

***Women's employment: The interplay between individual work preferences and country liberalism
in 24 European countries***

Wouter Andringa, Rense Nieuwenhuis, Minna van Gerven

Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies (IGS), University Twente

Abstract

This article studied the interplay between women's individual work preferences and country liberalism in 24 European countries. Analyzing the data from the European Social Survey (round 2), we found that the negative association between motherhood and women's employment is stronger for women living in conservative countries compared to liberal countries. We also found that home-centered women were less likely to be employed than adaptive and work-centered women, and that this difference was larger in liberal countries compared to conservative countries.

Keywords: women's employment, work preferences, country liberalism, ESS, multilevel models

Bio

All authors work at the Institute for Innovation and Governance Studies (IGS) of the University of Twente. Wouter Andringa is a researcher. Rense Nieuwenhuis is a PhD candidate. His research interests include cross-national comparisons of women's employment. He has recently published in the Journal of Marriage and Family. Minna van Gerven is an Assistant Professor of Sociology. Her research interests include comparative social policy and welfare state attitudes. She has recently published in European Societies.

Background & Research Question

Key explanations of women's employment refer both to the individual characteristics of women and households, as well as to the influences of country-level determinants. More recently, the academic interest has turned towards answering the question how macro-level contexts shape micro-level outcomes (Cooke & Baxter, 2010; Pettit & Hook, 2005; Matysiak & Vignoli, 2008; Van der Lippe & Van Dijk, 2002). This study provides such a macro-micro analysis of how individual women's work preferences and motherhood are associated with their employment decisions, and especially how this varies between countries that are conservative or liberal towards women's employment.

Individual-level factors that are often found to be associated with women's employment include women's educational level, marital status, motherhood, and personal work preferences (Becker, 1981; Becker, 1985; Cohen, 1999; Fuwa, 2004; Polavieja, 2008). The degree to which these individual-level factors influence women's employment decisions, however, is not constant but varies between countries. This variation is thought to be associated with contextual factors, such as social policy and the gendered bias of social policy (Nordenmark, 2004), and national attitudes about the role of mother in the labor force (Albrecht et al., 2000).

A key perspective on women's employment refers to the mismatch between the promotion of gender equality for individuals on the one hand and societal values and institutions that still promote traditional family models on the other. This creates a situation where many women pursue education and work on the same level as men, then later find out that professional life is not very compatible with family life (McDonald, 2000). The key idea in this perspective is that gender role attitudes, ideas about the social roles that men and women are supposed to perform in society, are important in explaining work behavior of women. This notion of a mismatch is also found in the research of Rindfuss et al. (2003) on role incompatibility between women's worker and family roles. In their conclusion, Rindfuss et al. (*ibid.*, p.430) discuss the need for "comparable surveys across countries indicating the attitudinal/normative climate in those countries regarding various aspects of both combining of work and child-rearing and aspects of the linkage between marriage and motherhood".

One such study found that a woman's individual background was more important in shaping her employment decisions when she lives in a gender-egalitarian country, compared to when she lives in a conservative country (Fuwa, 2004).

In general, however, many of the previous studies either focus on how the association between demographic characteristics of women and their employment is shaped by the country-context, or how their work preferences shape employment decisions. We combine both. Therefore, in this study we answer two questions:

Question 1: To what extent does the strength of the (negative) association between motherhood and women's employment vary between (1) women with different work preferences, and (2) between women living in conservative or liberal countries?

Question 2: To what extent does the association between women's work preferences and employment status vary between women living in conservative or liberal countries?

By answering these questions, we contribute to the literature in two ways. First, by adopting a macro-micro comparative perspective as the basis for our empirical analyses we add to the research into the interactions between macro-level contexts and individual level outcomes by identifying and testing clearly defined hypotheses. Secondly, by combining household economic theories with theories on work preferences we demonstrate that explanations from these perspectives are complementary rather than competing. Doing so, we show how the outcomes on employment of individual women's work preferences and of individual women's motherhood are shaped by the macro-level country-context in which they live. This is highly relevant, for it shows that different women respond differently to a commonly shared societal context.

Theory

In this theoretical paragraph, we combine three types of individual-level factors that are often found to be associated with women's employment: investments in human capital, household composition, and women's personal preferences for employment. We do not believe that these perspectives are incompatible. Rather, we argue that studying how the interplay between individual women's demographic background and their personal work preferences affects their employment decisions can greatly contribute to our understanding of women's employment. First, we outline the economic household theories on the effects of human capital and household composition, then the theories on work preferences. Finally, we hypothesize on how country-level attitudes towards women's employment shape the micro-level outcomes.

Economic household theories on women's employment view employment decisions as resulting from an allocation issue within the family and subjected to expected returns from investments in human capital (Polavieja, 2008, Becker 1981, 1985). The basis of human-capital approach is that continued investments in human capital such as educational level result in increasing returns on the labor market. Differences in employment rates between men and women are then attributed to differences in human capital investments, such as the education gap between men and women. The decline of the 'male breadwinner' model in practice, and the increased labor force participation of married women in the twentieth century are, according to Becker (1985), caused by women's increased earning power.

Next to investments in human-capital, household composition is considered as an important factor in human-capital models of female employment. Partnered households have the advantage over single households that its members can choose to specialize in market work or housework, while in a single person household one person must allocate time and effort to both activities (Becker, 1985). Since, it is argued, men often can expect higher returns from employment on the labor market than their spouses, women are less likely to specialize in market work compared to men. As a result, women living in shared households are less likely to be employed than single women. The presence of young children in the household has strong repercussions for work decisions, and especially those of women.

Time and energy spent on childcare competes with allocation to employment responsibilities and this leads to a higher risk of interrupted work careers, especially when children are young (Becker, 1985, Polavieja, 2008). When children are present in the household, the task distribution between spouses is renegotiated, and as a result of differences in human capital investments and earning potential on the labor market, mothers opt out of employment more often than fathers.

Hakim's (2002) preference theory challenges the utility of human capital theory. Hakim (2002, 432) claims that conventional human capital factors overlook the importance of motivations, values and attitudes as key determinants of female labor market behavior. This claim is also put forward in an extensive body of literature discussing gender role attitudes as a set of ideas about the goals, expectation, and actions associated with a particular gender (see also Eagly and Wood, 1999, Nordenmark, 2004). Through the socialization process children inherit the social norms, customs and beliefs of their society and learn the behavior and attitudes that are appropriate for a given sex through social institutions in their environment. A distinction is often made between traditional and egalitarian gender role attitudes (Nordenmark, 2004; Fuwa 2004). In the traditional view women are better off training interpersonal skills that are useful in both nurturing and the few occupations more compatible with motherhood (teacher, nurse, social worker). In contrast, the egalitarian view is linked to the equal opportunities revolution that established equal access to all professions for women. The assumption in using this kind of typology is that women can be divided in those who support a gendered division of labor and those who oppose it. Hakim's preference theory (2002) rejects this idea and emphasizes that women are more heterogeneous in their preferences and behavior. Hakim (2002: 436) stresses the importance of individual work-life orientations and preferences in determining labor market outcomes and accordingly distinguishes between women with three types of work preferences: home-centered, adaptive, and work-centered. The majority of women is adaptive, meaning that they value work and family about equally and as a consequence they drift between social roles depending on the circumstances: they change their time allocation to homemaker, caretaker and provider roles in accordance with economic downturns, childcare policy, availability of part-time work etc. The other women are fixed in their work behavior: home-centered women do not have a strong attachment to the

labor market and will always put the needs of the family first while work-centered women will try to avoid dropping out of the labor market at all cost. While Hakim (2002: 447) does not dispute the impact of young children on female work rates, she does stress that it is essential to differentiate between the three preference groups among women. Regarding the demographic background, it was found in country-comparative research that motherhood was the most important factor in explaining women's employment (Van der Lippe & Van Dijk, 2002). This often found negative association between motherhood and the employment of women, however, needs not be equally strong for all individual women. It might very well be the case that women with very strong preferences to work 'opt out' (cf. Stone, 2008) of employment less often when they become a mother, compared to women with home centered preferences. We therefore expect:

Hypothesis 1: The negative association between motherhood and employment is stronger for home-centered women, compared to adaptive and work-centered women.

This first hypothesis provides a preliminary answer to the first part of research question 1. Below, we hypothesize on how prevailing country-liberalism towards women's employment affect the association between motherhood and employment, and between women's work preferences and employment.

Macro-level influences

According to Eagly and Wood (1999), the root cause of a gendered system of social roles is a combination of biological factors and activities required by a society's economy and social organization. The distribution of men and women in social roles, the formulation of gender roles as stereotypical beliefs about appropriate behavior for each sex and the reproduction of these attitudes and behaviors by individuals through socialization, induction, and self-regulation are society-bound. Gender roles are transferred through a national education system, labor market organization, legal system, and media. Likewise social policy systems, as representations of gender ideologies on a structural level, can affect values and behavior among individuals (Nordenmark, 2004, 234).

The expectation derived from this is that in countries where the prevailing norms are traditional, women's employment will be lower than in countries where the prevailing norms are more liberal. Regarding the interaction between the macro-level context provided by these prevailing norms on women's employment, and the individual-level outcomes of women's motherhood on their own employment decisions, we expect that in liberal countries mothers are faced with fewer barriers to combine motherhood and employment. As a result, we expect:

Hypothesis 2: The negative association between motherhood and employment is stronger for women living in a conservative country, compared to women living in a liberal country.

Up to this point we have hypothesized on how the impact of a woman's motherhood on her likelihood of being employed is associated with both her individual work preferences and the normative context of the country she lives in. Together, these first 2 hypotheses provide a preliminary answer to our first research question. To answer the second question, the focus should be on the interaction between a woman's individual work preferences, and the normative context of the country she lives in.

Preference theory argues that that women with different work preferences are affected to a different extent by the degree of liberalism in a country towards women's employment (Hakim 1998, 140, Hakim 2002, 430). Home-centered women are not responsive to country-level attitudes to female employment, as they prefer not to work and prioritize their family. Adaptive women are very responsive to country-level attitudes and preferences as well as other societal factors such as economic cycle, trade union attitudes to working women and availability of part-time work. Work-centered women are less responsive to country liberalism, as they have a high attachment to the labor market anyway, although liberal societies are more favorable towards women working.

Hypothesis 3a: Adaptive women are more likely to be employed than home-centered women, and this difference is bigger in liberal countries than in conservative countries.

Hypothesis 3b: Work-centered women are more likely to be employed than adaptive women, and this difference is smaller in liberal countries than in conservative countries.

Data & Method

The hypotheses in this study are tested using data from the European Social Survey Round 2 2004/2005, edition 3.2. The ESS uses biennial rounds of surveys consisting of a core module which is repeated at each round and two or three rotating modules. The core module provides continuity in the measurement of socio-economic, political and demographic variables, while the rotating modules provide more in depth information centered on a specific theme. We used the ESS because it contains a rotating module focused on the inter-relations between work, family and well-being. This module has specific questions about individual attitudes concerning family-work balance and obligations (questions G6-G10). A reason for using the ESS in cross-national research is the rigorous approach to probability sampling, question-testing, event-recording, translation, and response rate enhancement that ensures the comparability of national samples (Vitali et al., 2009).

Sample

There are 26 participating countries in ESS, of which 25 are included in the integrated data file with a total sample size of 47,537 individuals. The data for Italy is not included because no respondents were asked the full version of the questionnaire and the sample design was not signed off by the expert panel (ESS, 2011). Based on preliminary descriptive statistics we removed Turkey from the analysis as it is too much of an outlier in the dependent variable: while all other countries had female employment rates of at least 50% Turkey only had 13%. We limit our analyses to the women in our sample. Further sample restrictions are the same as used by Hakim (2002): no pensioners, no students in full-time education and an age restriction of 20-59 years. This results in a final sample size of 13,971. All analyses use the design and population weights provided in the ESS (modified to a central value of one) to account for selection bias resulting from national differences in sampling methods and variation in sample size relative to country population. Table 1 displays a summary of the variables used in the analysis, including sample sizes, percentages or means and standard deviations where appropriate.

<< Table 1 about here >>

Measures

The dependent variable in this study is involvement in paid employment. This variable is measured as respondents who reported having done any paid work in the last seven days. Although this measure does not let us to distinguish between women who have demanding full time careers and women who only work a few hours a week, there is no better alternative available. Alternative measures in the ESS such as the number of hours worked were asked to all women currently employed or who were employed in the past about their last job. This means that their current household situation cannot be directly linked to their hours worked, which makes the chosen binary measure of doing paid work more suitable for testing the hypotheses.

The main independent variable is a woman's personal work preferences. We categorize women into the home-centered, adaptive, and work-centered groups according to their response on the statement "A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of the family" (question G6). Women who agree strongly are labeled home-centered, those who disagree strongly are labeled work-centered and the rest is labeled adaptive. We do not construct a scale of gender role attitudes as is common in sociological research on relations between attitudes and behavior (Braun et al., 1994; Greenstein, 1995; Fuwa 2004; Nordenmark 2004;), but instead opt for the measure in the ESS that is most specific about the relation between family and work responsibilities. This choice is based on a recommendation of identifying key diagnostic questions instead of a series of questions making up a scale that Hakim (2003, 339) made in a critique of social attitude surveys.

Education is measured by years of full-time education completed. Shared household refers to women who reported living together with a husband or partner, as in this situation the household as a whole could benefit from specialization by its members. Age of respondents has been calculated by the ESS team based on year of birth and date of the interview.

Motherhood is measured using the presence of any children aged 12 or under in the household. Children aged 12 or under can be considered young since they still need supervision for many of their daily tasks.

The impact of prevailing norms in society is measured by aggregating responses to the statement “A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of the family” of all men and women in a country into an average score (range = 1 to 5, where 1 is ‘agree strongly’ and 5 is ‘disagree strongly’). For each country we calculated the mean score on this variable given by all respondents in that respective country (that is, also including the men in the sample). The resulting variable is called country liberalism.

Analyses

The multilevel, logistic regression models presented in Table 2 provide a general overview of the amount of variation in women’s employment between countries (Model 1), the multivariate association between the independent variables and the likelihood a woman is employed (Model 2), and the test of hypothesis 1 (Model 3).

<< Table 2 about here >>

Model 1 is a baseline model, in which only the intercept is estimated and in which this intercept is allowed to vary between countries. The estimated logit of the intercept is .91, indicating that $\exp(.91) / [1 + \exp(.91)] = 71\%$ of the women in our sample were employed at the time of the interview. This corresponds to the proportion employed women presented in our descriptive table (Table 1). The random variance of the intercept (estimated at .17) represents the amount of variation in women’s employment between countries. The standard deviation of this variance ($.17^{1/2} = .41$) can be used to

calculate that the estimated percentages of employed women in 95% of the countries lie between 52% and 85%.

In Model 2, all variables are included. Not all findings on the demographic variables are in line with those commonly reported: We do not find an association between women's employment on the one hand, and her age and whether or not she lives in a shared household on the other. Other findings are as expected: Women are more likely to be employed when they have completed more years in full-time education. When a woman has one or more young children living at home, she is less likely to be employed compared to women without young children living at home. The findings also indicate that women's work preferences are associated with her employment decisions: both women with adaptive work preferences and women with work-centered preferences are more likely to be employed compared to women with home-centered work preferences. These findings hold while controlling for several demographic variables. Finally, the results for the contextual variable indicating country liberalism indicate that, after controlling for personal work preferences and other individual-level factors, the degree of liberalism of a country does not affect the likelihood that women in that country are employed. Here, it should be emphasized that this specific estimate refers to the effect of country liberalism on *all* women, whereas in later models we test whether country liberalism affects specific groups of women differently. The variance of the random intercept now is .12 (compared to .17 in Model 1). This means that the individual-level and country-level variables in Model 2 account for $(.17-.12) / .17 = 29\%$ of the variation in women's employment between countries.

Model 3 includes the first interaction terms, and is used to test Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis states our expectation that the negative association between motherhood and employment is stronger for home-centered women, compared to adaptive and work-centered women. In Model 3, the association between motherhood and employment for home-centered women is estimated at -.91 (this represents the 'main' effect of having children at home, since home-centered women were used as the reference category of the variable indicating preferences). Based on the interaction terms between having children at home and work preferences, we can calculate that for women with adaptive preferences,

this association is $-.91 + .17 = -.74$. This indeed is less negative than for women with home-centered preferences. For work-centered women, the negative association between having children at home and employment is also less strong compared to amongst home-centered women: $-.91 + .39 = -.52$. However, both interaction terms do not reach statistical significance and therefore we need to reject Hypothesis 1.

The Models presented in Table 3 include cross-level interactions between country liberalism on the one hand, and having young children at home and a woman's personal work preferences on the other. These models are used to test Hypotheses 2 and 3.

<< Table 3 about here >>

In Model 1 of Table 3, all variables are included. In addition, the degree to which having young children at home is negatively associated with women's employment is now allowed to vary between countries. In technical terms, this model includes a random slope over countries of the effect of having young children at home on a woman's likelihood of being employed. The amount of variation between countries is represented by the variance component of 'young child at home': .22.

Model 2 presents the cross-level interaction between country-liberalism, and the association between having young children at home and employment. In this model, the 'main' effect of country liberalism is not statistically significant, indicating that women without children (the reference category) are not more likely to be employed in a more liberal country than in a more conservative country. However, the interaction term of country liberalism and having a young child at home is positive and significant (.65). This indicates that in a liberal country having young children at home has a much less negative association with women's employment, compared to conservative countries in which this association is much more negative. In other words, in countries in which the population on average is favorable towards women's employment, the difference in employment between mothers and women without (young) children is smaller. This supports Hypothesis 2. A different interpretation of these findings is that although country liberalism does not seem to affect all women on average (as we have seen in

Model 2 of Table 2), country liberalism does in fact positively influence the employment of mothers. This cross-level interaction with country-liberalism also accounts for part of the variation between countries in the strength of the association between having children at home and women's employment, which now is .17 (compared to .22 in Model 1): a reduction of 23%.

In Model 3, the effect of personal work preferences on employment is allowed to vary between countries, as indicated by the variance components of adaptive (.07) and work-centered women (.10). The main effect of country liberalism now is statistically significant, and positively related to women's employment.

Next, in Model 4, the cross-level interaction between country-liberalism and personal work preferences is estimated. The effect of country liberalism for home-centered women (the reference category) now is no longer statistically significant, indicating that home-centered women are as likely to be employed in conservative countries as in liberal countries. The difference between home-centered women and adaptive women is bigger in liberal countries than it is in conservative countries, as is indicated by the positive interaction term between country-liberalism and the dummy indicating adaptive women (which is estimated at .87 and statistically significant). This is in line with hypothesis 3a and suggests that adaptive women indeed are more responsive to country liberalism than home-centered women. The interaction term between country liberalism and work-centered women is positive and statistically significant (although only just so), and estimated at .66. This is lower than the interaction term for adaptive women, but given the standard errors the difference in effect of country liberalism for adaptive and work-centered women is not statistically significant. This was also confirmed with additional analyses by the authors (not shown). Therefore, we do not find support for hypothesis 3b, that expected the difference between adaptive and work-centered women to be smaller in liberal countries than in conservative countries.

Finally, it is noted that the cross-level interaction between country-liberalism and women's personal work preferences accounts for a very substantial part of the random-slope variation of both adaptive and work-centered women. For adaptive women this variation was .07 in Model 3, but is reduced to

.02 in Model 4 (a 71% reduction). For work-centered women this variation is reduced from .10 (Model 3) to .04 (Model 4): a 60% reduction. This can be interpreted as follows. The difference between the employment of home-centered women on the one hand, and adaptive and work-centered women on the other, is bigger in some countries than in other countries. These differences are to a large extent explained by the degree to which the population of a country is liberal towards women's employment.

Conclusion & Discussion

In this paper we have concentrated on the employment decisions of women in European countries. Our point of departure was the increasing interest for the question of how macro-level contexts shape micro-level outcomes. The paper has analyzed the employment decisions and work preferences of individual women from 24 European countries, as well as the degree of liberalism of those countries.

The paper answered two questions:

1. To what extent does the strength of the (negative) association between motherhood and women's employment vary between (1) women with different work preferences, and (2) between women living in conservative or liberal countries?
2. To what extent does the association between women's work preferences and employment status vary between women living in conservative or liberal countries?

We have shown that the association between motherhood and employment is less negative for women living in a liberal country compared to women living in a conservative country. However, we found no substantial differences between home-centered, adaptive and work-centered women in the negative effect of motherhood on employment. We also found that adaptive women are more responsive to country-liberalism in their employment decisions, compared to home-centered women. Women with adaptive and work-centered preferences were found to be equally responsive. Country-liberalism accounts for most of the variation between countries in employment of home-centered women compared to the employment of adaptive and work-centered women. The micro-level associations differ substantially between countries, and can to a large extent be explained with country liberalism.

We recognize that the chosen measure for employment, doing paid work in the last seven days, is limited in describing employment decisions. A more refined measure of employment is necessary to distinguish between women with a demanding full-time career and women who only work a few hours a week. In the case of the interaction between women's work preferences and having young children at home it could provide the necessary contrast between home-centered women on the one hand, and

adaptive and work-centered on the other. Nevertheless, even with a (crude) binary measure of employment we can conclude that in particular women with young children and women with adaptive work preferences are affected in their employment decisions by the normative climate in a country. Country liberalism is not a factor that stands on its own, but may be positively associated with other macro-level factors, such as family policies. Our study did not take those into account, nor was it the goal to do so. To the extent, however, that liberal (family) policies are indeed positively associated with liberal norms, our study suggests that mothers of young children and women with adaptive work preferences will be most responsive to these policies.

The paper makes a strong case for the use of combined macro-micro analyses in explaining women's employment. We have demonstrated that the interplay between macro-level contexts and micro-outcomes can explain cross-national differences to a large degree. We argue that the study of macro-micro interactions adds more to our understanding of women's employment than research into additional explanatory factors.

In this study we only used individual and macro-level characteristics taken from a single source, but future research designs can incorporate more detailed macro-level variables of country contexts relevant to female employment. Both the work of Hakim (2002) and Genre et al. (2010) provide ample suggestions for contexts that affect the employment decisions of women. Of special interest are contextual factors associated with a liberal normative climate, as our analyses have shown that mothers and adaptive women are particularly responsive in their employment decisions. For policy makers these groups are of special interest as well, since it concerns the group most often targeted by gender specific policy (mothers) and the group with the most prevailing work preferences (adaptive women). Policy makers should further take note that women's employment decisions are not dependent on human-capital and household-composition factors alone, but that preferences matter even while taking these into account. With further development of macro-micro analysis such as employed in this paper, cross-national research can inform interested policy makers about aggregate as well as individual-level effects of (proposed) policy changes.

References

- Albrecht, J.W., Edin, P.A., & Vroman, S.B. (2000). A cross-country comparison of attitudes towards mothers working and their actual labor market experience. *Labour*, 14(4), 591-607.
- Becker, G.S. (1981) *A Treatise on the Family*. Harvard University Press.
- Becker, G.S. (1985) Human capital, effort, and the sexual division of labor. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3(1), 33-58.
- Braun, M., Scott, J., & Alwin, D.F. (1994) Economic necessity of self-actualization? attitudes toward women's labour-force participation in east and west Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 10(1), 29-47.
- Cohen, P.N., & Bianchi, S.M. (1999). Marriage, children, and women's employment: what do we know? *Monthly Labor Review*, 122, 22-31.
- Cooke, L., & Baxter, J. (2010). "Families" in International Context: Comparing Institutional Effects Across Western Societies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 516-536.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00716.x
- Eagly, A.H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54(6), 408-423.
- ESS Round 2: European Social Survey. (2011). *ESS-2 Documentation Report*. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, 3.2 edition.
- Fuwa, M. (2004). Macro-level gender inequality and the division of household labor in 22 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 69(6), 751-767.
- Genre, V., Salvador, R.G., & Lamo, A. (2010). European women: why do(n't) they work? *Applied Economics*, 42(12), 1499-1514.

- Greenstein, T.N. (1995). Gender ideology, marital disruption, and the employment of married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57(1), 31-42.
- Hakim, C. (1998). Developing a sociology for the twenty-first century: preference theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 137-143.
- Hakim, C. (2002). Lifestyle preferences as determinants of women's differentiated labor market careers. *Work and Occupations*, 29(4), 428-459.
- Hakim, C. (2003). Public morality versus personal choice: the failure of social attitude surveys. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 54(3), 339-345.
- Matysiak, A., & Vignoli, D. (2008). Fertility and Women's Employment: A Meta-analysis. *European Journal of Population*, 24, 363-384.
- McDonald, P. (2000) Gender equity, social institutions and the future of fertility. *Journal of Population Research*, 17(1), 1-16.
- Nordenmark, M. (2004). Does gender ideology explain differences between countries regarding the involvement of women and of men in paid and unpaid work? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 13(3), 233-243.
- Pettit, B., & Hook, J. (2005). The Structure of Women's Employment in Comparative Perspective. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 779-801.
- Polavieja, J.G. (2008). The effect of occupational sex-composition on earnings: Job-specialization, sex-role attitudes and the division of domestic labour in Spain. *European Sociological Review*, 24(2), 199-213.
- Rindfuss, R.R., Guzzo, K.B., & Morgan, S.P. (2003). The changing institutional context of low fertility. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22(5), 411-438.

- Scott, J. (1999). European attitudes towards maternal employment. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 19(9/10/11), 144-177.
- Sjöberg, O. (2004). The role of family policy institutions in explaining gender-role attitudes: a comparative multilevel analysis of thirteen industrialized countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 14(2), 107-123.
- Stone, P. (2008). *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. University of California Press.
- Van der Lippe, T., & Van Dijk, L. (2002). Comparative Research on Women's Employment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28(1), 221-241.
Doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.28.110601.140833
- Vitali, A., Billari, F.C., Prskawetz, A., & Testa, M.R. (2009). Preference theory and low fertility: A comparative perspective. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de Démographie*, 25(4), 413-438.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics (N=13,971)

	Proportion	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Employed	.71	0	1		
Age		20	59	40.54	10.43
Education		0	32	12.62	3.62
Partnered Household	.70	0	1		
Young child at home	.37	0	1		
Preference: Home centered (ref)	.10	0	1		
Preference: Adaptive	.80	0	1		
Preference: Work-centered	.09	0	1		
Country liberalism		2.1	3.6	2.78	.36

Table 2: Women's employment regressed on individual and contextual characteristics (logistic multilevel regression of 13,971 individuals in 24 countries).

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B(se)	Sig.	B(se)	Sig.	B(se)	Sig.
<i>Fixed Effects</i>						
Intercept	.91 (.09)	***	-1.78 (.62)	**	-1.71 (.62)	**
Age / 10			-.02 (.02)		-.02 (.02)	
Education			.15 (.01)	***	.15 (.01)	***
Partnered Household			-.05 (.05)		-.05 (.05)	
Young child at home			-.91 (.10)	***	-.91 (.10)	***
Preference: Home centered (ref)						
Preference: Adaptive			.38 (.06)	***	.31 (.08)	***
Preference: Work-centered			.50 (.09)	***	.39 (.11)	***
Country liberalism			.32 (.22)		.32 (.22)	
<i>Interactions between young child at home and:</i>						
Preference: Home centered (ref)						
Preference: Adaptive					.17 (.11)	
Preference: Work-centered					.26 (.17)	
<i>Variance Components</i>						
Intercept	.17		.12		.12	
Young child at home						
Preference: Adaptive						
Preference: Work-centered						
Deviance	17,143		16,029		16,026	

* P<.05, ** P<.01, *** P<.001

Hypotheses were tested one-tailed

Table 3: Women's employment regressed on cross-level interactions between motherhood and work preferences, and country liberalism (logistic multilevel regression of 13,971 individuals in 24 countries).

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	B(se)	Sig.	B(se)	Sig.	B(se)	Sig.	B(se)	Sig.
<i>Fixed Effects</i>								
Intercept	-1.80 (.62)	**	-1.01 (.70)		-2.44 (.60)	***	.18 (.97)	
Age / 10	-.02 (.02)		-.02 (.02)		-.02 (.02)		-.02 (.02)	
Education	.15 (.01)	***	.15 (.01)	***	.15 (.01)	***	.15 (.01)	***
Partnered Household	-.05 (.05)		-.05 (.05)		-.05 (.05)		-.05 (.05)	
Young child at home	-.74 (.11)	***	-2.52 (.83)	**	-.77 (.04)	***	-.76 (.04)	***
Preference: Home centered (ref)								
Preference: Adaptive	.39 (.06)	***	.39 (.06)	***	.42 (.09)	***	-1.86 (.59)	***
Preference: Work-centered	.51 (.09)	***	.51 (.09)	***	.53 (.13)	***	-1.20 (.96)	
Country liberalism	.34 (.22)		.05 (.25)		.55 (.20)	**	-.44 (.35)	
<i>Interactions between Country Liberalism and:</i>								
Young child at home			.65 (.29)	*				
Preference: Home centered (ref)								
Preference: Adaptive							.87 (.22)	***
Preference: Work-centered							.66 (.35)	*
<i>Variance Components</i>								
Intercept	.16		.14		.31		.22	
Young child at home	.22		.17					
Preference: Adaptive					.07		.02	
Preference: Work-centered					.10		.04	
Deviance	15,965		15,961		16,011		16,002	

* P<.05, ** P<.01, *** P<.001

Hypotheses were tested one-tailed