According to spillover theory, the experiences one undergoes in one area of life positively or negatively influence (spill over to) another area. This spillover takes place in both directions: from private life to work and from work to private life. This study only explores the latter. Scientific papers (Greenhaus–Powell, 2006) usually differentiate between affective and instrumental spillover between work and family. Affective work-family spillover means taking home one’s feelings and attitudes from work, while the transfer of skills is called instrumental spillover.

In the work-family spillover literature, temporal and spatial flexibility receives special focus. Flexible work arrangements may significantly support the reconciliation of work and family obligations but also often make establishing and maintaining borders between various areas of life difficult.

At the same time, the flexibility of work is also a privilege that not all groups possess. Men tend to be able to choose their place of work more flexibly than women. Similarly, individuals with a higher social status are more likely to have a job that does not require permanent presence and, in this way, may be carried out remotely.

As part of the Omnibus survey by TÁRKI, the study titled Dilemmas and Strategies for Reconciling Family and Work (K104707) by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund explored, on a representative sample of the Hungarian adult population, in May 2014, to what extent work spills over to private life, merging negative and positive spillover effects in one index. The analysis primarily concerned the association between gender and spillover. Figure K9.1.1 presents differences in spillover according to gender, financial well-being and flexibility of work. It shows that men, those enjoying financial well-being and those with more flexible work arrangements reported more positive spillover.

Then it was examined whether spillover is independent of gender if the flexibility of work and financial well-being are controlled for (Figure K9.1.2). The model below shows that after controlling for financial well-being and the flexibility of work, spillover is independent of gender.

In order to better understand the estimated parameters of Figure K9.1.2, the categories of the variables should be examined in more detail. The gender variable assumes the value 1 if the respondent is male and the value 2 if the respondent is female. The financial well-being variable assumes the value 1 if the respondent is poor and the value 2 if the respondent is rich. The ‘flexibility of work’ variable assumes the value 1 if the respondent has flexible work arrangements and the value 2 if he or she has fixed work arrangements. Finally, the value of the spillover variable is 1 if work has a negative effect on private life, 2 if it has a neutral effect and 3 if it has a positive effect.

* The detailed analysis in English is included in Radó et al. (2015).
In conclusion, women are significantly less likely than men to have a job with a positive effect on family life, even though spillover is independent of gender, if financial well-being and flexible work arrangement are controlled for. This is because women are less likely to report financial well-being and flexible work arrangement, which would increase the possibility of positive spillover.

Our analysis revealed that gender disparities are caused and maintained by various social inequalities such as access to flexible work arrangements and subjective financial well-being. The results confirmed that men are characterised by better subjective financial well-being. The study also revealed that after controlling for subjective financial well-being, men are more likely to perceive they are able to influence their working conditions. The findings point out that equal access to flexible work arrangements and increasing the perceived financial well-being of women significantly improve the social position of women both directly and indirectly.
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