The challenge of balancing work responsibilities and familial obligations is among the foremost concerns of American families. Today, seven in ten working-age American women are in the labor force, including more than six in ten women with children under age six, so the vast majority of parents are working parents.¹

Politicians often suggest that government holds the key to helping working parents meet these competing demands. Before embracing a particular policy agenda, though, we should understand the nature of the challenges parents face—which vary significantly from family to family—and the tradeoffs that come with greater government intervention.

Most important, different families have different preferences about balancing work and family, and when greater flexibility and more options are what most people crave, one-size-fits-all government solutions won’t move society in the right direction. Rather, policies that lead to greater opportunity, encourage the creation of a wider variety of work options, and reduce financial pressures will better help parents by enabling them to tailor their situations to their own unique preferences.

Different families have very different preferences about balancing work and family, and when greater flexibility and more options are what most people crave, one-size-fits-all government solutions won’t move society in the right direction.

A Diversity of Preferences
Most proposals offered by progressive politicians under the guise of helping men and women achieve a work-family balance are aimed at facilitating full-time work and the use of institutional daycare centers, and are predicated on the assumption that most employers offer inadequate family-leave benefits. The actual situations and preferences of many families are very different.

While a majority of mothers work for pay, research suggests that most would prefer to work part-time. For example, in March 2013, Pew Research released a report that assessed parents’ attitudes toward work and family life.² It found that nearly half
(47 percent) of mothers view part-time work as ideal, compared to one-third (32 percent) who prefer full-time work. Reality differed from the ideal: Only 19 percent actually worked part-time, while 51 percent held full-time positions and 29 percent were unemployed.

Unsurprisingly, the desire for work was heavily correlated with economic need: Women struggling to make ends meet had a much stronger preference for full-time employment than women living comfortably. Forty-seven percent of women who said they didn’t have enough for basic expenses want full-time work, compared to 31 percent of those who “live comfortably.” This relationship also carried into marital status, with nearly half of single mothers (49 percent) preferring full-time work, compared to only 23 percent of married mothers.

The takeaway for policymakers is that different families have different goals when it comes to balancing work and parenting obligations. Policymakers have a variety of factors to consider when crafting policies related to supporting families, including how a proposal will impact a family’s potential take-home pay, the ability of employers to offer flexible work options, the availability of work opportunities overall, and the very real challenges faced by lower-income mothers in particular.

Similarly, when it comes to childcare arrangements, most parents prefer to have a parent—specifically, the mother—directly provide care for children. Just 16 percent of mothers surveyed thought that having a mother working full-time was best for children, compared to 33 percent who thought it was best for the mother not to work at all.

The preference for parental care echoes earlier, more extensive research showing that most parents prefer to have children under the supervision of either a parent or another family member, and view institutional daycare as the least appealing option. When the research firm Public Agenda asked parents of children under age five about the best child-care arrangement during a child’s earliest years, 70 percent thought it was best for one parent to be at home, while just 6 percent thought a quality daycare center was optimal. More than seven in ten parents agreed with the statement, “parents should only rely on a day care center when they have no other option.”

Most parents act on these preferences. According to the Census Bureau, in 2011, less than one-quarter of children under age five were in an organized daycare facility, and just 13 percent were at daycare centers. About 60 percent of children under five spent some time in an alternative childcare arrangement, but most of that care was provided by a relative (such as a grandparent or father). Even among employed mothers, daycare remains relatively rarely used, especially for the youngest children. Just 15.9 percent of babies (under age one) of working moms were in a daycare center in 2011.

In Public Agenda’s report, parents overwhelmingly understood and sympathized with those for whom daycare was a necessity. Those using daycare mostly were satisfied with their arrangement. Policymakers should be aware, though, that most parents prefer familial care for their children. Therefore, programs or policies that favor the use of institutional daycare centers over other arrange-
ments are contrary to parents’ desires and what parents perceive as children’s best interests.

Proponents of greater government involvement in providing greater parental support following the birth or adoption of a child should also know that, while the United States does not have a government program providing paid leave and does not mandate that employers provide paid leave, this does not mean that all new mothers lack economic support.

The Census Bureau studied the experience of women having their first child and found that roughly 70 percent of these women worked during pregnancy (a percentage that fell to slightly under 60 percent in the month preceding the birth), and that three months after the birth, 59 percent of the women who worked during pregnancy had returned to work; 79 percent were working by their child’s first birthday.5

These working mothers made use of a variety of leave options following the birth of their children. For example, 56 percent of full-time working mothers reported using paid leave, 42 percent used unpaid leave, 10 percent used disability leave, 19 percent quit their job, while nearly 5 percent reported being let go. Part-time workers were more likely to quit (37 percent reported quitting their jobs) and they had less access to benefits: 20 percent used paid leave, 46 percent used unpaid leave, and just two percent had disability leave.6

The 2012 National Study of Employers (a survey of more than 1,100 employers, all with 50 employees or more) also found that most employers offer parental leave, and a majority offer at least some paid leave. Larger employers surveyed (those with more than 1,000 employees) were most likely to offer some paid parental leave, with 68 percent of such companies providing this benefit. Even among the smallest companies in the survey (those with between 50-99 employees), a majority (54 percent) provided paid leave following the birth of a child.7

Policymakers should not conclude from these data that all American women enjoy sufficient leave time or have adequate pay-replacement following the birth of a child. They should instead take into account the fact that most employers voluntarily provide leave, in particular to full-time workers, and consider how any government mandate or government-administered paid leave program might disrupt current employment contracts and benefit packages. Rather than seeking to create one-size-fits-all leave policies for all employers and all working parents, policymakers ought to target their assistance to low-income families in need of support following a child’s birth.

A Diversity of Options

As they try to balance the needs of and their desire for paid work and family, parents—and mothers in particular—often face challenges that pull them in different directions: Some want to work more, some less. Some prefer to be at home with their youngest children, others to make use of childcare services. Government policy should not tip the balance in one direction or another, but create an environment in which parents are more likely to be able to fulfill their own objectives.

Unfortunately, most policies proposed under the guise of helping parents
achieve a work-family balance today focus on facilitating full-time work for mothers and the use of full-time, non-familial daycare arrangements. While those measures may benefit a subset of women, they won’t help—and could harm—the many others who have different goals.

Consider the “Family and Medical Insurance Leave Act,” also known as the FAMILY Act, legislation to expand the Family and Medical Leave Act dramatically. Rather than the current mandate on larger employers to provide unpaid leave, the FAMILY Act would create a new federal entitlement program under which qualified workers would be entitled to 60 days of family and medical leave per year. When on leave, workers would receive two-thirds of their average pay from the federal government. This new entitlement would be funded with a dedicated payroll tax and administered through the Social Security Administration.

Proponents claim this program would inexpensively provide needed assistance to those lacking paid leave, and would particularly benefit women by providing paid maternity leave. But while it would assist some women, it would also disrupt the employment contracts of the majority of working Americans who currently have leave benefits. This new federal entitlement would encourage businesses currently providing paid leave programs—including more generous leave packages—to cease doing so. Companies and employees would also be less likely to seek mutually beneficial arrangements, such as part-time and work-from-home options, during periods of leave.

The costs would go far beyond the new payroll tax. Women would also face lower wages and constricted employment opportunities. Knowing that any worker facing a medical issue could take up to three months of paid leave creates a significant new risk for employers. While the federal government would pick up the direct costs of workers’ wages during their absence, businesses would still have to identify and train a replacement, or shift work to remaining employees, which can be particularly difficult for very small businesses.

Given that women, particularly of childbearing age, are more likely to take extended medical leave, employers may be reluctant to consider them for senior positions with significant responsibilities. This is particularly unfair to women who do not want or are unable to have children. The expectation that they may take off three months may unfairly hamper their career prospects.

These are not just theoretical risks. European countries offer women extensive paid-leave time, but European women pay a price in terms of workplace opportunities. They are far less likely than their American counterparts to be in managerial positions. Fourteen percent of American women workers are managers (compared to 15 percent of American men); just 5.9 percent of European women workers are (compared to 12.2 percent of European men).8

A one-size-fits-all paid leave program may sound like a panacea for parents, but it misses the target by failing to recognize the divergent needs of different families and the real costs of these benefits in terms of economic opportunity.
Similarly, progressive proposals to assist working parents with child-care rely on increasing funding for Head Start and Early Start, and bolstering other government support for child-care centers (such as through training and subsidies for child-care workers and through a child-care tax credit). What is notable is that the vast majority of this federal support goes to programs that benefit parents solely when they make use of their least preferred option: institutional child-care arrangements.

Such subsidies make it harder for parents to pursue their preferred option of family-based care. As the price of institutional child care goes down for the user, the value of the service provided by the stay-at-home parent or grandparent also goes down. For example, imagine if daycare was free for the user (all costs were borne by taxpayers). A working couple would be more reluctant to ask a grandparent to watch their baby. Even if all parties believe that family care is preferable, it is harder to justify asking for such help when they can costlessly enroll the baby in a child-care center.

Policymakers may want to reduce the burdens on parents, but they should strive to do so without tipping the balance of how parents choose to raise their children, and particularly not tip them away from the course they believe is best.

A Conservative Proposal to Advance Work-Family Balance
Rather than government programs or mandates that attempt to assist parents pursuing specific types of arrangements, we should enact policies that give parents the flexibility to choose the best options for their lives and families. That would include expanding workplace opportunities, giving them greater power to direct the use of government subsidies that are provided for their children, and improving their financial prospects across the board.

Facilitating Opportunity and Flexible Work Options
The real key to helping parents achieve their vision of work-family balance is to encourage more job opportunities, allow greater workplace flexibility, and increase take-home pay for working families so they can spend their money as they see fit. Above all, this requires a healthy economy and expanding employment opportunities, which is why comprehensive tax reform, streamlining regulations, and reducing distorting government spending are critical. Policymakers’ top priority should be to make it easier for employers to create jobs.

In addition, policymakers should seek to reform existing labor laws that discourage the kind of flexible work arrangements that would make it easier for parents to balance work and family. For example, it is past time to reform the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), a law enacted during the Great Depression, when most jobs could be easily categorized and work typically was performed for certain hours during the day, at a specific place of employment.

Today, our work world has transformed, which makes it a challenge for businesses to apply many of FLSA’s outdated concepts. For example, FLSA requires that non-exempt employees receive a minimum wage (currently $7.25) and time-
and-a-half for time worked in excess of 40 hours per week. To comply, employers must carefully monitor how much time their employees work. Exempt workers (generally white-collar professionals) who receive a set salary rather than an hourly wage operate differently and do not necessarily accrue overtime.

So who can companies safely put on salary? The Department of Labor stipulates that exempt employees' work must involve the “consistent exercise of discretion and judgment.” Today, employers are struggling with such questions as how this applies to accountants, computer technicians, and engineers, whose valuable technical skills command far more than minimum wage, but whose early work is often closely supervised and focused on following complicated procedures and protocols. Are they exercising discretion and judgment?

Employers face an equally difficult challenge in deciding what constitutes “work.” Does checking e-mail from home count? What about other time spent on company-owned computers or other electronic devices? As a result, working from home can open a Pandora’s box of questions, since at-home workers typically blur the lines of work and home life. Such flexibility can be a boon to parents, but if at-home work creates major administrative hassles—and worse, potential liability exposure—many companies simply default to disallowing it.

Congress needs to reform FLSA. Instead of exempting classes of workers from the law, it ought to instruct specifically which classes of employees must be hourly and subject to the regulations. At the same time, they should give employees additional flexibility. Rather than requiring them to receive 150 percent of their pay, employees should have the option to receive time-and-a-half off from work for each hour of overtime.

**Giving Parents Control of Resources**

Subsidies for specific families or programs and benefits that help only a subset of parents distort the choices parents make as well as their options and opportunities. Policymakers should instead seek to alleviate parents’ financial burdens and return resources spent by the government on children to parents to spend as they see fit.

For example, the Government Accountability Office estimates that in 2012 the federal government administered 45 programs related to early learning and child care, which cost taxpayers roughly $14.2 billion per year. In addition, there are five tax provisions to support individual spending on child-care services, which reduce tax receipts by approximately $3.1 billion annually. These resources solely benefit families using formal, paid child-care arrangements—overwhelmingly center-based care. Rather than favoring those choices, policymakers ought to make that support available to all families with children under age five, and give them greater power to pick the right child-care arrangements for their children. Since many of the current programs, like Head Start, are geared to assist low-income women, a new mechanism for support should be allocated on a means-based scale to help those with lower incomes most.
Policymakers should also explore increasing the child tax credit more broadly to alleviate the burdens on parents. The Urban Institute reports that: “tax expenditures on children were just 8 percent of the approximately $1.2 trillion in individual and corporate tax expenditures identified by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2012.” This suggests that other investments that taxpayers make—whether in their homes or in savings vehicles—receive better tax treatment than raising children.

Economists (such as Robert Stein in his chapter in this volume) persuasively argue that parents are overtaxed compared to their investment in and contribution to society, and the child tax credit should be enlarged to compensate for this inequity. Congress ought to consolidate existing child-centered tax credits and spending, and use those savings to provide added tax relief for parents, particularly to the parents of the youngest children.

This would accomplish numerous important policy goals by alleviating disincentives for childbearing, ending the current government bias against stay-at-home parents, and simplifying the tax code. It would also reduce the need for additional government entitlement programs for paid-leave, which would primarily benefit the subset of parents who are both working and currently lack leave benefits.

Of course, child care is just a small slice of what the federal government spends on children. The Urban Institute details $348 billion in federal outlays, and $99 billion in tax reductions that were targeted toward children in 2012. Together, those amount to nearly $6,000 per child. There may be reasons for some of this money to be allocated by the government to directly support certain populations of children (such as those with disabilities) and for programs that provide services (rather than financial support) to children and families. Policymakers should nonetheless consider how to consolidate and eliminate inefficient, redundant programs, and return those resources to parents to use as they see fit.

**Targeting Paid Leave Assistance to Those in Need**

On the state and federal level, numerous programs provide income support or other assistance to families with low-incomes, particularly families with young children. Most families with children living below the poverty line lack jobs. In fact, in 2012, 74 percent of households with children under the poverty line were home to no full-time worker. That means that programs like the FAMILY Act—which require that one must have worked for pay within the past year to be eligible for any benefits—would do little to help this population. Moreover, any government initiative that raises the cost of employment (and therefore makes it less likely that parents will find job opportunities) is counterproductive for these families.

Policymakers could instead make the child credit bigger for low-income families in the year that a child is born, in order to cover lost wages during time spent out of the workforce. Importantly, such a credit would not affect employers’ expectations about the benefiting workers’ propensity to take leave or be absent for long periods of time, and would not distort
labor-force participation or childbearing, since the credit would be available only in the year of a child’s birth. The IRS should make it possible for new parents to file tax returns or a tax document to request a refund at the time of the child’s birth (rather than having to wait for the following tax year).

All parents face the challenge of balancing the need to care for children with other responsibilities and desires. People have very different preferences and goals for meeting these challenges. Policymakers therefore ought to be cautious in pushing one-size-fits-all government mandates or creating programs and policies that favor one set of choices over another.

Instead, policymakers should create an environment in which parents can pursue their vision for happiness and raise their children as they see fit, and target assistance to those truly in need. This begins with pursuing an agenda to encourage greater economic growth and job creation, and includes consolidating government spending programs and returning those resources to parents.

Carrie Lukas is the managing director of the Independent Women’s Forum, a contributor to Forbes.com, and the vice president for policy and economics at the Independent Women’s Voice.
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