.222)
Youngest Child Under 6	0.000	(0.118)	0.030	(0.106)	-0.011	(0.082)	0.004	(0.079)	-0.506 *	(0.211)	-0.562 **	(0.199)	0.092	(0.175)	0.075	(0.149)
Spouse Employed Less Than Full-Time	0.124	(0.157)	0.190	(0.140)	-0.151	(0.109)	-0.117	(0.105)	-0.023	(0.276)	-0.089	(0.260)	0.107	(0.234)	-0.004	(0.198)
Gender Role Ideology	-0.019	(0.073)	0.007	(0.066)	0.004	(0.050)	0.007	(0.049)	-0.019	(0.126)	-0.022	(0.120)	0.080	(0.107)	0.104	(0.092)
Exempt	-0.322	(0.236)	-0.274	(0.212)	-0.107	(0.165)	-0.081	(0.159)	0.023	(0.415)	-0.068	(0.394)	0.592	(0.340)	0.623 *	(0.290)
Non-Supervising Employee (Reference)																
Manager	0.068	(0.125)	0.043	(0.119)	0.066	(0.086)	0.042	(0.086)	-0.119	(0.218)	-0.063	(0.215)	-0.181	(0.183)	-0.027	(0.163)
Senior Manager and up	0.233	(0.145)	0.260	(0.138)	0.086	(0.100)	0.084	(0.099)	0.005	(0.252)	-0.004	(0.247)	0.171	(0.212)	0.248	(0.189)
Job Demands	0.335 **	(0.116)	0.280 **	(0.104)	0.203 *	(0.081)	0.167 *	(0.078)	-0.418 *	(0.192)	-0.314	(0.181)	-0.488 **	(0.162)	-0.334 *	(0.138)
Decision Authority	-0.113	(0.092)	0.014	(0.088)	-0.042	(0.064)	0.026	(0.066)	-0.009	(0.161)	-0.152	(0.164)	0.370 **	(0.141)	0.251 *	(0.126)
ROWE	-0.247 *	(0.104)	-0.114	(0.108)	-0.115	(0.073)	-0.017	(0.082)	0.292	(0.183)	-0.082	(0.203)	0.401 *	(0.155)	0.099	(0.153)
Work-Time Control (wave 1)			-0.376 ***	(0.085)			-0.161 **	(0.061)			0.384 *	(0.154)			0.352 **	(0.126)
Work-Time Control Change			-0.523 ***	(0.074)			-0.253 ***	(0.056)			0.643 ***	(0.138)			0.777 ***	(0.104)
Telecommutes (wave 1)			-0.049	(0.176)			0.017	(0.133)			0.183	(0.327)			-0.256	(0.248)
Telecommutes Change			0.011	(0.149)			0.010	(0.112)			-0.059	(0.276)			-0.517 *	(0.210)
Telecommuting Variability (wave 1)			0.055	(0.081)			-0.049	(0.061)			0.108	(0.150)			0.236 *	(0.114)
Telecommuting Variability			0.055	(0.067)			-0.009	(0.050)			0.176	(0.124)			0.261 **	(0.094)
Constant	0.806 +	(0.465)	1.897 ***	(0.473)	0.477	(0.332)	1.031 **	(0.356)	3.064 ***	(0.859)	2.057 *	(0.850)	2.710 ***	(0.750)	1.290	(0.661)
N	212		211		212		211		212		211		215		214	
R-squared	0.470		0.589		0.478		0.540		0.535		0.606		0.373		0.569	

Note: Sample Restricted to Parents

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