

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**CORRELATES OF THE USE AND PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF
FAMILY FRIENDLY INITIATIVES**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

at Massey University, Albany

Jenny Pianina

2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My initial thanks must go to Dr. Hillary Bennett who provided me not only with academic knowledge, but also encouraged me, listened to me, and made me laugh. To Dr Robbie Sutton, I have great admiration for your patience and your intellect and would not have been able to complete this project if it had not been for both of those qualities.

Thanks must also go to those who agreed to participate in this study. In an age where we are bombarded with forms and surveys, your willingness to complete yet another piece of paperwork is much appreciated.

The final thanks goes to my family and friends. In particular, my husband Renzo, my mother Linda, and my great friend Christina who all contributed to the production of this thesis in different and invaluable ways. To Matthew and Isabella, Mummy's back!

ABSTRACT

The present research investigated the relationship between family friendly initiatives (FFIs) and work-family conflict (WFC), performance, psychological strain, and turnover intent. In addition to considering the use of FFIs the current study also examined the perceived importance of FFIs, currently a neglected variable in FFI research. The importance of considering factors that may impact on the relationship between the use of FFIs and outcomes was also addressed in the current study by examining several support variables both within and outside the organisation, as well as psychological job involvement and effort in the work and family domains. Respondents were from one large New Zealand organisation that had well established FFIs in place. A self-report questionnaire was developed that contained items from existing scales as well as some items developed specifically for the current research. Overall 169 male and female employees returned useable questionnaires resulting in a response rate of 51 percent. As expected women perceived FFIs to be more important than men, but only those women with dependents. Interestingly the men in the current study showed higher levels of WFC than the women. In terms of 'outcomes' use of FFIs was positively related to intention to stay, this relationship was mediated though by team leader support and the work-family balance dimension of organisational support. Use of FFIs was also positively related to psychological strain suggesting that as strain increases so does the use of FFIs. Limitations of the current research along with suggestions for future research.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
CHAPTER ONE: WORK AND FAMILY INTERACTION	4
Theories of Work and Family Interaction	4
Work-Family Conflict	7
Outcomes of WFC	7
Antecedents of WFC	8
Sources of WFC	9
Theories of WFC	10
Alleviating WFC	12
CHAPTER TWO: FAMILY FRIENDLY INITIATIVES	14
Defining FFIs	14
Prevalence of FFIs	15
Barriers to Implementing FFIs	16
Barriers to Utilising FFIs	17
Efficacy of FFIs	18
What Needs to be Done	21
CHAPTER THREE: THE PRESENT RESEARCH	22
Review of Constructs	23
Performance	23
Turnover Intent	25
Psychological Strain	25
Organisational Support	26
Social Support	27
Job and Family Involvement	28
Work and Family Effort	29
Research Aims	30

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	38
Participants	38
Procedures	39
Measures	41
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS	53
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations	53
Scale Reliability	55
Factor Structure	56
Hypothesis Testing	61
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION	
Findings	77
Limitations and Directions for Future Research	92
Summary	93
REFERENCES	95
APPENDICES	127
Appendix A	128
Information Sheet	
Instruction Sheet	
Work and Family Questionnaire	
Appendix B	
Cohen and Cohen's (1983) Test for Differences	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations between Variables	54
2	Proportions for FFI Use and Importance	55
3	Scale Reliability Estimates	56
4	Rotated Factor Matrix for Organisational Support Items	58
5	Rotated Factor Matrix for Performance Items	60
6	Regression Analyses between Importance of FFIs and Outcomes	62
7	Regression Analyses between Importance of FFIs and Control Variables	63
8	Independent Samples T-tests between men and women with and without dependents	64
9	Hierarchical Multiple Regression between Use of FFIs, Controls and Outcome Variables	68
10	Regression Analyses between Use of FFIs and Control Variables	70
11	Mediation between Use of FFIs and Intention to Stay	71
12	Regression Analyses between Control Variables and Outcomes	72
13	Multiple Regression between WFC and Other Outcomes	76

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades the business environment, the nature of work, and the workforce itself have undergone major changes. The economic forces driving these changes include deregulation, global competition, technological innovation, consolidation, privatisation of many public sector organisations, and a shift from manufacturing to service (Geurts, Rutte, & Peeters, 1999; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999). As organisations try to increase productivity and remain competitive with fewer people and fewer resources, the result is people working longer and harder, with less security and commitment (Fallon, 1997; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

The most dramatic change over the last few decades has been the growing number of women entering the workforce. International statistics show that women now make up around 50 percent of the workforce in Western Europe, Australasia, and the U.S.A (N.Z. Department of Statistics, 1996; Poole & Langan-Fox, 1997), compared to around 20 percent in the 1950s (Napoli, 1994; Parasuraman & Greenhouse, 1997). Consequently, the traditional family comprising dad the full-time breadwinner and mum the full-time caregiver, is fairly uncommon in contemporary society (Rothausen, 1999). Families are now extremely diverse and include couples who both work, single parents, blended families, and workers with both elderly and young dependents (Callister, 1996; Mitchell, 1997). In the U.S.A, for example, nearly half of all workers are part of dual-earner families, 62 percent of women with children under six are employed, and 75 percent of women with children aged 6-17 years are in paid work (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). In New Zealand both parents are employed full time in 40

percent of two parent families, 49 percent of women with children aged 1-4 years are in the workforce, and over 60 percent of women with children aged 5-17 are currently employed (N.Z Department of Statistics, 1996). In the U.S.A single parent families make up 23 percent of the workforce and are the fastest growing sector (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

Increased pressures have contributed to the concern about the detrimental effects that juggling work and family can have on both individuals and organisations. Work and family interaction has become a major social issue in the last decade and is investigated by researchers from many disciplines including psychology, management, and sociology (Barnett, 1998; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Kosek & Ozeki, 1999; Marshall & Barnett, 1994; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

The emphasis in the work and family literature that organisations cannot afford to dismiss work-family issues has seen the advent of the family-friendly workplace (Callister, 1996; Frankel, 1998; Freidman & Galinsky, 1992; Lobel, Googin, & Bankert, 1999). Initiatives implemented by organisations to assist employees in balancing work and family life are varied and include parental leave, flexible work arrangements, and on-site childcare (Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Dex & Scheibl, 1999; Galinsky & Stein, 1990). However, there is criticism that such initiatives are often underutilised (Frankel, 1998; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999), and are frequently unsupported by the prevailing organisational culture (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999).

There is an acknowledged paucity of research examining family friendly initiatives (FFIs) and work-family conflict (WFC) in the same study (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999), as well as a lack of research examining the

relationship between FFI's, WFC, and various work outcomes (Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999). Research also suggests that FFIs on their own may not be sufficient to achieve desirable outcomes and may be of no benefit if other factors such as having a supportive supervisor are not present (Pulman, 1998; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Warren & Johnson, 1995).

The main purpose of the current research is to provide a comprehensive study that focuses on the relationship between FFIs and WFC and also examines pertinent work outcomes including performance and turnover intent. The current study focuses not only on the use of FFIs, but also on the perceived importance of FFIs which is a neglected variable in previous FFI research.

In keeping with research which suggests that other factors aside from FFIs are also important, the current research examines several sources of support from within and outside the organisation, and also investigates the relationship that psychological factors such as job involvement have with various outcomes including WFC, performance, turnover intent, and psychological strain. The term outcome in the current study is intended to reflect areas that are salient to both individuals and organizations. It is not used to imply that differences in these areas are caused by the predictor variables.

The following chapters provide some context for the study by discussing the pertinent work and family literature, the research to date on family friendly initiatives, and taking a detailed look at the variables included in the present study along with the specific research aims.

CHAPTER ONE

WORK AND FAMILY INTERACTION

The crucial social domains of work and family have been studied independently for several decades (Fox & Dwyer, 1999; Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996). However, evidence that many individuals experience difficulty in balancing work and family has lead to an emphasis on understanding on how the two domains interact (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 1999). This chapter examines the theory underlying work and family interaction, the rationale for focusing on work and family conflict, and looks briefly at what is being done to alleviate work-family issues.

Theories of Work and Family Interaction

There has been an emphasis of late on synthesizing research on work and the family (Barnett, 1998). It is not surprising though, given that the links between the work and family domains are both varied and complex, that no single integrative theoretical framework has appeared (Carlson et al., 1999; Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994; Warren & Johnson, 1995). It is suggested that no one theory is sufficient, and to an extent the various theories need to be seen as overlapping rather than competing (Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992). The three major theories of work and family interaction discussed in the literature are: 1) segmentation theory; 2) compensation theory; and 3) spillover theory ((Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Lambert, 1990; Zedeck, 1992).

Segmentation theory is the earliest view of the work and family relationship and postulates that the work and family domains are separate spheres in which individuals can operate successfully without either sphere influencing the other (Evans & Bartolome, 1984). The work arena is portrayed as impersonal and instrumental, whereas the family environment is said to provide intimacy and the opportunity to be expressive. However, this ‘segmented’ view of work and family has been challenged by researchers since the work of Kanter (1977), who states that the notion of work and family being “two separate and non-overlapping worlds” (p. 8) is a myth. Research suggests that if segmentation does occur it is not a natural process, but rather one that workers struggle to achieve (Lambert, 1990).

Compensation theory postulates that individuals tend to seek satisfaction in the work domain if they are dissatisfied with family life, and vice versa (Staines, 1980). It supposes that individuals will make distinct investments of themselves in each domain and that what is lacking in one domain is compensated for in the other, which implies the two domains must interact on some level (Evans & Bartolome, 1984; Lambert, 1990).

The third major model, spillover theory, is the most popular view in the research that investigates work and family interaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Lambert, 1990), and posits that attitudes, emotions, skills and behaviours established in one domain flow into the other (Staines, 1980). Therefore experiences, structures and values in one arena will inevitably impact on how one operates in the other (Bowen, 1988). Spillover can be positive or negative. For example, positive spillover may occur when an employee learns communication skills at work that then transfer to the home

environment and consequently improve relations between family members (Crouter, 1984). An example of negative spillover is where an employee has been having marital problems and then comes to work and takes out their frustration on their co-workers.

Compensation and spillover theory make it clear that there are definite links between the work and family domains and that it is unrealistic to expect them to operate independently of each other. Segmentation theory on the other hand expects interaction to be a non-issue. The general consensus in the work-family literature is that the work and family domains will invariably crossover, resulting in both positive and negative outcomes (Barnett, 1998; Crouter, 1984; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Lambert, 1990).

The current work ideology that many workers still encounter is that the worlds of work and family are separate spheres, and when you arrive at work you leave the family part of you behind (Bailyn, 1993; Barnett, 1998; Chapman, Ingersoll, & Neal, 1994; Hall & Parker, 1993; Zedeck, 1992). It is quite understandable then that many individuals experience difficulties when trying to balance work and family lives. Indeed there is a large body of literature that demonstrates the existence of work-family conflict (Frone et al., 1996; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; Stephens & Sommer, 1996; Thompson & Blau, 1993), which will be the focus for the remainder of this chapter.

Work-Family Conflict

Work-family conflict (WFC) is commonly defined as a type of inter-role discord where role pressures in one domain make it difficult to participate in the other domain (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Higgins & Duxbury, 1992; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connally, 1983).

Outcomes of WFC

WFC has been associated with reduced life satisfaction, marital tension and family distress (Brett, Stroh, & Reilly, 1992; Eagle, Miles & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992a; Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1994), psychological strains such as stress, anxiety and depression (Frone et al., 1996; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1991; Greenberger & O'Neil, 1993), symptoms of physical ill-health and fatigue (Adams & Jex, 1999; Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991; Williams & Alliger, 1994), reduced job satisfaction and organisational commitment (O'Driscoll, Ilgen & Hildreth, 1992), increased absenteeism and turnover (Warren & Johnson, 1995), reduced productivity (Frone et al., 1997; Williams & Alliger, 1994), and stress related accidents in the workplace (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). These findings demonstrate that difficulty balancing work and family affects not only the individual and their family, but can also be detrimental to the organisation and ultimately society as a whole.

Importantly, it is not just women who experience problems balancing work and family. Current research illustrates the importance men also place

on achieving a balance between work and family life (Fallon, 1997; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee 1994; Johnson, 1995; Lewis, 1997), and there is mounting empirical evidence that men too experience work/family conflict, particularly as they assume more child and eldercare responsibilities (Eagle et al., 1997; Frone et al., 1992a; Hall, 1990; Pleck, 1993).

Antecedents of WFC

In the search for antecedents of WFC, past research has tended to examine separately the relationship between work characteristics and family-related outcomes, and that between family characteristics and work-related outcomes, with the latter receiving less attention (Frone et al., 1997). Contemporary research on the work-family interface though, has attempted to provide more integrative and comprehensive models that take a bi-directional approach to WFC and examine both work interfering with family, and family interfering with work (e.g Adams, King, & King, 1996; Frone et al., 1992a; Gutek et al., 1991; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1998; McAulay, 1999; MacEwan & Barling, 1994; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996; Warren & Johnson, 1995).

Work-related antecedent variables that have been examined include supervisor support, co-worker support, work overload, work satisfaction, work hours, use of family oriented benefits, and psychological job involvement. Family related antecedents include psychological family involvement, family support, support from friends, parental overload, family time commitments, and family satisfaction. Demographic antecedents include gender, number of dependents, marital status, education level, and life cycle

stage. Findings however have been mixed, and have been dependent on how those variables are measured, how the data are gathered, and characteristics of samples (Barnett, 1998; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). For example, Adams et al. (1996) found that higher levels of job involvement were associated with higher levels of work interfering with family, whereas McAulay (1999) found no significant relationship between the two.

Gender has also been the subject of mixed findings. Some studies report no significant difference in the levels of WFC for men and women (Eagle, Icenogle, Maes, & Miles, 1998), others have found that WFC is greater for women (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997; Hammer et al., 1997), and a few have found higher levels of WFC for the men in their study (McAulay, 1999; Wallace, 1999).

Sources of WFC

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggest that there are three main sources of WFC. *Time-based conflict* is said to arise when there is competition between roles for an individual's time, either due to the cumulative demands becoming too great (Bacharach et al., 1991; Duxbury et al., 1994; O'Hare, 1997), or time pressures that make it difficult to allocate one's time (Eagles et al., 1997; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). *Strain-based conflict*, may arise when strain symptoms, such as exhaustion and irritability, cause interference between roles (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997; Staines, 1980). *Behaviour-based conflict* may become evident when behaviour styles exhibited in one role are deemed unsuitable, or incompatible, with another role (Priest, 1993, cited in Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

Theories on WFC

The most common approach to understanding WFC has been role theory (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Stephens & Feldman, 1997), upon which the definition of WFC is based (Kahn et al., 1964). An individual will have many roles within both the work and family domains. The notion that multiple roles can lead to overload and conflict is based on the *scarcity hypothesis* developed by Goode (1960). The scarcity hypothesis suggests that an individual has limited time and energy, and that adding extra roles and responsibilities creates tension between the competing demands (Marshall, 1994). Other frameworks that also revolve around the investment of time and energy, and the notion that individuals have finite resources, include the *rational view* (Gutek et al., 1991) and the *utilitarian approach* (Lobel, 1991).

The *rational view* is similar to the scarcity hypothesis, in that work-family tension is attributed to limited time and resources. However, the *rational view* uniquely proposes that the amount of conflict an individual perceives, and the direction of that conflict, is in direct proportion to the time and energy expended in each domain (Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987). For example, the time spent in work activities should be positively related to work interfering with family, and the time spent in family activities should be positively related to family interfering with work (Duxbury et al., 1994).

In contrast to the *rational view*, the *utilitarian approach* highlights the importance of role rewards and costs in an individual's decision where to invest their time and energy (Lobel, 1991). As the net rewards associated with

a role increase then so too will the individual's investment in that role, provided the rewards are appropriate to their needs. The *utilitarian* approach suggests that if the net rewards from both the work and family roles are similar, conflict may ensue (Lobel, 1991).

The final theory discussed here with regard to WFC focuses more on psychological factors, than limited time and resources. *Gender-role socialisation theory* suggests that the different expectations placed on men and women in society will impact on WFC (Gutek et al., 1991; Higgins et al., 1994). So although women are entering the workforce in increasing numbers, and men are taking on more responsibility in the home, the view that men are the breadwinners and women are the homemakers is so deeply ingrained in Western society that such expectations still have a psychological impact on men and women today (Fallon, 1997; Frone et al., 1996). Gender-role socialisation theory suggests that the hours spent in what is regarded by society as the opposite sex's domain, will have a greater impact on an individual's perception of WFC, than the hours spent in the domain perceived as appropriate for their gender (Gutek et al., 1991).

The theories and sources of conflict discussed above provide the background for understanding the tensions that arise when individuals attempt to balance work and family life. They also assist in understanding how work-family issues may affect men and women differently. Empirical research further elucidates the variables that are both antecedents and consequences of WFC. It is clear that WFC is an issue and has serious emotional and financial costs to individuals, society and organisations.

Alleviating WFC

Research in the past has tended to focus on strategies that individuals and families use to alleviate work-family difficulties (Hansen, 1991; Warren & Johnson, 1995). Examples of these strategies include reducing the time spent on household chores, sacrificing leisure time, having one partner working at night and the other during the day, and planning quality parent-child time (Piotrokowski, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1987). Since the late 1980s however, research has started to focus on what organisations and governments can do to reduce WFC (Callister, 1996; Johnson, 1995).

The responsibility taken by governments in assisting with work-family issues varies throughout the world. European countries such as Sweden have extensive government involvement in work and family issues, compared to countries such as the United States and Britain whose governments place more responsibility on the individual (Callister, 1996; Lewis, 1997; Thompson, Thomas & Maier, 1992; Tudhope, 1994). In Sweden for example, workers are entitled to 15 months parental leave with the government paying 90 % of lost income (Callister, 1996). Australia also provides paid parental leave for 12 weeks, and further unpaid leave until the child is twelve months old (Poole & Langan-Fox, 1997). In New Zealand and the U.S.A there is no law mandating paid leave. However, in New Zealand the *Parental Leave and Employment ACT (1987)* guarantees 52 weeks of unpaid leave. In the U.S.A the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) introduced in 1993, and although providing only a few weeks unpaid leave to qualifying parents, is seen by many as a positive shift in the government's

attitude about their responsibility in work-family issues (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Haas & Hwang, 1995).

Increasingly organisations are helping employees balance work and family life by providing flexible working hours, non-mandated paid parental leave, childcare subsidies, job sharing, compressed work weeks, employee assistance programmes, and on-site childcare. The next chapter explores the literature on FFIs.

CHAPTER TWO

FAMILY FRIENDLY INITIATIVES

Defining FFIs

FFIs can be broadly defined as policies or initiatives that have been implemented by an organisation, with the specific intent of helping its employees balance work and family life (Fallon, 1997; Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997). There are a variety of FFIs which typically fall into one of five main categories (Callister, 1996; Dex & Schieble, 1999; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1992; Work and Family Directions, 1995). *Flexible work practices* include offering part-time work, flexible hours, job-sharing, working from home, and compressed workweeks. *Sensitive organisational practices* include having meetings and training in core business hours, management training in work-family issues, and minimising relocation, work travel, and overtime. *Leave benefits* are classified as FFIs if they exceed legal requirements. Examples include emergency leave, paid leave to care for sick dependents, and paid parental leave. *Dependent assistance* covers a wide range of initiatives and includes direct provisions such as on-site childcare centres, having a family room at work, after-school care, and holiday care. *Dependent assistance* can also take the form of paying for emergency care, childcare subsidies, and paid care during training or whilst travelling. *Referral and information services* include distributing FFI information, holding parenting seminars, setting up support groups, and offering employee assistance programs that deal with a wide range of issues

Prevalence of FFIs

Over the last decade the availability of FFIs has grown substantially, with most large companies having implemented formal initiatives of some kind, particularly in the areas of special leave and flexible work hours (Dex & Schieble, 1999; Friedman & Johnson, 1997; Glass & Estes, 1997). For example Moore (1996), found in a survey of 72 Australian organizations that 69 percent offered paid special leave for childcare or eldercare, 74 percent offered flexible work hours, and 86 percent offered part-time hours. An American survey of around 800 organisations (of which over half employed more than 1,000 workers), reported that 94 percent of employers said they had flexible scheduling programs in place, with 53 percent of those stating that flextime programs were applied on a case by case basis (William Mercer Inc, cited in Scott, 1996). A survey by Buck Consultants (cited in Scott, 1996), found 42 percent of employers offered family sick leave, 32 percent offered flextime, 16 percent had compressed work weeks, 12 percent allowed job sharing, and 9 percent allowed employees to work from home.

The exact proportion of family friendly organisations throughout the Western world is hard to gauge. One of the problems with ascertaining prevalence is that the reliability of the information depends on who is doing the surveying, what criteria are used to rate the company, and the size of the company being surveyed (Callister, 1996; Dex & Schieble, 1999; Glass & Estes, 1997). Another problem with accurately establishing prevalence is that many of the reputedly family friendly organisations are in fact making only token gestures (Frankel, 1997).

Many organizations lack an integrated system to both monitor and implement FFIs, and access to policies may be limited by employment status or to certain times of the year (Glass & Estes, 1997). So whilst such companies may be judged family friendly on the surface, a more rigorous examination may reveal otherwise. Friedman and Galinsky (1992) propose that six criteria should be used to rate an organisations family friendliness. These include the ability of its FFIs to have a positive impact on work-family conflict, how widely available the FFIs are within the organisation, the presence of formal written FFIs, and a strong commitment to the implementation, maintenance and use of FFIs.

Barriers to Implementing FFIs

There are many perceived obstacles with regard to organizations adopting FFIs. A major issue for many organisations is cost, in terms of being able to pay for the set up and maintenance of FFIs, and also the realisation of the proposed benefits (Dex & Schieble, 1999; Glass & Fukimoto, 1995; Harker, 1995; Lewis, 1997; Starrels, 1992). Critically, there is a lack of evaluative research being conducted by companies that implement FFIs (Dex & Scheible, 1999; Verespej, 1999). Another issue is that negative outcomes of work-family issues, such as problems with retention and absenteeism, may not be a reality for some organisations, and therefore not considered relevant (Frankel, 1997). Equity issues are another concern for many organisations as some staff may perceive specific FFIs as unfair if they are not eligible to use them, resulting in bad

feeling and the need to introduce compensatory benefits (Frankel, 1997; Rothausen, Gonzalez, Clarke, & O'Dell, 1998).

Perhaps the most pervasive and difficult barrier to overcome though is where the prevailing culture of an organization refuses to acknowledge the need to address work-family issues (Haas & Hwang, 1995; O'Daniell, 1999; Thompson et al., 1992; Tudhope, 1994). Schein (1990) defines organisational culture as a pattern of basic underlying assumptions and values shared by members of an organisation. The culture of an organisation is grounded in its company philosophy and values and is reflected in the "how and why" of day to day operations (Thompson & Strickland, 1998). Senior management may for example find changes to established practices threatening and so resist policy implementation (Bankert & Googins, 1996; Tudhope, 1994).

Barriers to Utilising FFIs

Even though a company may implement FFIs the literature suggests that such initiatives are not widely used amongst employees (Dex & Schieble; Pulman, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999). For example, an American study that surveyed 80 large corporations found that less than 2 percent of employees utilised work-family programs (Galinsky, Bond & Friedman cited in Thompson et al., 1999). Pulman (1998) found that only 14 percent of the respondents had used, or were currently utilising FFIs.

The major reasons cited in the literature for not utilising FFIs, are the lack of a supportive organisational culture, or a lack of supervisor support (Haas & Hwang, 1995; Kozek & Ozeki, 1998; McAulay, 1999; Pulman, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999; Tudhope, 1994; Warren & Johnson, 1995). This may occur if the culture of the organisation is not overly receptive to work-family issues, or may be isolated to particular supervisors. More specific reasons suggested for the underutilisation of FFIs include poor communication about their existence and the perception that using FFIs may be detrimental to one's career. Using FFIs may also exacerbate work-family conflict. For example, in some organisations an individual may get family leave, but must work longer hours to make up the time (Hall & Parker, 1993; McAulay, 1999; Perlow, 1995; Pulman, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999; Tudhope, 1994). In addition, specific FFIs may not be utilised if they do not meet that employee's needs because they have not been well thought out or have been poorly implemented (Frankel, 1997).

Efficacy of FFIs

The research on work-family policies can typically be divided into a *demographic stream* or a *policy impact stream* (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). Those studies that fall into the *demographic stream* are those which examine employee characteristics in relation to both work outcomes and the appeal of particular policies (e.g Kossek, 1990). The *policy impact stream* aims to assess the effect of work-family policies on individual and work related outcomes (e.g Judge et al., 1994; Thomas & Ganster, 1995;

Warren & Johnson, 1995). In the latter group of studies two main methodological approaches tend to be used, with the most common approach being one-off measures of policy use in relation to work related variables such as organisational commitment and turnover (e.g., Aryee et al., 1998; Glass & Riley, 1998; Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997; Thompson et al., 1999 : for a review see Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). The present research examines the relationship between the use of FFIs and employee characteristics, as in the demographic stream, as well as correlates of a one off measure of FFI use.

Far less common is the use of pre- and post-treatment measures to ascertain the effects of implementing a particular policy on similar outcomes. Typically those that have used that type of methodology have investigated the impact of a single policy such as flexible work schedules or the introduction of an on-site daycare (e.g Dunham, Pierce, & Castenada, 1987; Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990).

FFI research has typically focused on whether FFIs reduce negative outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism and psychological strain (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Rothausen, 1994; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Other studies have examined whether FFIs are associated with improved performance (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999; Dunham et al., 1987; Greenhaus et al., 1987; Kossek & Nichol, 1992) and work attitudes such as affective commitment and job satisfaction (O'Driscoll, Ilgen & Hildreth, 1992; Pulman, 1998). Findings have been mixed but generally there is support for the idea that using FFIs can reduce negative outcomes such as turnover and

psychological strain, and have a positive effect on performance, commitment and job satisfaction.

Despite the fact that FFIs are implemented primarily on the assumption that they will assist with reducing WFC, very few studies investigating FFIs include measures of WFC (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). Those that have included measures of WFC have produced mixed findings. For example, Warren and Johnson (1995) found an inverse relationship between use of FFIs and work-family conflict, McAulay (1999) found no significant relationships between use of FFIs and WFC, and Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that the relationship between the use of FFIs and work-family conflict was mediated by perceived supervisor support.

Although companies have been slow to evaluate the impact of introducing FFIs, companies that do undertake such evaluations report benefits such as reduced turnover and absenteeism, increased recruitment and retention, and a reduction in stress related illnesses which all have a positive impact on the bottom line by increasing revenue and reducing overheads (Dex & Scheible, 1999; Lawlor, 1996; Lobel et al., 1999; Martinez, 1993; Smith, 1996; Verespej, 1999).

What Needs to be Done?

The business case for developing FFIs relies on demonstrating bottom line advantages (Dex & Schieble, 1999; Lewis, 1997). This means that any evidence that an organisation may suffer detrimental effects if it does not address individuals' needs regarding work and family issues, needs to be quantifiable and convincing. This includes measuring outcome variables that have been clearly shown to affect the bottom line.

Also more empirical research needs to be conducted that looks at organisations that have a comprehensive range of FFIs already in place, as the bulk of the FFI research has focused on flextime and childcare (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). In addition there is a call for more research that investigates the relationship between WFC and FFIs , together with work and individual outcomes (Johnson, 1995; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). The present study attempts to address both of these needs by investigating the relationship that using FFIs has with WFC, performance, turnover intent and psychological strain in a large organisation that has a comprehensive package of FFIs in place.

Also there is increasing evidence that simply putting in place FFIs without addressing attitudes, values, and organisational structure and culture, will not in its own right alleviate work-family issues (Lewis, 1997; Pulman, 1997; Swiss, 1998; Tudhope, 1994). Therefore the current study will also include a range of variables that may be directly related to potential outcome variables. These variables supervisor support which has been the most widely examined, and other variables not previously considered such as the effort an individual puts into their job.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

The objective of the current research is to examine the relationship between the use and importance of FFIs and WFC. As well as considering WFC as an outcome the current study also investigates performance, psychological strain, and turnover intent. The importance of considering factors that may impact on the relationship between the use of FFIs and outcomes was addressed in the current study by examining several support variables both within and outside the organisation, as well as psychological job involvement and effort in the work and family domains.

The ‘demand’ variables gender and dependents, the ‘support’ variables organisational support, team leader and team member support, and support from one’s partner, family and friends, and the ‘individual’ variables job and family involvement, and job and family effort, were included in the current study to: 1) achieve some control in terms of being able to hold them constant when examining the relationship between use of FFIs and WFC, performance, psychological strain, and intention to stay; and 2) out of interest to explore what relationships might exist between those variables and the outcome variables, and also the use and importance of FFIs.

This chapter will review each of the constructs included in the current study and proposes hypotheses that address in more detail the specific research objectives.

Review of Constructs

Performance

As organisations strive to increase their competitiveness in the present global market there is an emphasis on establishing practices that maximise employee performance (Rodwell, Kienzle, & Shadur, 1998). Such practices include information sharing by management, participatory management techniques, and the creation of teams (Rodwell et al., 1998). The fundamental aim of these practices is to encourage increased involvement so that employees' attitudes, work quality and productivity are at optimum levels (Cotton, 1996).

When measuring performance a distinction is generally made between in-role performance and extra-role performance, with the former referring to core technical tasks that are formally prescribed, and the latter describing behaviours that exceed specified job requirements and contribute to organisational goals (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999).

Behaviours that go above and beyond the call of duty have been most commonly referred to in the literature as pro-social behaviour (Brief & Motowildo, 1986), organisational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB: Organ, 1988), extra-role behaviour (ERB: Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995), and contextual performance (Borman & Motowildo, 1997). Whilst the concepts of OCB and contextual performance are similar they are quite distinct in terms of research origin and purpose (Organ & Paine, 1999). What distinguishes the two is that OCB, as defined originally, relates to discretionary

behaviours that are not prescribed, nor part of the formal reward system (Organ, 1988). On the other hand contextual performance is not limited to non-prescribed behaviours, but rather is defined as activities that support the psychological and social environment of the organisation, rather than the technical core directly (Borman & Motowildo, 1993). Organ (1997) has since revised the definition of OCB to make it synonymous with contextual performance and suggests that OCB and task performance differ in the extent they are enforceable, and formally rewarded. The current research uses the term extra-role performance to reflect the behaviours described variously as OCB or contextual performance.

There is empirical evidence that in-role and extra-role performance contribute independently to overall performance (Borman, White, & Dorsey, 1995; Conway, 1999; Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowildo, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991). There are also several studies that have demonstrated that in-role and extra-role performance are predicted by different variables (Borman, Hanson, & Hedge, 1997; McCloy, Campbell, Cudeck, 1994; McHenry, Hough, Touquam, Hanson, & Ashworth, 1990; Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994). These studies suggest that cognitive abilities and experience are more likely to predict in-role performance, and that volition, morale and personality factors have more relevance for extra-role behaviours (Arvey & Murphy, 1997; Conway, 1999; Furnham, Jackson, & Miller, 1999).

Turnover intent

An employee's intention to leave an organisation is generally viewed as a behavioural outcome, but essentially is a cognition that operates as a mediator between an individual's attitude toward the job, and whether they leave or stay (Sager, Griffeth, & Hom, 1998). Intention to leave an organisation has consistently been shown to be positively related to voluntary turnover, and to date is the best psychological predictor of actual turnover (Maertz & Campion, 1998). The negative consequences of turnover are clear: added staffing and training costs, operational disruption, and intangible factors such as low staff morale (Maertz & Campion, 1998).

Over the last decade or so a handful of studies have looked at the impact of FFIs and turnover intentions. On the whole the use of FFIs has been found to be positively associated with intentions to stay with an organisation (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Pierce & Newstrom, 1983; Rothausen, 1994). Supervisor support and flexibility have also been found to be positively associated with intentions to stay (Aryee et al., 1998; Beehr & Drexler, 1986; Cohen, 1997; Pulman, 1998).

Psychological Strain

The health of the workforce is of concern for both humanistic and economic reasons (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Ilgen, 1990). From a humanistic point of view poor mental or physical health can result in a reduced quality of life for both the individual and their family. The financial costs associated with ill-health are increasing and in particular

stress-related illnesses are costing organizations and governments dearly (Cartwright, Cooper & Murphy, 1995; Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). While measures of psychological distress vary from study to study, one of the primary indicators of mental health used in the literature is self-report scales that measure anxiety and/or depression (Barnett & Brennan, 1995).

Organizational Support

Organizational support in the present study refers to an overall perception that the organization is supportive of employees' needs. Several studies have included a measure of perceived organizational support that is distinct from both supervisor and co-worker support (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Lynch, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 1999; Pulman, 1998; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). Perceived organizational support has been found to be positively associated with the use of FFIs, affective commitment, performance, and job satisfaction, and negatively associated with intention to leave, WFC, and psychological strain (Frone et al., 1997; Lynch et al., 1999; McAulay, 1999; Pulman, 1998; Randall et al., 1999; Thompson et al., 1999).

Thompson et al. (1999) developed a multidimensional measure of organisational support for employees' work and family lives. Three dimensions were identified: managerial support for work-family balance, career consequences associated with utilizing work-family benefits, and organizational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities. Building on the work done by Thompson et al. (1999),

the present study also included a multidimensional measure of organisational support to ascertain if there were distinct components of a supportive culture that would each have unique relationships with FFIs and the other variables of interest.

Social Support

Prior to Cobb's (1976) seminal paper, the term 'social support' was rarely used in a research context (Veiel & Baumann, 1992). Since then, the conceptualisation and operationalisation of social support has varied greatly (Beehr, 1985; Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; House, 1981; McIntosh, 1991; Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990; Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Vaux, Phillips, Holly, Thomson, Williams, & Stewart, 1986). Whilst there is no commonly accepted definition of social support it is generally agreed that it is a multidimensional and complex phenomenon (Sarason et al., 1990).

The two dimensions of social support that have been consistently recognised are the type of support and the source of support (Cohen & Wills, 1985; McIntosh, 1991, Stewart, 1989). The two main types of support identified are emotional and instrumental support (King, Mattimore, King & Adams, 1995; Leiter & Durup, 1996; Parasuraman et al., 1996; Power, Champion, & Aris, 1988). Sources of support include work supervisors, co-workers, spouse/partner, family, and friends (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1994). Instrumental support includes information, advice, assisting with tasks, and financial assistance;

emotional support encompasses feedback, affirmation, caring, empathy, and trust (Power et al., 1988).

Research has shown quite clearly that both work and non-work sources of social support are associated with increased physical and psychological wellbeing, increased job and life satisfaction, and reduced work-family conflict (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Ganster et al., 1986; Greenberger & O'Neil, 1993; McAulay, 1999; O'Driscoll & Beehr, 1994; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992; Ray & Miller, 1994; Shinn, Wong, Simko, & Ortiz-Torres, 1989; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Warren & Johnson, 1995). There is however a lack of research investigating the relation of non-work support to outcomes such as turnover intent, performance, and WFC. There is also a lack of research that examines both work and non-work support in the same study.

Job and Family Involvement

In the present study the concept of job involvement refers to the extent that one psychologically identifies with one's job (Kanungo, 1982a; Lawlor & Hall, 1970; Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). The notion of family involvement reflects the importance an individual attaches to their family role (Frone & Rice, 1987; Yogeve & Brett, 1985).

The majority of studies examining the relationship between job involvement and WFC find that there is a positive association between the two, particularly for work interfering with family (Adams et al., 1996; Frone & Rice, 1987; Frone et al., 1992a; Hammer, Allen & Grigsby, 1997; Higgins, Duxbury & Irving, 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1996;

Thompson & Blau, 1993; Williams & Alliger, 1994). While fewer studies have examined the impact of family involvement on WFC, the general consensus is that family involvement is positively associated with family interfering with work (Adams et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1992a; Hammer et al., 1997). Job involvement has also been positively associated with performance (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Keller, 1997), and job satisfaction (Adams et al., 1996). The main reason for including job and family involvement in the present study was to examine variables that one would consider to be outside of the organisations' control, as the majority of FFI research focuses on what the organisation can do to assist employees with work-family issues. It is important for organisations to be aware of as many factors as possible that can impact on organisational effectiveness (Miller, Griffen, & Hart, 1999).

Work and Family Effort

Effort has been conceptualised as having three dimensions: time commitment, intensity, and direction (Brown & Leigh, 1996). The present research focuses on the dimension of intensity as it picks up on the energy expended by an individual in a particular area. Effort has been shown in previous empirical studies to be related to performance (Blau 1993; Brown & Leigh, 1996). One of the reasons for including a measure of effort put into the job was to ascertain if such factors add to performance over and above using FFIs.

Research Aims

Importance of FFIs and Outcome Variables

Typically, previous FFI research has assessed only the use of FFIs. The current study therefore extends previous research by examining the relationship between the importance of FFIs and WFC, along with the relationship between the importance of FFIs and the other outcome variables including performance, turnover intent, and psychological strain.

Two studies to date have examined the relationship between the perceived importance of FFIs and WFC (Frone & Yardley, 1996; Wiersma, 1990). Frone and Yardley (1996) were concerned with predictors of employed parents' importance ratings of FFIs and considered both WIF and FIW strain, number and age of dependents, gender, and family related support. Hierarchical regression analyses indicated that the age of the youngest child and the level of FIW strain were the most consistent predictors of perceived importance of FFIs. Wiersma (1990) also predicted, and found, a positive relationship between a global measure of WFC and the perceived importance of FFIs.

In the current study it was predicted that those with higher levels of WIF and FIW strain will perceive FFIs to be more important, because the need to alleviate WFC will be more salient. Although Frone and Yardley (1996) found no relationship between WIF and importance ratings their sample was limited to employed parents, whereas the current study sampled those with and without dependents.

The perceived importance of FFIs is predicted to be positively related to an employees' intention to stay with the organisation. The rationale for this prediction is if an organisation has in place FFIs and an individual regards some or all FFIs as important, then other organisations will be less attractive unless they offer a similar range of FFIs (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997). A positive relationship is also predicted between psychological strain and the importance of FFIs as those experiencing psychological strain are more likely to perceive FFIs as being important than those not experiencing any strain (Ginn & Sandell, 1997; Netemeyer et al., 1996).

A positive relationship is also predicted between the importance of FFIs and both in-role and extra-role performance. In-role performance has been linked to work effort and it seems logical that if an individual perceives that their organisation is offering ways to help them balance work and family life this may influence the amount of effort they put into their work (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Van Dyne et al., 1995). In addition feeling that the organisation is helping may positively impact on attitudinal variables leading to an increase in extra-role behaviours (Organ & Paine, 1999).

Importance of FFIs and Controls

Gender-role socialisation theory would suggest that FFIs will be more important to women than men as the former are expected to experience more WFC (Gutek et al., 1991). However, the increasing evidence that men are also experiencing difficulty in balancing work and family suggests that gender will not be a predictor of importance ratings (Eagle et al., 1997; Eagle et al., 1998).

It is predicted in the current study that FFIs will be more important for women, despite evidence that men also experience WFC, as ways of achieving a balance between work and family is expected to be more salient for women. (Frone et al., 1996; Lee & Duzbury, 1998; Wallace, 1999). It is also predicted that those with dependents will perceive FFIs as being more important and also use more FFIs than those without dependents, as the former is more likely to seek ways of balancing work and family life (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Frone & Yardley 1996).

Use of FFIs and Outcome Variables

The general expectation is that having FFIs available for use will mitigate negative consequences and have a positive effect on desirable outcomes (Dex & Sceible, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Warren & Johnson, 1995). On the other hand, those experiencing more WFC may use FFIs more thus there is a reason to predict both positive and negative relationships at the zero order level. However, if variables relating to the demand for FFIs are controlled for

then all else being equal FFIs will be negatively related to both WIF and FIW strain.

It is also predicted that the use of FFIs will be negatively related to psychological strain. Psychological strain is different to WFC in that it does not refer specifically to work or family demands impinging on work or family life. However, factors such as role ambiguity, lack of task autonomy and various other work conditions can be stressful for many workers and it may be that using FFIs may reduce some of those stresses (Adams & Jex, 1999; Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

The current study also predicts that the use of FFIs will be positively related to both in-role and extra-role performance and an individual's intention to stay with the organisation. Those who use FFIs could be expected to have more time and resources to allow them to devote more time and effort to their job (Thompson et al., 1999). They might also be expected to think more highly of the organisation because they can address work and family issues and therefore be more inclined to engage in extra-role behaviours (Lynch et al., 1999). Those that use FFIs are also less likely to leave the organisation unless similar benefits can be offered by another organisation (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1995).

Use of FFIs and Controls

Predicting relationships between the use of FFIs gender, and dependents is more complex than importance of FFIs in the sense that FFIs such as flexible hours are likely to be used by a wide range of

employees, not just those with family commitments (Baltes et al., 1999; Christensen & Staines, 1990; Grover & Crooker, 1995). Therefore it is hypothesised that there will be no significant relationships between these demographic variables and the use of FFIs. What is hypothesised in the current study though is that gender and having dependents will moderate any relationships between use of FFIs and WFC, performance, intention to stay, and psychological strain.

Control Variables and Outcomes

Gender role socialisation theory suggests that women should experience more WFC, particularly family interfering with work, as the perception still exists that women should be the primary caregivers and are expected to take care of things on the home front whether or not they are in paid work (Gutek et al., 1991). On the other hand the rational and utilitarian views, discussed in chapter one, would suggest that men these days are equally susceptible to WFC given they are becoming more responsible for household duties and are expressing the desire to be more involved with their families (Fallon, 1997; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee 1994; Johnson, 1995; Lewis, 1997).

As discussed in Chapter One research findings on whether gender has any bearing on WFC have been mixed with some studies finding no relationship, some finding that women experience more WFC, and some finding that men experience more WFC. It is predicted that there will be no relationship between gender and WFC on the basis that owing to social change men and women are equally susceptible to the strains of

balancing work and family life (Fallon, 1997; Johnson, 1995; Lewis, 1997.

Having dependents is predicted to be positively related to both WIF and FIW as the individual will experience greater demands on their time, which in turn may lead to WFC. Previous research has shown that employees with dependents are more susceptible to WFC (Frone et al., 1992a; Lee & Duxbury, 1998; McAulay, 1999). No difference is expected between men with dependents and women with dependents as having dependents is expected in itself to be sufficient to cause difficulties between work and family life regardless of gender. Having a live in partner is also predicted to be positively related to WFC, in particular WIF strain, as there is more likely to be pressure to spend time on home activities.

Various types of support have been shown in previous research to be positively related to performance and intention to stay (Cohen, 1997; Lynch et al., 1999; Randall, et al., 1999). Support has also been linked to the reduction of psychological strain and WFC (McAulay, 1999; Pulman, 1998; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Warren & Johnson, 1995). It is predicted in the current study that all sources of support from within and outside the organisation will be positively related to in-role performance, extra-role performance and intention to stay; and inversely related to WIF, FIW and psychological strain. It is also hypothesised that the support variables within and outside the organisation may mediate any relationships found between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables. This is suggested on the basis of both empirical and anecdotal evidence discussed in Chapter

Two that highlights the mediating effects of variables such as supervisor support and perceived organisational support (Lynch et al., 1999; Pulman, 1998; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999; Warren & Johnson, 1995).

Job involvement and job effort are included primarily to see if such factors have an effect on any direct relationships between the use of FFIs and outcomes. However, it is predicted that job involvement and effort will be positively correlated with in-role performance, extra-role performance, WIF, and psychological strain. The rationale is that those who are more psychologically involved in their jobs and put in more effort will have higher levels of both in-role and extra-role performance because they are motivated to put a lot of time and energy into their jobs (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Kanungo, 1982a; Thompson & Blau, 1993;

However, a negative aspect of being immersed in one's job is the likelihood of experiencing more WIF strain and more psychological strain (Adams et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1992a). This hypothesis is supported by the rational view toward WFC, which suggests the more time and energy an individual expends in a particular domain then the more conflict they will experience between that domain and the other (Greenhaus et al., 1987; Gutek et al., 1991).

Family involvement and effort is predicted to be associated with the level of FIW strain. Those who are more involved with their families, and put in more effort, are expected to experience greater levels of FIW strain simply because family issues are likely to be more salient and as a result may interfere with work (Adams et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1992a).

WFC and the Other Outcome Variables

It is hypothesised that both WIF and FIW will be negatively related to in-role performance, extra-role performance and intention to stay, and positively associated with psychological strain. The main rationale for examining these relationships is that WFC has been associated with negative consequences and it is expected that similar findings will be obtained in the current study (Adams & Jex, 1999; Frone et al., 1996; O'Driscoll et al., 1992).

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

In the social sciences, questionnaires are one of the most commonly used research methods (Liebert & Liebert, 1995). The questionnaire approach was chosen for the current research project as it provided the most efficient way of gathering information. For example, a much higher response rate could be expected relative to an interview method, because a questionnaire generally requires far less time than an interview, and does not require participants to reveal their identity to the researcher thereby assuring anonymity. Secondly, the data collected from a questionnaire is more amenable to statistical analyses. The design in the current research is correlational, as none of the predictor variables could have been manipulated for practical and ethical reasons.

Participants

Of the 330 packages sent out, 169 useable questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 51 percent. Of those who returned questionnaires 73 percent were male and 27 percent were female. This percentage is similar to that found in the organisation which has approximately 30 percent female employees and 70 percent male employees. With regard to age, 18 percent of the respondents were aged between 20 and 29, 30 percent were aged between 30 and 39, 30 percent were aged between 40 and 49, and 22 percent were aged 50 or over. Just

on 55 percent of the respondents reported having dependents, with 9 percent of those being women and the remaining 45 percent being male respondents. Out of a total of 187 dependents, 23 percent were preschoolers, 65 percent were school age, 10 percent were at university, and 2 percent fell into the category of "other". Eighty-two percent of respondents reported having a "live-in" partner, with 43 percent of those respondents indicating that their partner worked full-time, 22 percent stating their partners worked part-time, 14 percent were classed as full-time "at home" parents, and 3 percent fell into the category of "other". Ninety one percent of the 169 respondents reported that they were employed full-time, 1 percent stated they worked part-time, and 8 percent said they were contractors. The average hours worked by those employed full-time was 45 hours per week, with a modal response of 50 hours. The average number of years served in the organisation was 11, with a modal response of 1. The education level of respondents was fairly high with 78 percent reporting tertiary as their highest level of education. However the organisation estimated that approximately 75 percent of its employees would have some type of tertiary qualification.

Procedures

The search for a suitable organisation to participate in the current study started with the Equal Employment Opportunities Trust (EEO Trust), based in Auckland. A search of EEO Trust publications identified several companies as potential participants. The major criterion that an

organisation needed to meet to be considered was that it be "family-friendly", due to the presence of well established family-friendly practices that had been recognised by the EEO Trust. Also an organisation needed to have sufficient employees to ensure a reasonable number of responses. The researcher made initial contact by phone, followed with an email detailing the project. Out of several organisations approached a large international company agreed to participate.

Prior to sending out any questionnaires, approval for the research was obtained from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. Three hundred and thirty questionnaire packages were put together and couriered to the contact person in the human resource department. Included in each package were a questionnaire, instruction sheet, information sheet, and a freepost envelope addressed to the researcher (Appendix A). An email detailing the project, and why the company wanted to be involved, was sent out just before a questionnaire package was distributed to each employee via the internal mail system. Respondents were informed that the primary purpose of the questionnaire was for an independent research project examining the impact of family friendly practices on work performance and general wellbeing. A secondary goal was to provide feedback to the company regarding work-family issues and employees' needs. It was made clear to all staff that participation was voluntary, that they had the right not to answer any particular question, and that they had the right to withdraw up until they returned the questionnaire. It was also indicated that all replies would be

anonymous, and that returning questionnaires direct to the researcher would ensure confidentiality. Respondents were also made aware that completing the questionnaire implied informed consent and that a summary of the general findings would be made available to each employee.

Measures

A self-report questionnaire was developed to measure work-family conflict, work performance, psychological strain, and turnover intent, along with the usage and importance of family-friendly practices offered by the participating organisation. Other variables measured included organisational support, job and family involvement, and social support. Demographic questions about personal background and work life were also included in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into five sections. Section one was about family-friendly initiatives. Section two covered questions that asked specifically about other aspects of work life including organisational support, team leader and team member support, job involvement and job effort, and work performance. Section three asked respondents questions to do with their personal lives including support received from family and friends, their level of family involvement and effort, and levels of anxiety. Section four examined work-family interaction. Section five asked for demographic information. Detailed descriptions about each measure are given below.

Family-Friendly Initiatives

A list of FFIs was obtained from a joint publication by the Ministry of Women's Affairs, New Zealand Employers' Federation, and EEO Trust (1995). This list was then given to the participating organisation as a guide, with the request that they come back to the researcher with a list that reflected what their company actually offered. The definitive list from the organisation is what was included in the questionnaire. Examples of FFIs include the availability of part-time work, job sharing, paid parental leave, and meetings held in core hours. Respondents were asked to indicate their use of a particular practice as well as how important they believed each item to be. The other questions in the FFI section were concerned with awareness, availability, and communication of the practices listed.

Organisational Support

A 20-item work-family culture scale, developed by Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999), was used as the basis for this measure. Their items were generated from a review of the literature, input from four experts in the area of work and family, and previous pilot studies (Beauvais & Kowalski, 1993; Francesco & Thompson, 1996 both cited in Thompson et al., 1999). Thompson et al. (1999) carried out a principal components analysis (PCA) to identify underlying dimensions which they interpreted to be managerial support, career consequences of devoting time to family responsibilities, and organisational time demands. The

Thompson et al. (1999) scale was tested on a sample of 276 business program graduates from two universities in the northeast United States. A three factor solution was supported according to multiple criteria used by Thompson et al. (1999). The internal consistency for the scale was high as demonstrated by a coefficient alpha of .92. The coefficient alphas for the composite scales were .91 for managerial support, .74 for career consequences, and .80 for organisational time demands.

Due to concerns over the length of the questionnaire in the current study several items were dropped from the original scale. In addition, all references to the terms “management” or “manager” were replaced with the term “team leader”. Examples of work/family support items are: “*In general this organisation is quite accommodating of family-related needs*”, and “*Team leaders in this organisation are encourage to be sensitive to employees' family and personal concerns*”. A sample “time demands” item is “*To get ahead in this organisation employees are expected to work extra hours, whether at work or at home*”. An example of “FFI support” is “*In this organisation those that use family friendly initiatives are viewed as less serious about their careers than those that don't*”. Each item was scored using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Eight items were reverse scored. In the current study the higher the score then the higher the level of perceived support.

Job and Family Involvement

The job involvement items were taken from the ten-item scale developed by Kanungo (1982a). Kanungo (1982b) administered the scale to 900 English and French speaking employees taking evening courses at three different Montreal universities. Analysis of the 703 returned questionnaires showed good internal consistency with a reliability coefficient of .87. To establish test-retest reliability a parallel study was conducted in two of the universities. The scale showed of a reliability coefficient of .85. The job involvement scale was subjected to various tests of unidimensionality, construct and criterion validity, and convergent and discriminant validity using the other scales in the study including work involvement, and job satisfaction (see Kanungo, 1982a). The outcome of these tests provides support for the psychometric properties if the job involvement scale.

Due to concerns over questionnaire length, five items based on shortened job involvement measures used successfully by previous researchers (Adams et al., 1996; Frone & Rice, 1987; Frone et al., 1992a, 1994; McAulay, 1999) were selected from Kanungo's (1982a) scale. The coefficient alphas for these studies ranged from .68 to .88, indicating good internal consistencies. The response scale used in this study was a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. One item was reverse scored. The higher the score in this study, the greater one's psychological involvement. Sample items include: " *I am*

very much personally involved with my job", and "my job is central to my existence".

A family involvement scale was developed specifically for the current research by replacing the word "job" with the word "family", for the five job involvement items selected. This procedure has been used successfully in previous research. For example, Frone and Rice (1987) took four items and exchanged the word job with "spouse", Frone et al. (1992a), selected five items and developed a ten-item scale by using the term "spouse" or "children" for each item. Adams et al. (1996), selected five items and replaced the word "job" with the word "family". The coefficient alphas for family involvement in these studies ranged from .76 to .88, indicating good internal consistencies. In the current study a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, was used to score each item. One item was reverse scored. As with the job involvement scale the higher the score then the greater one's psychological family involvement is taken to be.

Work and Family Effort

The work effort items were taken from a ten-item scale developed by Brown and Leigh (1996) to measure effort. A confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Brown and Leigh (1996), showed a two-factor solution with five items reflecting a dimension of effort labelled time commitment (persistence), and five items reflecting a dimension labelled work intensity (energy expended). Brown and Leigh (1996) tested their

scale on two independent samples of salespeople. Sample one consisted of 178 sales representatives from three different paper goods manufacturing companies. Sample two consisted of 161 sales representatives from one large medical products company. The internal consistencies reported for work intensity were good for both samples with coefficient alphas of .82 and .83 respectively.

Four of the five work intensity items were selected for the current study. For example, "*When there is a job to be done I devote all my energy to completing it*". The item "*When I work I do so with intensity*" was dropped as it was considered to be superfluous given the nature of the other questions. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to score each item, which was also the same response format used by Brown and Leigh (1996). A family intensity scale was developed specifically for the current research by taking the four work intensity items and changing the wording to reflect the family situation. For example, "*When there are family activities on I devote all my energy to them*". For both scales a higher score indicated greater effort.

Social Support

The items used for the social support measures were based on a ten-item "Significant Others Scale" (SOS) developed by Power et al. (1988). A set of factor analyses conducted by Power et al. (1988) provides support for making a distinction between practical and emotional support. From the Open University Psychology Society, Power

et al. (1988) obtained a total sample of 135 women. They administered the SOS at two points in time, six months apart. Information was available for both administrations from a total of 73 women. Four summary support scores were obtained as both actual and ideal support were measured. The test-retest correlations ranged between .73 and .83. No reliability coefficients were provided for internal consistencies.

Eight items were selected to measure social support. Four of the items were intended to measure emotional support, and four to measure practical support. An example of a practical support item is: "*To what extent can you get practical help in times of difficulty*". An example of an emotional support item is: "*To what extent can you trust and share personal feelings*". The items were included in both the work life section, so as to measure support from team leaders and team members, and then repeated in the personal life section in order to assess the level of support received from partners, family and friends. In the personal life section the item "discuss your personal life" was changed to read "discuss your work life". Respondents were asked in both sections to give a rating for each relationship on a 6 point scale, and coded from 1-6, using the following anchors: never; not very often; sometimes; often; very often; all of the time.

Work Performance

A sixteen-item scale developed by Lynch et al. (1999), was adapted for the current study. Lynch et al. (1999) drew items from several existing relevant scales, as in their view no one scale adequately distinguished in-role and extra-role performance as defined by George and Brief (1992). Lynch et al. (1999) conducted factor analyses in two separate studies to determine the unidimensionality of both in-role and extra-role performance. In the first study a sample of 300 employees of a retail chain in the United States was obtained. The second study sampled 221 employees of various organisations. The respondents' names were obtained from the university records of an eastern United States university. The result was a clear two-factor solution with nine items loading onto a factor they called in-role performance, and seven items loaded onto a factor described as extra-role performance. The coefficient alphas reported for both studies show good internal consistency, with .87/.88 for in-role performance and .91/.90 for extra-role performance.

In total twelve items were used in the current study, with six items intended to measure in-role performance, and six to measure extra-role performance. Four items from the original sixteen were dropped due to concerns over conceptual redundancy and questionnaire length. Three of the items dropped related to in-role performance, and one to extra-role performance. Also the wording was changed in the current study from "this employee" to "I" to reflect the self-report nature of the questionnaire. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to

strongly agree was used to score each item. One item was reverse scored. On both scales the higher the score the greater the individual perceived their performance to be. A sample item for in-role performance is: "*I always perform the tasks that are expected of me*". A sample item for extra-role performance is: "*I would often volunteer for activities outside my normal duties*".

Intention to Stay

The items used in the current study were based on a three-item turnover intention scale, developed by O'Driscoll and Beehr (1994). The respondents for that study came from a sample selected from two major accounting firms: one in New Zealand and one in the United States. The data from both countries was pooled and a reliability coefficient of .93 was obtained from the turnover intention scale, indicating excellent internal consistency. Several other studies have used similar three to four item scales to assess turnover intentions (e.g Aryee et al., 1998; Cohen, 1997; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Greenhaus et al., 1997; Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999; Nelson & Quick, 1991; Rothausen, 1994). The internal consistency alphas in the preceding studies ranged from .74 to .90. For the scale used in the current study a higher score indicates a greater intention to stay with the organization. A sample item from the current study is : "*I never think about leaving this organisation*".

Psychological Strain

The scaled General Health Questionnaire (GHQ 28) was developed by Goldberg and Hillier (1979) by subjecting the GHQ 60 to various factor analyses. The result was a four factor solution from which the seven highest loadings on each factor were retained. The four subscales of the GHQ 28 are identified as follows: somatic symptoms; anxiety and insomnia; social dysfunction; and severe depression. Patton (1987, cited in Goldberg & Williams, 1988) administered the GHQ 28 to a sample of schoolgirls on two different occasions, twelve months apart. Principal components analyses revealed results very similar those obtained by Goldberg and Hillier (1979). When Patton (1987, cited in Goldberg & Williams, 1988) compared the results of the first and second administrations they found each factor had an alpha coefficient of .99, thus suggesting that the factor structure has a high degree of stability over time. Robinson and Price (1982, cited in Goldberg & Williams, 1988) administered the GHQ 28 to 103 stroke patients, some eight months apart, and reported test-retest correlations of .90.

In the current study only the anxiety subscale was selected due mainly to concern over questionnaire length. One of the primary indicators of mental health used in the literature is self-report scales that measure anxiety and/or depression. The anxiety subscale was selected in the current study over the depression subscale as the depression scale items were inappropriate given the context of the current study as they are designed as an indicator of severe depression. For example many of the

questions in the depression subscale focus on suicidal intent, whereas in the anxiety subscale the items address whether lack of sleep is an issue for example, or whether the individual has been feeling edgy and bad-tempered. A 4-point Likert scale was used to score each item and was anchored by the following: not at all; no more than usual; rather more than usual; much more than usual. A high score on the anxiety scale indicates high levels of anxiety.

Work-Family Conflict

The items used to measure WFC were from a twelve-item scale developed by Frone and Yardley (1996). Six of the items measured the extent that a respondent's work interfered with their family life (WIF), and six items assessed the degree to which a respondent's family life interfered with their work (FIW). For both dimensions Frone and Yardley (1996) combined four items from Gutek et al. (1991), and two items from Frone et al. (1992a, 1992b). Frone and Yardley's (1996) sample was obtained from a mid-sized financial services company located in Ontario, Canada. While 480 questionnaires were returned, data from a sub-sample of 252 respondents, with children living at home, were used in the analyses. Frone and Yardley (1996) also conducted a confirmatory factor analysis which supported a two factor solution that made a distinction between work interfering with family, and family interfering with work. The internal consistency alphas reported by Frone and Yardley (1996) were .87 for WIF, and .79 for FIW.

Frone et al. (1997) used the scale developed by Frone and Yardley (1996) on a sample of 372 employed adults who were either married and/or had children living at home. The alpha coefficient was .88 for the WIF items, and .80 for the FIW items. Gutek et al. (1991) conducted two separate studies using two four-item scales to measure work-family conflict. The sample in study 1 consisted of 423 male and female psychologists who had at least one family member living with them. Study 2 was based on 178 senior managers who participated in executive education programmes at an American business school. As with the first study only those with one family member living with them were included in the data analyses. The alphas for WIF items were .81 in the first study and .83 in study 2. Alphas for the FIW items were .79 in study 1 and .83 in study 2.

The current study used the same twelve items as Frone and Yardley (1996). A sample WIF item is "*My job or career keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family*". A sample FIW item is "*My home life keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend on job or career related activities*". A 5-point Likert scale, which consisted of the following anchors: never; seldom; sometimes; often; and very often, was used to score each item. The higher the score on both the WIF and FIW scales then the greater the strain experienced in those areas.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

This chapter reports the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations of the major variables, reliabilities for the measures used, factor analyses run on particular measures, and multiple regression analyses along with tests for mediator and moderator effects. To be conservative all tests for significance, throughout the entire study, were two-tailed even where hypotheses were directional.

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

The means and standard deviations of the major variables, presented in Table 1, indicate that each employee uses or has used an average of 3.85 FFIs from the twenty FFIs available. The mean importance rating was 2.00 indicating that overall FFIs are rated as somewhat important. The percentage of respondents that use each FFI, along with the spread across importance ratings, are presented in Table 2. This table shows that all FFIs are being used or have been used at one time.

Flexible hours and a fourth week of annual leave were rated as being very important by over 60 percent of respondents, and have been utilised by over 50 percent. Special leave for exceptional personal needs was rated as very important by seventy percent of respondents, but only utilised by 28 percent. Approximately one third of respondents have worked from home, use the family contact phone, and have meetings and training in core business hours. The aforementioned FFIs were regarded as somewhat or very important by over 70 percent of respondents. Around 20 percent of

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations Between Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Use FFI's	3.85	3.01																			
2 Importance FFI's	2.00	.43	.22**																		
3 Job Involvement (a)	3.83	1.17	-.01	.05																	
4 Job Intensity (a)	6.00	0.88	.08	.00	.37**																
5 Workplace Support (a)	5.51	1.03	.19*	.23**	.18*	.34**															
6 Career Consequences (a)	4.68	1.31	.04	.07	.06	.23**	.34**														
7 Time Demands (a)	3.66	1.29	-.01	.04	-.22**	.04	.41**	.38**													
8 Team Leader support (b)	3.50	1.15	.16*	.18*	.25**	.30**	.63**	.31**	.37**												
9 Team member support (b)	3.80	1.04	.10	.24**	.15	.26**	.50**	.25**	.30**	.56**											
10 In-role performance (a)	5.79	0.71	-.04	.03	.10	.43**	.12	.09	.00	.01	-.04										
11 Extra-role performance (a)	6.16	0.64	.10	.06	.36**	.49**	.46**	.24**	.13	.53**	.37**	.29**									
12 Intention to leave (a)	4.08	1.68	.14	.02	.11	.20**	.32**	.09	.22**	.34**	.12	.12	.25**								
13 Family Involvement (a)	5.50	1.04	.12	.12	-.10	.09	.07	.09	-.05	-.07	.04	.07	-.05	.07							
14 Family Intensity (a)	5.68	1.19	.13	.07	-.08	.21**	.04	.06	-.10	-.15	-.01	.16*	-.03	.04	.74**						
15 Support partner (b)	4.55	1.91	.19*	.02	.21**	.26**	.23**	.11	-.07	.14	.13	.10	.16*	.08	.33**	.23**					
16 Support family (b)	4.14	1.31	.05	.17*	.01	.22**	.10	.10	.12	.21**	.41**	.12	.17*	-.03	.21**	.21**	.23**				
17 Support Friends (b)	3.75	1.13	.05	.20*	-.07	.22**	.09	.08	.16*	.24**	.43**	-.04	.23**	-.09	-.03	.01	.03	.68**			
18 Anxiety/strain (c)	3.39	1.00	.10	.09	.16*	.06	-.28**	-.14	-.36**	-.18*	-.21**	-.03	-.12	-.17*	-.02	.02	-.05	-.10	.00		
19 Work interfering family (d)	2.64	0.78	.14	.13	.40**	.17*	-.06	-.14	-.59**	-.03	-.15	.00	.13	-.10	-.08	-.05	.14	-.12	-.08	.42**	
20 Family interfering work (d)	1.64	0.48	.08	.00	.11	-.08	-.08	-.26**	-.30**	-.18*	.03	-.18*	-.10	-.15	.08	.01	.07	-.08	-.02	.25**	.46**

(a) 7-point response scale

* p<.05

(b) 6-point response scale

** p<.05

(c) 4-point response scale

(d) 5-point response scale

respondents make use of cashing in leave and approximately the same percentage attend family social activities. These two FFIs are rated as important by just over 65 percent of respondents. Parent centre membership for all new parents is used by only 3 percent of respondents and is seen as unimportant by 65 percent.

Table 2
Proportions for FFI Use and Importance

FFI	Use Percent Previous or Current	Importance (%)		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Part-time work	8	40	40	20
Flexible Hours	56	9	26	65
Job Sharing	5	53	37	10
Work from home	34	24	45	31
Compressed work week	5	41	40	19
Staggered return from parental leave	2	40	37	23
4th week annual leave	54	11	24	65
Buyable leave	9	29	46	25
Leave cash up	22	29	48	23
Paid parental leave	10	27	27	46
Special leave personal needs	28	8	22	70
Unpaid leave	10	25	42	33
Family room at work	5	51	36	13
Parent Centre membership-new parents	3	64	29	7
Parents newsletter	6	73	23	4
Parents magazine distribution list	2	74	23	3
Phone for family contact	33	29	23	49
Family social activities	20	36	46	18
Meetings in core hours	36	18	38	44
Training in core hours	36	16	41	43

Scale Reliability

The alpha coefficient provides a statistical estimate of the reliability of a scale with multiple items. The greater the consistency among item responses, the higher the alpha coefficient will be. The reliability estimates for all the scales used in the current study were good, apart from in-role performance, and ranged from .71 to .99. The reliability of in-role

performance was low at .57. The alpha coefficients for each scale are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Scale Reliability Estimates

Scale	Alpha
Use of FFIs	.76
Importance of FFIs	.91
Job involvement	.71
Job effort	.83
Workplace support	.85
Career support	.75
Time support	.76
Team leader support	.94
Team member support	.91
Family involvement	.71
Family effort	.90
Partner support	.99
Family support	.95
Friend support	.93
In-role performance	.57
Extra-role performance	.76
Intention to stay	.77
Psychological strain	.88
WIF	.88
FIW	.78

Factor Structure

The scales in the current study that were subjected to factor analyses were organisational support and performance. The rationale for doing so lies with the multidimensional nature of those constructs as espoused in the literature. Two issues were of concern: 1) did the scales used in the current study load clearly onto distinct factors; and 2) if multi-factor solutions did occur, were they in line with previous theory and research.

To identify the underlying structure of the work-family culture scale a principal components analysis, with varimax rotation, was conducted. This

analysis was based on 169 respondents for 13 items. This meets the suggested minimum of a 10:1 ratio of observations to items (Nunnally, 1978). The results supported a three factor solution when using the latent root criterion, where the eigenvalue of each factor must be greater than one to be selected. The results of the rotated factor matrix are shown in Table 4, and suggested interpretations for each factor are written in italics. While three factors were expected based on the research by Thompson et al. (1999; see methodology section), the labelling of the factors was different due to the nature of the items in the current study that loaded onto each factor.

Six items loaded clearly onto the first factor, which captured the extent to which the organisation was supportive of employees' family responsibilities, and so was labelled *work/family support*. Four items loaded onto a second factor that was more difficult to label, but ultimately appeared to represent the expectation that the organisation has of its employees to make personal sacrifices to meet organisational demands and so was labelled *personal sacrifice*. Three items loaded onto the third factor where the theme was quite clearly about the perceived negative consequences of using FFIs and was labelled *negative consequences*. Together the three factors accounted for 62 percent of the total variance. Factor 1 explained the most with 37 percent, and Factors 2 and 3 explained 14 percent and 11 percent respectively. The Cronbach alphas for the composite dimension scales were .85 for work-family support (6 items), .76 for organisational demands (4 items), and .75 for negative consequences (3 items). Cronbach's alpha for the whole scale was .85.

Table 4

Rotated Factor Matrix for Organisational Support Items

Item	Factor Loading			Communality
	1	2	3	
<i>Work-Family Balance</i>				
In general this organisation is quite Accommodating of family-related needs (1)	.61	.24	.29	.52
Team leaders in this organisation are encouraged to be Sensitive to employees' family and personal concerns (2)	.80	.11	.12	.67
In the event of a conflict, team leaders are understanding when employees have to put their family first. (3)	.70	.16	.27	.59
My team leader is supportive in helping me Balance work and personal commitments. (5)	.80	.13	.08	.66
My team is supportive in helping me balance work and personal commitments. (6)	.76	.11	.10	.60
Flexible ways of working are explored and supported in my team. (13)	.74	.16	-.10	.57
<i>Personal Sacrifices</i>				
In this organisation it is difficult to balance Work and family lives. (4)	.16	.65	.11	.46
To turn down a promotion or transfer for family reasons Will seriously hurt one's career progress in this Organisation. (10)	.20	.60	.23	.46
To get ahead in this organisation employees are expected to work extra hours, whether at the workplace or at home. (11)	.12	.86	.06	.75
Employees in this organisation are often expected to take work home at night and/or weekends. (12)	.15	.83	.11	.72
<i>Negative Consequences</i>				
Many employees are resentful when men in this organisation take parental leave. (7)	.10	.19	.86	.78
Many employees are resentful when women in this organisation take parental leave (8)	.23	-.01	.84	.76
In this organisation those that use family friendly Initiatives are viewed as less serious about their careers than those that don't. (9)	.05	.34	.64	.52

A principal components analysis, with varimax rotation, was also conducted on the performance measure. Using the latent root criterion a three-factor solution emerged. However, as only two of the items loaded on to the third factor, and it is recommended that each factor have a minimum of three variables, the factor analysis was run again and stopped once two factors had been extracted. The rationale for selecting two factors is also supported by previous research that has found two clear factors using similar items (Lynch et al., 1999; Williams & Alliger, 1994). The two items that had previously loaded on to a third factor loaded on to factor 2 in the subsequent analysis.

Factor 1 appeared to best represent the extent to which an employee perceived they exceeded the basic requirements of the job, and was labelled *extra-role performance*. Factor 2 represented the extent to which an employee perceived that they met the requirements of the job, and was labelled *in-role performance*. The results are shown in Table 5. Together the two factors accounted for 44 percent of the total variance. Factor 1 explained most of the variance with 31 percent. The Cronbach alphas for the composite dimension scales were .57 for in-role performance (5 items), and .76 for extra-role (7 items), and .77 for the performance scale as a whole.

Table 5

Rotated Factor Matrix for Performance Items

Item	Factor Loading		Communality
	1	2	
<i>Extra-Role Performance</i>			
I work cooperatively with my team leader. (7)	.58	.22	.38
I make constructive suggestions to improve the overall functioning of my team. (8)	.74	-.11	.56
I am always looking for ways to improve the effectiveness of my work. (9)	.73	.13	.55
I take action to protect the organisation from potential problems. (10)	.76	.09	.58
I would go out of my way to help new employees	.71	.20	.54
I would often volunteer for activities outside my normal duties. (11)	.57	.10	.34
My attendance at work is above the norm. (6)	.40	.00	.16
<i>In-Role Performance</i>			
I always perform tasks that are expected of me (1)	.10	.78	.61
I am punctual in getting back to work after breaks (2)	.04	.60	.36
I spend idle time in conversation (3)	-.07	.48	.23
I adequately complete assigned duties (4)	.18	.61	.40
I fulfil the responsibilities specified in my job description (5)	.43	.60	.54

Finally, a principal components analysis with varimax rotation was carried out for the social support scales. Contrary to expectations the results show that all items in each scale loaded clearly on to one factor. The variance explained by the single factor for each scale was 91 percent for social support from partner, 73 percent from family support, 67 percent from friend support, 70 percent from team leader support, and 63 percent from team member support. Possible reasons for finding no distinction between those items intended to measure practical support and those designed to measure emotional support are outlined in the discussion.

Hypothesis Testing

Importance of FFIs and Outcome Variables

Single linear regressions were run with WIF and FIW entered as predictors and importance of FFIs as the criterion. Regression enables one variable to be predicted from another by using the association between the two variables to build regression lines for each. Single linear regressions were run to see if importance of FFIs was related to in-role and extra-role performance, intention to stay or psychological strain. The hypothesis that the perceived importance of FFIs would be positively related to WIF and FIW strain was not supported. Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Regression Analyses between Use and Importance of FFIs and Outcomes

Predictor	Criterion Importance of <u>FFIs</u>
WIF	.13
FIW	.00
In-role Performance	.03
Extra-role Performance	.06
Intention to Stay	.02
Psychological Strain	.09

Importance of FFIs and Control Variables

Single linear regressions were run to test separately the relationships between gender and dependents and the importance of FFIs. As predicted gender was related to the perceived importance of FFIs with the direction indicating that women perceive FFIs as more important than men. There was no relationship between those with dependents and the importance of FFIs. Results are shown in table 7.

To further clarify relationships between gender and dependents independent-samples *t*-tests were run on men and women with dependents, men and women without dependents, and the importance of FFIs. The results in table 8 show that on average women with dependents perceive FFIs to be more important than men with dependents. No other significant differences were found. ANOVA statistics were not used as a Pearson's Chi-squared revealed that a greater percentage of the male respondents had dependents compared to the women, and that difference was significant, $\chi^2=10.85$, $p<.01$.

Table 7
Regression Analyses between Importance of FFIs and Controls

Predictor	Criterion Importance <u>FFIs</u>
Gender	.17*
Dependents	.08
Work-family balance	.23**
Negative Consequences	.07
Personal Sacrifice	.04
Team Leader Support	.18*
Team Member Support	.24**
Partner Support	.02
Family Support	.17*
Friend Support	.20*
Job Involvement	.05
Job Intensity/effort	.00
Family Involvement	.12
Family Intensity/effort	.07

Notes

* p<.05 ** p<.01

Single linear regressions between the rest of the control variables and the importance of FFIs revealed positive relationships between support from family, friends, team leader and team members and the importance of FFIs. The work/family balance dimension of organisational support was also positively related to the importance of FFIs. Results are shown in table 7.

Table 8

Independent Samples T-tests between Men and Women with and without Dependents

Test Variable	M	M	t	df
	<u>Men with Dependents</u>	<u>Men without Dependents</u>		
Use FFIs	4.23 (3.32)	3.62 (2.56)	-1.06	120
Imp FFIs	1.94 (.42)	1.85 (.41)	-1.17	120
WIF	2.94 (.74)	2.62 (.79)	-2.24*	120
FIW	1.56 (.53)	1.5 (.36)	-3.25**	120
	<u>Women with Dependents</u>	<u>Women without Dependents</u>		
Use FFIs	4.44 (2.58)	3.03 (2.88)	-1.63	44
Imp FFIs	2.18 (.39)	2.01 (.45)	-1.26	44
WIF	2.25 (.70)	2.10 (.55)	-.80	44
FIW	1.56 (.41)	1.50 (.42)	-.48	44
	<u>Men with Dependents</u>	<u>Women with Dependents</u>		
Use FFIs	4.23 (3.32)	4.44 (2.58)	-.23	91
Imp FFIs	1.94 (.42)	2.18 (.39)	-2.11*	91
WIF	2.94 (.74)	2.25 (.70)	3.44**	91
FIW	1.56 (.53)	1.56 (.41)	1.59	91
	<u>Men without Dependents</u>	<u>Women without Dependents</u>		
Use FFIs	3.62 (2.56)	3.03 (2.88)	.93	73
Imp FFIs	1.85 (.41)	2.01 (.45)	-1.65	73
WIF	2.62 (.79)	2.10 (.55)	3.14**	73
FIW	1.50 (.36)	1.50 (.42)	-.04	73

* .p<.05 ** .p<.01 ***.p<.001

Use of FFIs and Outcome Variables

A hierarchical regression analysis was run to examine the relationship between the use of FFIs and WIF, FIW, in-role performance, extra-role performance, intention to stay and psychological strain. A hierarchical model was adopted in this study to see in the first instance if there was a zero-order relationship between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables. Gender and dependents were then entered at the second step to see what effect holding constant 'demand' factors may have. Support variables were entered after gender and dependents in order to ascertain if any relationships found at step 2 would still hold once support variables were included. Psychological involvement and effort variables for work and family were entered in the final step to see if those types of variables would cause any existing relationships to either surface or disappear.

The advantage of using the hierarchical approach is that it is possible to ascertain what happens to the relationships between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables when selected factors are held constant. That is do the relationships between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables hold or do they disappear. This is of particular interest in the current study due to possible cancelling out effects between use and WFC, for example, discussed in Chapter Three. However once variables are added in to the model a clearer picture the ambivalence is removed. Hierarchical regression is also advantageous as it is possible to ascertain if other variables increase the amount of variance explained in the outcome variable by looking at the significance of the change in R^2 after each step.

The hypothesis that the use of FFIs would be negatively related with both WIF, and FIW was not supported. The hypothesis that the use of FFIs would be positively associated with in-role performance, extra-role performance, and intention to stay with the organisation was partially supported as the use of FFIs was positively related to intention to stay in step 1 indicating a zero-order relationship between the two. However, this relationship was not evident at any of the other steps in the regression equation. Use of FFIs was not negatively related to psychological strain as predicted. However, a positive relationship was evident in step 4 indicating that as psychological strain increases so does the use of FFIs when other relationships with use of FFIs are held constant. The results of the hierarchical regression are shown in table 9

The R^2 statistic indicates the variance explained between the predictor variables and the criterion. However, as R^2 always increases with each variable added, it tends to be an overly optimistic estimate of how well the model fits the population (Draper & Smith, 1998). Therefore when assessing the strength of a multivariate relationship the adjusted R^2 provides the best index. As can be seen in Table 9, the use of FFIs explains virtually none of the variance for any of the outcome variables.

Use of FFIs and Control Variables

Single linear regressions were run to test separately the relationships between gender and dependents and the use of FFIs. As predicted no significant relationships were found. See Table 10 for results. Gender and dependents were then tested to see if they moderated any relationships

between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables. Given that FFIs are primarily directed at those with the greatest needs (e.g., women with dependents), it is reasonable to examine a relevant subset as effects can be masked when looking at the participants as a whole. A moderator variable, as described by Baron and Kenny (1986), is a variable that has an effect on the direction and/or strength of the relationship between a predictor and criterion variable. The notion of a moderator variable is generally introduced when there are unexpectedly weak or inconsistent relationships between a predictor and criterion variable.

To test for moderation multiple regression analyses were run separately for males and females, and for those with and without dependents, between use of FFIs and the outcome variables, and the use of FFIs with the control variables. Where the results indicated that a particular relationship was significant for one group and not the other (e.g significant for males but not females), the standardised Beta weights were examined and then Cohen and Cohen's (1983) test for differences between two independent unstandardised regression slopes (Appendix B), was performed. Having dependents was the only moderator found with a positive association between use and anxiety, $F=-4.57$, $p<.001$.

Table 9
Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Use of FFIs, Controls and Outcome Variables

STEP	Predictor Variable	Outcomes variables				
		WIF	FIW	In-Role Performance	Extra-Role Performance	Intention to Stay
1.	Use of FFI	.13	.06	-.02	.09	.17*
	R squared	.02	.00	.00	.01	.03
	Adj. R squared	.01	-.00	-.01	.00	.02
	F	2.44	.53	.08	1.19	4.29*
2.	Use FFI	.08	.02	-.04	.08	.15
	Gender	-.34***	-.10	.06	-.07	.04
	Dependents	.15	.23**	.13	.00	.11
	R squared	.18	.08	.02	.01	.04
	Adj. R squared	.16	.06	-.00	-.01	.02
	F=	10.87***	4.17**	.85	.66	1.98
	Change in R squared	.16***	.07**	.02	.01	.01
3.	Use FFIs	.04	.01	-.05	-.06	.10
	Gender	-.17*	-.05	.12	-.18*	-.02
	Dependents	.12	.24**	.08	.01	.07
	Workplace support	.06	.02	.28*	.29**	.20
	Use support	.05	-.18*	.10	.10	-.05
	Personal demands	-.62***	-.20*	-.10	-.13	.15
	Team Leader Support	.20*	-.23*	-.07	.35***	.25*
	Team Member Support	-.09	.31**	-.20	.03	-.13
	Partner Support	.05	.06	-.02	-.04	-.07
	Family Support	-.21*	-.29**	.32**	-.04	.12
	Friend Support	.23*	.20	-.21	.21*	-.19
	R squared	.48	.26	.12	.39	.21
	Adj. R squared	.44	.21	.05	.35	.15
	F=	12.21***	4.69***	1.75	8.47***	3.44***
	Change in R squared	.31***	.19***	.10*	.38***	.17***
4.	Use FFIs	.08	.02	-.04	-.04	.11
	Gender	-.14*	-.02	.08	-.18*	-.02
	Dependents	.16*	.25**	.04	-.01	.06
	Workplace support	.04	.05	.13	.21*	.18
	Use support	.03	-.17*	.02	.05	-.07
	Personal demands	-.54***	-.20*	-.04	-.03	.19
	Team Leader Support	.09	-.27*	-.07	.28*	.24*
	Team Member Support	-.11	.29**	-.18	.02	-.13
	Partner Support	.02	.03	-.02	-.07	-.08
	Family Support	-.17	-.29**	.28*	-.05	.11
	Friend Support	.21*	.24*	-.28*	.19*	-.19
	Job Involvement	.18*	.10	-.09	.15	-.08
	Job Intensity/effort	.13	-.06	.47***	.25**	.05
	Family Involvement	-.01	.21	-.13	-.03	-.01
	Family Intensity/effort	-.12	-.21	.12	.01	.04
	R squared	.55	.29	.30	.48	.22
	Adj. R squared	.50	.22	.23	.42	.13
	F=	11.27***	3.89***	4.01***	8.54***	2.59**
	Change in R squared	.06**	.03	.18***	.09***	.01

Notes

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Next the prediction that support from within and outside the organisation would mediate any direct relationships between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables was tested. According to Baron and Kenny (1986) a mediator is the mechanism that allows a particular predictor variable to influence the criterion variable of interest. There are three regression equations specified by Baron and Kenny (1986) to test for mediation. First, regress the mediator variable on the predictor variable. Second, regress the criterion variable on the predictor variable. Third, enter both the predictor and mediator together, with the criterion as the dependent variable. A variable qualifies as a mediator when the following conditions are met: 1) there is a significant relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion variable; 2) there is a significant relationship between the predictor variable and the potential mediator; 3) there is a significant relationship between the potential mediator and the criterion variable and 4) when the mediator and predictor variable are entered together the relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion is less than in second regression equation.

Partial support was received for the mediation hypothesis. The first condition was satisfied for use of FFIs and intention to stay. Of the support variables only work/family balance, team leader support and partner support were all positively and significantly related to use of FFIs (see table 10). Out of those three, work/family balance and team leader support clearly mediated the relationship between use of FFIs and intention to stay. The results are shown in table 11.

Table 10
Regression Analyses between Use of FFIs and Controls

Predictor	Criterion Use of <u>FFIs</u>
Gender	-.07
Dependents	.15
Work-family balance	.19*
Negative Consequences	.04
Personal Sacrifice	-.01
Team Leader Support	.16*
Team Member Support	.10
Partner Support	.19*
Family Support	.05
Friend Support	.05
Job Involvement	-.01
Job Intensity/effort	.08
Family Involvement	.12
Family Intensity/effort	.13

Notes

* p <.05 ** p <.01

Table 11
Mediating Regression Equation for Intention to Stay

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta	Adjusted Coefficient R2
<u>Mediator = Work-Family Balance</u>				
1	Work-family balance	Use of FFIs	.19*	.03
2	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.17*	.02
3	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.08	
		Work-family balance	.31***	.10
<u>Mediator = Team Leader Support</u>				
1	Team leader support	Use of FFIs	.16*	.02
2	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.17*	.02
3	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.10	
		Team leader support	.33***	.12
<u>Mediator = Partner Support</u>				
1	Partner support	Use of FFIs	.19*	.03
2	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.17*	.02
3	Intention to stay	Use of FFIs	.13	
		Partner support	.05	.01

Notes

* p <.05 ** p <.01 *** p <.001

Control and Outcome Variables

Relationships between the control variables and WFC, performance, intention to stay and psychological strain were tested at zero-order level (see Table 12) as well as being included in the hierarchical model. Contrary to predictions gender at the zero-order level was negatively related to WIF indicating that men in the current study have higher levels of WIF strain than the women. When the support variables were entered at step 3 of the hierarchical regression model, gender appeared as being inversely related to extra-role performance and positively associated with psychological strain. These two findings suggest that the women in the current study have higher levels of psychological strain and that the men engage in more extra-role behaviours.

Table 12
Regression Analyses between Control and Outcome Variables

Predictor Variable	Outcome Variables					
	WIF	FIW	In-Role	Extra-Role	Intention to Stay	Psychological Strain
Gender	-.38**	-.15	.08	-.07	.01	.04
Dependents	.26**	.26**	.10	.03	.14	.04
Work-family balance	-.06	-.08	.12	.46***	.32***	-.28***
Negative Consequences	-.14	-.26**	.09	.24**	.09	-.14
Personal Sacrifice	-.59***	-.30***	.00	.13	.22**	-.36***
Team Leader Support	-.03	-.18*	.01	.53***	.34***	-.18*
Team Member Support	-.15	.03	-.04	.37***	.12	-.21**
Partner Support	.14	.07	.10	.16*	.08	-.05
Family Support	-.12	-.08	.12	.17*	-.03	-.10
Friend Support	-.08	-.02	-.04	.23**	-.09	-.00
Job Involvement	.40***	.11	.10	.36***	.11	.16*
Job Intensity/effort	.17	-.08	.43***	.49***	.20*	.06
Family Involvement	-.08	.08	.07	-.05	.07	-.02
Family Intensity/effort	-.05	.01	.16*	-.03	.04	.02

* p <.05 ** p <.01 *** p <.001

Having dependents was positively related to both WIF and FIW indicating that those with dependents experience greater levels of both types of WFC. These relationships were still evident in step 4 of the hierarchical model indicating their robustness. An independent-samples t-test showed that men with dependents show on average higher levels of WIF strain than their female counterparts. Men without dependents also showed a higher level on average of WIF than women without dependents. Men with dependents have higher levels on average of both WIF and FIW strain than men with no dependents. However, there are no significant differences between women with and without dependents. T-test results are shown in table 8.

Clearly the most robust relationship was between the *personal sacrifice* dimension of organisational support and WIF strain. The relationship was highly significant at both the zero-order level and at step 4 in the hierarchical model. *Personal sacrifice* was also significantly related to psychological strain. The direction of the relationships indicates that as the perception that one does not have to make personal sacrifices for the organisation increases then both WIF strain and psychological strain are reduced. The *work/family balance* dimension of organisational support was positively related to extra-role performance and inversely related to psychological strain. These relationships were also evident in step 4 of the hierarchical model. A positive relationship between *work/family balance* and intention to stay was found at the zero-order level, but not once other variables were held constant. The *negative consequences* dimension of

organisational support was negatively related to FIW strain and positively related to extra-role performance.

Team leader support was positively related to extra-role performance and intention to stay, and negatively related to FIW and psychological strain. However, the relationship between team leader support and psychological strain was not evident in step 3 or 4 of the hierarchical regression. Team member support was positively related to FIW strain and extra-role performance, and negatively associated with psychological strain. The only relationship to hold in the hierarchical regression was that between team member support and FIW strain.

Partner support and family support were both positively related to extra-role performance, but these relationships disappeared in the hierarchical regression. However, once other relationships were held constant family support showed as being negatively related to FIW strain, and positively related to in-role performance. Support from friends was positively related to extra-role performance. When relationships with the other variables were held constant support from friends was found to be negatively associated with in-role performance and positively associated with WIF, FIW, and extra-role performance.

As predicted job involvement was positively associated with WIF, psychological strain and extra-role performance. Only job involvement and WIF strain were significantly related once the other relationships were held constant. As predicted job effort was positively associated with in-role and extra-role performance both at zero-order and when other relationships were held constant. Also as predicted job effort was also positively associated

with WIF and intention to stay at zero-order only. Family involvement was not associated with any of the outcome variables and family effort was positively related with in-role performance.

When gender and dependents were entered at step 2 in of the hierarchical model shown in Table 9, the change in R^2 was significant for both WIF and FIW. Once all the support variables were entered at step 3 the increase in the variance explained increased significantly for all the outcome variables. Adding the involvement and effort variables in at step 4 resulted in a significant increase in the variance explained for WIF, in-role performance and extra-role performance.

Work-family Conflict and the Other Outcome Variables

Only FIW strain was significantly related to in-role performance, with the direction indicating that as the level of FIW strain increases the level of task performance decreases. Both WIF and FIW were significantly related to extra-role performance, however WIF was positively related suggesting that as extra-role performance increases so does the level of WIF strain. FIW strain on the other hand was inversely related to extra-role performance suggesting that as FIW strain increases extra-role performance decreases. Only WIF strain was associated with anxiety with the direction of the relationship indicating that as one type of strain increases so does the other. Neither WIF or FIW strain was related to turnover intent. Results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Multiple Regression of WFC and Outcome Variables

Predictor Variable	Outcome Variables			
	In-Role Performance	Extra-Role Performance	Turnover Intent	Anxiety
Work interfering family	.11	.22*	-.04	.39***
Family interfering work	-.22*	-.20*	-.13	.08
R squared	.04	.05	.02	.18
Adj. R squared	.03	.04	.01	.17
F=	3.43*	4.21*	1.98	18.51***

Notes

* p <.05; ** p <.01; *** p <.001

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the relationship between the use and importance of FFIs and WFC, performance, turnover intent, and psychological strain. Also included were several other variables such as gender, support from within the organisation, support from family and friends, and psychological job involvement. Several interesting relationships were uncovered and are discussed below.

Findings

Use and Importance of FFIs

Although FFIs are rated on average as being somewhat important each employee only uses on average four FFIs out of a possible twenty. This suggests that FFIs can be perceived as being important even if they are not being used. Reasons for low usage could simply be that there are only a few of the FFIs that really matter to employees. Another reason could be that only 40 percent of respondents indicated that they were aware that all the FFIs listed were offered by the organization. FFI research does state repeatedly though that utilisation is usual reported as being fairly low (Dex & Schieble; Pulman, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999). What was pleasing though, was that 72 percent of respondents indicated that they felt free to use the FFIs listed. As previous studies have not examined FFI importance in relation to usage this finding, along with possible reasons for it, should be explored in future research.

Although the focus of the present research was not to ascertain how well used FFIs are or how important they are it is pertinent to note what employees want to see in place and what they actually use, and to compare the two. Flexible hours was the most utilised FFI, as well as being the most important. This is not surprising given that much of the literature on FFIs talks about flexible work schedules and indicates that being able to have some flexibility in one's hours will help balance work and family responsibilities (Baltes et al., 1999; Christensen & Staines, 1990; Thompson et al., 1999; Warren & Johnson, 1995).

Having a fourth week of annual leave was also well utilised and was rated as very important by 65 percent of respondents and somewhat important by 24 percent indicating that extra time off work is crucial to allow employees to deal with non-work responsibilities, or simply to have time out from working. Special leave was also rated as very important by over 70 percent of respondents even though it has only been utilised by 28 percent. It makes sense however that employees would value having special leave available for use should the need arise. Working from home, having a phone for family contact, and having meetings and training in core business hours were rated as important by over 70 percent of respondents.

Importance of FFIs and Outcomes

The hypothesis that the perceived importance of FFIs would be positively related to WIF, FIW and psychological strain was not supported. One possible explanation for these null findings is that FFIs are important to a wide range of employees, including those who are not so susceptible to WIF or FIW (e.g those without dependents). If we look for example at the most popular FFI flexible work hours, being able to fit personal commitments around one's work would appeal to many employees for a variety of reasons (Baltes et al., 1999; Christensen & Staines, 1990; Grover & Crooker, 1995). The same for psychological strain, those who are stressed and perceive FFIs as an important way of alleviating stressful situations may be offset by those individuals who like what FFIs offer should the need arise but who are not currently under any strain.

Neither was the importance of FFIs associated with in-role performance, extra-role performance or intention to stay. What this suggests is that other factors aside from perceiving FFIs as important have more bearing on how well an individual does their job, the extra they put in to their work, and whether they intend to stay with the organisation (Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999; Organ & Paine, 1999; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Importance should certainly not be discounted on the basis of the above findings, but rather be investigated in future research with other more emotional/attitudinal variables like affective commitment and job satisfaction.

Importance of FFIs and Controls

As predicted the women in the current study perceived FFIs as being more important than the men. This finding fits with gender-role socialisation theory which predicts that working women should experience more conflict than men because they are working outside of their assigned role of homemaker, and therefore ways to alleviate that conflict should seem more salient and hence more important (Gutek et al., 1991).

As predicted the current study found that those respondents who have dependents perceived FFIs to be more important. What is interesting is that when further analysis was conducted it was revealed that on average it was the women with dependents that perceived FFIs to be more important. This finding highlights that those who are most in need of assistance in balancing work and family, namely women with dependents, do actually value FFIs more highly (Frone & Yardley, 1996). This is particularly important for organisations to note and needs to be explored further to assess the impact that having FFIs in place may have on the effectiveness of such an organisation, versus an organisation that has no, or few, FFIs in place.

Use of FFIs and Outcomes

Overall only one two significant relationships emerged between the use of FFIs and the outcome variables. Use of FFIs was positively associated with an employee's intention to stay with the organisation, but this relationship did not hold once the control variables were entered into the regression equation. A possible explanation is that the initial finding was being influenced by the control variables and once the relationships amongst use, importance, and the control variables were held constant use on its own was not related to intention to stay. Although given that the beta weight reduction was minimal we cannot conclude that the other variables had much of an impact.

Contrary to the direction predicted, the relationship between the use of FFIs and psychological strain was positive, when all other variables were held constant. This suggests that those currently experiencing strain use FFIs the most and that this relationship can be masked by other factors. The positive direction of the relationship suggests that there are a high number of employees in the current organisation with substantial levels of strain. What is not clear if that is the case, is why psychological strain was not associated with the perceived importance of FFIs. Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that utilising flexible schedules was associated with lower levels of psychological strain.

Looking first at WFC it is initially quite surprising that there was no negative association between use of FFIs and either WIF or FIW, given previous research findings (Judge et al., 1994; Warren & Johnson, 1995). The absence of a significant finding does not indicate though that FFIs are not important when it comes to addressing WFC. The possibility was raised in Chapter Three that those who use FFIs will likely fall into three groups, those that are currently experiencing either WIF or FIW strain, those who are using FFIs but were not motivated to do so because of WFC, and those who started using FFIs initially because of WIF or FIW strain but who no longer find WFC a problem. The possible cancelling out effect that each group may have had on the use of FFI and WFC relationship was countered by controlling for gender and dependents.

An alternative explanation then for finding no relationship is that all the employees who need to be using FFIs are, and so because of a lack of variability in the data we could not get a true picture of the impact that using FFIs may have on WFC. Future research therefore needs to be done that can assess the use of FFIs at an organisational level. That is, design a study that can take measures prior to FFIs being implemented then again after FFIs have been established. Alternatively an organisation with no formal FFIs in place could be compared with an organisation with established FFIs and participants matched in each sample. Finding an organisation with no formal policies that is a good match may prove quite difficult, particularly in a small country like New Zealand.

Use of FFIs was not associated with in-role or extra-role performance. Previous research on use of FFIs and performance is limited and finds modest support for a positive relationship between performance and flexible work schedules (Baltes et al., 1999; Dunham et al., 1987). Research however on self-rated performance suggests that self-reports of performance tend to be higher than ratings given by others (Baltes et al., 1999). Given that the mean rating for in-role performance was 5.8, and for extra-role performance was 6.2, it is quite likely that the current study was subject to a 'ceiling effect'. That is, performance ratings were so close to the top of the scale that there was not a lot of room for performance to improve, hence no relationship between use and performance.

Use of FFIs and Control Variables

As predicted no relationship was found between gender and dependents and use of FFIs. This finding supports the view that although FFIs are directed at those with work-family issues, FFIs such as flexibility would also be utilised by those who do not have any family commitments, but may have other personal commitments outside work that require flexibility. It was found however that dependents moderated the relationship between use of FFIs and psychological strain with the direction indicating that the positive association found between the use of FFIs and psychological strain applied only to those with dependents. This finding supports previous research that associates having

dependents to look after with increased psychological strain (Ginn & Sandell, 1997; Lee & Duxbury, 1998; Marks, 1998).

As predicted work/family balance, team leader support and partner support were all positively and significantly related to use of FFIs. These findings certainly support the view that using FFIs is more likely if the organisation provides the support that allows employees to feel comfortable using FFIs (Pulman, 1998; Warren & Johnson, 1995; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). Interestingly the dimension of organisational support that related specifically to the negative consequences of using FFIs was unrelated to their use, suggesting further exploration needs to be carried out into the specific mechanism of organisation support.

The finding that partner support was the only non-work support associated with using FFIs is perhaps not so surprising. As we cannot draw any strong conclusions with regard to causal direction from mere correlations, it could actually be that those who use FFIs get more support from their partner as they are better able to balance work and family life.

Control and Outcome Variables

It was clearly demonstrated that the men in the current study were experiencing greater levels of WIF strain. The finding of greater levels of WIF strain for men is contrary to most previous findings (Greenhaus et al, 1997; Gutek et al, 1991; Thompson & Blau, 1993; Warren & Johnson, 1995), except for McAuley (1999), and Wallace

(1999), who also reported greater levels of work-family strain for men. In the current study though 63 percent of male respondents stated they had dependents compared to only 35 percent of the women. In addition the men work significantly longer hours per week than the women, and showed higher levels of extra-role performance-two factors which could easily be linked to work interfering with family. As predicted having dependents was also positively related to WIF strain This supports the view that those with dependents need to be targeted for support especially when it was also found that those with dependents perceive FFIs as being more important.

There was no support for the prediction that organisational support, team leader support and support for team members would be positively related to in-role performance. Previous findings have been mixed with Randall et al. (1999), also finding no relationship between perceived organisational support and in-role performance, and Lynch et al. (1999) finding a positive association between the two. A possible explanation for the current findings is that in-role performance is not driven by external factors such as perceived support, but stems from an internal motivation to do a good job regardless of whether they get support for doing so (Motowildo & Van Scotter, 1994; Organ & Paine, 1999). In contrast, perceived support from one's family was positively related to in-role performance. This finding indicates the importance of considering factors outside the organisation that can influence organisational outcomes.

Also unexpected was the inverse relationship between support from friends and in-role performance. A possible explanation for the latter finding is that the more support one perceives as getting from one's friends then the less time there is to carry out essential tasks because they are more concerned with outside interests. Alternatively, friends may be giving support that encourages an individual not to perform, by way of putting down the organisation if increased support is being sort because of job pressures. As with family and partner support this area has not been explored in previous literature and is worthy of further investigation.

The lack of any relationship between psychological job involvement and in-role performance goes against both expectations and previous findings (Keller, 1997). What the finding does suggest though is that for some individuals their ability to get the job done is unrelated to their feelings about the job.

Not surprisingly work effort was found to be quite significantly related to in-role performance, with the more effort put in by an individual the greater their performance rating. Brown and Leigh (1996) measured both work effort and psychological job involvement and found that work effort mediated the relationship between job involvement and in-role performance. The current research findings therefore could be seen as adding support for the idea that psychological job involvement has no direct relationship to in-role performance, and it is really work effort that needs to be encouraged. Interestingly the effort an individual perceives they put into their family was also positively

related to in-role performance. This suggests that future research should include measures of effort to try and ascertain a more comprehensive picture of the antecedents and consequences of work effort.

As predicted team leader support, team member support, *work-family balance*, and a lack of *negative consequences* for using FFIs were positively associated with extra-role performance. This finding is supported indirectly by previous research in that extra-role performance has been linked to attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction and affective commitment (Lynch et al., 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995), and in turn, these attitudinal variables have been linked with organisational, supervisor and co-worker support (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Guzzo, Noonan & Elron, 1994; Pulman, 1998; Settoon, Bennett & Liden, 1996). The only dimension of organisational support not related to extra-role performance was *personal sacrifice*.

Importantly not just organisational variables were related to extra-role performance. Support from one's partner, family and friends were also positively related to extra-role performance. This provides support for the view that extra-role behaviours are related to attitudinal and motivational variables as perceiving support from outside of the organisation has been linked to higher levels of general wellbeing (Cohen & Wills, 1985), which may lead to an increase in extra-role behaviours.

Both job involvement and effort were positively associated with extra-role performance. This is an area that makes sense intuitively, but

lacks an empirical foundation. Given that job involvement is defined as the extent an individual psychologically identifies with their job it makes sense that the stronger that identification the more likely that individual is to engage in behaviours outside of their normal duties.

The *work-family balance* and *personal sacrifice* dimensions of organisational support, along with team leader support were positively related to intention to stay, indicating that the more supportive an individual perceives their team leader to be, the more likely they are to stay with the organisation. Given that intention to quit surfaces as the most consistent predictor of actual turnover (Maertz, Jr & Campion, 1998), these findings are very important.

Work-family balance and team leader support were also clear mediators of the relationship between use of FFIs and intention to stay. This indicates that using FFIs is not sufficient to make an employee want to stay, rather it is the support they get from their team leader and the organisation that will make the difference. Perceived organisational support and supervisor support have been positively linked with intent to stay in previous research findings (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

As predicted *work-family balance* and *personal sacrifice* support were both inversely related to psychological strain. No other sources of support, from within or outside the organisation, were related to psychological strain. These findings are somewhat difficult to explain and are contrary to previous research. Pulman (1998) for example, found evidence for a negative relationship between psychological strain and perceptions of supervisor support. Viswesvaran, Sanchez, and

Fisher (1999) found in a meta-analyses of 68 studies, that support from supervisors, co-workers, family and friends can mitigate psychological strain. One suggestion is that the types of support found to be related to psychological strain have something in common that offer a more relevant solution to an individuals level of strain. To ascertain this common factor would require further analysis that is beyond the scope of the current research. Given the negative consequences associated with strain such as reduced productivity, job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, and the high cost of stress related illnesses to both organisations and society (Thomas & Ganster, 1995), it is clearly important to be aware of what helps to reduce psychological strain.

As predicted the personal sacrifice dimension of organisational support was negatively associated with WIF. This measure represents the component of organisational support that allows employees to feel they don't have to transfer or accept promotions, that they don't have to work long hours, and nor do they have to take work home all the time. This is an extremely important finding. Previous studies looking at organisational support have not been specific about what is really important and the current study shows that it is time and sacrifice issues when it comes to mitigating this type of strain.

As expected higher levels of psychological job involvement and effort were related to increased levels of WIF strain. This relationship has been established in previous literature (Adams et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1992a), and indicates that while high levels of job involvement may be seen as a desirable factor due to the association with extra-role

performance, this has to be balanced with the finding that job involvement is also positively associated with WIF strain. Future research should therefore pay attention to the job involvement-WIF strain relationship and examine what factors may help reduce the positive relationship between the two.

Team leader support and organisational support for *negative consequences* and *personal sacrifices* were all negatively associated with FIW strain. This finding suggests that support in those particular areas may mitigate perceptions of family interfering with work because they can attend to family needs and feel supported by the organisation on a practical level. The lack of any relationship between *work-family balance* and FIW strain could be because mechanisms to reduce FIW need to be quite specific and so being supportive of the need to balance work and family is not sufficient

A surprising finding was the positive relationship between team member support and FIW. A possible explanation for the finding is that the more support one gets from one's team members the more likely they are to socialise with them and therefore any conflict between work and family may be perceived by the individual as family life interfering with work. Alternatively an individual having difficulties at home may turn to their workmates, who in providing support end up exacerbating the situation thereby increasing FIW strain.

As expected there was a negative association between family support and FIW strain, but not between partner support or friends support, and FIW strain. The relationship between family support and

FIW suggests that the support an individual receives from their family is more practical (e.g help with childcare). A positive association was found between support from friends and FIW. The explanation for this finding is similar to that posed for the relationship between team member support and FIW. That is, an individual having difficulties at home may turn to their friends, who in providing support end up exacerbating the situation thereby increasing FIW strain.

As expected family involvement was positively associated with FIW, suggested that the more an individual identifies psychologically with their family the more likely family life is to impinge on work life. The lack of any relationship between family effort and FIW is most likely to be a result of what the family effort measure tapped into. This measure was adapted for the current study and requires further research to ascertain where it fits into FFI research, if at all.

WFC and Other Outcomes

FIW strain was found to be inversely related to both in-role and extra-role performance. Both these findings suggest that FIW strain is an important factor to be considered and that clear ideas of how to reduce FIW strain are important if desirable performance outcomes are to be achieved. WIF on the other hand was positively associated with extra-role performance which while opposite to the direction one might expect, could be explained by the idea that an increase in extra-role performance will result in more time and energy being expended in the work domain thereby increasing the level of strain between work and

family (ref). WIF was also positively associated with psychological strain. This is important to note as it supports the view that WIF has negative consequences for the individual as well as the organisation.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The current study has a number of limitations which should be considered when interpreting the findings. Firstly since the design used in this study was correlational, causal relationships cannot be reliably established as they can in an experimental design. In addition, the cross-sectional nature of the study precludes any definitive assertions with regard to causality and direction. A cross sectional design may be also be confounded by lag effects. That is, if some of the sample have just started to use FFIs, while other respondents have been using them since their inception then different outcomes might ensue for the two groups, but those differences are more due to time delays. One way around the issues inherent in cross sectional studies is the use of a longitudinal design, however, these are extremely costly and time consuming, and have their own drawbacks due to difficulties in retaining participants and researchers.

Another limitation in the current study is that all the data were obtained from self-report by respondents. This type of data is subject to common method variance and response consistency effects. Caution must also be used when interpreting the findings as there were a large amount of variables included in the statistical analyses. This increases the risk of committing a type 1 error (concluding there is a difference

when there isn't), as the results may have been statistically significant by chance alone.

Finally, external validity must be considered. Being able to generalise the findings of a study is always an issue and in the present research it must be noted that the organisation sampled had a disproportionately large percentage of males in its employ. Also the findings can only be generalised to organisations that have similar FFIs in place and a high percentage of tertiary educated staff that work in a head office environment.

Summary of Findings

This study has contributed to the research on work and family issues in four main ways. First, perceived importance ratings of FFIs were obtained. Although there were no significant findings between the importance of FFIs and any of the outcome variables, the research did indicate FFIs are most important to women who have dependents. Second, the present research focused not only on the relationship between FFIs and WFC, but also examined pertinent work outcomes including performance and turnover intent. Third, a multidimensional measure of organisational support was included that provided some insight into what aspects of support are related to different outcomes. Fourth, social support from outside the organisation was measured which allowed an investigation into the relationships between sources of support outside the organisation and work outcomes.

One of the clearest implications from this piece of research, is that overall support from within the organisation is crucial. Whilst this may seem like common sense, the need for hard empirical evidence to validate such intuitive assumptions is paramount. Team leader support was significantly related to both extra-role performance and intention to leave suggesting that for organisations to get the most out of their employees they need to ensure that team leaders are adequately equipped to deal with employees needs, and that they “walk the talk”.

The *personal sacrifice* dimension of organisational support was also clearly related to WIF strain indicating that to avoid the negative outcomes associated with WIF strain attention needs to be paid to the hours employees work, the need of many employees to achieve a balance between work and family life, and the expectation that employees will relocate simply to ensure they either keep their job, or to obtain a promotion.

The finding that social support from outside the organisation was related to both in-role and extra-role performance is also noteworthy as it takes away the emphasis on making everything okay in the workplace and ignoring what is happening for workers outside the office.

It is also critical to note that overall use of FFIs made no difference to outcomes such as performance and WFC. This does not mean that FFIs are unimportant but does echo the sentiments of previous researchers that the FFIs are not a ‘fix’ for WFC, but should be part and parcel of the organisations overall repertoire when addressing work/family issues.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. A., & Jex, S. M. (1999). Relationships between time management, control, work-family conflict, and strain. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 72-77.
- Adams, G. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 411-420.
- Arvey, R. D., & Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 141-168.
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., & Stone, R. (1998). Family-responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents. *Human Relations, 51*, 73-87.
- Bacharach, S., & Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 39-53.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mould: Women, men, and time in the new corporate world*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bankert, E., & Googins, B. (1996). Family-friendly—says who? *Across the Board, 33*, 45-49.
- Barnett, R. C. (1998). Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 124*, 125-182.

Barnett, R. C., & Brennan, R. T. (1995). The relationship between job experiences and psychological distress: A structural equation approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 259-276.

Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.

Beehr, T. A., & Drexler, J.A. (1986). Social support, autonomy, and hierarchical level as moderators of the role characteristics-outcome relationship. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7*, 207-214.

Borman, W. C., Hanson, M. A., & Hedge, J. W. (1997). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 299-337.

Borman, W. C., & Motowildo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*, 99-109.

Borman, W. C., White, L. A, & Dorsey, D. W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 168-177.

Bowen, G. L. (1988). Corporate supports for the family lives of employees: A conceptual model for program planning and evaluation. *Family Relations, 37*, 183-188.

Brett, J. M., Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1992). What is it like being a dual-career manager in the 1990's? In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 138-167). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

- Brief, A. P., & Motowildo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710-725.
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 358-368.
- Callister, P. (1996). 'Family-friendly' workplaces: Why do we need them and who potentially benefits? *New Zealand Sociology, 11*, 183-222.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams L. J. (1999). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 249-276.
- Cartwright, S., Cooper, C. L., & Murphy, L. R. (1995). Diagnosing a healthy organization: a proactive approach to stress in the workplace. In L. R. Murphy, J. J. Hurrell, S. L. Sauter, & G. P. Keita (Eds.) *Job stress interventions* (pp.217-233).
- Cascio, W. F. (1991). *Applied psychology in personnel management*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Neal, M. B. (1994). Balancing the multiple roles of work and caregiving for children, adults and elders. In G. Keita and J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity and family issues* (pp. 283-299). Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.
- Christensen, K. E., & Staines, G. L. (1990). Flextime: A viable solution to work/family conflict? *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 455-476.

- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic medicine, 38*, 300-314.
- Cohen, A. (1997). Nonwork influences on withdrawal cognitions: An empirical examination of an overlooked issue. *Human Relations, 50*, 1511-1536.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*, 310-357.
- Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 3-13.
- Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984). Stress and strain from family roles and work-role expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 252-260.
- Cotton, P. (1996). The prevention and management of psychological dysfunction in occupational settings. In P. Cotton and H. Jackson (Eds.), *Early intervention & prevention in mental health*, (pp. 247-282). Victoria, Australia: Australian Psychological Society Ltd.
- Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations, 37*, 425-442.
- Draper, N. R., & Smith, H. (1998). *Applied regression analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Dunham, R. B., Pierce, J. L., & Castenada, M. B. (1987). Alternative work schedules: Two field quasi-experiments. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 215-242.
- Department of Statistics (1996) *House and families*. Wellington: Author.

Dex, S., & Scheibl, F. (1999). Business performance and family friendly policies. *Journal of General Management*, 24, 22-37.

Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15, 449-466.

Eagle, B. W., Icenogle, M. L., Maes, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1998). The importance of employee demographic profiles for understanding experiences of work-family interrole conflicts. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 690-709.

Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., & Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Interrole conflicts and the permeability of the work and family domains: Are there gender differences? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 168-184.

Edwards, J. R. & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 85-129.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.

Evans, P., & Bartolome, F. (1984). The changing pictures of the relationship between career and family. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 5, 9-21.

Fallon, B. J. (1997). The balance between paid work and home responsibilities: Personal problem or corporate concern. *Australian Psychologist*, 32, 1-9.

Fox, M. L., & Dwyer, D. J. (1999). An investigation of the effects of time and involvement in the relationship between stressors and work-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 164-174.

Frankel, M. (1998). Creating the family friendship workplace: Barriers to solutions. In S. Klarreich (Ed), *Handbook of organizational health psychology: Programs to make the workplace healthier* (pp. 79-100). Madison, CT: Psychosocial Press.

Friedman, D. E., & Johnson, A. A. (1997). Moving from programs to culture change: The next stage for the corporate work-family agenda. In S. Parasuraman and J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 192-208). Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.

Friedman, D. E., & Galinsky, E. (1992). Work and family issues a legitimate business concern. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 168-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Frone, M. R., & Rice, R. W. (1987). Work-family conflict: the effect of job and family involvement. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 8, 45-53.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Barnes, G. M. (1996). Work-family conflict, gender, and health-related outcomes: A study of employed parents in two community samples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 57-69.

- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1991). Relationship of work and family stressors to psychological distress: The independent moderating influence of social support, mastery, active coping, and self-focused attention. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6*, 227-250.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992a). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 65-78.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992b). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 723-729.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1994). Relationship between job and family satisfaction: Causal or noncausal covariation? *Journal of Management, 20*, 565-579.
- Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69*, 351-366.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145-167.
- Furnham, A., Jackson, C. J., & Miller, T. (1999). Personality, learning style and work performance. *Personality & Individual Differences, 27*, 1113-1122.

Fusilier, M. R., Ganster, D. C., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). The social support and health relationship: Is there a gender difference? *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 145-153.

Galen, M. (1993). Work and family. *Business Week, June 28*, 81-88.

Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 368-383.

Ganster, D. C., Fusilier, M. R., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). Role of social support in the experience of stress at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 101-110.

Geller, P. A., & Hobfoll, S. E. (1994). Gender differences in job stress, tedium and social support in the workplace. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 11*, 555-572.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good, doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work/organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 310-329.

Geurts, S., Rutte, C., & Peeters, M. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of work-home interference among medical residents. *Social Science & Medicine, 48*, 1135-1148.

Ginn, J., & Sandell, J. (1997). Balancing home and employment: Stress reported by social services staff. *Work, Employment & Society, 11*, 413-434.

Glass, J., & Fujimoto, T. (1995). Employer characteristics and the provision of family responsive policies. *Work and Occupations, 22*, 380-411.

- Glass, J., & Riley, L. (1998). Family responsive policies and employee retention following childbirth. *Social Forces*, 76, 1401-1435.
- Glass, J. L. & Estes, S. B. (1997). The family responsive workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 289-313.
- Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K., & Jamison, R. L. (1990). Employer supported childcare, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: a field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 793-809.
- Goldberg, D. P., & Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine*, 9, 139-145.
- Goldberg, D., & Williams, P. (1988). *A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire*. Berkshire: The NFER-NELSON Publishing Company Ltd.
- Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.
- Goodman, S. A., and Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person-organisation fit and contextual performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 254-275.
- Goodstein, J. D. (1994). Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: Employer involvement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 350-382.
- Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 350-370.
- Greenberger, E., & O'Neil, R. (1993). Spouse, parent, worker: Role commitments and role-related experiences in the construction of adults wellbeing. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 181-197.

Greenberger, E., Goldberg, W. A., Hamill, S., O'Neil, R., & Payne, C. K. (1989). Contributions of a supportive work environment to parents' well-being and orientation to work. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17*, 755-783.

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*, 200-215.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., Singh, R., & Parasuraman, S. (1997). Work and family influences on departure from public accounting. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 249-270.

Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 271-288.

Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 560-568.

Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 617-626.

Haas, L., & Hwang, P. (1995). Company culture and men's usage of family leave benefits in Sweden. *Family Relations, 44*, 28-36.

- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler III, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*, 259-286.
- Hall, D. T. (1990). Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach. *Organization Dynamics, 18*, 4-18.
- Hall, D. T., & Parker, V. A. (1993). The role of workplace flexibility in managing diversity. *Organizational Dynamics, Summer*, 5-18.
- Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 185-203.
- Hansen, G. L. (1991). Balancing work and family: A literature and resource review. *Family Relations, 40*, 348-353.
- Harker, L. (1995). Towards the family-friendly employer. In J. Shaw and D. Perrons (Eds.), *Making gender work: Managing equal opportunities*, (pp. 89-107). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Harrick, E. J., Vanek, G. R., & Michlitsch, J. F. (1986). Alternate work schedules, productivity, leave usage, and employee attitudes: A field study. *Public Personnel Management, 15*, 159-169.
- Hart, P. M. (1999). Predicting employee life satisfaction: a coherent model of personality, work and nonwork experiences, and domain satisfactions. *Journal of Applied psychology, 84*, 564-584.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Lee, C. (1994). Impact of life-cycle stage and gender on the ability to balance work and family responsibilities. *Family Relations, 43*, 144-150.

Higgins, C. A., & Duxbury, L. E. (1992). Work-family conflict: a comparison of dual-career and traditional-career men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 389-411.

Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., & Irving, R. H. (1992). Work-family conflict in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 51*, 51-75.

Hochschild, A. R. (1997). When work becomes home and home becomes work. *California Management Review, 39*, 79-97.

Hoffman, C. C., Nathan, B. R., & Holden, L. M. A comparison of validation criteria: Objective versus subjective performance measures and self-versus supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 601-619.

Honeycutt, T. L., & Rosen, B. (1997). Family friendly human resource policies, salary levels, and salient identity as predictors of organizational attraction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 271-290.

House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub Co.

Hudek-Knezevic, J., & Kardum, I. (1996). A model of coping with conflicts between occupational and family roles: Structural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Individual Difference, 21*, 355-372.

Hui, C., Law, K. S., and Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77*, 3-21.

- Ilgen, D. R. (1990). Health issues at work: Opportunities for industrial/organizational psychology. *American Psychologist*, 45, 273-283.
- Johnson, A. A. (1995). The business case for work-family programs. *Journal of Accountancy*, 180, 53-58.
- Joplin, J. R. W., Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1999). Attachment behavior and health: Relationships at work and home. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 783-796.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., and Bretz, Jr. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 767-782.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982a). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982b). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 341-349.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karambayya, R., & Reilly, A. H. (1992). Dual earner couples: Attitudes and actions in restructuring work for family. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 585-601.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.

- Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 539-545.
- King, L. A., Mattimore, L. K., King, D. W., & Adams, G. A. (1995). Family support inventory for workers: A new measure of perceived social support from family members. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 235-258.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1993). Nonwork-to-work spillover: A more balanced view of the experiences and coping of professional women and men. *Sex Roles, 28*, 531-552.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assessment of organizational responses. *Human Relations, 48*, 515-536.
- Kirchmeyer, C., & Cohen, A. (1999). Different strategies for managing the work/non-work interface: A test for unique pathways to work outcomes. *Work & Stress, 13*, 59-73.
- Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: a construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*, 198-215.
- Kossek, E. E., & Nichol, V. (1992). The effects of on-site childcare on employee attitudes and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 485-509.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: a review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 139-149.
- Kossek, E. E., and Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work-family policy and productivity gap: A literature review. *Community, Work and Family, 2*, 7-32.

- Kossek, E. E., Dass, P., & DeMarr, B. (1994). The dominant logic of employer-sponsored work and family initiatives: human resource manager's institutional role. *Human Relations, 47*, 1121-1149.
- Lambert, S. (1990). Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations, 43*, 239-257.
- Lawler III, E. E., & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*, 305-312.
- Lawlor, J. (1996). The bottom line on work-family programs. *Working Woman, 21*, 54-58.
- Lee, C. M., & Duxbury, L. (1998). Employed parents' support from partners, employers, and friends. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 138*, 303-322.
- Leiter, M. P., & Durup, M. J. (1996). Work, home and in-between: A longitudinal study of spillover. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32*, 29-47.
- Lewis, S. (1997). 'Family friendly' employment policies: A route to changing organizational culture or playing about at the margins. *Gender, Work and Organization, 4*, 13-23.
- Lewis, S., & Lewis, J. (1997). Work, family and well-being: Can the law help? *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 2*, 155-167.
- Lightsey, O.W. Jr. (1996). What leads to wellness? The role of psychological resources in well-being. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*, 589-735.

Lobel, S. (1991). Allocation of investment in work and family roles: Alternative theories and implications for research. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 507-521.

Lobel, S. A., & St Clair, L. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender, and career identity salience on performance outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 1057-1069.

Lobel, S. A., Googins, B. K., and Bankert, E. (1999). The future of work and family: critical trends for policy, practice, and research. *Human Resource Management, 38*, 243-254.

Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 49*, 24-33.

Loerch, K. J., Russell, J. E. A., & Rush, M. C. (1989). The relationships among family domain variables and work-family conflict for men and women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35*, 288-308.

Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 616-628.

Lynch, P. D., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (1999). Perceived organizational support: inferior versus superior performance by wary employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 467-483.

MacEwen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1994). Daily consequences of work interference with family and family interference with work. *Work and Stress, 8*, 244-254.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 87-98.

Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (1998). 25 years of voluntary turnover research: A review and critique. In C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology: Vol.12* (pp. 115-173).

Manning, M. R., Jackson, C. N., & Fusilier, M. R. (1996). Occupational stress, social support, and the costs of health care. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 738-750.

Marks, N. F. (1998). Does it hurt to care? Caregiving, work-family conflict, and midlife well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 951-966.

Marshall, N. L., & Barnett, R. C. (1994). Family-friendly workplaces, work-family interface and worker health. In G. Puryear Keita and J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity and family issues* (pp. 253-264). Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.

Martinez, M. N. (1993). Family support makes business sense. *HR Magazine*, 38, 38-43.

Mathieu, J. E., & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 127-133.

Matsui, T., Ohsawa, T., & Onglatco, M. (1995). Work-family conflict and the stress-buffering effects of husband support and coping behavior among Japanese married working women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47*, 178-192.

McAulay, F. E. (1999). *Employee perceptions of support for family friendly initiatives in the workplace*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Massey University.

McBey, K. (1996). Exploring the role of individual job performance within a multivariate investigation into part-time turnover processes. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 223-233.

McCloy, R. A., Campbell, J. P., & Cudeck, R. (1994). A confirmatory test of a model of performance determinants. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 493-505.

McHenry, J. J., Hough, L. M., & Toquam, J. L., Hanson, M. A., Ashworth, S. (1990). Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 335-354.

McIntosh, N. J. (1991). Identification and investigation of properties of social support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 201-217.

Miller, R. L., Griffen, M. A., & Hart, P. M. (1999). Personality and organizational health: The role of conscientiousness. *Work & Stress, 13*, 7-19.

Milliken, F. J., Martins, L. L., & Morgan, H. (1998). Explaining organizational responsiveness to work-family issues: The role of human resource executives as issue interpreters. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 580-592.

Ministry of Women's Affairs, New Zealand Employers' Federation, & Equal Employment Opportunities Trust (1995). *Work and family directions: What New Zealand champions are doing*. Wellington: Ministry of Women's Affairs.

Moore, T. (1996). Work and family - a balancing act. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 34, 119-125.

Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.

Motowildo, S. J. (1982). Relationship between self-rated performance and pay satisfaction among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 209-213.

Motowildo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475-480.

Napoli, J. (1994). *Work and family responsibilities*. Sydney: CCH Australia Limited.

Near, J. P., Rice, R. W., & Hunt, R. G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: a review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 415-429.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1991). Social support and newcomer adjustment in organizations: attachment theory at work? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 543-554.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 400-410.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Daniell, E. E. (1999). Energizing corporate culture and creating competitive advantage: a new look at workforce programs. *Benefits Quarterly, 15*, 18-25.

O'Driscoll, M. P., & Beehr, T. A. (1994). Supervisor behaviors, role stressors and uncertainty as predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 141-155.

O'Driscoll, M. P., Ilgen, D. R., & Hildreth, K. (1992). Time devoted to job and off-job activities, interrole conflict, and affective experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 272-279.

O'Hare, M. (1997). Managing work-family tensions: a counseling perspective. In S. Parasuraman and J.H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 57-68). Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.

Organ, D.W. (1977). Inferences about trends in labor force satisfaction: A causal-correlational analysis. *Academy of Management Journal, 20*, 510-519.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85-97.

Organ, D. W., and Paine, J. B. (1999). A new kind of performance for industrial and organizational psychology: recent contributions to the study of organizational citizenship behavior. Edited by *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 14*, 337-368.

Organ, D., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.

Osterman, P. (1995). Work/family programs and the employment relationship. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 681-700.

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1997). The changing world of work and family. In S. Parasuraman and J. H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 3-14). Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Granrose, C. S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and well-being among two-career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 339-356.

Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., Godshalk, V. M., & Beutell, N. J. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 275-300.

Paullay, I. M., Alliger, G. M., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 224-228.

Perlow, A. (1998). Boundary control: The social ordering of work and family time in a high-tech corporation. *Administrative Quarterly*, 43, 328-357.

Perlow, L. A. (1995). Putting the work back into work/family. *Group & Organization Management*, 20, 227-239.

Perrin, K. M., & McDermott, R. J. (1997). Instruments to measure social support and related constructs in pregnant adolescents: a review. *Adolescence*, 12, 533-557.

Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom, J. W. (1983). The design of flexible work schedules and employee responses: Relationships and process. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4, 247-262.

Piotrkowski, C. S., Rapoport, R. N., & Rapoport, R. (1987). Families and work. In M. B. Sussman and S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family*, (pp.251-283). New York: Plenum Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1977). The work-family role system. *Social Problems*, 24, 417-427.

Pleck, J. H. (1993). Are "family-supportive" policies relevant to men? In J. C. Hood (Ed), *Men, work, and family* (pp 217-237). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pleck, J. H., Staines, G. L., & Lang, L. (1980). Conflicts between work and family life. *Monthly Labor Review*, 103, 29-32.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 351-363.

- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., and MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262-270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 380-399.
- Pond, S. B. III., Nacoste, R. W., Mohr, M. F., & Rodriguez, C. M. (1997). The measurement of organizational citizenship behavior: Are we assuming too much? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 1527-1544.
- Poole, M. E., & Langan-Fox, J. (1997). *Australian women and careers: Psychological and contextual influences over the life course*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Power, M. J., Champion, L. A., & Aris, S. J. (1988). The development of a measure of social support: The significant others (SOS) scale. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27*, 349-358.
- Pulman, J. A. J. (1998). *Correlates of family supportive elements and employee variables*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Waikato University.
- Procidano, M. E., & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and family: three validation studies. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 11*, 1-24.
- Quick, J. C. (1999). Occupational health psychology: The convergence of health and clinical psychology with public health and preventive medicine in an

organizational context. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 30, 123-128.

Raabe, P. H. (1990) The organisational effects of workplace family policies. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 477-491.

Raabe, P. H., & Gessner, J. C. (1988). Employer family-supportive policies: Diverse variations on the theme. *Family Relations*, 37, 196-202.

Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin* 84, 265-288.

Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., and Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 159-174.

Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support, home/work stress and burnout: who can help? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 30, 357-373.

Reifman, A., Biernat, M., & Lang, E. L. (1991). Stress, social support, and health in married professional women with small children. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 431-445.

Rice, R. W., Frone, M. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1992). Work-nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 155-168.

Riipinen, M. (1997). The relationship between job involvement and well-being. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131, 81-89.

Rodgers, C. S. (1993). The flexible workplace: What have we learned? *Human Resource Management*, 31, 183-199.

- Rodgers, F. S., & Rodgers, C. (1989). Business and the facts of family life. *Harvard Business Review, 67*, 121-129.
- Rodwell, J. J., Kienzle, R., & Shadur, M. A. (1998). The relationships among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee performance: the integral role of communication. *Human Resource Management, 37*, 277-293.
- Rosenbaum, M., & Cohen, E. (1999). Equalitarian marriages, spousal support, resourcefulness, and psychological distress among Israeli working women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 102-113.
- Rothausen, T. J. (1994). Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 317-336.
- Rothausen, T. J. (1999). 'Family' in organizational research: A review and comparison of definitions and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 817-836.
- Rothausen, T. J., Gonzalez, J. A., Clarke, N. E., & O'Dell, L. L. (1998). Family-friendly backlash—fact or fiction? The case of organizations' on-site childcare centers. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 685-706.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 719-727.
- Sager, J. K., Griffeth, R. W., & Hom, P. W. (1998). A comparison of structural models of representing turnover cognitions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 53*, 254-273.
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The social support questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 127-139.

Sarason, B. R., Sarason, I. G., & Pierce, G. R. (1990). Traditional views of social support and their impact on assessment. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.) *Social support: An interactional view*, (pp. 9-25). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schein, V. E. (1993). The work/family interface: Challenging the corporate convenient. *Women in Management Review*, 8, 22-27.

Scott, M. B. (1996). Work/life programs encompass broad range of benefit offerings. *Employee Benefit Plan Review*, 51, 26-27.

Sekaran, U. (1985). The paths to mental health: an exploratory study of husbands and wives in dual-career families. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 129-137.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.

Sherbourne, C. D., & Stewart, A. L. (1991). The MOS social support survey. *Social Science Medicine*, 32, 705-714.

Shinn, M., Wong, N. W., Simko, P. A., & Ortiz-Torres, B. (1989). Promoting the well-being of working parents: Coping, social support, and flexible job schedules. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17, 31-55.

Shumaker, S. A., & Brownell, A. (1984). Toward a theory of social support: Closing conceptual gaps. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40, 11-36.

- Smith, A. (1996). Would the real 'family-friendly' workplace please stand up? *Management, March*, 91.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Staines, G. L (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations*, 33, 111-129.
- Stephens, G. K. & Feldman, D. C.(1997). A motivational approach for understanding career versus personal life investments. *Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 333-377.
- Stephens, G. K., & Sommer, S. M. (1996). The measurement of work to family conflict. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 475-486.
- Sullivan, S. E., & Bhagat, R. S. (1992). Organizational stress, job satisfaction and job performance: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 18, 353-374.
- Swiss, D. J. (1998). Good worker or good parent: The conflict between policy and practice. In M. G. Mackavey and R. J. Levin (Eds.), *Shared purpose: Working together to build strong families and high-performance companies*, (pp. 87-104). New York: AMACOM.
- Tharenou, P. (1986). Moderating influence of defensiveness on the relationship between self-esteem and job performance. *Psychological Reports*, 58, 403-409.

Thomas, T. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 6-15.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (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*, 392-415.

Thompson, C. A., & Blau, G. (1993). Moving beyond traditional predictors of job involvement: Exploring the impact of work-family conflict and overload. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8*, 635-646.

Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (1998). *Crafting and implementing strategy*. Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Thompson, C. A., Thomas, C. C., & Maier, M. (1996). Work-family conflict: reassessing corporate policies and initiatives. In U. Sekaran and F.T.L. Leong (Eds.), *Womanpower: Managing in times of demographic turbulence*, 59-84.

Tompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management, 23*, 583-601.

Tudhope, J. L. (1994). *'Family friendly' policies: an alleged panacea*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Auckland.

Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does

investment in employees pay off? *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1089-1121.

Uchino, B. N., Cacioppo, J. T., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (1996). The relationship between social support and physiological processes: A review with emphasis on underlying mechanisms and implications for health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 488-531.

Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The job-demand-control (-support) model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress*, 13, 87-114.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (abridge over muddied waters). In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, (pp. 215-330). Greenwich, Connecticut: Jai Press Inc.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.

Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowildo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525-531.

Vaux, A., Phillips, J., Holly, L., Thomson, B., Williams, D., & Stewart, D. (1986). The social support appraisals (SS-A) scale: Studies of reliability and validity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14, 195-219.

Veiel, H. O. F., & Baumann, U. (1992). The many meanings of social support. In H.O.F. Veiel and U. Baumann (Eds.), *The meaning and measurement of social support*, (1-7).

Verespej, M. (1999). Work vs life. *Industry Week*, 248, 37-42.

Verespej, M. A. (1992). Face time's importance fading away. *Industry Week*, 241, 12-18.

Vest, M. J., Scott, K. D., & Markham, S. E. (1994). Self-rated performance and pay satisfaction, merit increase satisfaction, and instrumentality beliefs in a merit pay environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 9, 171-181.

Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, F. (1999). The role of social support in the process of work stress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 314-334.

Wallace J. E. (1999). Work-to-nonwork conflict among married male and female lawyers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 797-816.

Wallace, J. E. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 227-248.

Warren, J. A., & Johnson, P. J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. *Family Relations*, 44, 163-169.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect : The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

- Werner, J. M. (1994). Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 98-107.
- Wiersma, U. J. (1990). Gender differences in job attribute preferences: work-home role conflict and job level as mediating variables. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 231-243.
- Wiersma, U. J., & Van den Berg, P. (1991). Work-home role conflict, family climate, and domestic responsibilities among men and women dual-earner families. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1207-1217.
- Wiley, M. G. (1991). Gender, work, and stress: The potential impact of role-identity salience and commitment. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 32, 495-510.
- Williams, K. & Alliger, G. M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 837-868.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17 (3), 601-617.
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 486-493.
- Yogev, S., & Brett, J. (1985). Patterns of work and family involvement among single and dual-earner couples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 754-768.

Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families, and organizations* (pp. 1-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Zedeck, S., & Mosier, K. L. (1990). Work in the family and employing organization. *American Psychologist*, 45, 240-251.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Information Sheet

Instruction Sheet

Work and Family Questionnaire

INFORMATION SHEET

My name is Jenny Pianina and I am currently studying for a Masters degree in Organisational Psychology at Massey University, Albany. My research topic is based on the use and importance of family friendly initiatives in the workplace.

Integrating work and family, and recognising the conflicts employees' face, is crucial for both individual and organisational health. Implementing family friendly practices provides a way of meeting employees' needs and improving organisational effectiveness.

The primary aim of this research project is to examine the impact of family-friendly practices on both individual wellbeing and work outcomes, such as performance. Specifically there will be a focus on factors that influence the impact of family-friendly practices so that organisations can be aware of what else they must take into account if the potential benefits of such practices are to be realised.

Your organisation has many family-friendly practices, so I invite you to participate in this research by taking approximately 20 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. Consent to participate is deemed to be given upon return of a completed questionnaire. The rights of participants are as follows:

- any participation is entirely voluntary, and therefore prospective participants may decline to participate
- anonymity and confidentiality are assured as no identifying information will be obtained, and a stamped addressed envelope is provided with the questionnaire.
- participants have the right not to answer any particular question.
- a summary report of the research findings will be given to participating organisations, and made available to all those who are interested.

The information gathered will be used for my Master's thesis and the findings will be published in the appropriate forums. The completed questionnaires will be stored securely at the researcher's home until the thesis is complete, at which time they will be destroyed.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact either myself, or my supervisor, on the numbers listed below:

Jenny Pianina (09) 828-1592 E-mail: jennypia@ihug.co.nz

Dr Hillary Bennett (09) 443-9799 ext 9864 E-mail: H.F.Bennett@massey.ac.nz

Thank you for your time.

A study on the impact of family friendly practices on work performance and general wellbeing

Instructions

Thank you for participating in this voluntary study. The following questionnaire has five sections. It is estimated that it will take between 20 and 30 minutes to complete.

There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly and state your opinions as accurately as possible. Please remember you have the right not to answer any particular question.

Upon completion please return the questionnaire in the self addressed envelope provided. The deadline for returning completed questionnaires is the **15th June 2000**. You have the right to withdraw from this study at any point, until the questionnaire has been returned to the researcher.

This is an anonymous questionnaire and responses cannot be traced. Please do **not** put your name on the questionnaire. All information will remain confidential.

Thank you for your time and participation

Section One: Family Friendly Practices

In this section we would like you to answer some questions relating to family friendly initiatives and your organisation.

1. The following list details a number of family friendly initiatives offered by your organisation. Please indicate whether you currently use, or have used, any of the policies/services by putting a tick on the *left hand* side of the item. Please also indicate how important you believe EACH initiative to be, REGARDLESS of use, by ticking *one* of the three columns on the *right hand* side

USE		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
	Part-time work			
	Flexible hours			
	Job sharing			
	Work from home			
	Compressed work week (e.g 4 x 10 hour days)			
	Staggered return from parental leave			
	4 th week annual leave			
	Buyable leave			
	Leave cash up			
	Paid parental leave			
	Special leave for exceptional personal needs			
	Unpaid leave			
	Family room at work			
	Parent centre membership – for all new parents			
	Parents newsletter			
	Parents magazine distribution list			
	Phone available for family contact			
	Family social activities			
	Meetings held in core hours			
	Training held within core hours			

2. Were you aware that all of the options/services listed in question 1 are offered by your organisation?

Yes

No

3. Do you feel free to use the options/services listed in question 14? (If you tick no please specify why).

Yes

No, (Please specify why _____)

Section One: Family Friendly Practices (Continued)

4. How would you rate the communication of family friendly practices in your organisation? (Please tick one of the boxes below).

Very Poor Poor Don't know Good Very Good

□ □ □ . □ □

Section Two: Work Life

In this section we would like you to answer some questions that relate to both your job and the organisation you work for.

5. The following statements are about what your job means to you. Please tick the box that most accurately describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Section Two: Work Life (Continued)

6. The following statements are concerned with the culture of your organisation. Please tick the box that most accurately describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Section Two: Work Life (Continued)

7. The following statements relate to the support you receive from your team leader and your team members. For *each* item please give a rating (per the scale below) for your team leader, and *one* rating for your team.

1=never; 2=not very often; 3=sometimes; 4=often; 5=very often; 6=all the time	Team leader	Team members
To what extent can you trust and share personal feelings		
To what extent can you get emotional support, in times of difficulty		
To what extent can you discuss your personal life		
To what extent can you get interest, reassurance, and good feelings		
To what extent can you get practical help with regard to work responsibilities		
To what extent can you get suggestions, advice, feedback		
To what extent can you get practical help in times of difficulty		
To what extent can you spend social/enjoyable time		

Section Two: Work Life (Continued)

8. The following statements are concerned with the way you work. Please tick the box that most accurately describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

9. The following statements concern your intentions to stay with xxxx. Please tick the box that most accurately describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree		

Section Three: Personal Life

This section contains questions that relate to your personal and family life.

- 10. The following statements are about what your family means to you Please tick the box that most accurately describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.**

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
I am very much personally involved with my family.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To me, my family is only a small part of who I am.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Most of my personal life goals are family oriented.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My family is central to my existence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Most of my interests are centered around my family.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When there are family activities on, I devote all my energy to them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When in my family role, I devote all my energy to family activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I strive as hard as I can to be successful in my family role.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I spend time with my family, I do so with intensity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 11. The following statements relate to the support you receive from your partner/family/friends. For each item please put a rating from 1 to 6 (see below)**

1=never; 2=not very often; 3=sometimes; 4=often; 5=very often; 6=all the time	Spouse/ Partner	Family	Friends
To what extent can you trust and share personal feelings			
To what extent can you get emotional support, in times of difficulty			
To what extent can you discuss your worklife			
To what extent can you get interest, reassurance, and good feelings			
To what extent can you get practical help with regard to family responsibilities (e.g. household tasks, dependent care)			
To what extent can you get suggestions, advice, feedback			
To what extent can you spend social/enjoyable time			
To what extent can you get practical help in times of difficulty			

Section Four: Personal Life (Continued)

- 12. The following statements are concerned with your general wellbeing. Please tick the box for the response that you think is most applicable to you.**

	Not at all	No more than usual	Rather more than usual	Much more than usual
Lost much sleep over worry?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had difficulty in staying asleep once you are off?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Felt constantly under strain?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been getting edgy and bad-tempered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been getting scared and panicky for no reason?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Found everything getting on top of you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been feeling nervous and strung up all the time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been managing to keep yourself busy and occupied?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been taking longer over the things you do?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Felt on the whole you were doing things well?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been satisfied with the way you've carried out your task?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Felt capable of making decisions about things?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section Four: Work and Family Interaction

13. The following statements relate to the interaction between your work and family life. Please tick the box for the response that you think is most applicable to you.

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very often
After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to do.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
On the job I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My work takes up time that I'd like to spend with my family/friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My job or career interferes with my responsibilities at home, such as childcare and housework.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My job or career keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend with my family.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I'm too tired at work because of the things I have to do at home.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My personal demands are so great that it takes away from my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My team leader and team members dislike how often I am preoccupied with my personal life while at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My personal life takes up time that I'd like to spend at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work, such as getting to work on time, managing daily tasks, working overtime.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
My home life keeps me from spending the amount of time I would like to spend on job or career related activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Section Five: Demographic Information

In this section we would like you to answer some questions regarding your background, work life, and family situation. Please tick the box next to the most appropriate answer.

14. Age

- Under 20 20-29 30-39
 40-49 50 and over

15. Gender

- Male Female

16. Which ethnic group do you identify with?

- European/Pakeha Maori Pacific Island
 Asian Other- Please specify _____

17. What is your highest educational level?

- Secondary Tertiary
 Other – Please specify _____

18. How long have you been employed with this organisation?

Years _____ Months _____

19. What is your employment status?

- Full-time Part-time (30 hours, or less, per week)
 Contractor Other –Please specify _____

20. How many hours *on average* do you work in a week? _____

Demographic Information (Continued).

21. What is your current position?

Team member Team Leader

Other –Please specify _____

22. Marital Status

Single Married De-facto Widowed

23. Dependents

None

Preschool age If yes, how many? _____

School age If yes, how many? _____

Other – Please specify _____
(e.g. Eldercare)

24. Please estimate how many hours you would spend each week, *on average*, on:

Household tasks _____ Family Activities _____ Caring for dependents _____

25. If you have a live-in partner please indicate their employment status.

Full-time Part-time (30 hours, or less, per week)

Contractor Other –Please specify_____

Thank you for your time

APPENDIX B

Cohen and Cohen's (1983, p. 56) test for differences between two **independent** unstandardized regression slopes.

$$t = \frac{B_E - B_F}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum(Y_E - \hat{Y}_E)^2 - \sum(Y_F - \hat{Y}_F)^2}{n_E + n_F - 4} \times \frac{\sum X_E^2 + \sum X_F^2}{\sum X_E^2 \bullet \sum X_F^2}}}$$