



**Is the push for employer provided family friendly  
practices context-dependent?**

Jasmin Joecks, Anna Kurowska and Kerstin Pull

# 1. General motivation

---

- ▶ Increase of the share of women in the workforce over the last decades
- ▶ Increase of companies engagement in family friendly practices
- ▶ Idea of a demand driven push by female employees
- ▶ Previous empirical results for a **demand driven push for employer-provided family friendly practices** are confined to **one country studies and inconclusive**: Some find a positive link (e.g. Goodstein et al 1994; Wood et al. 2003; Budd & Mumford 2006), others find no link (e.g. Morgan & Milliken 1992; Ingram & Simons 1995, Adame 2016)

### 3. Focus of the study and the theoretical background

---

- ▶ Our contribution: focus on **the role of the context of differences in broadly understood *care regime*** (policies and social norms; responsibility for care – state/employers vs. family)
- ▶ Moderation model: organizations are influenced by their external social environments (Haas et al. 2000; Ollier-Malaterre et al. 2013)
- ▶ Potential effects of the country institutional context on the provision of family friendly practices (e.g. Dulk et al. 2013; Lyness & Brummit Kropf 2005)
- ▶ How the *care regime* **alters the impact of the share of women employees on the provision of family friendly practices?**

## 4. The theoretical framework

---

- ▶ Normative climate gives rise to social expectations and ‘a sense of entitlement’ among employees (den Dulk 2012; Lyness, Kropf 2005), therefore **in a more de-familialized/de-genderized regime we expect a stronger impact** of the share of female employees on the provision of family-friendly practices in the workplace.
- ▶ However, it would **rather be true for flexible-employment practices than for childcare**, because de-familialized regimes offer public universal childcare of a good quality and therefore there is less of a need to provide childcare practices by the employers themselves

## 4. Three countries and hypotheses

---

- ▶ Sweden: the highest level of de-familialization/de-genderization – gender equality, high provision of public childcare
- ▶ Germany: recent change in policy orientation towards de-familialized/de-genderized regime; public childcare provision (0-2) not yet universal
- ▶ Poland: familialized/gendered regime, very low provision of public childcare (0-2); work-family reconciliation is the family responsibility

(H1): We expect the **demand-driven push for flexible-employment** in companies to be **stronger in Sweden than in Germany**

(H2): We expect the **demand-driven push for childcare** in companies to be **stronger in Germany than in Sweden**

(H3): We expect to find **no demand-driven push for family-friendly** practices in companies **in Poland**

## 5. Data (Thomson Reuters ASSET4) & Method

---

<b>Sample</b>	44 companies listed in DAX or MDAX; 20 companies listed in WIG20, 52 companies listed in the OMX 2005-2015
<b>Observations</b>	209 observations in the German DAX or MDAX index, 82 in the Polish WIG20 index; 441 in the Swedish OMX index
<b>Dependent variable</b>	provision of work family practices daycare service (0/1) flexible working (0/1)
<b>Explanatory variable</b>	share of female employees
<b>Controls</b>	return on equity (ROE), number of employees, industry, year
<b>Method</b>	Random effects logistic regressions with time lags

## 5. Dataset, Variables and Analysis – Descriptives

	(1) German Sample		(2) Polish sample		(3) Swedish sample	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
<b>Day care service</b>	0.58	0.49	0.10	0.32	0.05	0.22
<b>Flexible working</b>	0.83	0.37	0.22	0.41	0.14	0.34
<b>Share of female employees (t-2)</b>	30.94	18.20	40.98	21.32	33.78	16.23
<b>ROE (t-2)</b>	11.16	18.05	10.87	14.65	20.29	75.91
<b>Employees (t-2)</b>	36,537.75	63,282.53	14,917.77	12,035.5	25,337.9	40298.91
<b>N (obs)</b>	209		82		441	
<b>N (firms)</b>	44		20		52	

## 6. Results

Random Effects (Marginal Effects)	(1) German sample		(2) Polish sample		(3) Swedish sample	
	Day care	Flextime	Day care	Flextime	Day care	Flextime
Share of female employees (t-2)	<b>0.006**</b> (0.002)	<b>0.004**</b> (0.002)	<b>0.002</b> (0.002)	<b>0.003</b> (0.003)	<b>0.001</b> (0.0001)	<b>0.006***</b> (0.001)
ROE (t-2)	-0.001* (0.0009)	-0.001** (0.0009)	-0.0003 (0.0004)	-0.0006* (0.0004)	-0.000 (0.0001)	-0.000 (0.0001)
No. Employees (t-2)	0.00002* (0.00004)	0.00003* (0.000005)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.001* (0.0002)
Industry and Year dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
R <sup>2</sup>	0.21	0.23	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.23
N (obs)	209	209	82	82	441	441
N (firms)	44	44	20	20	52	52

Notes: Std deviation in parentheses \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$



## 6. Conclusion

---

- ▶ Our study shows that there is no automatism concerning a demand driven push towards employer provided work family practices
- ▶ The context of the broadly understood care regime seems to matter for the occurrence and strength of the demand driven push towards employer provided work-family practices
- ▶ The role of the context seems to be different when it comes to the type of family friendly practices
- ▶ Limitations: the number of companies in the Polish sample is rather small.
- ▶ Focus only on the larger companies.
- ▶ Differences in size between Polish, German and Swedish companies.

---

Questions? Remarks?  
Anna Kurowska: [a.kurowska@uw.edu.pl](mailto:a.kurowska@uw.edu.pl)