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.

Family Friendly Workplaces, the Work/Family Interface and their Relation to Work Outcomes among Working Parents.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Psychology at Massey University.

Annemarie Stanley

1999

ABSTRACT

Work/family conflict, family/work conflict, satisfaction with child care, the positive outcomes from combining work and family roles and social support were investigated as potential moderators and mediators between the two independent variables of family friendly policies and supervisor support and the dependent variables of job satisfaction, membership behaviours, organisational commitment and general health. Two models were devised to examine these relationships. A work/family questionnaire was distributed through nine New Zealand organisations, which were selected from the list of work/family network members. There were 121 complete questionnaires returned (giving a response rate of 29%) from working parents who had at least one child under the age of 18 years living at home. Work/family conflict and family/work conflict were found to be positively correlated however they were also found to be associated with unique antecedents and outcomes providing support for their independence as separate constructs. Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were utilised to examine the relationships between potential mediators and moderators, the independent variables of organisation policy and supervisor support and several outcomes. Three significant moderated relationships were identified with respect to the outcome of "intention to leave". There are several conclusions to be drawn from this study regarding the importance of supervisor support, the distinction between work/family conflict and family/work conflict and the different needs of working parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr Ross Flett, whose guidance and expertise provided valuable insights, which were crucial to the completion of this thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge the support and encouragement of my family and my partner Daniel, without which the completion of this thesis would have been impossible.

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this to my grandfather Charlie Stanley who passed away during the completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract			ii
Acknowledgements			iii
Dedication			iv
Table of Contents			v
List of Tables			vii
List of Figure	S		x
CHAPTER C	NE: I	NTRODUCTION	
1.1	Introdu	uction	1
1.2	Work-	family conflict	2
	1.2.1	Bidirectional nature of work/family conflict	2
	1.2.1.2	2 Summary of bidirectional nature of work/family conflict	4
	1.2.2	Strains versus gains	5
	1.2.3.2	2 Summary of strains versus gains	7
1.3	Family	y Friendly Policies	8
	1.3.1	Leave policies	9
	1.3.2	Flexible work arrangements	13
	1.3.3	Child care	17
	1.3.4	Organisational practices and culture	21
	1.3.5	Summary of family friendly policies	22
1.4	Suppo	rt	22
	1.4.1	Supervisor support	22
	1.4.1.2	2 Summary of supervisor support	23
	1.4.2	Social support from family and friends	24
	1.4.2.2	2 Summary of social support from family and friends	26
1.5	Work-	related outcomes	26
	1.5.1	Job satisfaction	26
	1.5.1.2	2 Summary of job satisfaction	28

		1.5.2	Ability to recruit and retain	28
		1.5.2.2	Summary of ability of recruit and retain	30
		1.5.3	Organisational commitment	30
		1.5.3.2	Summary of organisational commitment	32
		1.5.4	Absenteeism	32
		1.5.4.2	Summary of absenteeism	33
	1.6	Genera	l health	33
	1.6.2 Summary of health			34
	1.7	Gender		34
	1.7.2 S	Summary of gender		36
	1.8	Researc	ch Goals	36
		1.8.1	Model development	37
		1.8.2	Hypotheses	39
CHAPTER TWO: METHOD 40				40
	2.1	Sample		40
	2.2	Sample	mple Description 4	
	2.3	Procedure/Research design		
	2.4	Measures		44
		2.4.1	Background information	44
		2.4.2	Family friendly policies and practices within organisation	45
		2.4.3	Work-family balance	47
		2.4.4	Satisfaction with child care	48
		2.4.5	Positive outcomes of managing work and family	48
		2.4.6	Supervisor support	49
		2.4.7	Organisational commitment	49
		2.4.8	Organisational membership	50
		2.4.9	Absenteeism	50
		2.4.10	General health	51
		2.4.11	Social support	51
		2.4.12	Job satisfaction	52

2.5	Data preparation		53
CHAPTER T	HRFF.	RESULTS	
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS 3.1 Descriptive Statistics			55
3.2	Descriptive Statistics		66
3.2	Inferential Statistics		67
	3.2.1	testing for mediated relationships	
	3.2.2	testing for moderated relationships.	73
CHAPTER F	OUR : 1	DISCUSSION	
4.1			80
4.2		retation of findings	82
4.3	Limita	and the same according to the same and the s	85
4.4	Implic	cations	88
4.5		e research areas	89
1.0	Tuture	i Coolifor mous	O,
REFERENCE	ES		93
APPENDIX	A:	Models being tested	99
APPENDIX	B:	Letter to sample	101
APPENDIX C:		Work-family Questionnaire	102
APPENDIX D:		Recoding of variables	120
APPENDIX E:		Transformation of variables	122
APPENDIX F:		Correlation tables	123
APPENDIX G:		Comparison of two measures of organisational policy	12

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Gender and Martial Status of Participants	41
Table 2	Ethnicity and Qualification Status and number of	
	children	42
Table 3	Means, Standard Deviations, Scale Ranges for	
	variables in analysis.	56
Table 4	Differences in significant correlations between work/	
	family conflict and family/work conflict.	63
Table 5	Correlations among Conflict variables and Positive	
	outcomes	64
Table 6	Correlations between Supervisor Support,	
	Organisation Policy, the Mediators and Moderators in the	
	model	64
Table 7	Correlations between the Independent Variables of	
	Supervisor Support, Organisation Policy, and measured outcome	nes in the
	model.	65
Table 8	Correlations between satisfaction with child care,	
	Social support, positive outcomes and the measured	
	Outcomes in the model	66
Table 9	Significant regression statistics examining the relationship	
	Between the independent variables and the dependent	
	Variables in the model.	68
Table 10	The significant main effects between the independent	
	Variables and the mediators in the model.	70
Table 11	The regression statistics between the mediator and the	
	Dependent variables.	72
Table 12	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	Variable "intention to leave".	75

Table 13	Significant Interaction Terms with the Outcome of	
	"intention to leave" in Step 3.	75
Table 14	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	variable "organisational commitment"	76
Table 15	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	variable "health".	77
Table 16	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	variable "job satisfaction"	77
Table 17	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	variable "absenteeism"	78
Table 18	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	variable "membership total".	78
Table 19	Hierarchical Regression Statistics for the Dependent	
	Variable "turnover intention".	78.

List of Figures

Figure 1	Model distinguishing between moderator and mediator	
	Effects.	37
Figure 2	Percentage of family friendly policies available to	
	Respondents	58
Figure 3	Positive Outcomes	60
Figure 4	Work/family conflict	62
Figure 5	Family/work conflict	62
Figure 6	Mediator model	67
Figure 7	Regression results examining the relationship between	
	the independent variables and the dependent variables	
	in the model.	68
Figure 8	The significant A-C relationships (significant	
	relationships between the independent variables and	
	the dependent variables).	69
Figure 9	Regression statistics examining the relationship	
	between the independent variables and the possible	
	mediators in the model.	70
Figure 10	Possible mediational relationships after first two	
	Conditions are fulfilled.	71
Figure 11	Regression Statistics examining the relationships	
	Between the mediators and dependent variables in	
	The model	71
Figure 12	The possible mediated relationships after the first three	
	Conditions have been meet.	72

Few would argue with the principle that one should bend the tool not the worker – the workplace should fit the worker, not vice versa.

(Barnett, 1998).