How Individuals Perceive Reconciliation Problems: Childcare Policies and Gender-specific Patterns of Time Conflicts

Isabelle Stadelmann-Steffen and Dominique Oehrli
University of Berne
isabelle.stadelmann@ipw.unibe.ch
dominique.oehrli@ipw.unibe.ch

Accepted version of the article published in
Gender & Society Vol 31 No. 5, October, 2017 597–623

Abstract

In recent decades, many studies have examined gender-related differences in paid employment and the reconciliation of family and employment. Considering perceptions of time conflicts with regards to work at home and leisure activities, this paper contributes to a more encompassing understanding of attitudes towards reconciliation problems. Special attention is given to the role of external childcare services. The use of an original data set from 60 Swiss municipalities and of hierarchical multi-response regression models enable an analysis of the various aspects of time conflicts simultaneously, and a consideration of how different policy contexts shape these attitudes. This study provides evidence that the communal provision of external childcare is related to gender-specific perceptions of time conflicts. Most interestingly, men seem to be affected most strongly by communal policy conditions, whereby the provision of external childcare is related to systematically higher levels of time conflicts.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, a growing number of studies have examined gender-related differences in paid employment, particularly with regard to the reconciliation of family and employment (e.g., Blofield and Martínez Franzoni 2015; Chang 2004; Ferguson 2013; Gornick and Meyers 2005; Mandel and Semyonov 2006; Morgan 2009; Sainsbury 1996; Stadelmann-Steffen 2011). Much less attention, however, has been paid to gender-specific perceptions of reconciliation problems and time restrictions not only regarding employment and care duties, but also with respect to housework more generally and social activities (e.g., leisure activities, voluntary work) (Sayer 2005: 286, Sousa-Poza et al. 2001). Regarding the latter, Sayer (2005) has argued that access to free time must be seen as an arena of time inequality, the main reason being that women—despite their increasing labor market engagement—still do most of the work in the home. Against this background, the question arises as to whether factors facilitating equal labor market participation in fact induce new areas of gender-related inequality, i.e., regarding the allocation of time to activities outside the labor market. Hence, in this paper, we ask whether external child care supply affects men’s and women’s perceived time conflicts with regards to work at home and leisure activities.

The present paper contributes to existing research in several ways. First, it provides a more encompassing understanding of attitudes towards reconciliation problems and their related gender inequalities. Reconciliation problems, in the context of this paper, refer to the difficulties related to balancing the different spheres of life, i.e., work, family, and leisure, whereby in our analyses we focus on the time dimension of such reconciliation problems. Second, special attention is given to the role of child care policies, which is narrowly linked to increased female labor market participation (Chang 2004; Mandel and Semyonov 2006; Stadelmann-Steffen 2008) and, thus, can be considered to be an important trigger of the need to balance between paid work and other spheres of life. Theoretically, we argue that such
policies may have broad consequences that go far beyond the generally assumed support for female employment. In particular, childcare policies and women’s stronger labor market involvement may shift the allocation of paid and unpaid work between spouses (Greenstein 2000), and therefore also affect men’s perceptions and behavior (Offer and Schneider 2011: 812). Third, we focus on the perception of reconciliation problems, using the concept of perceived time conflicts. Most previous studies in this field (see Gallie and Russel 2009; McGinnity and Whelan 2009) have concentrated on subjective perceptions related to individual well-being and satisfaction. By focusing on the time aspect, we link the perspective on (subjective) perceptions to earlier studies that have analyzed the (objective) time allocation to different spheres (e.g., Greenhaus et al. 2003). In this vein, previous findings have suggested that different patterns of time allocation do not have a generic influence on the level of work-family conflict; rather, the perception of personal time conflicts is understood as an interaction between real time allocation and personal expectations (Fahey et al. 2003).

Empirically, the present paper is based on data from the “Swiss Volunteering Survey—Communes,” which contains information on individual perceptions of time conflicts regarding the personal allocation of time between paid work, house work, and other activities in 60 Swiss municipalities. Moreover, this data has been expanded by original data on local childcare supply.

From a comparative perspective, family policy in Switzerland can be described as liberal-conservative (Häusermann and Zollinger 2014). This description reflects the persistence of traditional attitudes and norms towards gender-specific family roles. In fact, the dominant family model is a full-time employed father with a mother staying at home or working (marginal) part-time, i.e. a (modernized) male-breadwinner model. The policy side is characterized by limited public intervention and comparatively low public expenditures for childcare policies. Accordingly, regulations regarding the provision and funding of external
childcare are scarce, and childcare coverage is far from being universal. Nevertheless, in recent years, demographic changes, increasing economic pressures on households and a growing emphasis on promoting gender equality have triggered the development of childcare services. As childcare policies fall under the competence of the Swiss municipalities, the system and provision of childcare supply varies greatly among them. This observation makes the local level the most reasonable one from which to analyze childcare provision and its potential effects.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we discuss the theoretical background of our analyses and then provide hypotheses about how childcare policies may lead to gender-specific patterns of perceived time conflicts. Next, we describe the methodological approach and the operationalization of the variables. The fourth section presents the empirical results. Then, we conclude with a summary of the most important findings and conclusions.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In recent years, comparative welfare state research has extensively discussed gender-related labor market inequalities and factors promoting and hindering the equal labor market involvement of women and men. In light of the fact that gender-related labor market inequalities are mostly attributable to lower participation rates and opportunities for women with childcare duties, one of the main research findings has been that policies that help to combine paid work and family work are crucial factors contributing to more frequent and more intense female employment (Chang 2004; Mandel and Semyonov 2006; Stadelmann-Steffen 2008). Policies that facilitate the reconciliation of family duties and paid work not only provide women with the opportunities to become (intensively) employed, but also
promote the preference to do so (Stadelmann-Steffen 2011). However, policy measures vary in their aims and abilities to reshape work and family relations and, consequently, the gendered division of labor (Blofield and Martínez Franzoni 2015). While maternalist policies (e.g., maternity leave) perceive caregiving as a female responsibility, policies promoting co-responsibilities aim at “distributing responsibility away from a sole reliance on mothers” (Blofield and Martínez Franzoni 2015). Therefore, with respect to our research question, we focus on childcare policies that (partially) disengage parents, especially mothers, from childcare activities. These measures are particularly imperative for a reorganization of gender roles within families, and a more equal division of labor among parents (ibid.). Empirically, explicit and even causal tests of how exactly these policies impact gender-specific opportunities in the labor market and beyond are still rare and not always consistent (e.g., Baker et al. 2008; Lefebre and Merrigan 2008; Havnes and Mogsted 2011; Korpi et al. 2013; Mandel and Semyonov 2006). However, there is some evidence suggesting that childcare policies have the potential to equalize gender roles not only in the labor market but also at home (Craig and Mullen 2011).

Departing from this policy perspective, we consider two sociological perspectives, which help us to derive potential childcare effects on individual perceptions of time conflict. First researchers have been interested in the *allocation of time to paid and unpaid work within households* (Sayer 2005; Greenstein 2010). Second, only a rather small group of studies has been focusing on the *perceptions of reconciliation problems* and particularly the question of how individual, household, and policy-related factors affect the degree of conflict and well-being (e.g., Gallie and Russel 2009; Hagqvist et al. 2012).
The Within Household Division of Labor

Several theoretical approaches have been proposed to explain gender differences in time use, particularly within households (Sayer 2005: 286ff.). The economic/bargaining perspective emphasizes rationality and relative resource levels. In response to shifting economic, demographic, and normative conditions, women’s and men’s time allocations can be expected to change. In particular, women’s rising educational achievements and wages have reduced their comparative advantage in unpaid work. At the same time declines in rates of marriage, increases in age at first marriage, declines in fertility, and the introduction of household technology have reduced unpaid work demands. Therefore, women should reallocate time from unpaid to paid work. Also, increases in women’s education, employment, and wages have strengthened their bargaining power within households (Greenstein 2000), so an increase in unpaid work by men should be observable.

The gender studies perspective, however, argues that unpaid work is not a gender-neutral bundle of work that women just do out of comparative advantage and lower resources, but rather that the within household distribution of work is integral to the reproduction of unequal power relations between women and men (Thompson and Walker 1995). This view predicts that although some changes in time allocation have occurred, gender inequality continues to be a fundamental product of gendered time allocations. Moreover, this perspective implies that women should have less free time than men because women are responsible for ensuring that all unpaid work gets done, regardless of how much time they spend in paid work (Sayer 2006: 287f.). This assumption is in accordance with recent findings from political participation research. It has been shown that women’s main responsibility for housework combined with increased labour market participation may lead to a lack of time for political activities (Stadelmann-Steffen and Koller 2015). In a similar vein, Hook (2004) has
demonstrated that the extent of voluntary engagement correlates positively with the degree to which the partner participates in doing housework.

A third view stresses the importance of *societal norms and structures*. Societal values and norms about how time should be allocated within households, and which activities will be prioritized, limit the ability of women and men to autonomously determine how they will allocate their time. In particular, parents are constrained by norms of parenting and the lack of adequate institutional policies designed to facilitate and enhance a more equitable gender division of labor (Sayer 2005: 297). Since in most countries “traditional” societal norms and structures (e.g., involving lower salaries and more unattractive work options for women) prevail, mothering remains an important source of self-identity, satisfaction, and autonomy. Thus, women may be reluctant to abandon family power in exchange for a more equal division of unpaid/childcare work (Sayer 2005: 298). Moreover, and given traditional societal norms, women who are strongly integrated in the labor market may overcompensate their engagement at home in terms of “deviance neutralization” (Greenstein 2000). This mechanism might even be reinforced by increased expectations and ideals of intense mothering (Craig and Mullen 2011: 836). Hence, when increasing their labor market participation, women will not necessarily reduce their childcare and domestic work, but rather deliberatively cut back their time for leisure, personal care and sleep (Craig 2007). Conversely, not doing or avoiding unpaid work is one way men display masculinity and reinforce their structural and cultural power (Risman 1998).

Lastly, *research on fatherhood and masculinity* has more specifically emphasized men’s role for the within household division of labour and in particular of child care duties. Traditionally, being a good father meant to generate income and thus was related to activities away from home (Brandth and Kvande 1998: 299). This also found its correspondence in a “hegemonic masculinity” (Connell 1987; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005), where masculine identity was
crucially linked to men’s employment and income (Brandth and Kvande 1998: 296; Morgan 1992). In recent decades, it has been argued that a “new-father image” (Brandth and Kvande 1998: 294) has developed with fathers being supposed to increasingly participate and get involved in childcare and household duties. In this vein, Wall and Arnold (2009) expect that early childhood education and care (ECEC) policies may add to this change by altering the “taken-for-granted understandings” of women’s sole caregiving responsibility and eventually lead to more egalitarian behavior patterns within households.

Empirically, these changes, however, stand in a certain contrast to the above mentioned persistence of traditional gender-roles in the actual division of labour within households. While some argue that the changed culture has not yet been transferred to changed behavior, others more fundamentally question whether a cultural change has actually occurred. Wall and Arnold (2009: 523), for instance, conclude that the fact “that the traditional masculinity of fathers is positively emphasized in articles describing involved fathers also speaks to the extent to which the care and nurture of young children continues to clash with cultural ideals of hegemonic masculinity” (Wall and Arnold 2009: 523). Hence, this implies that persistent ideals of what masculinity means prevents the development of equalized gender roles within households.

Perceptions of Reconciliation Problems

Typically, matters of time allocation have been analyzed based on time diary data (Bianchi et al. 2000; Sayer 2005) or direct time use questions in surveys (Alvarez and Miles 2003; Greenhaus et al. 2003; Sousa-Poza 2001). However, it has been increasingly argued that the perception of work-life conflicts is not just a logical consequence of actual time allocation, and therefore deserves attention on its own (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; MacGinnity and Whelan 2009). In this respect, several studies have emphasized that work-life conflicts are
more important for the well-being of individuals than the actual time spent on various types of work (Hagqvist et al. 2012). Moreover, high levels of work-life conflict may have various detrimental effects, as for instance on personal effectiveness, marital relations, child-parent relationships, child development, and mental health (Allen et al. 2000; Gornick and Meyers 2005; McGinnity and Whelan 2009).

Greenhaus et al. (2003) have theorized that a balanced allocation of time to different spheres results in the lowest level of work-family conflict. Empirically, however, they cannot confirm this expectation, but rather find that individuals who invest most of their time in family duties experience less conflicts, since they actually do not have employment responsibilities that interfere with their family duties. Accordingly, individuals who are more strongly engaged in employment reported the highest levels of conflict. Several studies, moreover, have emphasized that contextual factors—such as national policies, labor market characteristics, and firm-level work arrangements—also impact on the degree of work-life conflicts (Gallie and Russel 2009; Russel et al. 2009; McGinnity and Whelan 2009). Lastly, gender-specific patterns of work-life conflicts have been identified. Most interestingly, Gallie and Russel (2009) have demonstrated that women’s work-life conflicts are astonishingly stable across countries, while men’s work-life conflicts seem to be more strongly contingent on the national context. For example, the universal nature of childcare and parental leave policies in Scandinavian countries are associated with relatively lower work-life conflicts in men, whereas women in these countries do not exhibit lower levels of work-life conflicts.

**Bringing the Perspectives Together: Childcare Policies, the Within Household Division of Labor, and Perceptions of Time Conflicts**

As the previous discussions have illustrated, different research perspectives focus on varying aspects and consequences of increased female labor market participation. However, an
encompassing perspective that explicitly integrates these different perspectives is still very rare. In particular, whereas research on female employment has focused on the effect of public policies, the role of these policies beyond the labor market, and especially also for men is typically not examined. In contrast, even though studies on the within household division of labor have integrated different spheres of life, they have little to say about how contextual (i.e., policy) factors affect reconciliation problems and the perception thereof. Last, research on the perception of work-family conflicts has acknowledged the importance of how people feel about their personal situation, and the relevance of gender- and context-specificity. However, they have conceptualized work-life conflicts quite broadly, typically referring to life satisfaction, and moreover have tended to be quite non-specific about why gender-specific patterns occur.

The following section brings the different perspectives together, since existent findings from the different research communities imply that interlinkages and potential conflicts between paid work, work at home, and other societal activities are important (Mencarini and Sironi 2012: 205). We start from the crucial assumption that childcare policies generate incentives for households to increase their combined amount of paid work, which has implications beyond the labor market. Most importantly, these implications concern the allocation of work at home and leisure activities between spouses (Greenstein 2000), and thus increased time constraints between the different spheres of life. Relying on the perception literature, we thereby acknowledge that successful balancing of the different spheres of life is not only a matter of the actual allocation of time, but also relates to how people feel about their personal situation (Hagqvist et al. 2012). However, we need to think carefully about the mechanisms behind gender-specific patterns, i.e., how and why childcare policies should influence time conflicts, and how these mechanisms may vary between women and men.
How childcare polices affect women’s perceived time conflicts

How can childcare policy affect female perceptions of time conflict? The most obvious conclusion is that childcare policies facilitate the reconciliation between work and family duties, since these policies allow families to transfer childcare to the public sector (Korpi et al. 2013: 10). Therefore, the available time for work and other activities increases, which should decrease the perceived level of time conflict between the different spheres of life. Moreover, increased opportunities to engage in paid work may be related to higher levels of women’s satisfaction (Mencarini and Sironi 2012: 213), and thus possibly to a more positive evaluation of their personal situation. Accordingly, external childcare services may lead to the perception of having less time restrictions – irrespective of the actual allocation of time. This leads to the first hypothesis:

H1: The provision of external childcare services decreases women’s perceptions of time conflict.

However, in view of the literature discussed previously, the reality may be more complex. Whereas the theory has suggested that the female relative workload at home should decrease, empirical evidence demonstrates that women—indeed of their labor market involvement—still do the large part of unpaid work at home. For employed women, this situation leads to a “second shift” (Sayer 2005) or a “double day” (Shelton 1993), which implies gender-related “time inequality” (Sayer 2005). More precisely, if childcare policies are related to women working more hours in the labor market, while the work at home remains constant, the overall workload will increase and therewith the perceived time conflicts. These negative feelings may be reinforced at the normative level, i.e. based on traditional and even intensified ideals of being a good mother and housewife (Craig 2007; Craig and Mullen 2011: 836; Greenstein 2000). Hence, we formulate the following hypothesis as a contrast to H1:
H2: The provision of external childcare services increases women’s perceptions of time conflict.

How childcare policies affect men’s perceived time conflicts

With respect to men, similar ambivalent expectations can be derived. Findings by Gallie and Russell (2009) have suggested that men’s perceptions of conflict are most strongly context dependent. In this vein, men in Scandinavian countries, where childcare policies are universally provided, have been shown to exhibit the least work-life conflicts. This can be interpreted to mean that in the general context of changing educational, occupational, and family patterns, childcare policies reduce also men’s time conflicts, since they reduce a household’s time spent on childcare duties (Korpi et al. 2013: 10). Moreover, the stress-reducing effect may be supported by the fact that childcare policies also have normative effects (Stadelmann-Steffen 2011). These policies may change traditional views on masculinity in a way to make them less conflictive with new ideals of fatherhood (Wall and Arnold 2009). Similar to women’s situation it can therefore be expected that childcare policies may reduce perceived time conflicts for men:

H3: The provision of external childcare services decreases men’s perceptions of time conflict.

Conversely, from the perspective of the within household division of labor, it can be assumed that childcare policies will induce at least some equalization of gender roles within households and lead to a reallocation of household and care duties to men. This, in turn, will increase their time constraints in balancing work, family, and other activities. These objective time constraints together with conflicts between a “new-father image” (Brandth and Kvande 1998: 294) and persistant cultural ideals of hegemonic masculinity (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Wall and Arnold 2009) may led to increased feelings of stress. This leads to the following hypothesis:
H4: The provision of external childcare services increases men’s perceptions of time conflict.

Conversely,

RESEARCH DESIGN

Our analyses are based on data from the Swiss Volunteering Survey of 60 communes carried out in 2010 (Schweizer Freiwilligen-Monitor Gemeinden 2010). The sample of the Swiss Volunteering Survey is a stratified random draw of all Swiss municipalities with 2’000 to 20’000 inhabitants based on the criteria language region, size, and rural/urban background. Initial analyses have shown that the sample is highly representative of the communes in the relevant segment, not only regarding the stratification criteria, but also with respect to other socio-economic aspects (i.e., educational composition, share of foreigners). On average, there are 83 respondents per community, with the most respondents in Prilly (N = 119) and the fewest in Zermatt (N = 34). We limit our analysis to persons in the reproductive years, i.e., aged between 25 and 50 years, who are not living in a one-person household. Thus, our sample includes those persons who are potentially the most affected by time conflicts with respect to family and household duties. Moreover, we excluded seven municipalities due to a lack of contextual data. We conducted multiple imputation procedures to maintain incomplete cases at the individual level in the sample. The final sample contains 1181 individuals from 53 Swiss communes.

To measure individual perceptions of time conflict between different spheres of life, we use the approval or disapproval of the following three items (on a scale from 0 to 10):

1) “Besides my work and family duties, I do not have enough time for leisure activities.”

2) “Given my work and leisure activities, I often miss out on doing housework.”
3) “When I need to decide whether to allocate my time to housework or leisure activities, I opt for housework.”

These three items enable us to measure various aspects of time conflicts in accordance with the different (gender-specific) mechanisms discussed in the theoretical section. Whereas the first item focusses on whether a time conflict mainly exists at the cost of leisure time, the second captures whether people find it difficult to find the time for housework. The third item more strongly concentrates on priorities, and thereby particularly relates to the expectation that mainly employed women will not reduce time spent on housework, but rather cut back their personal time (Craig 2007).

The crucial explanatory factor at the aggregate level is external childcare supply in municipalities. This data has been collected through a survey of the communal administrations. Two types of external childcare were considered: 1) early childhood education and care (ECEC) services, i.e., the childcare institutions taking care of children before school age and 2) out-of-school childcare services taking care of school-age children before and/or after school and/or during lunchtime. For our main analyses, we use two simple dummy variables to differentiate between municipalities that provide the respective types of childcare and municipalities without childcare supply. This crude measurement seems reasonable in our context, since 28.3% of the municipalities in our sample do not provide ECEC services. Out-of-school childcare exists in only 43.4% of the surveyed municipalities. However, further analyses based on a smaller sample (due to missing values) but using a more nuanced variable that accounts for how much childcare is provided (i.e., number of ECEC-full-time places) roughly confirmed the results presented in the following pages (see Appendix I).

With respect to our dependent and crucial explanatory variables, the data is quite original and extremely useful for our purposes. To our knowledge, this is the only data set that combines
information on individual perceptions of reconciliation problems on the one hand, with data on local childcare provision on the other. However, it must be stated that the data also has some weaknesses. In particular, the information on households and labor market involvement is quite scarce. For instance, we can only distinguish between not employed, part-time, and full-time working individuals, while information is lacking on their exact activity level. These limitations are problematic particularly with respect to women, since interesting differences may occur between marginal and more substantial part-time workers. Moreover, information on the partner and household situations (i.e., on the actual division of labor within a household) is very limited. As a result, we are not able to systematically test the complete causal chain between childcare supply and perceptions, i.e. including the effect of childcare services on the within household division of labor.

To account for the individual work and family situation, we integrate the following individual level variables: presence of children under the age of 6, presence of children aged 6–15 years, employment situation (dummies for “not employed” and part-time employment; the reference category in the models is “full-time employment”), and a variable measuring an individual’s relative share of housework. Furthermore, we integrate two dummy variables—one that measures an individual’s engagement in volunteering (1 = at least one voluntary activity), and the other that takes the value 1 if the respondent is the main caregiver in the household. Unfortunately, the data does not contain valid information on whether a household uses or does not use external childcare.

Moreover, we control for the following individual characteristics: household income (dummies for low, medium, and “unknown” income categories; the reference category in the models is “high income”), highest education, marital status, and age.

Last but not least, we need to consider potential confounding variables at the contextual level. Although Swiss municipalities share many institutional and political commonalities, they are
characterized by a large diversity regarding size, structural composition, and most importantly, norms and attitudes. Therefore, following previous research (Mosimann and Giger 2008; Zollinger and Widmer 2016), we integrate the following contextual factors: the distinction between rural (the reference category) and urban areas has been shown to be a crucial variable that captures important structural differences between municipalities (i.e., the educational level of the population, share of foreign population, and economic structure). Furthermore, in the context of our analysis, differences regarding norms and attitudes play an important role. The distinction between linguistic regions captures well-known attitudinal differences, whereby the Latin part of Switzerland tends to support more strongly state intervention, social policy, and modernized gender roles (Stadelmann-Steffen and Gundelach 2015). Moreover, at the level of political parties, the Swiss People’s party most strongly advocates for a traditional family model and limited state intervention. Thus, we integrate the communal share of votes for the Swiss People's Party (Schweizerische Volkspartei, SVP) in national elections. Finally, to more specifically measure municipal attitudes towards modernized gender roles and public childcare, we use the communal share of yes-votes on a recent mandatory referendum (the so-called “family-article” of March 2013). The government’s proposal aimed at incorporating a constitutional article that encouraged the reconciliation of family and working life, especially through public efforts to establish needs-oriented external child care services. Although 54.3% of voters cast a yes-vote, the constitutional article did not pass, since the majority of cantons rejected the article (no double majority). Interestingly, the variance in yes-votes at the communal level (also within cantons) was impressive, ranging from 22.1% (Rothenturm) to 83.1% (Troinex) in our sample. The integration of these contextual factors particularly aims at countering problems of endogeneity, i.e., sorting effects. For example, it could be argued that childcare services are fewer in those communes where the share of SVP votes is high and/or the share of votes in favor of the family article was low, since both factors imply that attitudes supporting the
traditional family model are prevalent within the communes. Furthermore, childcare services have been established more widely in the French-speaking part of Switzerland—compared to the German-speaking part—and are more prevalent in urban compared to rural areas. Further information on the variables, their operationalization, and data sources, can be found in Appendix II.

We apply multi-response multilevel models using a Bayesian estimation approach (Hadfield 2010). A multi-response multilevel model enables us to not only consider the hierarchical structure of the data (i.e., individuals are nested within municipalities; Steenbergen and Jones 2002), but also to simultaneously analyse different facets of time conflicts (i.e., to account for the fact that responses to the three items may be correlated). We estimate separate models for women and men. A Bayesian estimation approach is used, which—particularly when employing multilevel models and faced with a small number of level-2 units—has been shown to perform better than maximum likelihood (Stegmüller 2013). Moreover, in contrast to frequentist statistics, a Bayesian estimation does not rely on repeatable random samples and asymptotical assumptions, and seems, therefore, to be particularly suited to our small, non-random sample. By using Bayesian statistics, we can directly express the uncertainty in our estimates by presenting the posterior distribution, i.e., the distribution of a parameter after considering the available data. For an easy interpretation of the Bayesian estimation results, we present the mean of the posterior distribution, which can be interpreted similar to a standard regression situation: the mean is the average effect of an independent variable on the outcome variable. Moreover, we provide the 95% credible intervals that are the Bayesian equivalent to confidence intervals in a standard regression context, which give a sense of the statistical reliability of the estimate. If these credible intervals do not include zero, the estimated coefficient can be considered to be systematic, i.e., “significant”.2
EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The results of the Bayesian multi-response multilevel analysis are shown in Figure 1. Initially, the results imply that especially the presence of children and the employment level affect the perception of time conflicts. Moreover, a voluntary engagement exhibits a negative and “significant” coefficient in all models, suggesting that this variable captures the freedom to get involved rather than a potential effect on the perceptions of time conflict. Moreover, it should be noted, that important differences can be observed between women and men, but also regarding the three aspects of time conflict.

--- Figure 1 about here ---

However, our main interest is the relationship between children, childcare supply, and perceived time conflicts. We expect that childcare services mainly affect those individuals with children. For this reason, we have integrated interactions between the two childcare variables and the presence of children of the according age in the household. To illustrate the results of the interaction effects, Figures 2 and 3 provide the marginal effects of (younger and older) children on perceived time conflicts for women and men in municipalities with and without childcare services. Appendix III moreover provides the gender differences in these marginal effects in order to test their statistical “significance”.

Gender-specific Time Conflicts in Municipalities without Childcare Provision

First, and as is shown in Figure 2, in municipalities without childcare provision, the presence of children aged less than 6 years is associated with an increased perception of mothers that they do not have enough free time and that leisure time falls short due to household chores.
Conversely, mothers with small children agree less with the statement that time for housework is lacking. Moreover, they strongly agree with the statement “when I need to decide whether to allocate my time to housework or leisure activities, I opt for housework.” These findings may be due to the fact that women with small children in Switzerland—and particularly in municipalities without childcare provision—typically (partially) retreat from the labor market (Stadelmann-Steffen 2011). Staying at home, these women quite naturally assume the responsibility for housework, which becomes part of their daily routine.

--- Figure 2 ---

From Figure 3, we can moreover conclude that women in these municipalities (without childcare provision) are clearly relieved when their children get older. When children reach school age, these women even feel weaker time conflicts regarding leisure time and housework than women without children. This corroborates the idea of the traditional male breadwinner model, where women do not (fully) reenter the labor market once the children have grown older, and therefore do not face time conflicts regarding housework and leisure activities anymore.

For men, the situation in municipalities without childcare provision is different. Small children do not induce any time conflicts in these communes (Figure 2). With respect to housework, this situation changes slightly when the children get older (Figure 3). Overall, these results clearly support the argument that the non-provision of childcare services in a municipality goes along with traditional gender roles and family models.

**Gender-specific Time Conflicts in Municipalities with Childcare Provision**
In municipalities with external childcare supply, some important differences occur. It can be seen in Figure 1 that generally the main effect of childcare provision comprises zero. This finding corroborates our assumption that childcare supply does not affect individuals without children. By contrast, several interaction terms are “significant,” meaning that childcare provision is related to the level of the perceived time conflicts of individuals with children.

This is particularly true for fathers of small children. In fact, the existence of ECEC services is not systematically associated with women’s time conflicts as Figure 2 illustrates—the marginal effects of having small children in communes with and without early childcare supply merely differ (and not “significantly” as the interaction terms in Figure 1 show). By contrast, and interestingly, having small children in a municipality with early childcare provision is clearly and systematically associated with increased time conflicts in men (all three interaction terms for men are positive and do not include zero). These fathers sense that they do not have enough time for leisure and housework activities, and they feel more frequently urged to opt for housework instead of leisure time. As a result, gender differences in the perception of time conflicts are smaller in municipalities that provide early childhood education and care compared to communes that do not provide any childcare for small children (The exception is the item “not enough time for housework”, see Appendix III).

For mothers, childcare services targeted at older children seem to be somewhat more relevant as two out of the three interaction terms are systematically different from zero (see Figure 1). However, the coefficients are positive, suggesting that perceived time conflicts for mothers of school-aged children are lower in municipalities without out-of-school services. In fact, in these municipalities, mothers of school aged children exhibit lower time conflicts than mothers that (also) have smaller children. This stress-reducing effect of children entering school seems to be dampened in municipalities that offer out-of-school services, which might be a result of the fact that Swiss mothers (particularly in municipalities with out-of-school...
services) tend to increase their level of employment as their children grow older.\(^3\) The results could moreover point to the fact that working mothers are less willing to cut back on their personal time (see Craig 2007), once the children have grown older. It is important to note that fathers of school-aged children exhibit higher levels of time conflicts regarding leisure activities, but not housework, when they live in a commune that provides out-of-school childcare. Overall, these results however suggest that municipal childcare provision is less important for male time conflicts as the children grow older.

--- Figure 3 about here ---

The findings so far imply that childcare provision rather increases than decreases perceived time conflicts among parents. However, interestingly, men seem to be more strongly affected by communal policy conditions than women. Obviously, especially men in municipalities with ECEC services feel much more under pressure regarding the reconciliation of different spheres of life. As mentioned before, we do not explicitly test in how far childcare supply affects the within household division of labor. However, the findings are clearly in accordance with our theoretical expectations that childcare policies trigger a more egalitarian division of labor (see also Mikucka 2008: 15), which objectively increases men’s time restrictions but also may induce conflicts between new ideals of fatherhood and persisting conservative takes on masculinity. Put differently, men, in contrast to women, seem to lack a mechanism that makes them accept these objective constraints. In contrast, a persisting clash between their new father role in the family and societal views on masculinity fuels negative perceptions of time restrictions.

As previously mentioned, due to a lack of information in the data set, we were not able to integrate more precise measures on a person’s work intensity, the partner’s employment
situation and thus the actual division of labor within the household. Nevertheless, we have estimated further models in order to test some assumed channels through which childcare provision may affect parental time conflicts. First, we have not explicitly modelled the structural effects, i.e., whether a childcare provision actually is related to a more equal time allocation. As discussed previously, we are only able to distinguish between full-time and part-time employed persons and not employed persons, but do not know our respondents’ exact employment levels. Hence, we cannot say whether a part-time employed woman works 1 or 4 days a week, for instance, which of course should heavily influence the within household division of labor. However, we estimated models in which the reported share of housework served as the dependent variable, while we integrated interaction terms between the rough employment measure and external childcare provision as explanatory variables (Appendix IV). These analyses reveal that, regarding the group of part-time employed individuals, women with small children have a smaller share of housework in municipalities with childcare provision, whereas the opposite is true for men. Similarly, two out of three marginal effects of out-of-school services are positive and different from zero for men. By contrast, childcare policies only affect fulltime working mothers with school-aged children, whereby out-of-school services increase these women’s share of housework. This finding is in accordance with Greenstein’s (2000) argument of “deviance neutralization”. Finally, the negative and systematic marginal effect of ECEC services on full-time employed fathers may be indicative of two different household constellations: the traditional (maybe slightly modernized) male-breadwinner model with women doing the work at home, or a real dual-earner model with the housework being externalized. In both cases, full-time employed men are mostly released from doing the chores. Overall, these analyses lend some support for our assumption that external childcare provision is related to a somewhat equalized within household division of domestic work.
Second, and relatedly, the interpretation of our results rely on the assumption that an equal within household division of labor triggers gender-specific perceptions of time conflicts. Again, we lack systematic data on these household aspects, and in particular we do not know whether and to what degree partners are employed. In order to still substantiate this link between family models and gender-specific perceptions of time conflict, we used the limited information we have on children, main caregiver, a respondents’ part-time vs. fulltime employment and housework, to assign respondents to different family models. For example, married fathers with fulltime employment, indicating that they do only a marginal share of housework, while “another person in the household” is the main caregiver, most probably live a traditional male breadwinner model. The same is true for not employed mothers identifying themselves as main caregiver and as being the person who does most part of the housework. In contrast, we identify men and women living an equalized family model, if they work at least part-time, do roughly half of the housework, and indicate that neither (s)he nor another person is the main caregiver (i.e., this speaks for an equal division of childcare and/or the use of external childcare). For women we can further distinguish a group most probably living a modernized form of the breadwinner model, which differs from the traditional model in that the woman is part-time employed but still assumes main caregiver and housework responsibilities. Note that we cannot make this distinction for men, since from the male perspective this model differs from the traditional male breadwinner model only with respect to their wife’s work situation—information that we do not have. Hence, for men, the category “modernized form of the breadwinner model” only includes the small group of men who adopt the “female role” in this model, i.e. who work part-time, are the main caregiver and conduct most part of housework. When we use these categories to predict perceptions of time conflict for parents, we see the expected pattern (see Figure 4 for the relevant marginal effects; the full model can be found in Appendix V). It can be seen that fathers in egalitarian households (compared to the traditional and modernized male breadwinner situation) exhibit
systematically higher time conflicts in all three dependent variables. For women, this
difference is “significant” only in one case, namely with regards to the perceptions of not
having enough time for housework. Female respondents, in contrast, face stronger time
conflicts in a modernized breadwinner situation, i.e., if they work part-time but still assume
main caregiver responsibilities and the largest share of housework. Interestingly, however,
these women agree less on the statement that they opt for housework instead of leisure time.
Against the background of previous research (Craig 2007) this seems to confirm the fact that
these women have reduced their time spent on personal activities, meaning that they sense to
have not enough time for leisure activities, while they do not find themselves in the situation
to choose between housework and leisure time.4

--- Figure 4 ---

Finally, an important question that arises is whether our results are due to a sorting effect,
namely that individuals with “modern” attitudes towards gender inequality chose to live in
municipalities in which childcare structures facilitate an equalized division of labor. While
our control variables to a certain extent control for this endogeneity, we estimated further
models including interactions between the children variables and the share of yes-votes on the
“family article.” If our findings regarding childcare provision were just due to a sorting effect,
we should find the same pattern when interacting the family situation with the municipal
values on gender roles instead of the childcare provision. However, this is not the case.
Whereas our conclusions regarding childcare policies remain the same, communal attitudes
towards gender roles do not systematically affect gender-specific patterns of time conflict
(Appendix VI). Moreover, these additional tests are in accordance with recent findings, which
argue that traditional/modern gender roles are only one among various factors that help to explain the provision of childcare institutions in Switzerland (Zollinger and Widmer 2016).

CONCLUSIONS

The primary objective of this study was to contribute to a more encompassing understanding of time conflicts and related gender inequalities by considering reconciliation problems not only between work and family duties, but also regarding leisure activities. Thus, we focused on perceptions of time conflicts and argued that reconciliation problems are not only a matter of actual time allocation to different spheres of life, but also how individuals feel about their personal situation. Moreover, special attention was given to the role of childcare policies and particularly the question of whether ECEC and out-of-school services are associated with gender-specific patterns of perceived time conflicts.

The main findings can be summarized as follows. The results show that the presence of children and the employment level, in particular, increase the perception of time conflicts regarding housework and leisure activities. Whereas this finding confirms earlier research (e.g., Jacobs and Gerson 2004), we also were able to show that time conflict perceptions differ between varying policy contexts and between women and men. For women, the perceived conflicts regarding housework and leisure time ascend with the presence of small children and increased labor market involvement, irrespective of whether they live in a municipality with ECEC provision or not. Importantly, childcare provision is associated with stronger perceptions of time conflicts only when children get older, probably because then mothers typically use this opportunity to increase the intensity of their employment. For men, on the other hand, having (small) children does not induce any time conflicts if they do not live in a municipality that provides ECEC services. By contrast, fathers living in a municipality with
ECEC services face substantially higher time conflicts regarding both leisure and housework activities. Although this pattern is less consistent when children reach school age, the present study corroborates earlier studies that have emphasized the importance of examining the outcomes and impacts of policies more broadly, and also potential unintended consequences (Castles and Mitchell 1992; Stadelmann-Steffen 2011: 350; Zollinger and Widmer 2016: 132).

Given these results, do we need to question the positive framing of external childcare provision in the context of reconciliation problems that was found in previous research? While our findings may seem to be somewhat disillusioning at first sight, a closer look leads to a more positive conclusion. In fact, our findings clearly support the hypothesis that the provision of childcare services is associated with a more equal within household division of labor. It is true that this increased equality induces some “costs” (i.e., stronger perceptions of time conflicts) that are mainly borne by fathers: our results imply that—in the Swiss context—changing gender roles provoke more negative feelings and stress in men than in women. This finding may be explained by the fact that a more equal division of labor for mothers is strongly related to increased opportunities (Stadelmann-Steffen 2011), and possibly even with increased women’s happiness (Boye 2009; Mencarini and Sironi 2012: 213). Put differently, although a stronger labor market involvement may objectively mean more time conflicts for women as well (Jacobs and Gerson 2004: 39), this situation does not automatically translate into stronger perceptions of time conflict. Another element adding to this picture is Craig’s (2007) argument that working mothers tend to reduce time spent on personal activities. While our analyses suggest that this may in fact lead to the feeling of not having enough time for leisure activities, this self-restriction practically reduces time conflicts regarding the other spheres of life.
By contrast, it can be argued that a more egalitarian division of labor makes fathers’ lives more complex. The advantages of more modernized family roles are less obvious for them, but rather they are confronted with new and stronger constraints. In fact, Hagqvist et al. (2012: 458) recently have shown that work-family conflict decreases the well-being of men to a greater extent than that of women. This is also in accordance with research on fatherhood and masculinity showing that while an ideal of an involved and participating father has evolved over the last decades, not much has changed regarding the image of what a “real man” is meant to be (Brandth and Kvande 1998; Wall and Arnold 2009) – a conclusion that seems to be reasonable also in the Swiss context. Hence, it is the clash between the different normative ideals that makes the situation particularly difficult for fathers.

It needs to be mentioned that our analyses have some limitations. First, strictly speaking, our cross-sectional design does not enable us to causally interpret our findings, mainly because of potential endogeneity problems. Although we could provide evidence that sorting effects did not drive our results, reversed causality may be a relevant issue. In particular, higher female employment and a more egalitarian division of labor could increase the demand for external childcare supply. While we acknowledge that this reciprocity exists, we also argue that this endogeneity does not fundamentally question our main results. Although the endogenous relationship between women’s labor market participation, a more egalitarian division of labor, and childcare policies is quite obvious, this is much less the case with respect to perceptions of time conflicts. Our results show that in a municipal context with external childcare provision and a more egalitarian division of labor, men feel particularly strong time conflicts. This conclusion is reasonable and relevant, independently of how exactly childcare provision and the within household division of labor are causally related.

Against this background, our results eventually point to the need for policy makers to consider and target not only women but increasingly also men when crafting childcare (but probably
also parental leave) policies. Our findings importantly support the view that childcare policies possibly have different consequences depending not only on their specific design, but also on cultural factors. In particular, gender norms may be relevant both at the contextual as well as the individual level: First, regarding the former, previous research from Scandinavian countries has shown that these policies mainly reduce work-life conflicts for men. In contrast, our results suggest that in a country like Switzerland, in which a (modernized) male-breadwinner model still dominates and in which childcare coverage is far from universal, these policies have quite different implications. We mainly attribute this to the clash between a more equalized within household division of labor these policies induce and the still prevalent traditional norms on gender roles, particularly also on masculinity. A path for future research will be to analyze these contingencies in more detail—i.e., across countries or cultural contexts. Second, at the individual level, our analyses point to the fact that gender-specific norms and understandings may lead to different reactions to the same policies (see also Lalive and Stutzer 2010). A crucial conclusion we derive from our analyses is actually, that the differential relationship between childcare policies and perceptions of time conflict between men and women is not just about objectively stronger time constraints, but it is mainly also about how these objective restrictions are translated – through a filter of gender-specific norms and opportunities – into perceptions of one’s personal situation.

NOTES

1 For our argument, it is not essential to assume that childcare policies causally influence female labour market participation. Based on the literature, we actually conclude that childcare policies and female labour market participation are endogenously related. However,
our main arguments are concerned with the possible policy effects of childcare provision on
the perceptions of time-conflict. Thus, increased female labour market participation is
considered to be a crucial driver of reconciliation problems within households, but it does
actually not really matter whether women’s employment is the result or the source of
childcare policies. We come back to this issue in the conclusions.

2 A full Bayesian analysis requires the specification of priors for the unknown parameters. We
used non-informative normal priors \( \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 10^8) \) for the fixed effect parameters, and inverse
Wishart priors \( \sim \mathcal{W}^{-1}(2, 2) \) for the variance component. All models have been estimated in R
using the package MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010). We let the models run for 400’000
iterations, with a burn-in of 200’000 and a thinning of 50. Different diagnostics based on the
graphical inspection of the trajectories and the autocorrelations lead to the conclusion that the
chains have mixed well and converged (provided upon request).

3 See the data provided by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office available at
https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/wirtschaftliche-soziale-situation-bevoel-
kerung/gleichstellung-frau-mann/vereinbarkeit-beruf-familie/erwerbsbeteiligung-muettern-

4 Note that the large and negative effects for the modernized breadwinner model for men
stems from the fact that these coefficients stand for men who assume the “female role” in this
family model. In other words, the few men who work only part-time and are the main
caregiver exhibit much lower time conflicts than women in this family situation.
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Figures

Figure 1: Bayesian Multi-response Multilevel Models

Note: Multi-response multilevel regression estimates (means and 95% credible intervals). See note 2 for further information on the Bayesian specification. For illustrative purposes, the coefficients for the share of housework, approval of family-article, and the share of SVP-votes depict 10% changes. Similarly, the estimate for age stands for a ten-year change.

Figure 2: Marginal Effects: Children < 6 years

Note: Marginal effects of having at least one child under the age of 6 years for women and men, and in communes with and without ECEC provision. Based on the model presented in Figure 1.
Figure 3: Marginal Effects: Children between 6 and 15 years

- Women - Men

Note: Marginal effects of having at least one child of 6-15 years of age for women and men, and in communes with and without out-of-school-service provision. Based on the model presented in Figure 1.

Figure 4: Perceptions of time conflicts contingent on the family model

- Women - Men

Note: Marginal effects of living in the respective family model for women and men with children. Reference category: Traditional male breadwinner. The full model is presented in Appendix V.
Appendix I: The amount of childcare provision (number of ECEC-fulltime places)

Note: Multi-response multilevel regression estimates (means and 95% credible intervals). See note 2 for further information on the Bayesian specification.
### Appendix II: Variables and operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Perception of time conflict between different spheres of life – three interdependent variables | Approval or disapproval (range from 0 (not agree at all) to 10 (do very much agree)) of the following questions:  
1) “Beside my work and family duties I do not have enough time for leisure activities.”  
2) “Given my work and leisure activities, I often miss out housework.”  
3) “When I need to decide whether to allocate my time to housework or leisure activities, I opt for housework.” | Swiss volunteering survey (SVS) 2010 | **Women**  
1) Mean: 5.45  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10  
2) Mean: 4.32  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10  
3) Mean: 5.33  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10 | **Men**  
1) Mean: 5.20  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10  
2) Mean: 5.2  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10  
3) Mean: 4.43  
   Min: 0  
   Max: 10 |
| **Independent Variables** | | | |
| Gender | Dummy variable | SVS 2010 | **Women**: 62.52  
   **Men**: 37.48 |
| Early childhood education and care services (ECEC services) | Dummy variable: 1 = communes with ECEC services; 0 = communes without ECEC services | Own data collection | Share:  
   - Communes with ECEC services: 71.7% |
| Out-of-school-services | Dummy variable: 1 = communes with Out-of-school-services; 0 = communes without Out-of-school-services | Own data collection | Share:  
   - Communes with Out-of-school-services: 43.4% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Women: Share of respondents with at least one child</th>
<th>Men: Share of respondents with at least one child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &lt; 6 years</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = at least one child under the age of six within the household.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Share of respondents with at least one child under the age of six within the household: 18.16%</td>
<td>Share of respondents with at least one child under the age of six within the household: 17.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 6-15 years</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = at least one child between 6-15 years within the household.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Share of respondents with at least one child between 6-15 years within the household: 49.46%</td>
<td>Share of respondents with at least one child between 6-15 years within the household: 43.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td>Three categories: 1=Fulltime employment; 2 = Part-time employment; 3 = “not employed”.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women: Shares: Fulltime: 17.62% Part-time: 63.82% Not emp.: 18.56%</td>
<td>Men: Shares: Fulltime: 92.08% Part-time: 5.20% Not emp.: 2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>Individual relative share of housework.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women: Mean: 19.21 Min: 0 Max: 97</td>
<td>Men: Mean: 5.82 Min: 0 Max: 59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = at least one voluntary activity.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women: Share of respondents with at least one voluntary activity: 34.96%</td>
<td>Men: Share of respondents with at least one voluntary activity: 41.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main child carer</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = main caregiver within the household.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women: Share of respondents who are main caregiver within the household: 59.49%</td>
<td>Men: Share of respondents who are main caregiver within the household: 10.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>Income Categories: 1= low (&lt; CHF5000); 2= medium (CHF 5000 – 9000); 3 = high (&gt; CHF 9000); 4 = unknown</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women:</td>
<td>Men:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women: Share:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 21.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium: 41.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High: 22.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown: 14.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational categories: 1= low (primary education); 2=medium (secondary education); 3=high (tertiary education).</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women:</td>
<td>Men:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women: Share:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 2.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium: 70.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High: 27.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = Married</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Women: Share of respondents who are married:</td>
<td>Men: Share of respondents who are married:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.58%</td>
<td>77.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Region</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1 = German-speaking part; 0= French- and Italian-speaking part.</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Share of German-speaking communes:</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family article</td>
<td>Communal share of votes (in %) in favor of the family article in June 2012.</td>
<td>Swiss Federal Statistical Office: <a href="http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/17/03/blank/key/2013/011.html">http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/17/03/blank/key/2013/011.html</a></td>
<td>Mean (communes): 48.96%</td>
<td>Min: 22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP-vote</td>
<td>Communal share of votes (in %) for the Swiss People's Party (Schweizerische Volkspartei, SVP) in national elections</td>
<td>Swiss Federal Statistical Office: <a href="http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/regionalportraits/gemeindesuche.html">http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/regionalportraits/gemeindesuche.html</a></td>
<td>Mean (communes): 34.57%</td>
<td>Min: 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 1=urban, 0=rural</td>
<td>SVS 2010</td>
<td>Share of communes in rural area: 13.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix III: Gender Differences in marginal effects

A. Gender Differences: Marginal Effects of having small children (< 6 years)

B Gender Differences: Marginal Effects of having school-aged children (6 - 15 years)

Note: Differences between men and women in marginal effects of having at least one child in the respective age category in municipalities with and without childcare service provision. Based on the model presented in Figure 1. Mean and 95% credible interval of the joint distributions are presented, i.e., if the interval does not include zero, the difference between men and women is systematic with a probability of at least 95%.
Appendix IV: The relationship between childcare provision in a municipality and a person’s share of housework

A Full model

- Women = Men

Note: Multilevel linear regression estimates (means and 95% credible intervals). Models were run for 100,000 iterations with a burn-in of 80,000 using non-informative priors. In the model for men effects for the interaction “Child <6*not employed”, as well as for the interaction “Child <6*parttime *ECEC” are not estimable (due to a lack of information) and have been removed. All estimates were transformed (divided by ten) for reasons of presentation.
B Marginal effect of childcare having small children (<6 years, left graph) and children between 6 and 15 years (right graph)

Note: Marginal effects based on the results as shown in A.

Appendix V: Family models and perceived time conflicts

Note: Multi-response multilevel regression estimates (means and 95% credible intervals). The estimations only include men and women with children. Models have been estimated in R using the package MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010). The models were run for 200'000 iterations, with a burn-in of 100’000 and a thinning of 50 using non-informative priors. For illustrative purposes, the coefficients for the approval of family-article, and the share of SVP-votes depict 10% changes. Similarly, the estimate for age stands for a ten-year change, whereas the variables “German-speaking part” as well as male low education have been divided by 10.
Appendix VI: Bayesian Multi-response Multilevel Models including an interaction between family situation and the approval of the “family article”.

- Women - Men

Variable: not enough free time
- Child <6
- Child 6-15
- Main child carer
- Share of housework
- Volunteering
- Not employed
- Part-time empl.
- Household inc., low
- Household inc., medium
- Household inc., unknown
- Low education
- Medium education
- Age (in years)
- Married
- ECEC services
- Out-of-school services
- German-speaking part
- Approval of family-article
- Share of SVP-votes
- Rural
- Child <6: Approval of family-article
- Child 6-15: Approval of family-article
- Child <6: ECEC services
- Child 6-15: Out-of-school services

Variable: not enough time for housework

Variable: housework instead of free time

Note: Multi-response multilevel regression estimates (means and 95% credible intervals). See note 2 for further information on the Bayesian specification. For illustrative purposes, the coefficients for the share of housework, approval of family-article (also the interaction term), and the share of SVP-votes depict 10% changes. Similarly, the estimate for age stands for a ten-year change.