

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of DREAM_{TALK} Participants

Sample characteristics ^{a, b}	Total (n = 25)		
	n (%)	M ± SD (Range)	Ratio
Participation of partner ^c			
Partner participates in study	22 (88)		
Partner does not participate in study	3 (12)		
Sex			
Female	13 (52)		
Male	12 (48)		
Age in years		31.7 ± 2.6 (28–36)	
Education ^d			
University degree	14 (56)		
No university degree	11 (44)		
Income ^{e, f, g}			
Own income		1,875 (930–15,000)	
Household income		3,662 (1,875–>20,000)	
Own income : household income			0.51
Household income : average household income of Saxony ^h			1.77
Number of children			
One child (i.e., toddler ⁱ)	22 (88)		
Two children (i.e., toddler ⁱ and sibling ^j)	3 (12)		
Toddlers age in months ⁱ		17 ± 1.44 (15–20)	
Siblings age in years ^j		6 ± 1.41 (5–8)	

Note. ^a Characteristics at time of interview, if not indicated otherwise. ^b Characteristics described for each participant individually. ^c Both partners of a couple could participate in the study; participants were interviewed and data analyzed individually. ^d Measured at T1 (during pregnancy) of the quantitative DREAM study. ^e Missing data of one participant. ^f Income statistics calculated using median. ^g Monthly net income in Euro, including all assets. ^h Average monthly net income of all households in Saxony in 2019 = 2068€ (Statistisches Landesamt des Freistaates Sachsen, 2021). ⁱ Toddler = child participants were expecting at T1 of the quantitative DREAM study. ^j Sibling = child born prior to participation in the quantitative DREAM study.

Table 2. The Frequency of the 50/50-Split-Model via Four Measures

		Final sample (couple data)			
		<i>n</i> = 1,036			
		50/50-split- model via time use estimates	50/50-split- model via subjective reporting	50/50-split-model via time use estimates and/or subjective reporting	50/50-split- model via time use estimates and subjective reporting
		<i>n</i> (%) ^a	<i>n</i> (%) ^a	<i>n</i> (%) ^a	<i>n</i> (%) ^a
50/50-split-model	Yes	65 (7.3)	124 (13.1)	152 (17.5)	37 (3.8)
	No	826 (92.7)	821 (86.9)	715 (82.5)	932 (96.2)
	Missing data ^b	145	91	169	67
	Sample size (couple data) within screening time for DREAM _{TALK}				
	<i>n</i> = 289				
	Yes	16 (6.5)	30 (11.5)	37 (15.7)	9 (3.3)
	No	232 (93.5)	230 (88.5)	198 (84.3)	264 (96.7)
	Missing data ^b	41	29	54	16

Note. ^a Valid percent. ^b The calculations of these measures include up to twelve questionnaire responses. If one response is missing, the measure cannot be calculated.

**Table 3. The Coding Frame with its Main-, Sub-, and Sub-subcategories Including the
Number of Participants and References Regarding each Sub- and Sub-Subcategory**

Main category ^a	CK	Subcategories • Sub-subcategories	Participants		References
			(n = 25)		(N = 1,345) ^b
			n	% ^c	n
1. Childcare assistance					
1.1 Childcare assistance network	.96	1.1.1 ECEC ^d	25	100	119
		1.1.2 Parents' informal childcare assistance network	22	88	165
		• 1.1.2.1 Grandparents (maternal) ^d	18	72	84
		• 1.1.2.2 Grandparents (paternal) ^d	17	68	29
		• 1.1.2.3 Aunts/uncles (maternal) ^d	8	32	21
		• 1.1.2.4 Aunts/uncles (paternal) ^d	2	8	4
		• 1.1.2.5 Friends of parents ^d	8	32	19
• 1.1.2.6 Neighbors of parents ^d	4	16	8		
1.2 Intensity of utilizing parents' <u>informal</u> childcare assistance network	1	1.2.1 Overnight-care ^e	7	28	20
		1.2.2 Weekly care-day ^e	7	28	15
1.3 Objective of utilizing parents' <u>informal</u> childcare assistance network	.92	1.3.1 Supporting parents to master daily routine	16	64	50
		1.3.2 Enabling parents to spend me- or couples-time	15	60	44
		1.3.3 Unburdening parents during time spent together	14	56	22
1.4 Mindset towards childcare assistance network	.9	1.4.1 Positively connoted thoughts regarding childcare assistance network	21	84	74
		1.4.2 Negatively connoted thoughts regarding childcare assistance network	18	72	48

Main category ^a	CK	Subcategories	Participants (n = 25)		References (N = 1,345) ^b
			n	% ^c	n
2. Parental leave					
2.1 Division of parental leave months	1	2.1.1 Fathers taking the two non-transferable partner months	9	36	9 ^f
		2.1.2 In between (fathers taking more than the two non-transferable partner months, but less than 50% of parental leave months)	11	44	11 ^f
		2.1.3 50/50-split of months	5	20	5 ^f
2.2 Fathers' solo parental leave	1	2.2.1 Fathers taking solo parental leave months	14	56	14 ^f
		2.2.2 Fathers not taking solo parental leave months	11	44	11 ^f
2.3 Resources to facilitate the return to paid work	.92	2.3.1 Regular contact to paid work during parental leave	7	28	27
		2.3.2 Irregular contact to paid work during parental leave	4	16	5
		2.3.3 Gradually increasing paid working hours after parental leave	3	12	4
		2.3.4 Other resources	7	28	7
3. Paid work characteristics					
3.1 Occupational group [deductive] ^g	1	3.1.1 Legislators, senior officials and managers	1	4	1 ^f
		3.1.2 Professionals	10	40	10 ^f
		3.1.3 Technicians and associate professionals	7	28	7 ^f
		3.1.4 Clerks	3	12	3 ^f
		3.1.5 Service workers and shop and market sales workers	1	4	1 ^f
		3.1.6 Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	0	0	0
		3.1.7 Craft and related trades workers	2	8	2 ^f
		3.1.8 Plant and machine operators and assemblers	1	4	1 ^f
		3.1.9 Elementary occupations	0	0	0
		3.1.10 Armed forces	0	0	0

Main category ^a	CK	Subcategories	Participants (n = 25)		References (N = 1,345) ^b
			n	% ^c	n
3.2 Occupations related specifics	1	3.2.1 Same occupation or employer as partner	11	44	11 ^f
		3.2.2 Additional occupation or occupations related commitment	6	24	6 ^f
3.3 Paid working hours (only main occupation)	1	3.3.1 Hrs/week: <30	1	4	1 ^f
		3.3.2 Hrs/week: 30–32	6	24	6 ^f
		3.3.3 Hrs/week: 33–35	2	8	2 ^f
		3.3.4 Hrs/week: 36–38	0	0	0
		3.3.5 Hrs/week: 39–41	16	64	16 ^f
		3.3.6 Hrs/week: >41	0	0	0
3.4 Paid working hours (incl. additional occupation or commitment)	1	3.4.1 Hrs/week: <30	0	0	0
		3.4.2 Hrs/week: 30–32	4	16	4 ^f
		3.4.3 Hrs/week: 33–35	2	8	2 ^f
		3.4.4 Hrs/week: 36–38	0	0	0
		3.4.5 Hrs/week: 39–41	15	60	15 ^f
		3.4.6 Hrs/week: >41	4	8	4 ^f
3.5 Workplace flexibility [deductive] ^h	1	3.5.1 Flexibility options for employees	16 ⁱ	64	28 ^j
		3.5.2 No flexibility for either side (fixed working times)	5 ⁱ	20	5 ^j
		3.5.3 Flexibility requirements from employees	9 ⁱ	36	10 ^j
		3.5.4 Others	3 ⁱ	12	3 ^j
3.6 Family-friendliness	.82	3.6.1 Further family-friendly benefits	17	68	37
		3.6.2 Family-friendly workplace culture	24	96	90
4. Paid work management resources					
4.1 Paid work management resources	.94	4.1.1 Segmentation	25	100	171
		4.1.2 Integration	24	96	169
		4.1.3 Time management	14	56	26
		4.1.4 Supporting the partner with his/her work	8	32	17
		4.1.5 Self-sacrifice	6	24	10
		4.1.6 Long-term decisions to ensure compatibility of paid work and family	17	68	36

Note. CK = Cohen's kappa, resulting from trial coding.

^aCategories created inductive if not indicated otherwise. ^bSum of all references of codes presented in this article.
^cPercentage scores exceed 100% as different references from the same participant can be coded into different sub-
categories. ^dThe criterion of mutual exclusiveness (Schreier, 2012) was omitted due to participants sometimes
stating more than one location of child in the same sentence such as, “child is with my parents or my brother while
I do XYZ”; in such cases double coding within the main category was allowed. ^eThe criterion of mutual
exclusiveness (Schreier, 2012) was omitted due to participants sometimes stating *overnight-care* and *weekly care-*
day in the same sentence such as, “child is picked up by grandparents once a week and sleeps over”; in such cases
double coding within the main category was allowed. ^fSubcategory only coded once, even if mentioned more
often. ^gDeductive based on International Labour Organization (2012). ^hDeductive based on KONTEXT Oster &
Fiedler GmbH (2019). ⁱSum of participants exceeds 25, as one individual participant can have flexibility options
and requirements at the same time, e.g., flexplace and business travel. ^jEach different flexibility
option/requirement only coded once, even if mentioned more often.

**Table 4. References Regarding Mindset Towards Childcare Assistance (1.4) Combined
with References Regarding Childcare Assistance Network (1.1)**

		Childcare assistance network	
		ECEC	Parents’ informal childcare assistance network
Mindset towards childcare assistance	Positively connoted thoughts regarding childcare assistance	11 (18)	18 (56)
	Negatively connoted thoughts regarding childcare assistance	12 (33)	11 (15)

Note. Participants (number of references). Combining categories means to filter with NVivo for references
assigned to specific combinations of subcategories. E.g., if the subcategory *ECEC* is combined with *positively
connoted thoughts regarding childcare assistance*, references where ECEC was evaluated positively are filtered
out and references where parents’ informal childcare assistance network was evaluated positively are omitted.

Table 5. Gender Difference Tests Regarding Resources to Facilitate the Return to Paid Work (2.3)

		Participants					
		Mothers		Fathers		Sum	Fisher's exact test
		<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	<i>p</i>
Resources to facilitate the return to paid work	Regular contact to paid work during parental leave	3 (15)	43 (56)	4 (12)	57 (44)	7 (27)	.67
	Irregular contact to paid work during parental leave	2 (3)	50 (60)	2 (2)	50 (40)	4 (5)	1.00
	Gradually increasing paid working hours after parental leave	3 (4)	100 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4)	.22
	Other resources	6 (6)	86 (86)	1 (1)	14 (14)	7 (7)	.07

Note. Number/percentage of participants (number/percentage of references). Fisher's exact tests show no significant differences ($p < .05$) between mothers and fathers in the application of resources. Note that the Fisher's exact tests are only indicative, as the gender sub-groups are small, and the Fisher's exact test has a high probability of a beta-error.

Table 6. Gender Difference Tests Regarding Family-Friendliness (3.6)

		Participants					
		Mothers		Fathers		Sum	Fisher's exact test
		<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	<i>p</i>
Family-friendliness	Further family-friendly benefits	9 (16)	53 (43)	8 (21)	47 (57)	17 (37)	1.00
	Family-friendly workplace culture	12 (38)	50 (41)	12 (54)	50 (59)	24 (92)	1.00

Note. Number/percentage of participants (number/percentage of references). Fisher's exact tests show no significant differences ($p < .05$) between mothers and fathers in the experience of family-friendliness. Note that the Fisher's exact tests are only indicative, as the gender sub-groups are small, and the Fisher's exact test has a high probability of a beta-error.

Table 7. Gender Difference Tests Regarding Paid Work Management Resources (4.1)

		Participants					
		Mothers		Fathers		Sum	Fisher's exact test
		<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	%	<i>n</i> (ref)	<i>p</i>
Paid work management resources	Segmentation	13 (66)	52 (38)	12 (107)	48 (62)	25 (66)	1.00
	Integration	12 (82)	50 (49)	12 (87)	50 (51)	24 (82)	1.00
	Time management	5 (10)	36 (38)	9 (16)	64 (62)	14 (10)	.11
	Supporting partner with his/her work	4 (9)	50 (53)	4 (8)	50 (47)	8 (9)	1.00
	Self-sacrifice	4 (7)	67 (70)	2 (3)	33 (30)	6 (7)	.65
	Long-term decisions to ensure compatibility of paid work and family	9 (19)	53 (53)	8 (17)	47 (47)	17 (19)	1.00

Note. Number/percentage of participants (number/percentage of references). Fisher's exact tests show no significant differences ($p < .05$) between mothers and fathers in the application of resources. Note that the Fisher's exact tests are only indicative, as the gender sub-groups are small, and the Fisher's exact test has a high probability of a beta-error.

References

- International Labour Organization. (2012). *International standard classification of occupations: ISCO-08* (1st ed., Vol. 1). International Labour Organization.
- KONTEXT Oster & Fiedler GmbH. (2019). *Flexible Arbeitszeitmodelle. Überblick und Umsetzung* (2nd ed.). Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin (BAuA).
<https://doi.org/10.21934/baua:praxis20170719>
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice* (1st ed.). SAGE.
- Statistisches Landesamt des Freistaates Sachsen. (2021). *Monatliches Mittleres Nettoeinkommen der Haushalte nach Kreisen*. Statistisches Landesamt des Freistaates Sachsen. Retrieved May 19, 2021 from
<https://www.statistik.sachsen.de/genonline/online?language=de&sequenz=tabellen&sektionname=12211-001Z#abreadcrumb>

Main article: Schaber, R., Patella, T., Simm, J., & Garthus-Niegel, S. (2024).
German parents attaining intrapersonal work-family balance while implementing the 50/50-split-model with
their partners. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*.

Author Affiliations and E-Mail of Corresponding Authors

Ronja Schaber^{1,*}, Tirza Patella¹, Josefine Simm¹, Susan Garthus-Niegel^{1,2,3,**}

¹*Institute and Policlinic of Occupational and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Carl
Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany*

²*Institute for Systems Medicine (ISM) and Faculty of Human Sciences, Medical School
Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany*

³*Department of Childhood and Families, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway*

*Ronja Schaber: ronja.schaber@ukdd.de

**Susan Garthus-Niegel: susan.garthus-niegel@ukdd.de