11. Work-family policies within the workplace

Laura den Dulk, Mara A. Yerkes and Bram Peper

INTRODUCTION

Work-family researchers increasingly point out the need to broaden the scope of research in order to shed light on the interactions between public policies at the country level, collective agreements at the industry level, and workplace policies and practices at the organizational level in relation to employees' needs and work-family experiences (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Policies and practices in organizations and collective agreements at the industry and organizational level can supplement and restrict existing statutory family policies. Moreover, it is in the context of the workplace that policies play out and affect work-family experiences.

This chapter offers a state of the art review on the role of work-family policies within the workplace across different European countries. What policies and arrangements do organizations offer in the context of different family policy models and how are existing policies implemented in the workplace? We will review research on the adoption of workplace policies as well as research on the management of work-family policies in organizations. We also explore the role of collective agreements. Trade unions can pressure organizations to extend existing statutory family policies. Whether this is a factor affecting the development of support at the organizational, sector or national level is not yet clear. Powerful unions are able to influence management's decisions about employee benefits and the implementation of policies in organizations, but may also choose to raise the issue at the bargaining table at sector or national level, leading to the development of public provisions rather than specific workplace support.

In the next section, the focus is on the adoption of workplace policies and how this interacts with state policies, followed by a discussion on the role of trade unions and collective labour agreements. The following section offers an overview of research on the management of work-family policies in organizations. Specific attention will be paid to the role of top managers and supervisors on the work floor. The chapter ends with concluding remarks, accompanied by a research agenda for future research.

ADOPTION OF WORKPLACE POLICIES

There is a growing body of research on the adoption of workplace policies directed at the combination of paid work and family life. Workplace work-family policies can either extend public policies, for instance by offering enhanced leaves (longer leave or higher payment), or complement existing national policies by offering other types of policies, such as flexible working hours and teleworking (den Dulk et al., 2012). With respect to workplace work-family policies a distinction can be made between workplace childcare support and enhanced leave arrangements, which enable workers

to combine their job with caring responsibilities, and flexible work arrangements, which are not restricted to employees with children or other dependent family members in need of care. In addition, employers can introduce supportive arrangements such as counselling for working parents or work-life balance management training (den Dulk, 2001). Organizations vary in the number and the nature or type of policies introduced both within and between countries. In particular, extensive within-country variation exists along the lines of organizational conditions, although the national context in which organizations operate clearly shapes the number and types of workplace policies offered (den Dulk and Groeneveld, 2013; den Dulk et al., 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014). A cluster analysis based on the *Working Time and Work-Life Balance in European companies. Establishment Survey on Working Time 2004–2005* (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2006) that takes both state and workplace support into account shows, for instance, that employees working in public sector organizations, large organizations, organizations with a large proportion of female workers (up to 80 per cent), and those operating in Scandinavian countries have the most policy support (den Dulk et al., 2014). Other cross-national and single country studies confirm that, in particular, public sector and large organizations take the lead in the adoption of workplace polices (Appelbaum et al., 2005; Bond et al., 2005; den Dulk, 2001; den Dulk et al., 2010; Evans, 2001; Goodstein, 1994; Ingram and Simons, 1995; Osterman, 1995; Wood et al., 2003), and that employers operating in country contexts with generous public policies do not lag behind compared to those in more liberal policy contexts (Den Dulk et al., 2013).

These findings raise relevant questions, such as why do some organizations offer more workplace support (extending legislation) than others, and how public policies at the country level interact with collective agreements and policies at the organizational level. Extant work-family research relies on a number of theoretical arguments to explain this variation in the adoption of workplace work-family policies and arrangements across organizations, including (neo) institutional theory, economic arguments (the business case), or a combination of both (Appelbaum et al., 2005; den Dulk, 2001; den Dulk et al., 2010, 2013). The (neo) institutional approach argues that coercive and normative institutional pressures influence the adoption of workplace policies because organizations wish to safeguard their social legitimacy in society. Employers not only have to meet economic considerations, but also need to respond to regulations, norms, laws and social expectations (Goodstein, 1994). Public attention towards the combination of paid work and care, the increase of public family policies, as well as a changing workforce that increasingly consists of dual-earner families leads towards norms and social expectations regarding workplace work-family support and the need for organizations to comply with laws and regulations. Hence, legislation and collective agreements designed to ease the combination of work and family life requires organizations to offer some type of support, such as parental leave. In addition, the same regulations can lead to a social climate in which organizations are increasingly expected to provide additional support, leading to workplace arrangements that complement or extend legal entitlements (den Dulk, 2001; den Dulk et al., 2013).

Next to state support, the cultural context and in particular gender ideology is expected to contribute to the degree of institutional pressure that employers experience. Lyness and Brumit Kropf (2005), for instance, examined (among others) the relationship between

national gender equality and the adoption of flexible work arrangements among a sample of managers and professional workers across 20 European countries. Higher gender equality implies that women are a valuable part of the workforce and this may increase the likelihood that organizations adopt workplace work-family policies. In addition, a high level of gender equality may also contribute to a social climate in which employees experience a sense of entitlement to family support, leading to more institutional pressure on organizations (Lewis and Smithson, 2001; Poelmans and Sahibzada, 2004). Research has yet to fully confirm the expected positive relationship between national gender equality and the adoption of workplace family policies, however (den Dulk and Groeneveld, 2013; den Dulk et al., 2012, 2013). This might be related to measurement issues, that is, including gender equality outcomes rather than ideology and beliefs (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013) or that the cultural context is more relevant for the support of the work-family culture in organizations than for the adoption of formal work-family policies (Lyness and Brumit Kropf, 2005).

Economic or business case arguments, in contrast, emphasize the costs and benefits of workplace arrangements to the organization. Organizations will adopt workplace work-family policies and arrangements when it helps them to gain competitive advantage over other employers in the recruitment and retention of workers, when it improves the commitment and productivity of workers and when it does not entail high costs (see, e.g., Budd and Mumford, 2004; Davis and Kalleberg, 2006; Glass and Fujimoto, 1995; Wood et al., 2003). It is argued that the costs and benefits of workplace arrangements vary across organizations, depending upon organizational conditions such as size, sector and the composition of the workforce as well as macro-level factors such as labour market conditions and the economy (den Dulk et al., 2010). Moreover, it is assumed that some organizations are more sensitive to institutional pressures than others (den Dulk and Groeneveld, 2013; den Dulk et al., 2013). For example, public sector organizations are more likely to be judged according to government standards and norms (den Dulk, 2001) although their sensitivity varies depending on how close they are to politics and policymaking (i.e., the degree of publicness; Boyne, 2002) (den Dulk and Groeneveld, 2013). Private companies, in contrast, are more likely to be affected by profit-related arguments. The size of the organization is relevant since it affects economics of scale and their visibility in society. The former reduces the costs of the introduction of policies per employee and the latter makes the organization more sensitive to institutional pressure (Goodstein, 1994). In addition, a large proportion of female employees can result in more requests and demands for work-family support. Moreover, in the context of ongoing gendered assumptions about family roles, organizations with a female-dominated workforce may also benefit more from the effect of the introduction of workplace policies on productivity, absenteeism and turnover than male-dominated organizations (Budd and Mumford, 2006; Davis and Kalleberg, 2006; Goodstein, 1994; Wood et al., 2003). However, the skill level of female workers may be an important mediator here (Ingram and Simons, 1995). For organizations that depend on low-skilled, temporary workers, it makes less sense business-wise to invest in additional work-family policies with such easily replaceable employees (e.g., Whitehouse and Zetlin, 1999). However, a large proportion of women in an organization can induce employee representatives to take up this issue. Union members within organizations may also pressure employers to adopt policies to ease the combination of work and family life (Forth et al., 1997). In the next section, we

will discuss the role of trade unions and collective agreements in relation to the adoption of workplace family policies in more detail.

ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS AND COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS

A state of the art review on the role of employers in European countries would be incomplete if attention were not given to the role of collective bargaining and the role of trade unions. Trade unions can pressure organizations to adopt work-family policies. However, whether this is a factor affecting the development of support at the organizational, sector or national level is not yet clear. Powerful unions are able to influence management's decisions about employee benefits, but may also choose to raise the issue at the bargaining table at sector or national level, leading to the development of public provisions rather than specific workplace support.

At the European level, organizations such as Business Europe (formerly the Union of Industrial and Employer Confederations Europe, UNICE) and the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), promote work-family reconciliation as part of a broader framework on gender equality issues (UNICE, 2005). Yet, recently, ETUC noted the difficulties in going beyond 'soft policy' instruments (e.g., recommendations, studies, reports) at the European level in relation to work-family support (Gréboval and Sechi, 2015). At the national level, the influence of trade unions is often greater. Trade unions can play a significant role in prioritizing work-family issues in both collective bargaining and the workplace (Berg et al., 2014; Budd and Mumford, 2004; Yerkes and Tijdens, 2010).

Both trade union membership and collective bargaining coverage can be important for employees' reconciliation of work and family within the organizational context. For example, as shown by Berg et al. (2004), the combined effect of high trade union membership and/or coverage, extensive collective bargaining practices and trade unions focused on working time issues was found to increase collective control over working time in Germany, Sweden and the Netherlands. But in countries where these factors are less prevalent or absent (e.g., in the US), employees are more dependent upon their own labour market position or importance to an employer for gaining control over working time. Chung (2008) finds similar effects in relation to flexible working. In countries where unions are stronger, flexi-time practices are generally more worker-friendly. In countries where unions are weaker, company-oriented options are more prevalent. Similar evidence is also found in single country studies. In the US, trade union behaviour has been found to have a significant yet varied effect on employees' access to and use of flexibility practices (Berg et al., 2014). In Spain, unions have shown a preference for managing work-family issues through collective bargaining practices, while employers continue to see work-family reconciliation as an individual human resources issue (Carrasquer et al., 2007). In Germany, in sectors where collective bargaining coverage is higher, works councils have also been found to have greater influence in achieving positive work-family outcomes for employees (Heywood and Jirjahn, 2009). It should be noted, however, that while unions clearly play an important role in work-family reconciliation at the organizational level, their power and influence has declined in recent decades, particularly through a decline in trade union density (i.e., membership; Visser, 2013).

While the issue of trade union influence on the work-family situation at the organizational level has received moderate attention in the literature (e.g., Berg et al., 2014; Budd and Mumford, 2004), research on work-family issues in collective bargaining is limited (Yerkes and Tijdens, 2010). At the European level, research suggests that collective bargaining plays only a minor role, if any, in new European Union (EU) member states. In these countries, national legislation is generally used to develop work-family provisions. Exceptions to this include Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Slovenia, where it appears that some issues such as paid leave to care for children, the protection of pregnant women in the workplace and childcare policy have been subject to collective bargaining in some instances (European Commission, 2008). In the remaining European countries, the interaction between national-level policies and collective bargaining appears to be greater. The European Commission (2008) notes the existence of collective agreements on leave issues and career breaks at the national level in Belgium, Finland, Greece and Ireland and at the sectoral level in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden. In addition, collective bargaining agreements on these issues have been concluded at the company level in Greece, Italy and Portugal (European Commission, 2008).

At the national level, the limited evidence on work-family arrangements in collective bargaining suggests collective bargaining agreements perform at least two important functions in relation to country-level public policies. Collective agreements can complement existing policies (e.g., den Dulk, 2014; Yerkes and Tijdens, 2010), broadening the scope of policy or providing additional payment, as well as compensate for an absence of protection, although cross-country variation exists. Research from Yerkes and Tijdens (2010) on the Dutch case reveals collective agreements provided significant coverage for childcare subsidies and part-time work arrangements prior to national legislation being developed. In addition, while public sector agreements were generally found to exhibit work-family arrangements more quickly than private sector agreements, this was not the case for childcare subsidies and part-time work arrangements. In both of these policy areas, private sector collective agreements appeared to be more responsive to employees' work-family needs. Recent evidence from Sweden and Australia (Raven et al., 2014a) shows Swedish trade unions have succeeded in topping up parental leave benefits through collective bargaining, complementing national-level policies (Raven et al., 2014b). Compensation differs across sectors, however, with non-manual workers generally enjoying higher compensation levels than manual workers. Australian unions have been less successful than Swedish unions in developing parental leave clauses (Yerkes et al., 2014). Evidence from Whitehouse et al. (2013) suggests that employer-provided maternity leave increased from 46 per cent in 2004–05 to 55 per cent in 2009–10, although this reflects provisions in both collective agreements and company policies. Since the introduction of federal parental leave legislation in 2011 (which in essence offers paid maternity leave), unions have been less successful in topping up payment levels (Yerkes et al., 2014). The study by Raven and colleagues (2014a) further showed that in contrast to Sweden and Australia, German collective agreements neither compensate nor complement national-level parental leave policies. Evidence from Italy suggests that a minor number of collective agreements offer compensatory work-family arrangements in the face of little state support (Ponzellini, 2006). Yet the introduction of work-family measures in private company collective agreements is so low (estimated at 3.5 per cent) that the author suggests these arrangements do

little to close the gap with extensive work-family policies offered through national-level policies in other countries (see also Riva, 2016).

Another way of looking at the impact of trade unions and collective agreements on the adoption of workplace work-family polices is examining the relationship between the degree of unionization and the presence of workplace work-family policies. In Europe (in contrast to the US), the (relative) level of unionization in an organization was found to be positively related to the adoption of workplace childcare and leave support, but not to the adoption of flexible work arrangements (Anxo et al., 2007; den Dulk et al., 2012). Unions might be reluctant to support flexibility in the workplace, as it can be seen as employer-led flexibility rather than supportive for employee wellbeing (Ravenswood and Markey, 2011). Overall, based on the limited research so far, there are strong indications that in many country contexts, unions are important partners regarding the adoption of state and workplace work-family support. In addition, unions play a role in raising employee awareness of existing policies and entitlements (Haas and Hwang, 2013; Ravenswood and Markey, 2011). We will now turn to the managements of work-family policies in organizations.

MANAGEMENT OF WORK-FAMILY POLICIES IN ORGANIZATIONS

Existing research shows that there is often a gap between policy and practice, that is, workers refrain from taking advantage of existing national and/or workplace policies because they are afraid of career repercussions (Blair-Loy and Wharton, 2002; Eaton, 2003; Kossek et al., 1999; Thompson et al., 1999). Cultural assumptions within organizations, in which long hours and face time in the workplace are seen as a sign of commitment and work devotion, can co-exist with the adoption of work-family policies like flexible work hours and parental leave (Lewis, 2003). As argued by Kossek et al. (2010), both structural and cultural change is needed for organizations to become supportive. Policy alone is often not effective and needs to be accompanied by a supportive organizational culture. Managerial support is a critical aspect of organizational culture and hence critical in the use of workplace work-life policies. Organizational cultures both reflect and shape managerial attitudes and practices (den Dulk and Peper, 2007; den Dulk and de Ruijter, 2005, 2008). They can enhance or inhibit the sense of entitlements of workers to exercise rights and utilize options to combine work and family life (Kanjuo Mrčela and Černigoj Sadar, 2011). With respect to the management of policies included in legislation, collective agreements and workplace policies, different levels of management are relevant to the organizational context: the executive level or top management (managers at the highest level of the organization) and the direct supervisors to whom employees directly report. Within this section, we specifically look at the role of organizational culture given its importance in shaping how work-family policies are managed within the workplace, alongside the broader economic, cultural and policy context. As it becomes clear that the implementation of work-family policies often implies transformational change within organizations (Wells, 2016), we will end with a brief discussion of intervention research within the work-family field.

A Supportive Organizational Culture

Simply introducing work-family policies is not enough to create a supportive organization in which people feel free to use them. Work-family policies such as leave arrangements need to be integrated into an organizational culture that is aware of the responsibilities of employees outside their work. In many organizations, the idea of the ideal worker as someone who is always available and does not have any distractions outside work is still present as an organizational norm (Dumas and Sanchez-Burks, 2015; Kossek et al., 2010). Shared norms, values and assumptions form the basis for symbols and 'unwritten rules' regarding how work gets done and how people should behave within the organization. When the standards and values within the organization conflict with the utilization of work-family policies, policies are often implemented ineffectively and employees make little use of them (Allen, 2001; Dikkers et al., 2007; Thompson et al., 1999). Because values and assumptions are taken for granted and underlie the way employees behave within the organization, they are very often not talked about or discussed and it is not easy to identify and change them. It is simpler, for example, to introduce a leave policy than it is to make the transition from a culture based on workplace attendance to one that manages output.

Management of Work-Family Policies

Top managers of organizations are important actors in the construction and continuation of organizational culture (Major and Litano, 2016; Schein, 2004). They are responsible for the adoption and design of formal workplace policies and are in a position to stimulate the implementation and utilization of policies throughout the organization (Major and Litano, 2016; Poelmans and Sahibzada, 2004). There are few studies that examine the role of top managers with respect to the adoption and implementation of work-family policies in organizations. A notable exception is the study of Been et al. (Been, 2015; Been et al., 2017) that investigated the views of top managers in relation to their organizational and national context in five European countries: Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia and the UK. The study applied a vignette design to capture the conditions under which top managers in these countries support work-family policies, namely, to what degree business case considerations and institutional pressures play a role (Been et al., 2017). The study shows that, in line with the business case argumentation, top managers in these countries are more supportive of work-family policies when they require few financial investments and contribute to employee commitment. In other words, when the top manager assumes that policies benefit the organization. European top managers in this study were inclined to stay in control of how policies are implemented by setting specific conditions on employee take-up. Top managers tend to shape policies in a way that aligns with the goals and aims of the organization by using the existing latitude within legislation (Been et al., 2016). In the UK and the Netherlands, for instance, public family policies as well as formal workplace policies often contain an element of employer discretion. For example, in both countries, managers can decline a request to reduce working hours on the basis of business needs (den Dulk et al., 2011).

However, findings also indicate that next to business case arguments, societal norms shape top managers' decision-making in relation to work-family policies. In particular, public sector top managers preferred work-family policies available to all employees

rather than introducing policies targeted specifically towards employees that are costly to lose (i.e., high performers). Moreover, the types of policies that top managers supported the most were also found to be related to the national context that top managers operate in. In general, CEOs and board members in this study preferred policies that have a limited impact on the number of hours employees work, that is, flexible working hours and teleworking. They showed less support for leave policies and part-time work, although this was clearly related to the national context. For example, in countries in which part-time work is more common, like the Netherlands and the UK, top managers were more positive about the reduction of working hours, more so than in countries in which there is no tradition of part-time employment (Been et al., 2017). Moreover, in countries with extensive national family policies, top managers also framed their support for policies in terms of social responsibility and did not only apply business case arguments (Been, 2015). This finding is in line with previously discussed research on the adoption of workplace policies across countries (den Dulk et al., 2013; Ollier-Malaterre, 2009).

Supervisory Support

Another important actor in the organization affecting the everyday practices of work-family policies is the direct supervisor. The direct supervisor communicates, implements and manages formal policies (Lewis, 2003). In most work organizations, the normal procedure for an employee who wishes to use a work-family policy is to submit a request to his or her direct superior. A supervisor's negative attitude may prevent an employee from submitting a request. When an employee does submit a request to utilize a policy, his or her direct supervisor decides whether that request will be granted. In the case of a statutory right, the role of the supervisor refers to the practical arrangements for utilizing the scheme, like the duration or timing of take-up.

The manner in which managers respond to a request to utilize a policy is associated with the design of the formal policy and the organizational culture (den Dulk and de Ruijter, 2005; den Dulk et al., 2011). Supervisors assess requests in light of the prevailing standards and values within the organization, expressed for instance by the top managers in the organization. The manner in which they respond to such requests may, in turn, bring about changes in the organization's culture or in fact maintain that culture. However, the organizational culture can also contain contradictory elements (Peper et al., 2009). An organization may consider the combination of work and family life to be important but at the same time associate employee commitment with attendance and working long hours. In such cases, supervisors have to deal with contradictory signals, leaving discretionary scope for individual supervisors. Hence, factors other than organizational culture or the formal policy shape their attitude, such as practical consequences for the work that needs to be done (den Dulk and de Ruijter, 2005, 2008).

Dealing with requests to use existing policies refers to instrumental supervisory support. Hammer and colleagues (2009) developed a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB) distinguishing instrumental support, emotional support, role modelling behaviours and creative work-family management. Emotional support includes feeling that your supervisor cares about you and your family life and feeling comfortable talking about family commitments. 'Role modelling behavior refers to supervisors demonstrating how to integrate work and family through modelling

behaviors on the job' (Hammer et al., 2009, p. 841), for example, a supervisor who takes up parental leave, shares ideas or gives advice on how to combine work and family life. Creative work-family management refers to proactive behaviours in which supervisors look for ways to redesign work to help workers balance work and family life. This fourth dimension is based on the literature on the dual agenda (Bailyn, 2011; Rapoport et al., 2002), which emphasizes that work can be redesigned in such a way that is both helpful for workers who have family commitments outside work and the effectiveness of the organization.

Intervention Research Within the Work-Family Field

Research indicates that the effects of work-family policies (state or workplace based) tend to be limited when not accompanied by a supportive organizational culture and a supportive supervisor (Allen et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 1999). Institutional theory provides an explanation for the gap between policy and practice. Work-family policies are frequently implemented for symbolic, rather than substantive reasons (Blair-Loy and Wharton, 2002). This results in policies that are not anchored in the organization, and that can conflict with organizational norms on time and career demands. In fact, in many organizations implementing work-family policies requires a fundamental cultural change, challenging existing norms and values (Dumas and Sanchez-Burks, 2015). According to Wells (2016), 'an organizational change lens is key to generating the scholarship and practice required to achieve family-friendly organizations' (p. 216). She argues that the adoption and implementation of work-family policies often requires organizational change. However, few work-family scholars draw upon a processual change framework that acknowledges the complexity, disorderly and dynamic nature of the change required. So far, limited attention has been paid as to how work-family policies can be successfully introduced and managed within organizational contexts. A notable exception is the work of Bailyn and colleagues (2002), who have argued for collaboration and participation as means to overcome resistance that occurs when existing cultural norms are challenged with the introduction of work-family policies and practices. They conducted various organizational work-family interventions, which focus on the redesign of work that contributes to gender equity, the combination of work and family life and organizational performance. They developed the Collaborative Interactive Action Research (CIAR), a form of action research that aims to engage resistance, challenges existing norms and in which collaboration and participation of workers and managers is crucial (Bailyn, 2011; Bailyn et al., 2002). There is another stream of intervention research within the work-family field focusing on evidence-based outcomes using experimental designs. Hammer and colleagues (2016) offer an overview of this new type of intervention studies that use rigorous experimental designs. Interventions studies try to determine, for instance, the causal effects of alternative work arrangements, family supportive supervisor behaviour training and work redesign to increase schedule control. They argue that sound evidence of the effectiveness of work-family interventions is necessary for the organizational adoption and implementation of work-family policies, in order to convince organizations of the added value of such policies. In fact, both types of intervention research are likely to help bring about structural and cultural organizational change to make work-family policies more effective for employees and employers.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RESEARCH AGENDA

Existing research on the adoption of workplace work-family policies shows large variation between organizations and increasingly provides evidence for how workplace provisions are embedded within the larger societal context. However, despite the fact that research indicates it is important to investigate the interaction between different levels of policy provisions – public policies at the national level, collective agreements at the industry level and workplace policies – cross-national data that allow such an examination are limited. Few large-scale cross-national data sets that collect data at the organizational level exist. Notable exceptions in Europe are the European Company Survey of the European Foundation and the Cranfield Network on Comparative Human Resource Management Survey (Cranet). However, they do not always pay attention to work-family issues in every round of data collection, making it difficult to track the development of workplace support over time (den Dulk et al., 2014). The lack of longitudinal data inhibits researchers from taking a more dynamic approach that takes into account policy changes that occur over time as well as rapid and sometimes dramatic changes on the labour market and in the economy (Trefalt et al., 2013). 'Policies and practices to support the reconciliation of work and family or "work-life balance" in Europe, whether stemming from government regulation or voluntary organizational initiatives, are being implemented at a time when employing organizations are undergoing massive and rapid changes in a context of global competition and efficiency drives' (Lewis et al., 2009, p. 1). In addition, the cross-sectional data preclude the ability to draw conclusions about causality. Although most research (implicitly) assumes that the national context shapes workplace policies and provisions, employers are also important actors in society influencing the design and adoption of public policies.

Multi-level analysis has shown how the national policy context interacts with workplace policies; future research should also strive to examine the role of other relevant country-level variables and in particular the role of collective agreements and trade unions in a more systematic way. However, as discussed in this chapter, research has, so far, paid only limited attention to the role of industrial relations and work-family provisions in collective agreements.

In addition, alongside the adoption of workplace work-family policies, future research should continue to pay attention to the management of work-family policies in the workplace as well as existing workplace cultures. We know that organizational culture and managerial support is crucial (Allen et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2009). The development of sound measures of supervisory support, such as the multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviours of Hammer and colleagues (2009), and measures that examine the degree to which organizational culture is supportive to the combination of paid work and family life (e.g., Dikkers et al., 2007; Thompson et al., 1999) is an important step forward. These measures should be included in cross-national data sets in order to contribute to our understanding of how the national cultural contexts interact with norms and values in organizations, ultimately shaping the way policies play out in the workplace. The adoption of workplace work-family policies is a response to societal change and implementation often requires fundamental cultural change within organizations (Wells, 2016). Intervention studies, both based on experimental designs and action research, can be important drivers of that change and increase our understanding of the conditions

under which work-family policies improve the ability to combine work and family life and the effectiveness of the organization (Bailyn, 2011; Hammer et al., 2016).

REFERENCES

Allen, T.D. (2001), 'Family supportive work environments: the role of organizational perceptions', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **58**, 414–35.

Allen, T.D., L.M. Lapierre, P.E. Spector et al. (2014), 'The link between national paid leave policy and work–family conflict among married working parents', *Applied Psychology*, **63**, 5–28.

Anxo, D., C. Fagan, M. Smith, M.T. Letablier, and C. Perraudin (eds) (2007), *Parental Leave in European Companies*, Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Appelbaum, E., T. Bailey, P. Berg, and A. Kalleberg (2005), 'Organizations and the intersection of work and family: a comparative perspective', in S. Ackroyd, R. Batt, P. Thompson, and P.S. Tolbert (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Organizations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 52–73.

Bailyn, L. (2011), 'Redesigning work for gender equity and work-personal life integration', *Community, Work & Family*, **14** (1), 97–112.

Bailyn et al. (2002)

Been, W.M. (ed.) (2015), *European Top Managers' Support for Work-Life Arrangements*, Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Been, W., L. den Dulk, and T. van der Lippe (2016), 'Dutch top managers and work-life arrangements in times of economic crisis', *Community, Work & Family*, **19** (1), 43–62.

Been, W.M., T. van der Lippe, L. den Dulk, M. Das Dores Horta Gurreiro, A. Kanjuo Mrčela, and C. Niemistö (2017) 'European top managers' support for work-life arrangements', *Social Science Research*, **65**, 60–74.

Berg, P., E. Appelbaum, T. Bailey, and A.L. Kalleberg (2004), 'Contesting time: international comparisons of employee control of working time', *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, **57** (3), 331–49.

Berg, P., E. 2011, K. Misra, and D. Belman (2014), 'Work–life flexibility policies: do unions affect employee access and use?', *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, **67** (1), 111–37.

Blair-Loy, M. and A.S. Wharton (2002), 'Employees' use of work-family policies and the workplace social context', *Social Forces*, **80** (3), 813–45.

Bond, J.T., E. Galinsky, S.S. Kim, and E. Brownfield (eds) (2005), *The National Study of Employers*, New York: Families and Work Institute.

Boyne, G.A. (2002), 'Public and private management: what's the difference?', *Journal of Management Studies*, **39** (1), 97–122.

Budd, J.W. and K. Mumford (2004), 'Trade unions and family-friendly policies in Britain', *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, **57** (2), 204–22.

Budd, J.W. and K. Mumford (2006), 'Family-friendly work practices in Britain; availability and perceived accessibility', *Human Resource Management*, **45** (1), 23–42.

Carrasquer, P., M. Massó, and A. Martín Artiles (2007), 'Discursos y estrategias en torno a la conciliación de la vida laboral y familiar en la negociación colectiva', *Papers Revista de Sociologia*, **83**, 13–36.

Chung, H. (2008), 'Do institutions matter? Explaining the use of working time flexibility arrangements of companies across 21 European countries using a multilevel model focusing on country level determinants', WZB Discussion Paper No. 1011-9523, Social Science Research Centre, Berlin.

Davis and Kalleberg (2006)

den Dulk, L. (ed.) (2001), *Work-Family Arrangements in Organisations: A Cross-national Study in the Netherlands, Italy, the United Kingdom and Sweden*, Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.

den Dulk, L. and S. Groeneveld (2013), 'Work-life balance support in the public sector in Europe', *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, **33** (4), 384–405.

den Dulk, L. and B. Peper (2007), 'Working parents' use of work-life policies', *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas*, **53**, 51–70.

den Dulk, L. and J. de Ruijter (2005), 'Werk/privé cultuur en de houding van managers ten aanzien van werk/privé beleid in de financiële sector', *Gedrag en Organisatie*, **18** (5), 260–75.

den Dulk, L. and J. de Ruijter (2008), 'Explaining managerial attitudes towards the use of work-life policies in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **19** (7), 1224–38.

den Dulk, L., S. Groeneveld, and B. Peper (2014), 'Workplace work-life balance support from a capabilities perspective', in B. Hobson (ed.), *Worklife Balance: The Agency and Capabilities Gap*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 153–73.

den Dulk, L., P. Peters, and E. Poutsma (2012), 'Variations in adoption of workplace work-family arrangements

in Europe: the influence of welfare-state regime and organizational characteristics', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **23** (13), 2785–808.
den Dulk, L., S. Groeneveld, A. Ollier-Malaterre, and M. Valcour (2013), 'National context in work-life research: a multi-level cross-national analysis of the adoption of workplace work-life arrangements in Europe', *European Management Journal*, **31** (5), 478–94.
den Dulk, L., P. Peters, E. Poutsma, and P.E.M. Ligthart (2010), 'The extended business case for childcare and leave arrangements in Western and Eastern Europe', *Baltic Journal of Management*, **4** (2), 156–84.
Den Dulk, L., B. Peper, N. Cernigoj-Sadar, S. Lewis, J. Smithson, and A. Van Doorne-Huiskes (2011), 'Work, family and managerial attitudes and practices in the European workplace: comparing Dutch, British and Slovenian financial sector managers', *Social Politics*, **18** (2), 300–29.
Dikkers, J., S.A.E. Geurts, L. den Dulk, B. Peper, T.W. Taris, and M.A.J. Kompier (2007), 'Dimensions of work-home culture and their relations with the use of work-home arrangements and work-home interactions', *Work & Stress*, **21** (2), 155–72.
Dumas, T.L. and J. Sanchez-Burks (2015), 'The professional, the personal, and the ideal worker: pressures and objectives shaping the boundary between life domains', *The Academy of Management Annals*, **9** (1), 803–43.
Eaton, S.C. (2003), 'If you can use them: flexible policies, organizational commitment and perceived performance', *Industrial Relations*, **42** (2), 145–67.
European Commission (2008), *Industrial Relations in Europe*, Brussels: European Commission.
European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2006), *Working Time and Work-Life Balance in European companies. Establishment Survey on Working Time 2004–2005*, Luxembourg: European Communities.
Evans, J.M. (2001), 'Firms' contribution to the reconciliation between work and family life', *Occasional Papers*, No. 48, Paris: OECD.
Forth, J., S. Lissenburgh, C. Callender, and N. Millward (1997), *Family Friendly Working Arrangements in Britain, 1996*, Research report No. 16, Department for Education and Employment, Policy Studies Institute, University of London.
Glass, J.L. and T. Fujimoto (1995), 'Employer characteristics and the provision of family responsive policies', *Work and Occupations*, **22** (4), 380–411.
Goodstein, J.D. (1994), 'Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: employer involvement in work-family issues', *The Academy of Management Journal*, **37** (2), 350–82.
Gréboval, C. and C. Sechi (eds) (2015), *ETUC 8th March Survey 2015*, 8th edn, Brussels: Confederation Syndicat European Trade Union and European Trade Union Institute.
Haas, L. and P. Hwang (2013), 'Trade union support for fathers' use of work-family benefits. Lessons from Sweden', *Community, Work & Family*, **16** (1), 46–67.
Hammer, L.B., E.E. Kossek, N.L. Yragui, T.E. Bodner, and G.C. Hanson (2009), 'Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB)', *Journal of Management*, **35** (4), 837–56.
Hammer, L.B., C.A. Demsky, E.E. Kossek, and J.W. Bray (2016), 'Work-family intervention research', in T.D. Allen and L.T. Eby (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 349–61.
Heywood, J. and U. Jirjahn (2009), 'Family-friendly practices and worker representation in Germany', *Industrial Relations*, **48** (1), 121–45.
Ingram, P. and T. Simons (1995), 'Institutional and resource dependence determinants of responsiveness to work-family issues', *The Academy of Management Journal*, **38** (5), 1466–82.
Kanjuo Mrčela, A. and N. Černigoj Sadar (2011), 'Social policies related to parenthood and capabilities of Slovenian parents', *Social Politics*, **18** (2), 199–231.
Kossek, E.E., A.E. Barber, and D. Winters (1999), 'Using flexible schedules in the managerial world: the power of peers', *Human Resource Management*, **38** (1), 33–46.
Kossek, E.E., S. Lewis, and L. Hammer (2010), 'Work-life initiatives and organizational change: overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream', *Human Relations*, **63**, 1–17.
Lewis, S. (2003), 'Flexible working arrangements: implementation, outcomes, and management', *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, **18**, 1–28.
Lewis, S. and J. Smithson (2001), 'Sense of entitlement to support for the reconciliation of employment and family life', *Human Relations*, **54**, 1455–81.
Lewis, S., J. Brannen, and A. Nilsen (eds) (2009), *Work, Families and Organisations in Transition. European perspectives*, Bristol: Policy Press.
Lyness, K.S. and M. Brumit Kropf (2005), 'The relationships of national gender equality and organizational support with work-family balance: a study of European managers', *Human Relations*, **58** (1), 33–60.
Major, D.A. and M.L. Litano (2016), 'The importance of organizational leadership in managing work and family', in T.D. Allen and L.T. Eby (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 242–54.

Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2009), 'Organizational work-life initiatives: context matters. France compared to the UK and the US', *Community, Work & Family*, **12** (2), 159–78.
Ollier-Malaterre, A., M. Valcour, L. den Dulk, and E.E. Kossek (2013), 'Theorizing national context to develop comparative work-life research: building bricks and research agenda', *European Management Journal*, **31** (5), 433–47.
Osterman, P. (1995), 'Work-family programs and the employment relationship', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **40**, 681–700.
Peper, B., A. van Doorne-Huiskes, and L. den Dulk (2009), 'Work-family policies in a contradictory culture: a Dutch financial sector corporation', in S. Lewis, J. Brannen, and A. Nilsen (eds), *Work, Family and Organisations in Transition: A European Perspective*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 113–28.
Poelmans, S.A.Y. and K. Sahibzada (2004), 'A multi-level model for studying the context and impact of work-family policies and culture in organizations', *Human Resource Management Review*, **14**, 409–31.
Ponzellini, A.M. (2006), 'Work–life balance and industrial relations in Italy', *European Societies*, **8** (2), 273–94.
Rapoport, R., L. Bailyn, J.K. Fletcher, and B.H. Pruit (eds) (2002), *Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Raven, J., R. van der Veen, and M.A. Yerkes (2014a), *Cao's en sociale zekerheid in vergelijkend perspectief*, Rotterdam: Stichting Instituut Gak.
Raven, J., E. Wadensjö, and A. Wennemo Lanninger (2014b), 'Sweden', in J. Raven, R. van der Veen, and M.A. Yerkes (eds), *Cao's en sociale zekerheid in vergelijkend perspectief*, Rotterdam: Stichting Instituut Gak, pp. 47–86.
Ravenswood, K. and R. Markey (2011), 'The role of unions in achieving a family-friendly workplace', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, **53** (4), 486–503.
Riva, E. (2016), 'Familalism reoriented: continuity and change in work-family policies in Italy', *Community, Work & Family*, **19** (1), 21–42.
Schein, E.H. (2004), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Thompson, C.A., L.L. Beauvais, and K.S. Lyness (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.
Trefalt, S., M. Drnovšek, A. Svetina-Nabergoj, and R.V. Adlešič (2013), 'Work-life experiences in rapidly changing national contexts: structural misalignment, comparisons and choice overload as explanatory mechanisms', *European Management Journal*, **31**, 448–63.
UNICE (2005), *Framework of Actions on Gender Equality*, Brussels: UNICE, accessed 11 November 2015 at https://resourcecentre.etuc.org/linked_files/documents/Framework%20of%20actions%20%20on%20gender%20equality%20EN.pdf.
Visser, J. (2013), 'Wage bargaining institutions. from crisis to crisis', *European Economy Economic Papers*, No. 488.
Wells, K.J. (2016), 'Work-family initiatives from an organizational change lens', in T.D. Allen and L.T. Eby (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 215–28.
Whitehouse, G. and D. Zetlin (1999), '"Family friendly" policies: distribution and implementation in Australian workplaces', *Economic & Labour Relations Review*, **10** (2), 221–39.
Whitehouse, G., B. Hewitt, B. Martin, and M. Baird (2013), 'Employer-paid maternity leave in Australia: a comparison of uptake and duration in 2005 and 2010', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, **16** (3), 311–27.
Wood, S.J., L.M. de Menezes, and A. Lasaosa (2003), 'Family-friendly management in Great Britain: testing various perspectives', *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, **42** (2), 221–50.
Yerkes, M.A. and K. Tijdens (2010), 'Social risk protection in collective agreements: evidence from the Netherlands', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, **16** (4), 369–83.
Yerkes, M.A., J. Corrie, J. Raven, and M. Baird (2014), 'Australia', in J. Raven, R. van der Veen, and M.A. Yerkes (eds), *Cao's en sociale zekerheid in vergelijkend perspectief*, Rotterdam: Stichting Instituut Gak, pp. 133–78.