

**Work-life balance
of dual-earner couples:**

**Do advantages and disadvantages of
workplace demands and resources
accumulate within partnerships?**

**Stephanie Pausch
Mareike Reimann
Anja-Kristin Abendroth
Martin Diewald**

Stephanie Pausch, Mareike Reimann, Anja-Kristin Abendroth, Martin Diewald

**Work-life balance of dual-earner couples:
Do advantages and disadvantages of workplace demands and resources
accumulate within partnerships?**

SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 54
DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities
Research Project B3
Bielefeld, June 2015

SFB 882 Working Paper Series
General Editors: Martin Diewald, Thomas Faist and Stefan Liebig
ISSN 2193-9624

This publication has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

SFB 882 Working Papers are refereed scholarly papers. Submissions are reviewed by peers in a two-stage SFB 882 internal and external refereeing process before a final decision on publication is made.

The Working Paper Series is a forum for presenting works in progress. Readers should communicate comments on the manuscript directly to the author(s).

The papers can be downloaded from the SFB 882 website <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

SFB 882 "From Heterogeneities to Inequalities"
University of Bielefeld
Faculty of Sociology
PO Box 100131
D-33501 Bielefeld
Germany
Phone: +49-(0)521-106-4942 or +49-(0)521-106-4613
Email: office.sfb882@uni-bielefeld.de
Web: <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

DFG Research Center (SFB) “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities”

Whether fat or thin, male or female, young or old – people are different. Alongside their physical features, they also differ in terms of nationality and ethnicity; in their cultural preferences, lifestyles, attitudes, orientations, and philosophies; in their competencies, qualifications, and traits; and in their professions. But how do such heterogeneities lead to social inequalities? What are the social mechanisms that underlie this process? These are the questions pursued by the DFG Research Center (Sonderforschungsbereich (SFB)) “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities” at Bielefeld University, which was approved by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as “SFB 882” on May 25, 2011.

In the social sciences, research on inequality is dispersed across different research fields such as education, the labor market, equality, migration, health, or gender. One goal of the SFB is to integrate these fields, searching for common mechanisms in the emergence of inequality that can be compiled into a typology. More than fifty senior and junior researchers and the Bielefeld University Library are involved in the SFB. Along with sociologists, it brings together scholars from the Bielefeld University faculties of Business Administration and Economics, Educational Science, Health Science, and Law, as well as from the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) in Berlin and the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. In addition to carrying out research, the SFB is concerned to nurture new academic talent, and therefore provides doctoral training in its own integrated Research Training Group. A data infrastructure project has also been launched to archive, prepare, and disseminate the data gathered.

Research Project B3 “Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations”

This research project primarily addresses “capabilities” in working and private life and the interrelations between them. Adapting Sen’s approach, capabilities are the ability to achieve one’s life goals. The project adopts a comprehensive view that identifies multidimensional states of inequality. Crucial is the recognition that pursuing one’s interests in one life domain may even constrain goal attainment in other life domains. The same personal circumstances and employment conditions may be perceived and evaluated differently against the background of heterogeneous life goals. The concept of employment relationships allows us to gain an overview of a wide range of different gratifications and different demands and stresses, against the background of different psychological contracts. On the level of employees, we therefore firstly study the heterogeneity of different employment relationships in companies situated in various business sectors. Secondly, we assess these employees in terms of their embedment in various forms and phases of life. Thus, also the situation and views of a partner will be considered.

In a next step this project examines how heterogeneities (e.g. gender, age, life style preferences, education) become social inequalities with a particular focus on the role of the organizational context. As possible mechanisms different individual interests within companies and private bonds being negotiated in different ways are investigated. Health also plays a role in these interdependencies influencing the prospects for successful multiple engagement in both life domains. It is a “hard” indicator of maladjustment.

In this project detailed studies of employees and characteristics of their companies are carried out. Companies play a dual role, first as negotiation partners and second as opportunity structures. Various actors within the companies and companies’ institutional and sector-specific context are considered.

Proceeding from a sample of 100 work organizations, an extended linked employer-employee design will be used to study an average of 65 employees in each organization. If employees have life partners, they will also be surveyed with a short version of the instrument. By combining these data with information from the same employees and their companies from the German Institute for Employment Research (IAB), we can achieve a unique density of information for large case numbers. The longitudinal design initiated during the first funding period allows distinguishing causal effects more clearly and to adequately study processes of discrimination and self-selection.

The Authors

Stephanie Pausch is a member of the SFB 882 project B3 “Interactions between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations” and PhD candidate at the Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology (BGHS). Her research focuses on the interrelation of work and family life of employees in different work organizations.

Contact: stephanie.pausch@uni-bielefeld.de

Mareike Reimann is a member of the SFB 882 project B3 “Interactions between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations” and PhD candidate at the Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology (BGHS). Her research focuses on the interplay of work and health of employees in different work organizations.

Contact: mareike.reimann@uni-bielefeld.de

Anja-Kristin Abendroth is a postdoctoral research fellow in the SFB 882 research project B3 “Interactions between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations”. She defended her dissertation with the title “Working Women in Europe. How the Country, Workplace, and Family Context Matter” conducted at the Department of Sociology at Utrecht University and the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS) in January 2013. Her research interests lie in the interplay of work and family life, social inequalities, social support and organizational and cross-national comparative research.

Contact: anja.abendroth@uni-bielefeld.de

Martin Diewald is Professor for Socio-Structural Analysis at Bielefeld University, Research Professor at the DIW Berlin and Member of the Academic Advisory Board on family issues at the Federal Ministry for Families, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth. Moreover, he is spokesperson of the SFB 882 “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities” and Director of the SFB projects A1 “Social Closure and Hierarchization: Contextual Conditions of Unequal Developmental Opportunities in Early Phases of Life” and B3 “Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations”. His specialist research areas are social inequalities, life courses, families, social networks and work-life interdependencies.

Contact: martin.diewald@uni-bielefeld.de

**Work-life balance of dual-earner couples:
Do advantages and disadvantages of workplace demands and resources
accumulate within partnerships?***

Stephanie Pausch, Mareike Reimann, Anja-Kristin Abendroth, Martin Diewald

Abstract

This study investigates the complex interplay between couples' work and private life spheres and disentangles how demands and resources affect partners' satisfaction with their work-life balance. Next to the individual process of spillover of workplace demands and resources to the private life sphere we investigate processes of crossover of one spouse's demands and resources to the other. We particularly argue that within partnerships an accumulation of individual demands and resources from both partners takes place leading to specifically disadvantaged situations, when it comes to demands, and specifically advantaged situations, when it comes to resources. Furthermore we investigate gender differences in the relevance of spillover, crossover and accumulation for a satisfying work-life balance. We make use of a German Linked Employer-Employee Panel Survey (LEEP-B3), which includes information on 100 work organizations, 6,454 employees, and their partners (2,185). Our results mainly support the spillover of demands and resources from work to private life meaning that workplace demands make integrating work and private life more difficult whereas workplace resources can help reaching a satisfying work-life balance more easily. The results also partly support the hypothesized crossover of demands and resources from one partner to the other. However, there is no such clear-cut picture for the accumulation of demands and resources within partnerships.

Keywords: work-life balance, dual-earner couples, job demands and resources, spillover, crossover, cumulative advantages and disadvantages, partnerships

* A previous version of this paper was presented at the Work and Family Researchers Network (WFRN) Conference on June 19-21, 2014 in New York.

Introduction

One of the main challenges that dual-earner couples have to face today is integrating responsibilities of work and private life to reach a satisfying work-life balance. Much of the research in this area shows that individuals' workplace demands and resources are likely to spill over into their private sphere and to lead to conflict between the two life domains (e.g., Staines, 1980; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Voydanoff, 2004; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Moreover, there is also research that focuses on dual-earner couples and the influence of one spouse's working conditions on the other (e. g., Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Becker & Moen, 1999; Bakker, Demerouti, & Burke, 2009). As suggested by the concepts of "linked lives" and "coupled-careers" of Elder (1995) and Han and Moen (1999), lives of spouses are interconnected, which means that it is likely that one spouse's workplace conditions affect the other's ability to integrate work and private life. Westman (2001, 2006) argues that processes of crossover take place within couples, meaning that job stress or strain is able to cross over from one spouse to the other through mechanisms like empathy. Bakker and Demerouti (2013) integrated both approaches of spillover and crossover into the spillover-crossover model (SCM), which is based on the assumption that a spillover of emotions from the workplace to the private domain takes place and then feelings cross over from one spouse to the other. The authors note that the *intra*-personal process of spillover takes place before the *inter*-personal process of crossover. In addition, the SCM suggests that workplace conditions and experience of conflict between work and private life have an impact on one's well-being. A question that must be asked aside from questions about the individual importance of one's own or the partner's demands is whether the accumulation of both partners' workplace demands in their partnership can lead to even greater difficulties in integrating work and private life. Conversely, workplace resources of both partners may also accumulate within partnerships and enable the partners to integrate work and private life even more satisfactorily. Following the definition by Valcour (2007), we define satisfaction with the work-life balance as the overall satisfaction with the integration of work and private life. To take into account the accumulation of demands and resources within partnerships in order to explain differences in the satisfaction with one's work-life balance, we argue in line with the concept of cumulative advantages and disadvantages (DiPrete & Eirich, 2006). By applying this aspect of inequality in the context of couples, we investigate whether spouses in a partnership in which both partners have demanding workplace conditions are specifically disadvantaged when it comes to achieving a satisfactory integration of work and

private life, as compared with couples with only one partner having to deal with high workplace demands. Spouses in a partnership in which both partners can benefit from a large amount of workplace resources may have a particular advantage because they are able to integrate work and family life more easily than are couples in relationships in which neither spouse or only one spouse has high resources. However, within couples, the effects of workplace demands and resources for one's work-life balance are likely to be different for women and men. Given that in Germany women are still responsible for most of the household and caring tasks (e.g., Blossfeld & Drobnič, 2001; Grunow, Schulz, & Blossfeld, 2007), and that it is thus more challenging to integrate the two life spheres, it can be assumed that women are more strongly affected by the accumulation of demands and resources than men.

The aim of this study, then, is to investigate the complex interplay between the work and the private life of women and men in partnerships and how demands and resources of both spouses mutually affect their ability to achieve a satisfying work-life balance. We consider processes of spillover from work to private life and processes of crossover from one partner to the other to investigate spouses' experience of a satisfying integration of work and family life. Moreover, we specifically focus on the accumulation of workplace demands and resources within partnerships. Our main research questions are:

(1) What effect do the spillover, crossover, and accumulation of workplace demands and resources have on one's own satisfaction with one's work-life balance?

(2) Do the spillover, crossover, and accumulation of demands and resources have the same effect on women's and men's work-life balance?

There is ample literature analyzing how workplace demands and resources influence individuals' private lives through processes of spillover (Staines, 1980; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Allen et al., 2000; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003; Kinman & Jones, 2008). Previous studies indicate that demanding workplace conditions that lead to stress and strain are likely to spill over into individuals' private life and make it difficult to integrate the two life spheres (Grzywacz, Almeida, & McDonald, 2002; Frone, 2003; Voydanoff, 2004; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Böhm & Diewald, 2012). Research has also found evidence of an effect of one partner's demanding workplace conditions on the other partner (e.g., Burke, Weir, & DuWors, 1980; Greenhaus et al., 1989; Jones & Fletcher, 1993; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Moen & Yu, 2000; Matthews et al., 2006; Fagan & Press, 2008). Findings concerning processes of crossover

indicate that a spouse's well-being is affected if their partner experiences stressful workplace conditions (Demerouti, Bakker & Schaufeli, 2005; Shimazu, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2009; Shimazu et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2014).

We contribute to previous research in different ways. Our focus is on the accumulation of demands and resources within couples and on its effects on one's work-life balance. By analyzing the workplace demands and resources of both spouses separately, as well as the accumulation within partnerships, we are able to follow the emergence of work-life balance from the individual level to constellations of workplace conditions of both partners. We also take a closer look at gender differences by examining whether one's own workplace conditions, the partner's workplace conditions, and the accumulation of the workplace conditions of both partners have the same effects on women's and men's work-life balance. In addition, we are able to consider different organizational and workplace contexts, whereas most of the previous research was based on case studies of employees working in one or a few work organizations (see Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Allen et al., 2000; Byron, 2005). We make use of a German Linked Employer-Employee Panel Survey (LEEP-B3), which includes information on 100 work organizations, 6,454 employees, and their partners (2,185) (for more information, see Abendroth et al., 2014; Diewald et al., 2014; Pausch et al., 2014). This national sample overcomes the limitations of the hitherto prevailing case studies and allows for a reliable examination of statistical associations for employees in a variety of workplaces and work organizations.

In our study, we disentangle workplace demands and resources that influence employees' satisfaction with their work-life balance in three steps (Sect. 1.1). First, we draw on the spillover approach (Staines, 1980; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003) to argue that the demands and resources from individuals' work sphere can spill over into their private sphere, thus leading to lower/higher satisfaction with the balance between the two spheres (1.2). Second, we introduce the crossover model (Westman, 2001, 2006; Bakker & Demerouti, 2013), according to which the job demands and resources of individuals in a partnership can cross over from one partner to the other (1.3). Third, we consider that the demands and resources of both partners can accumulate within the partnership, thus leading to even lower/higher levels of satisfaction with the work-life balance (1.4). We then also briefly discuss the role of gender differences (1.5). Section 2 presents the data used for the analyses, while Section 3 explains the method and the operationalization. The

descriptive and multivariate analyses are presented in Section 4, and Section 5 summarizes and discusses the results of the empirical analysis.

1. Theory and recent research

1.1 Satisfaction with the work-life balance

The literature concerning the integration of work and private life covers a number of theoretical approaches explaining the interplay of the two life spheres as for example work-family conflict or enrichment, compensation, segmentation, and resource drain (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Lambert, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). However, the concept of work-life balance is less disentangled. In our study, we consider the satisfaction with the integration of work and private life to capture the satisfaction with the work-life balance. We focus on satisfaction with the work-life balance, following Valcour (2007), who defines satisfaction with the work-life balance as “an overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one’s degree of success at meeting work and family role demands” (p. 1512). Likewise, Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw (2003) consider work-life balance as “the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in—and equally satisfied with—his or her work role and family role” (p. 513), which also suggests that a balanced integration of the roles of work and private life goes along with a low level of work-family conflict.

1.2 Spillover of demands and resources from work into private life

In this study, we focus on the effect of job conditions on how satisfied employed individuals in partnerships are with their work-life balance. According to the job demands-resources model (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), job conditions should be categorized primarily into demands and resources. The spillover approach is based on the assumption that workplace demands and resources can affect an individual’s private life and that they lead to similarities between the two spheres depending on factors such as mood or behavior (Staines, 1980; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). A stressful job and a monotonous schedule, for example, may lead to the depletion or loss of energy in the individual, which in turn may result in a lack of energy in the family (Zedeck, 1992). There is ample research showing that workplace demands and resources influence individuals’ private lives as a result of such spillover processes (e.g., Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Allen et al., 2000; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003; Voydanoff, 2004; Kinman & Jones, 2008). With regard to the context of couples, it is important to first consider the individual effect of

spillover because it is through this process that workplace conditions are carried over into the private life and the partnership.

Research on satisfaction with the work-life balance has shown that workplace demands such as work stress and long working hours are factors that make it difficult to reconcile responsibilities in the two life spheres (e.g., Byron, 2005; Abendroth & Dulk, 2011). Long working hours and having to work overtime are demands that can make it more difficult to fulfill one's role in the private-life domain (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Voydanoff, 2004, 2005) and make it less easy to reconcile work and family life, thus reducing satisfaction with the work-life balance (Valcour, 2007). Having to communicate about work-related aspects outside working hours with a supervisor or with co-workers is an example of a boundary-spanning demand which complicates the fulfillment of roles expected from the work and family domain (Clark, 2000; Voydanoff, 2005). Normative demands such as when employees are regarded as being less committed to their work if family-friendly arrangements are used can also make employees' integration of work and private life more difficult (Lewis, 1997; Fagan, 2004; Sheridan, 2004; Hobson & Fahlén, 2009; Lewis & Humbert, 2010). An environment that is experienced as not family-friendly has been found to prevent use of supportive benefits provided by the organization and thus to make it less likely that employees will be able to better integrate work and private-life responsibilities (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Allen, 2001).

Workplace resources can help directly to make achieving work-life balance easier, or they can indirectly allow for better integration of work and private life by preventing or buffering negative consequences of demanding conditions (Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Byron, 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). For example, greater autonomy over one's schedule allows for increased flexibility in responding to unpredictable demands at home, which is likely to reduce conflict between work and private life (Voydanoff, 2004, 2005; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Allen, Shockley, & Poteat, 2008; Hill et al., 2001, 2010). Hill et al. (2001) showed that schedule flexibility was related to a better work-life balance. Likewise, job autonomy was found to enable employees to arrange their working hours and work schedule more autonomously, which makes it easier for them to assume responsibilities in their private lives (Clark, 2000; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Research has shown that the family friendliness of an organizational culture facilitates one's ability to integrate work and private life (Lewis & Cooper, 1987; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Allen, 2001; Voydanoff, 2004). Support

from a supervisor was found to be particularly important for the ability to reconcile work with personal life (e.g., Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Allen, 2001; Frye & Breaugh, 2004; Voydanoff, 2004; Byron, 2005). Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that support from a supervisor goes along with a lower level of work-family conflict and a higher level of well-being, the proposed explanation being that supportive supervisors can empathize with their employees' need to integrate work and family responsibilities. Abendroth and Dulk (2011) found that, for employees in Europe, supervisor support is an important predictor of satisfaction with the work-life balance. Similarly, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) noted that social support is one of the most important resources that can buffer job strain, and Haddock et al. (2006) found in their qualitative study that dual-earner couples' resources such as flexible work scheduling, job autonomy, and support from a supervisor are some of the most-mentioned factors that support a satisfactory work-life balance. According to the spillover approach and recent research our hypotheses are:

H1a: If one experiences high levels of workplace demands, one is less satisfied with one's work-life balance.

H1b: If one experiences high levels of workplace resources, one is more satisfied with one's work-life balance.

1.3 Crossover of demands and resources from one partner to the other

Within partnerships, it is not only the demands and resources of one's own workplace that are likely to have an influence on one's satisfaction with one's work-life balance, but the demands and resources of the partner have an influence as well. According to the theoretical approach to crossover (Westman, 2001, 2006), experiencing demanding workplace conditions has an influence on spouses' well-being and life satisfaction (Bakker, Westman, & Emmerik, 2009). Crossover of workplace demands occurs if the job strain of one spouse affects the other spouse. Westman (2001, 2006) and Bakker and Demerouti (2009) distinguish three underlying mechanisms that lead to crossover from one individual to another: First, direct crossover of feelings from one partner to the other may occur via empathy. Second, there may also be stressors that affect both spouses directly and lead to an increased level of strain (e.g., through financial pressure). Third, crossover may occur as a result of indirect processes of interaction, as when one partner is unable to support the other due to stress at work. As a result of the same processes crossover can also lead to resources experienced by one partner having a positive effect on the other.

Research has shown that in addition to one's own demands in the workplace, stress and strain experienced by the partner may also affect one's own ability to reconcile one's work with one's personal life as a result of crossover processes (Westman & Etzion, 1995; Matthews et al., 2006; Demerouti, Bakker & Schaufeli, 2005; Bakker, Demerouti, & Burke, 2009; Shimazu et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2014). If a spouse has to work long hours or communicate with a supervisor or co-workers outside working hours, the partner also may be affected by a crossover of these demanding working conditions. Fagan and Press (2008) found a correlation between fathers' stress at work and a reduction in their wives' ability to integrate work with family life, the authors' conclusion being that the male partner's workload may negatively affect the female partner through the mechanism of empathy or as a result of the male partner's inability to spend more time with the family. Hammer, Allen, and Grigsby (1997) showed that women's work salience is a significant predictor of men experiencing work-family conflict. Likewise, Demerouti, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2005) found that effects of crossover occur within couples and provided evidence that females' exhaustion crosses over to their partner and leads to lower life satisfaction. By analyzing the effects of crossover within Japanese couples, Bakker et al. (2014) showed that not only is one's family satisfaction influenced by experiencing one's own demands or resources in the workplace, but that it is also an indirect effect of experiencing work-family conflict and a reduced family satisfaction of the partner. The authors pointed out that work engagement, which is likely to be influenced by workplace resources, had a positive effect on one's own family satisfaction and the satisfaction of the partner. The study of Demerouti (2012) provided also evidence of positive effects of resource crossover between spouses.

In line with the assumption of crossover our hypotheses are:

H2a: If one's partner experiences high levels of workplace demands, one is less satisfied with one's work-life balance.

H2b: If one's partner experiences high levels of workplace resources, one is more satisfied with one's work-life balance.

1.4 Accumulation of demands and resources within a partnership

In addition to considering the role of one's own and the partner's workplace demands and resources, we emphasize the importance of taking into account the special conditions within partnerships. We argue not only that individuals in partnerships influence each other through processes of crossover but that it is likely for effects of accumulation to occur within

partnerships. Drawing on the concept of cumulative advantages and disadvantages (DiPrete & Eirich, 2006), we argue that if both partners experience highly demanding workplaces, their experiences accumulate, leading to an even higher level of stress and strain within the partnership. Such an accumulation of demands may reduce partners' ability to integrate responsibilities of work and family life, thus reducing the level of satisfaction with the work-life balance. Recent research on workplace demands and resources has argued that experiences of demands and resources accumulate in an individual and lead to even greater negative effects such as burnout or engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009). Our approach is to consider the effect of accumulation not only in individuals but also within partnerships. Spouses in partnerships in which both partners experience demanding workplace conditions are particularly disadvantaged when it comes to achieving a satisfactory integration of work and private life, because the partner is less able to buffer negative consequences of a stressful job. In such cases, the partner is for example unable to take over some of the spouse's household responsibilities, which is likely to make integrating work and private life more difficult. If both partners often have to work overtime or communicate with supervisors and co-workers outside working hours, both partners have less time and energy left for the family, which may prove to be a double burden on the family. In contrast, if both partners have workplace conditions that provide a high level of resources, they have a particular advantage because the resources are likely to accumulate within the partnership. If both partners have a high level of job autonomy, or if they get support from their supervisor concerning family issues, they both are more flexible in spending time with the family, which makes it easier for them to integrate work and private life. This means that spouses in a high-resource partnership should find it easier to integrate work and family life than individuals in partnerships in which only one spouse has a high level of resources. Our hypotheses based on the argument of accumulation are:

H3a: If both partners experience high levels of workplace demands, one is least satisfied with one's work-life balance.

H3b: If both partners experience high levels of workplace resources, one is most satisfied with one's work-life balance.

1.5 Gender differences in the spillover, crossover, and accumulation of resources and demands

Even if both partners are employed, there are still differences between their work and private-life responsibilities (Blossfeld & Drobnič, 2001; Drobnič & León, 2014). Given that women still perform most caring and household tasks, it is likely that demands such as long working hours or overtime affect women more negatively than men. Therefore, it is likely that workplace demands and resources have a different effect on women's and men's satisfaction with the way their work and private lives are integrated. As a result of the prevailing gender norms, women may have different expectations as to how work and family life should be integrated. These different expectations of women and men may in turn lead to differences in satisfaction with how the two life spheres are balanced, even if they experience the same level of demands or resources. Studies on gender differences in the role of workplace conditions in the integration of work and family life have been mixed and some of those studies did not find any gender differences (e.g., Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007). However, recent research has shown that experiencing the same level of workplace demands leads to greater work-life conflict for women than it does for men (Grönlund & Öun, 2010). Kossek and Ozeki (1998) found that experiencing work-family conflict is more strongly related to life satisfaction for women than it is for men. In line with this, one can assume that women's work-life balance is more strongly affected by workplace demands through processes of spillover. Moreover, it is also likely that women are particularly disadvantaged by the experience of workplace demands within partnerships. Therefore, we also assume that women are more strongly affected by crossover of their partners' workplace demands and accumulation of demands experienced by both.

Since, as we argue, workplace demands affect women and men differently, it is also likely that workplace resources have a different effect on women's and men's satisfaction with their work-life balance. Given that women are responsible for most household tasks and that they take over most caring responsibilities, we argue that women benefit more from workplace resources than men. Byron (2005) was able to show that women benefit more from workplace resources such as flexible work schedules than do men. The same effect can be assumed if women have a high level of job autonomy, or if they receive support from their supervisors. Since women and men may be affected differently, it is important to consider the influence of the effects of demands and resources and the accumulation within

couples separately for women and men. Our spillover, crossover, and accumulation hypotheses concerning gender are:

H4a: Women's satisfaction with their work-life balance is more strongly affected by the spillover of workplace resources and demands.

H4b: Women's satisfaction with their work-life balance is more strongly affected by the crossover of their partner's workplace resources and demands.

H4c: Women's satisfaction with their work-life balance is more strongly affected by the accumulation of workplace resources and demands.

2. Data

We make use of a unique linked employer-employee data set (LEEP-B3). This data set is based on the "Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life" study, which is part of Bielefeld University's Collaborative Research Center "From Heterogeneities to Inequalities," founded by the German Research Foundation (for more information, see Abendroth et al., 2014; Diewald et al., 2014, Pausch et al., 2014). The data set provides information on 6,454 employees at 100 work organizations who were surveyed from August 2012 through April 2013. The work organizations were randomly selected from companies in Germany with at least 500 regular employees. The sample covers various segments of the economy. The data set offers a wide range of information on employment conditions and on the private lives of employees. In cases where an employee had a partner, the partner was interviewed using a shorter version of the questionnaire. Since both spouses were interviewed separately, we have individual information on each spouse. By using this data set we have information about 2,185 employees with additional partner information. Our sample contains 1,619 couples with both partners being employed and living in the same household. For the multilevel regression model we are finally able to use information on 1,111 partnerships. We have information on the individual satisfaction with the work-life balance of both partners from 1,109 partnerships (2,118 individuals). For two partnerships we have only information on the man's satisfaction. Since we analyze the individual satisfaction with work-life balance we do not necessarily need the information on the partner's satisfaction to use these two cases. Therefore, the multilevel analysis is based on 2,220 individuals of which 1,109 are female and 1,111 male.

3. Method

Our data on couples are hierarchically structured, meaning that individual employees are clustered into partnerships. To consider this hierarchical structure, we use a multilevel approach that allows us to analyze variances among couples and within partnerships. We estimate a multilevel regression model with robust standard errors to get a better idea of what effect demands and resources have within partnerships. To test for gender differences, we estimate an integrated model for women and men together, which enables us to test coefficients directly against one another. The regression model includes all workplace demands and resources, as well as the sociodemographic variables.

Measures

Dependent variable

We use as the dependent variable the main respondents' satisfaction with how their work and private lives are integrated. Respondents were asked, "How satisfied are you currently with the possibility to integrate work and private life?" They were then asked to indicate their level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale ranging from "totally unsatisfied" (0) to "totally satisfied" (10).

Independent variables

Workplace demands

To reflect demands in both partners' workplaces, we use variables for both partners.

Actual working hours: We integrate the actual working hours of both partners separately to control for different work status. In addition, we control for an interaction effect between one's own and the partner's actual working hours.

For all other crucial variables, we use combinations of high or low workplace demands and resources of each partner in order to assess different constellations within partnerships. The operationalization of combinations of high or low workplace demands and resources is used to illustrate the three hypothesized processes of spillover, crossover, and accumulation. For each of the workplace demands and resources, we differentiate between "neither partner has this high demand/resource level" (used as reference), "only oneself has this high demand/resource level" (spillover hypotheses), "only the partner has this high demand/resource level" (crossover hypotheses), and "both partners have this high demand/resource level" (accumulation hypotheses).

Overtime: High demand levels due to working overtime are present if employees stated that they worked overtime every day or every week. Our combined variable is generated as follows: 0 = neither partner high overtime; 1 = only oneself high overtime; 2 = only partner overtime; 3 = both partners high overtime.

Work communication outside working hours: Work-related communication outside working hours is measured by how often respondents answer emails or telephone calls from superiors or co-workers outside their working hours. A high level of demand means daily or weekly availability. As with the overtime variable, we use a combined variable for the high demand of frequent work communication outside working hours (0 = neither partner frequent work communication outside working hours; 1 = only oneself frequent work communication outside working hours; 2 = only partner frequent work communication outside working hours; 3 = both partners frequent work communication outside working hours).

Leadership responsibilities: Respondents were asked whether they had to supervise others, such as a team, a larger group, or parts of the business. We combine leadership responsibilities for both partners (0 = neither partner with leadership responsibilities; 1 = only oneself with leadership responsibilities; 2 = only partner with leadership responsibilities; 3 = both partners with leadership responsibilities).

Family-unfriendly work culture: Respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale how true it is that employees who make use of family-supportive measures are viewed as less committed to their company (1 = true; 5 = not true). If respondents indicated 1, 2, or 3, we assess the work organization as family-unfriendly. We then use the combined variable of both partners' work organization again (0 = neither partner in family-unfriendly work organization; 1 = only oneself in family-unfriendly work organization; 2 = only the partner in family-unfriendly work organization; 3 = both partners in family-friendly work organization).

Workplace resources

As with the demands, we use combinations of high and low levels of resources to reflect different situations within partnerships.

Job autonomy: We use three items to reflect the individual job situation ("Within my working hours I have control over the sequencing of my work activities"; "I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done"; "I am able to define what my job objectives

are”) and a 15-point scale to assess self-rated job autonomy (0 = low autonomy; 15 = high autonomy). We then combine the job autonomy levels of both partners using the same combination scheme as before, with high autonomy indicated by 13, 14, or 15 on the autonomy scale (0 = neither partner with high job autonomy; 1 = only oneself with high job autonomy; 2 = only partner with high job autonomy; 3 = both partners with high job autonomy).

Support from superiors: We use the rated amount of support that superiors provide to help with the integration of work and family life (1 = true; 5 = not true), with “1” being interpreted as a high level of support and “2” through “5” being taken to mean moderate support to no support at all. We then use the combined variable for high level of support for both partners from their respective superiors (0 = neither partner with high support; 1 = only oneself with high support; 2 = only partner with high support; 3 = both partners with high support).

Sociodemographic variables

To consider different types of division of labor within partnerships, we use the relative share of time spent on household work and/or childcare, which was calculated by the absolute hours spent on household and/or childcare tasks by each partner. For this purpose, a distinction is made between “equal division” (each partner contributes 40–60% to the total time spent on household work and/or childcare), “partner spends more time” (if the partner does more than 60% of the work), and “oneself spends more time” (if oneself does more than 60%).

On the household base, we include the number of children in the household (no children; one child; two children; three or more children) and the categorized monthly net household income (< €3,000; €3,000–5,000; > €5,000). In addition, we use the combined level of education of the two partners (0 = neither partner with a high level of education; 1 = only oneself with a high level of education; 2 = only the partner with a high level of education; 3 = both partners with a high level of education).

4. Results

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 shows the distribution, means and standard errors of the satisfaction with the work-life balance for the relevant variables separately for women and men. The results for women's workplace demands such as work communication outside working hours show the highest mean satisfaction scores for individuals in relationships in which neither partner has high workplace demands. Satisfaction is lower if the respondent or the partner has a highly demanding workplace, and is lowest if both partners work under demanding conditions, a finding that is consistent with the hypothesis of spillover, crossover and accumulation. The pattern is the same for other workplace demands such as having to work overtime, a family-unfriendly work organization, and leadership responsibilities because the cumulative experience of both partners shows the lowest level of satisfaction with the way work and family life are integrated. We do not find any such clear-cut results for men, however. Concerning work communication outside working hours we can also see effects of accumulation, with the lowest mean level of satisfaction with the work-life balance being observed if both partners experience these demands and the highest average satisfaction if neither partner experiences this demand. For working overtime men's satisfaction is lowest if both partners have to work a lot of overtime and only somewhat higher if only they experience high amounts of overtime. However, their satisfaction is highest if only their partner has to work overtime. The lowest mean for family-unfriendly work organization and leadership responsibilities is observed if the man is the only partner in the relationship who experiences these demands. The average satisfaction is highest if neither partner experiences a family-unfriendly work organization or leadership responsibilities.

The results for workplace resources are somewhat more mixed. Women who receive support with integrating work and private life are most satisfied if either only they or they and their partner get support from their respective supervisors. The mean level of satisfaction is lowest if neither partner is supported by supervisors. For men, however, we see a clear picture: men are least satisfied with the way their work and private life are integrated if neither partner gets any support from their respective supervisors, and most satisfied if both partners receive support in their respective workplace. This finding supports the hypothesis concerning the positive effect of resource accumulation by both partners. Men who are the only ones supported are slightly more satisfied on average compared with men whose partner is the only one in the partnership who receives support. Women benefit

most from a high level of job autonomy if both partners have this resource at their disposal, and less if they are the only one in the relationship who has a high level of job autonomy. On average, women's level of satisfaction is lowest if neither partner has a high level of job autonomy. For men we also see the lowest level of satisfaction if neither partner has a high level of occupational autonomy and the highest if only their partner experiences that resource. Compared to women, men explicitly profit from their partner's job autonomy even if they do not have job autonomy at their disposal themselves, which supports the crossover hypothesis. Women only profit if both partners have a high resource of job autonomy.

With regard the mean satisfaction scores for different types of labor division within the household: women are more satisfied with the way their work and private life are integrated if they perform most of the household tasks themselves, whereas men are most satisfied if the work is divided equally. Likewise, women whose partner performs more than 60 percent of the household work show the lowest mean satisfaction scores, whereas men who have to perform more than 60 percent of that work are least satisfied. In addition, we find a difference in the monthly net household income; we see some differences between women and men. The general tendency shown by the mean scores for men is that the lower the income the higher the average level of satisfaction. Men show the highest level of satisfaction if they have a monthly income of less than €3,000 and the lowest level of satisfaction if they are in the highest income category (more than €5,000). The results for women are comparable: the highest levels of satisfaction with the work-life balance can be observed in women who live in households with a net income of less than €3,000. The findings concerning level of education indicate that the mean level of satisfaction for men is lowest if both partners have a high educational level, and highest if neither partner is highly educated. However, men's satisfaction is comparably high if only they are highly educated. Likewise, the highest average level of satisfaction is observed in women in a partnership in which neither partner is highly educated, while the lowest average level of satisfaction is observed in women in a partnership in which both partners have a high educational level. Men with two children show the highest average level of satisfaction, whereas men with three or more children are least satisfied. Women who have no children are least satisfied and most satisfied if they have two children.

Table 1. Distribution, means, and standard errors of the satisfaction with the integration of work and private life over workplace demands and resources and socioeconomic variables

	Women			Men		
	%	Mean	SE	%	Mean	SE
Work communication outside working hours						
Neither partner	51.31	7.78	0.08	51.40	7.26	0.08
Only oneself	14.25	7.21	0.15	24.30	6.71	0.12
Only partner	24.35	7.73	0.11	14.22	7.18	0.16
Both partners	10.10	7.00	0.20	10.08	6.70	0.12
Overtime						
Neither partner	29.85	8.01	0.10	29.88	7.29	0.10
Only oneself	16.32	7.25	0.14	31.77	6.80	0.10
Only partner	31.74	7.72	0.10	16.29	7.46	0.15
Both partners	22.09	7.16	0.12	22.05	6.74	0.13
Family-unfriendly work organization						
Neither partner	37.78	7.97	0.08	37.80	7.37	0.09
Only oneself	24.89	7.17	0.12	20.88	6.44	0.14
Only partner	20.83	7.80	0.12	24.84	7.35	0.11
Both partners	16.50	7.17	0.16	16.47	6.57	0.14
Leadership responsibilities						
Neither partner	34.45	7.75	0.09	34.38	7.18	0.10
Only oneself	13.35	7.29	0.16	38.43	6.88	0.10
Only partner	38.32	7.76	0.09	13.32	7.11	0.16
Both partners	13.89	7.12	0.15	13.86	7.07	0.15
Much support from superiors						
Neither partner	39.40	7.15	0.09	39.51	6.62	0.09
Only oneself	28.40	8.20	0.08	18.72	7.60	0.13
Only partner	18.76	7.24	0.14	28.35	6.88	0.11
Both partners	13.44	8.17	0.13	13.41	7.85	0.14
High occupational autonomy						
Neither partner	50.68	7.36	0.08	50.59	6.85	0.09
Only oneself	19.57	7.91	0.12	18.99	7.51	0.12
Only partner	19.03	7.64	0.13	19.71	7.83	0.14
Both partners	10.73	8.11	0.15	10.71	7.49	0.15
Division of labor in the household						
Partner spends more time	10.10	7.47	0.18	60.67	7.01	0.08
Time spent about equal, 40–60%	29.22	7.50	0.10	29.25	7.17	0.10
Oneself spends more time	60.69	7.68	0.07	10.08	6.87	0.19
Monthly net household income						
< €3,000	14.52	7.78	0.14	14.49	7.19	0.17
€3,000–5,000	58.34	7.57	0.08	58.42	7.03	0.07
> €5,000	27.14	7.59	0.10	27.09	6.99	0.12
High level of education						
Neither partner	29.04	7.90	0.10	29.07	7.21	0.11
Only oneself	14.61	7.46	0.14	15.03	7.19	0.14
Only partner	15.06	7.77	0.15	14.58	7.02	0.16
Both partners	41.30	7.39	0.09	41.31	6.88	0.09
Number of children in the household						
No children	26.42	7.42	0.11	26.46	7.00	0.11
1 child	29.49	7.62	0.11	28.44	7.05	0.11
2 children	37.15	7.72	0.09	37.17	7.14	0.09
3 or more children	7.94	7.60	0.20	7.92	6.67	0.24
N of observations (spouses)	1,109			1,111		

Source: LEEP-B3. SFB 882 (doi:10.4119/unibi/sfb882.2014.12)

Multivariate Analysis

The results of the multivariate analysis are presented in Table 2. The regression model shows the effects of workplace demands and resources on satisfaction with the work-life balance.

The general pattern that the longer one's own actual working hours the lower the satisfaction with the work-life balance is found to be significant for both women and men, which supports the spillover hypothesis H1a. However, the effects of one's own actual working hours do not differ significantly between women and men, which means that there is no evidence to support the gender hypothesis H4a. Nor is there any significant effect of the partner's working hours on women or men, which means that neither the crossover hypothesis H2b nor the gender hypothesis H4b is supported. Nevertheless, the interaction of women's own working hours and those of their partners shows a small but significant effect, at least on the 10 percent significance level. This result partly supports the accumulation hypothesis H3a but not the gender hypothesis H4c, since there are no significant differences in this respect between women and men.

Working large amounts of overtime goes along with a significantly lower level of satisfaction with the work-life balance for women but not for men, a finding that partly supports the spillover hypothesis H1a. Women whose partner is the only one in the relationship who has to work excessive amounts of overtime feel less satisfied with their work-life balance. This was not observed for men, a finding that partly supports the crossover hypothesis H2a. This difference between women and men is statistically significant and indicates that women are negatively affected if their partner has to work excessive amounts of overtime, but that men who are in the same situation are not. This result partly supports hypothesis H4b, according to which women are more negatively affected than men by the workplace demands of their spouse. If both partners have to work large amounts of overtime, there is a significant negative effect on women but not on men. The effects on women and men differ significantly, which supports hypothesis H4c. However, the difference between the effects of only oneself working overtime and those of both partners working overtime is not significant for women or for men. This result indicates that the negative effects of working overtime experienced by both partners stem primarily from one's own demands, which suggests that, contrary to hypothesis H3a, there is no significant accumulation effect in this area.

The results indicate that men who experience the demand of work-related communication outside working hours on a regular basis have a lower level of satisfaction with their work-life balance, which supports the spillover hypothesis H1a. This effect was not found for

women: if the partner is the only one in the relationship who has to spend a considerable amount of time on work-related communication outside working hours, there is no significant effect on women's or men's level of satisfaction with the way their work and family life are integrated. This result contradicts the crossover hypothesis H2a. If both partners experience the demand to spend excessive amounts of time on work-related communication outside working hours, there is a significant effect on both women and men. However, the effect of the accumulation of this demanding workplace condition on both partners is not significantly different from the effect that this demand has if it is experienced only by oneself. This means that, as far as the demand work-related communication outside working hours is concerned, the results show no evidence to support the accumulation hypothesis H3a. Nor are the effects significantly different for women and men, which means that none of the gender hypotheses H4a through H4c is supported by our findings.

The demand leadership responsibilities does not show any significant effect on men at all, whereas women with leadership responsibilities are negatively affected. This supports the spillover hypothesis H1a, although the effect is significant only on the 10 percent level. Women's satisfaction is significantly negatively affected if they and their partners both have leadership responsibilities, a result that partly supports the accumulation hypothesis H3a. The differences in this respect between women and men are also significant in that they support hypothesis H4c concerning gender differences: women are more negatively affected by the accumulation of leadership responsibilities than are men.

A family-unfriendly work organization has a significant negative effect on one's satisfaction with one's own work-life balance, which confirms the spillover hypothesis H1a for women and men. If only one's partner experiences a family-unfriendly work organization, there is no effect, which means that the crossover hypothesis H2a is not supported by our findings. However, if both partners experience a family-unfriendly work organization, this has negative effects on both women and men, although these effects do not differ significantly from those of one being the only one in the partnership who experiences a family-unfriendly work organization. The results thus show no evidence to support the accumulation hypothesis H3a.

In addition, we estimate the effects of workplace resources on satisfaction with the way work and private life are integrated. On the whole, the results suggest that workplace resources are important for a satisfactory integration of work and private life. A high level of job autonomy goes along with a level of satisfaction that is higher than the level of

satisfaction in a situation where one does not have any job autonomy, a finding that is consistent with the spillover hypothesis H1b and that is true of both women and men. Women also show a significant effect if their partner is the only one in the relationship who has a high level of job autonomy; this supports the crossover hypothesis H2b, at least for women. A situation in which both partners experience a high level of job autonomy has a significant positive effect both on women and on men. However, this effect does not differ significantly from the effect of one's own high level of job autonomy, which suggests that this resource does not accumulate within partnerships. The results thus do not support the accumulation hypothesis H4b in this case.

A high level of support from supervisors has a significant positive effect on women and men. This means that employees who feel that their supervisors support them with integrating their work and their private life have a higher level of satisfaction with their work-life balance, which supports the spillover hypothesis H1b. Men whose partner is the only one in the relationship who experiences a supportive supervisor have a significant positive effect, which partly supports the crossover hypothesis H2b. Both women and men feel a significant positive effect if they are in a partnership in which both partners feel supported by their respective supervisors. However, since this effect is not significantly different from the effect of being the only one in the relationship who experiences support from supervisors, our results show no evidence to support the accumulation hypothesis H3b.

With regard to couples' sociodemographic background, we see no significant effect for division of labor within households. It does not appear to matter whether or not one partner performs more of the household tasks than the reference category (both share their tasks in the household equally, i.e., 40–60%). Nor does net household income appear to have any significant effect on men and only a slight one for women. Women with a net household income of more than €5000 are more satisfied with their work-life balance compared to women with an income less than €3000, even though this effect is only significant on the 10 percent significance level. With regard to educational level, we see that women's and men's satisfaction with their work-life balance is lower if both partners have a high educational level than if neither has a high educational level. The number of children does not appear to have a significant effect on women; men are less satisfied if they have three or more children but this effect is only significant on the 10 percent significance level.

Table 2. Multilevel regression models of satisfaction with the integration of work and private life

	Satisfaction with work-life balance				
	Women			Men	
	Coef.		Robust Std. Err.	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.
Actual working hours					
Oneself	-0.069 **		(0.025)	-0.039 *	(0.021)
Partner	-0.020		(0.019)	-0.025	(0.028)
Oneself#partner	0.001 +		(0.001)	0.000	(0.001)
Overtime (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	-0.376 *		(0.166)	-0.106	(0.149)
Only partner	-0.302 *		(0.137)	0.246	(0.177)
Both partners	-0.456 **		(0.158)	-0.136	(0.175)
Work communication outside working hours (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	-0.223		(0.155)	-0.361 *	(0.148)
Only partner	-0.066		(0.138)	-0.054	(0.174)
Both partners	-0.453 *		(0.198)	-0.417 *	(0.196)
Leadership responsibilities (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	-0.320 +		(0.177)	-0.135	(0.138)
Only partner	-0.055		(0.128)	-0.019	(0.175)
Both partners	-0.357 *		(0.171)	0.165	(0.188)
Family-unfriendly work organization (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	-0.479 **		(0.132)	-0.676 ***	(0.160)
Only partner	-0.081		(0.140)	0.055	(0.139)
Both partners	-0.597 ***		(0.161)	-0.608 ***	(0.167)
High level of job autonomy (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	0.437 **		(0.138)	0.609 ***	(0.141)
Only partner	0.308 *		(0.146)	-0.057	(0.156)
Both partners	0.679 ***		(0.160)	0.490 **	(0.172)
High level of support from superiors (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	0.873 ***		(0.123)	0.661 ***	(0.156)
Only partner	0.058		(0.160)	0.263 *	(0.140)
Both partners	0.729 ***		(0.156)	0.865 ***	(0.169)
Division of labor in the household (Reference: Equal amount of time, 40–60%)					
Partner spends more time	-0.067		(0.198)	-0.155	(0.128)
Oneself spends more time	-0.107		(0.113)	-0.260	(0.206)
Monthly net household income (Reference: < €3,000)					
€3,000–5,000	0.023		(0.159)	0.056	(0.165)
> €5,000	0.354 +		(0.188)	0.245	(0.193)
High level of education (Reference: Neither partner)					
Only oneself	-0.275		(0.166)	-0.042	(0.171)
Only partner	-0.128		(0.171)	-0.222	(0.180)
Both partners	-0.395 **		(0.136)	-0.412 **	(0.137)
Number of children in the household (Reference: No children)					
1 child	-0.148		(0.158)	-0.043	(0.159)
2 children	-0.049		(0.148)	0.052	(0.152)
3 or more children	-0.331		(0.225)	-0.404 +	(0.264)
Constant women/men	9.762 ***		0.879	9.379 ***	0.946
N of observations			2,220		

Source: LEEP-B3. SFB 882 (doi:10.4119/unibi/sfb882.2014.12); + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

5. Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the complex interplay between couples' work and private life spheres and to disentangle how demands and resources affect partners' satisfaction with their work-life balance. We examined whether there are processes of spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003), crossover (Westman, 2001, 2006; Bakker & Demerouti, 2013), or accumulation (DiPrete & Eirich, 2006) within partnerships. The descriptive results indicate that both women and men are less satisfied with their work-life balance if both spouses experience a high level of demands. With regard to resources, the descriptive results suggest that if both partners have large amounts of workplace resources at their disposal, they also show a higher level of satisfaction with the way their work and their family life are integrated. The multivariate analysis largely supports the spillover hypotheses and partly supports the crossover hypotheses, but it mainly does not support the hypotheses concerning accumulation of individual demands and resources within couples. However, since we considered only spouses who are employed, it may be assumed that couples have found strategies to deal with demanding job situations. If both partners experience highly demanding workplaces that does not necessarily mean added disadvantages. Therefore, an even more disadvantageous situation within the partnership may also go along with a mutual understanding of what it means to be closely involved in the job and to have less time for private-life responsibilities. These findings suggest that if both partners experience similar situations in their respective work domain, they may develop a better understanding of the partner's responsibilities in the work sphere. This result is in line with former research which showed that partners with similar working context have a greater understanding of the spouses' demanding workplaces (Han & Moen, 1999; Moen & Yu, 2000).

On the whole, one's own experience of demanding workplace conditions appears to be the most important factor that influences one's satisfaction with one's opportunities to integrate work and private life, which strongly supports the spillover hypothesis both for women and for men. Demands such as long working hours, having to work overtime, and the need to be reachable to supervisors, co-workers, and customers even outside working hours were found to have a negative effect on one's satisfaction with the integration of work and private life. A family-unfriendly work atmosphere and the perception that use of family-friendly benefits could affect one's career opportunities also correlated with a lower level of

satisfaction with the work-life balance. These results are in line with former research that indicated that a family-unfriendly work environment goes along with a level of conflict that is higher compared to those who experience a family-friendly working culture (e.g., Allen, 2001). Resources in the workplace were found to be important for one's integration of work and private life. Women and men who have a supportive supervisor or a high level of autonomy in the workplace were found to be more satisfied with the way their work and their private life are integrated. These findings are in line with recent research which indicates that flexible hours and scheduling are related to a lower level of work-family conflict and a better work-life balance (e.g., Clark, 2000; Hill et al., 2001; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). As with recent research in this area, our findings also indicate that supervisor support is of importance when it comes to employees' ability to reconcile work with family life (e.g., Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Allen, 2001; Frye & Breugh, 2004; Haddock et al., 2006).

In addition, we find some differences in how women and men perceive demanding workplaces. With regard to working overtime, we found that the partner's working overtime has a greater influence on women's satisfaction with their work-life balance than it does on the satisfaction of men, to whom their partner's working hours do not appear to be important. This may be explained by the problem that partners who work excessive amounts of overtime are unable to spend time on meeting their partnership responsibilities and on personal-life activities in general. Another possible explanation is that this is more important to women than it is to men because, generally speaking, women are responsible for performing most tasks in the household. This means that men who often have to work overtime are less able to carry over some tasks in the family, which in turn may lead to an even greater burden on employed women who also have to perform work in the household. Concerning leadership responsibilities, the results indicate that it is less easy for women to reconcile work and family life if both partners have leadership responsibilities, whereas men do not appear to be affected by leadership responsibilities at all.

For further research we are currently planning to conduct dyadic structural equation modeling to better investigate the structure of couples and to capture the interdependence of effects of demanding workplaces and the experience of work-family conflict by both spouses. This method will also enable us to first consider the effects of strain and stress

spillover and then to assess crossover effects as suggested by the spillover-crossover model of Bakker and Demerouti (2013). In addition, it seems to be important to investigate whether there are processes of adaptation going on so that as a result of negative experiences concerning work-life balance partners try to find solutions for arrangements within partnerships. It may be assumed that couples will, over time, try to reconcile their responsibilities at work with those at home in such a way as to ensure that both partners will be satisfied with the arrangement or, if this is not possible, that the partners will attempt to change some of the conditions at work, at home, or in both spheres.

References

- Abendroth A.-K., & Dulk L. d. (2011). Support for the work-life balance in Europe: the impact of state, workplace and family support on work-life balance satisfaction. *Work, Employment & Society*, 25(2), 234–256.
- Abendroth, A.-K., Melzer, S. M., Jacobebbinghaus, P., & Schlechter, F. (2014). *Methodological report employee and partner surveys of the Linked Employer-Employee Panel (LEEP-B3) in Project B3, "Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life: A Study of Employees in Different Work Organizations"* (SFB 882 Technical Report 12). Bielefeld: DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 "From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld."
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414–435.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308.
- Allen, T. D., Shockley, K. M., & Poteat, L. F. (2008). Workplace factors associated with family dinner behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(2), 336–342.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2009). The crossover of work engagement between working couples: a closer look at the role of empathy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(3), 220–236.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2013). The spillover-crossover model. In J. G. Grzywacz & E. Demerouti (Eds.), *New frontiers in work and family research* (pp. 54–70). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: a spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 23–33.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), 170–180.
- Bakker, A. B., Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (2014). Work engagement versus workaholism: a test of the spillover-crossover model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(1), 63–80.
- Bakker, A. B., Westman, M., & Emmerik, I. J. H. v. (2009). Advancements in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(3), 206–219.
- Becker, P. E., & Moen, P. (1999). Scaling back: Dual-earner couples' work-family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 995–1007.
- Blossfeld, H.-P., & Drobnič, S. (Eds.) (2001). *Careers of couples in contemporary society: From male breadwinner to dual-earner families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Böhm, S., & Diewald, M. (2012). Auswirkungen belastender Arbeitsbedingungen auf die Qualität privater Lebensverhältnisse. *WSI-Mitteilungen*, 65(2), 103–112.
- Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & DuWors, Jr., R. E. (1980). Work demands on administrators and spouse well-being. *Human Relations*, 33(4), 253–278.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 169–198.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: a new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.

- Demerouti, E. (2012). The spillover and crossover of resources among partners: the role of work-self and family-self facilitation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(2), 184–195.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Spillover and crossover of exhaustion and life satisfaction among dual-earner parents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(2), 266–289.
- Diewald, M., Schunck, R., Abendroth, A.-K., Melzer, S. M., Pausch, S., Reimann, M., Andernach, B., & Jacobebbinghaus, P. (2014). The SFB-B3 Linked Employer-Employee Panel Survey (LEEP-B3). *Schmollers Jahrbuch, 134*(3), 379–389.
- DiPrete, T. A., & Eirich, G. M. (2006). Cumulative advantage as a mechanism for inequality: a review of theoretical and empirical developments. *Annual Review of Sociology, 32*, 271–297.
- Drobnič, S., & León, M. (2014). Agency freedom for worklife balance in Germany and Spain. In B. Hobson (Ed.), *Worklife balance: the agency and capabilities gap* (pp. 126–150). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 178–199.
- Elder Jr, G. H. (1995). *The life course paradigm: Social change and individual development*. American Psychological Association.
- Fagan, C. (2004). Gender and working time in industrialized countries. In J. C. Messenger (Ed.), *Working time and workers' preferences in industrialized countries: finding the balance* (pp. 108–146). Oxon: Routledge.
- Fagan, J., & Press, J. (2008). Father influences on employed mothers' work-family balance. *Journal of Family Issues, 29*(9), 1136–1160.
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: a meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 57–80.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143–162). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Barnes, G. M. (1996). Work-family conflict, gender, and health-related outcomes: a study of employed parents in two community samples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*(1), 57–69.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of applied psychology, 77*(1), 65–78
- Frye, N. K., & Breaugh, J. A. (2004). Family-friendly policies, supervisor support, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and satisfaction: a test of a conceptual model. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(2), 197–220.
- Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees: balancing work/family life. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*(4), 368–383.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 510–531.

- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., Granrose, C. S., Rabinowitz, S., & Beutell, N. J. (1989). Sources of work-family conflict among two-career couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34(2), 133–153.
- Grönlund, A., & Öun, I. (2010). Rethinking work-family conflict: dual-earner policies, role conflict and role expansion in Western Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20(3), 179–195.
- Grunow, D., Schulz, F., & Blossfeld, H. P. (2007). Was erklärt die Traditionalisierungsprozesse häuslicher Arbeitsteilung im Eheverlauf: soziale Normen oder ökonomische Ressourcen?/What Explains the Process of Traditionalization in the Division of Household Labor: Social Norms or Economic Resources?. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 162–181.
- Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations*, 51(1), 28–36.
- Haddock, S. A., Zimmerman, T. S., Lyness, K. P., & Ziemba, S. J. (2006). Practices of dual earner couples successfully balancing work and family. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 27(2), 207–234.
- Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 185–203.
- Han, S. K., & Moen, P. (1999). Work and family over time: A life course approach. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 562(1), 98–110.
- Hill, E. J., Erickson, J. J., Holmes, E. K., & Ferris, M. (2010). Workplace flexibility, work hours, and work-life conflict: finding an extra day or two. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(3), 349–358.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: the positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49–58.
- Hobson, B., & Fahlén, S. (2009). Competing scenarios for European fathers: applying Sen's capabilities and agency framework to work-family balance. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624(1), 214–233.
- Jones, F., & Fletcher, B. C. (1993). An empirical study of occupational stress transmission in working couples. *Human Relations*, 46(7), 881–903.
- Kinman, G., & Jones, F. (2008). Effort-reward imbalance, over-commitment and work-life conflict: testing an expanded model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(3), 236–251.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: a review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139–149.
- Lambert, S. J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: a critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations*, 43(3), 239–257.
- Lewis, S. (1997). "Family friendly" employment policies: a route to changing organizational culture or playing about at the margins? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 4(1), 13–23.
- Lewis, S., & Cooper C. L. (1987). Stress in two-earner couples and stage in the life-cycle. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60(4), 289–303.
- Lewis, S., & Humbert, L. (2010). Discourse or reality? "Work-life balance," flexible working policies and the gendered organization. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 29(3), 239–254.
- Matthews, R. A., Del Priore, R. E., Acitelli, L. K., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2006). Work-to-relationship conflict: crossover effects in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3), 228–240.

- Moen, P., & Yu, Y. (2000). Effective work/life strategies: Working couples, work conditions, gender, and life quality. *Social problems*, 47(3), 291–326.
- Pausch, S., Harand, J., Schunck, R., & Jacobebbinghaus, P. (2014). *Technical report employer survey Project B3: Interactions Between Capabilities in Work and Private Life* (SFB 882 Technical Report 4). Bielefeld: DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities.”
- Roehling, P. V., Moen, P., & Batt, R. (2003). Spillover. In P. Moen (Ed.), *It’s about time: couples and careers* (pp. 101–121). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(7), 893–917.
- Sheridan, A. (2004). Chronic presenteeism: the multiple dimensions to men’s absence from part-time work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(2), 207–225
- Shimazu, A., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2009). How job demands affect an intimate partner: a test of the spillover-crossover model in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 51(3), 239–248.
- Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Shimada, K., & Kawakami, N. (2011). Workaholism and well-being among Japanese dual-earner couples: a spillover-crossover perspective. *Social Science & Medicine*, 73(3), 399–409.
- Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: a review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations*, 33(2), 111–129.
- 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(1), 6–15.
- 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.
- Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1512–1523.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004). The effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2), 398–412.
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 491–503.
- Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations*, 54(6), 717–751.
- Westman, M. (2006). Crossover of stress and strain in the work-family context. In F. Jones, R. J. Burke, & M. Westman (Eds.), *Work-life balance: a psychological perspective* (pp. 163–184). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (1995). Crossover of stress, strain and resources from one spouse to another. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 169–181.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121–141.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 1–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Previously published SFB 882 Working Papers:

Diewald, Martin / Faist, Thomas (2011): From Heterogeneities to Inequalities: Looking at Social Mechanisms as an Explanatory Approach to the Generation of Social Inequalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 1, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.

Busch, Anne (2011): Determinants of Occupational Gender Segregation: Work Values and Gender (A) Typical Occupational Preferences of Adolescents, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 2, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.

Faist, Thomas (2011): Multiculturalism: From Heterogeneities to Social (In)Equalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 3, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.

Amelina, Anna (2012): Jenseits des Homogenitätsmodells der Kultur: Zur Analyse von Transnationalität und kulturellen Interferenzen auf der Grundlage der hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 4, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.

Osmanowski, Magdalena / Cardona, Andrés (2012): Resource Dilution or Resource Augmentation? Number of Siblings, Birth Order, Sex of the Child and Frequency of Mother's Activities with Preschool Children, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 5, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.

Amelina, Anna / Bilecen, Başak / Barglowski, Karolina / Faist, Thomas (2012): Ties That Protect? The Significance of Transnationality for the Distribution of Informal Social Protection in Migrant Networks, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 6, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.

Alemann, Annette von / Beaufaÿs, Sandra / Reimer, Thordis (2012): Gaining Access to the Field of Work Organizations with the Issue of "Work-Family-Life Balance" for Fathers, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 7, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B5, Bielefeld.

Kaiser, Till (2012): Haben gebildete Mütter gewissenhaftere Kinder? Soziale Herkunft und Persönlichkeitsentwicklung im frühkindlichen Alter, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 8, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.

Gusy, Christoph / Müller, Sebastian (2012): Social Construction of Heterogeneity Indicators and their Relationship to Law. The Example of Guiding Principles in Immigration Law,

SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 9, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C4, Bielefeld.

Liebig, Stefan / May, Meike / Sauer, Carsten / Schneider, Simone / Valet, Peter (2012): Inequality Preferences in Interviewer- and Self-Administered Interviews, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 10, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.

Fausser, Margit / Voigtländer, Sven / Tuncer, Hidayet / Liebau, Elisabeth / Faist, Thomas / Razum, Oliver (2012): Transnationality and Social Inequalities of Migrants in Germany, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 11, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C1, Bielefeld.

Freistein, Katja / Koch, Martin (2012): Global Inequality and Development. Textual Representations of the World Bank and UNDP, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 12, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C5, Bielefeld.

Golsch, Katrin (2013): Shall I Help You My Dear? Examining Variations in Social Support for Career Advancement within Partnerships, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 13, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.

Bröckel, Miriam / Busch, Anne / Golsch, Katrin (2013): Headwind or Tailwind – Do Partner's Resources Support or Restrict a Promotion to a Leadership Position in Germany?, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 14, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.

Cardona, Andrés (2013): Closing the Group or the Market? The Two Sides of Weber's Concept of Closure and Their Relevance for the Study of Intergroup Inequality, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 15, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.

Friedhoff, Stefan / Meier zu Verl, Christian / Pietsch, Christian / Meyer, Christian / Vompras, Johanna / Liebig, Stefan (2013): Social Research Data. Documentation, Management, and Technical Implementation at SFB 882, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 16, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Project "Information and Data Infrastructure" (INF), Bielefeld.

Reinecke, Jost / Stemmler, Mark / Sünkel, Zara / Schepers, Deborah / Weiss, Maren / Arnis, Maria / Meinert, Julia / Kucur-Uysal, Burcu / Pöge, Andreas / Wallner, Susanne / Wittenberg, Jochen (2013): The Development of Deviant and Delinquent Behavior over the Life Course in the Context of Processes of Social Inequalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 17, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A2, Bielefeld.

Hense, Andrea / Edler, Susanne / Liebig, Stefan (2013): Individual Determinants of Recalls, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 18, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B4, Bielefeld.

- Bilecen, Başak (2013): Analyzing Informal Social Protection Across Borders: Synthesizing Social Network Analysis with Qualitative Interviews, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 19, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.
- Schunck, Reinhard / Abendroth, Anja-Kristin / Diwald, Martin / Melzer, Silvia Maja / Pausch, Stephanie (2013): What do Women and Men Want? Investigating and Measuring Preference Heterogeneity for Life Outcomes using a Factorial Survey, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 20, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B3, Bielefeld.
- Sauer, Carsten / Valet, Peter / Liebig, Stefan (2013): The Impact of Within and Between Occupational Inequalities on People's Justice Perceptions Towards their Own Earnings, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 21, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Schneider, Simone / Valet, Peter (2013): Social Comparison Orientations and their Consequences for Justice Perceptions of Earnings, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 22, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Cardona, Andrés (2013): The Programmatic Bias in the Discussion on Social Mechanisms in Sociology, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 23, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.
- Hille, Adrian / Schupp, Jürgen (2013): How Learning a Musical Instrument Affects the Development of Skills, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 24, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.
- Faist, Thomas (2014): "We are all Transnationals now": The Relevance of Transnationality for Understanding Social Inequalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 25, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C1, Bielefeld.
- Lohmann, Henning / Ferger, Florian (2014): Educational Poverty in a Comparative Perspective: Theoretical and Empirical Implications, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 26, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A5, Bielefeld.
- Freistein, Katja / Koch, Martin (2014): The Effects of Measuring Poverty – Indicators of the World Bank, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 27, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C5, Bielefeld.
- Andernach, Björn / Schunck, Reinhard (2014): Investigating the Feasibility of a Factorial Survey in a CATI, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 28, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B3, Bielefeld.
- Sauer, Carsten (2014): A Just Gender Pay Gap? Three Factorial Survey Studies on Justice Evaluations of Earnings for Male and Female Employees, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 29, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.

- Berger, Johannes (2014): Dringend erforderlich: eine stärker vereinheitlichte soziologische Ungleichheitsforschung, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 30, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project Z, Bielefeld.
- Karsch, Anna (2014): Geschlechtstypische Unterschiede in den Berufspräferenzen deutscher Jugendlicher, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 31, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.
- Barglowski, Karolina (2014): Social Classifications and Inequalities: Ideologies of Mobility, Care and Work in Transnational Families, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 32, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.
- Sauer, Carsten / Valet, Peter / Liebig, Stefan (2014): Ungleichheiten am Arbeitsmarkt und die Gerechtigkeitswahrnehmung von Erwerbseinkommen, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 33, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Dawid, Herbert / Harting, Philipp / Neugart, Michael (2014): Cohesion Policy and Inequality Dynamics: Insights from a Heterogeneous Agents Macroeconomic Model, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 34, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A4, Bielefeld.
- Liebig, Stefan / May, Meike / Sauer, Carsten / Schneider, Simone / Peter Valet (2014): The Effect of Interviewer Presence on Inequality Preferences, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 35, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Cardona, Andrés / Diewald, Martin (2014): Opening the Black Box of Primary Effects: Relative Risk Aversion and Maternal Time Investments in Preschool Children, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 36, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.
- Fehl, Caroline / Freistein, Katja (2014): Institutional Mechanisms of Global Inequality Reproduction, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 37, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C5, Bielefeld.
- Freistein, Katja (2014): Are there any Global Imaginaries of Equality and Democracy in Discussions about Inequality? SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 38, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C5, Bielefeld.
- Meinert, Julia (2014): Selection into criminogenic contexts by personal heterogeneity and its effects on delinquency, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 39, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A2, Bielefeld.
- Schepers, Debbie (2014): Social Inequalities as Causes of the Causes of Juvenile Delinquency. Heterogeneities in the Context of Situational Action Theory, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 40, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A2, Bielefeld.

- Abendroth, Anja-Kristin / Pausch, Stephanie / Böhm, Sebastian (2014): German Fathers and Their Preference to Reduce Working Hours to Care for Their Children, SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 41, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.
- Bürmann, Marvin: Determinanten beruflichen Aufstiegs (2014): Der Einfluss von Unterstützung durch Kollegen und Vorgesetzte. Eine Sekundäranalyse anhand der Daten des Sozio-oekonomischen Panels. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 42, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.
- Rosenbohm, Sophie / Gebel, Tobias / Hense, Andrea (2015): Potenziale und Voraussetzungen für die Sekundäranalyse qualitativer Interviewdaten in der Organisationsforschung. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 43, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B4/INF, Bielefeld.
- Schneider, Simone / Shamon, Hawal (2015): How Others' Earnings influence our Justice Perceptions. Studying the Effects of Income Distribution and Social Position on Reflexive Justice Evaluations among German Employees. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 44, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Kruphölter, Sonja / Sauer, Carsten / Valet, Peter (2015): Occupational gender segregation and gender differences in justice evaluations. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 45, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Liebig, Stefan / Sauer, Carsten / Hülle, Sebastian (2015): Why is justice regarded as so important? Theoretical considerations and an empirical test of a fundamental question. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 46, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Liebig, Stefan / Sauer, Carsten / Friedhoff, Stefan (2015): Using Factorial Surveys to Study Justice Perceptions: Five Methodological Problems of Attitudinal Justice Research. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 47, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Liebig, Stefan / May, Meike (2015): Gerechtigkeit als Kooperationsbedingung in modernen Gesellschaften. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 48, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.
- Ferger, Florian (2015): Bildungsarmut als soziales Problem. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 49, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A5, Bielefeld.
- Edler, Susanne / Hense, Andrea (2015): Changing Reward Structures: (Temporary) Layoffs and Returns on Human Capital. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 50, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B4, Bielefeld.

Edler, Susanne / Jacobebbinghaus, Peter / Liebig, Stefan (2015): Effects of Unemployment on Wages: Differences between Types of Reemployment and Types of Occupation. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 51, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B4, Bielefeld.

Pfinder, Manuela (2015): Effect of maternal educational level on offspring's educational attainment: Role of prenatal exposures. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 52, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.

Berger, Johannes (2015): Eine Theorie der Einkommensungleichheit in Marktwirtschaften. SFB 882 Working Paper Series No. 53, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.