


Summer 2002

Time-Based Work-Family Conflict: Myth or Reality?

Karyn H. Bernas
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds

 Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bernas, Karyn H.. "Time-Based Work-Family Conflict: Myth or Reality?" (2002). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, Psychology, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/6jhg-r876
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds/96

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

TIME-BASED WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT: MYTH OR REALITY?

by

Karyn H. Bernas

B.S. May 1994, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia

M.S. August 1996, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

August 2002

Approved by:

Debra A. Major (Director)

Glynn D. Coates (Member)

Barbara Winstead (Member)

Nancy Olivo (Member)

ABSTRACT

TIME-BASED WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT: MYTH OR REALITY?

Karyn H. Bernas
Old Dominion University, 2002
Director: Dr. Debra A. Major

The present study examined a time-based model of work-family conflict for a sample of 176 working women with childcare responsibilities. Building on the work of Edwards and Rothbard (2000) and role theory, a model was proposed to test the specific variables that define time-based work-family conflict. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test the proposed hypotheses. Contrary to assumptions about time-based conflict, the results suggest that role time has a very limited impact on work-family conflict. Variables that were related to role performance and satisfaction included traditional gender role expectations, family involvement, family instrumental support, leader-member exchange, role overload, and organizational family-friendliness. The current research also presented two new variables labeled work and family distractions. Work distractions appear to have a very harmful impact on work outcomes and warrant further investigation. Although time-based conflict was not supported in the present study, the current data offered credence for a number of alternative explanations.

I would like to dedicate this dissertation and all the glory that comes from this work to the Lord. He has provided everything I needed to accomplish this awesome task. “For I know the plans I have for you,” declares the Lord, “plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future (Jeremiah 29:11).”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the love and support of my family, this dissertation and my education would have been impossible. The love and encouragement offered by each of them has been my inspiration. My husband Jay has been my day-to-day source of encouragement. Jay has taught me how to fully embrace life and I am forever thankful that he thinks so highly of me. My parents, Perry Hofler and Carolyn Hofler, have supported me financially and emotionally throughout every step of my education. I am so grateful that they believe in me and are so proud of me. Thank you to my sister Kelly Wright for being willing to help me in any way she could and for being the big sister who is always looking out for me. Thank you to my grandparents, O.B. and Hazel Jones. I know they have a special place in God's heart and their prayers for me have made all the difference in my life. Thanks you also to my aunt and uncle, Lynn and Kirk Berkhimer for their wonderful support and prayers.

Thank you to my advisor, Debbie Major, who is one of the smartest women I know. I have grown to have a very deep respect and appreciation for the support she provides. She has a special talent for knowing when a student is working to her fullest potential. I would like to thank her for bringing out the best in me throughout my education and for this dissertation. I am also very thankful that she takes a personal interest in making sure that each student is well prepared for every step ahead. Her passion for her work is evident in all she does and has a tremendous impact on her students.

Thank you also to my committee members. I am very grateful that Glynn Coates was a part of my committee. He has a special way of providing support to students so

that they feel encouraged and confident. I am extremely appreciative for all the support he has provided over the years. Thank you also to Barbara Winstead for all the help she has provided. She was a wonderful source of support during the publication of my Master's thesis and has offered helpful perspectives and thoughtful insights during the dissertation process. Thank you also to Nancy Olivo who has supported my dissertation and my career over the past several years. I am so thankful that she opened the door to the City for this project to happen and for the thoughtful feedback she has provided. I look forward to working with her and learning from her in the years to come.

Thank you to the staff of the Old Dominion University Psychology Department. Mary Boswell, Peggy Kinard, and Jackie Winstead have supported and helped me so much over the past eight years. It is a wonderful feeling walking into the Psychology Department knowing that the individuals smiling back at you personally care about your progress. I am very thankful for their kindness, encouragement, and support.

Many individuals at the City of Norfolk have been extremely helpful throughout the data collection process. I am very thankful that the City allowed me to conduct research within the organization. A special thank you to Bill Goodbar for helping me devise a data collection strategy and opening doors to many departments in the City.

Thank you so much to my friend Jennifer Voces who has not only been an incredible source of emotional support, but has also used her skills as an English teacher to review several drafts and offer insightful feedback.

Of course, none of this would have been possible without the grace and wisdom provided by my Heavenly Father. The Lord has taught me so much along this journey. I have learned that I truly can do all things through Him, that He does not waste any

opportunity to teach us and grow us, and that sometimes the victories won during the race are just as precious as the finish line. Although I am looking forward to a season of rest, I am joyful and full of hope for the path that lies ahead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Overview of Theoretical Framework	1
Work-Family Conflict	2
Forces that Give Rise to Time Allocation	3
Hypotheses	6
II. METHOD	31
Participants	31
Measures.....	31
Procedure.....	41
III. RESULTS.....	42
Primary Analyses.....	42
Distractions.....	50
Additional Analyses	53
IV. DISCUSSION	57
Plausible Explanations.....	58
Implications of Specific Study Variables	62
V. CONCLUSIONS	67
Future Research	67
Limitations.....	71
General Conclusions.....	72
REFERENCES.....	75
APPENDIXES	
A. WORK TIME MEASURE.....	88
B. FAMILY TIME MEASURE.....	90
C. JOB INVOLVEMENT MEASURE.....	92
D. ROLE OVERLOAD MEASURE.....	94
E. JOB PERFORMANCE SELF-RATING.....	96
F. JOB SATISFACTION MEASURE	98
G. LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE MEASURE.....	100
H. FAMILY-FAMILY WORK CULTURE MEASURE	103

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONCLUDED)

	Page
I. COWORKER SUPPORT MEASURE.....	106
J. FAMILY INVOLVEMENT MEASURE.....	108
K. FAMILY INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT MEASURE.....	110
L. TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLE EXPECTATIONS MEASURE	112
M. FAMILY SATISFACTION MEASURE	114
N. FAMILY PERFORMANCE MEASURE.....	116
O. ORIGINALLY PROPOSED MEDIATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS	118
VITA	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Data for Study Participants.....	32
2. Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables.....	43
3. Correlations and Internal Consistencies for Study Variables.....	44
4. Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Work and Family Time	45
5. Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Job and Family Performance.....	47
6. Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Job and Family Satisfaction	49
7. Univariate F tests for Work Distractions.....	52
8. Univariate F tests for Life Role Priorities	54
9. Univariate F tests for Extreme Life Role Priorities.....	56

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Proposed predictors of work time	7
2. Proposed predictors of family time	8
3. Proposed predictors of job performance	19
4. Proposed predictors of family performance	20
5. Proposed predictors of job satisfaction	21
6. Proposed predictors of family satisfaction	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Working parents are faced with significant demands from both work and family roles. Successfully fulfilling the requirements of both roles can be challenging. Recent research suggests that the majority (89%) of working parents feel they face a time famine (Hoschschild, 1997). With a limited number of hours in each day, working parents are forced to make choices about how they should best spend every hour. As Hoschschild (1997) explains, our societal reward structure is based on long hours at work leaving working parents to struggle to fulfill their second shift (home and children) at the end of the workday. This struggle is particularly relevant to working mothers who spend more than three times the number of hours on childcare tasks than men (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Further, organizational attempts to alleviate this conflict between work and family have been largely unsuccessful (Kofodimos, 1995). The present research explores the pressures that give rise to women's time allocation for work and family roles and the subsequent performance and satisfaction experienced in both domains of life.

Overview of Theoretical Framework

The current research delves into one of the primary forms of work-family conflict: time-based conflict. A model was developed in an effort to test the underlying theoretical assumptions about time-based conflict. Existing theory in the work-family conflict (WFC) literature provides a starting point for the current model. Role theory purports that each life role presents demands. To the extent that we are able to fulfill the demands of a role, we will be successful in that role. Therefore, the basic model examines

The journal model format used is the *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

predictors of time allocation, the actual amount of time allocated to work and family roles, and subsequent performance and satisfaction. The current model departs from traditional research by exploring the specific variables and linkages assumed to create conflict.

Work-Family Conflict

The present model draws from early and new research to build a testable model of time-based WFC. WFC is grounded in role theory (Kahn, Wolf, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Successful fulfillment of role demands leads to heightened role performance and role rewards. WFC occurs when similar pressures arise from work and family roles, making it difficult to successfully fulfill the obligations of both roles. For example, a working mother may have an important business meeting the same evening as her daughter's dance recital. Since she cannot successfully be in two places at once, she is likely to experience conflict.

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) offered a useful framework for categorizing the sources of WFC. The first source of WFC is time-based conflict which refers to excessive time demands from either role or incompatible time pressures. Long hours at work, a sick child, or demands to be in both roles at the same time would result in time-based conflict. The second source of WFC is strain-based. This refers to physical and psychological demands in the workplace that may produce symptoms, such as tension, anxiety and fatigue. Lastly, behavior-based conflict arises when an individual cannot adjust her behavior to another role she holds (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Pleck, Staines & Lang, 1980). For example, to be a successful manager may require a woman to be assertive and aggressive, yet at home she needs to be caring and nurturing with her children.

Conspicuously missing from WFC research is a clear examination of the tenets put forth by this early theory. This may simply be the result of limited tools for translating the theory into testable assumptions (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Much of the contemporary WFC research measures the construct with two scales; work interference with family and family interference with work. These scales require a perceptual judgment on the part of participants as to whether WFC exists and to what degree. For instance, a traditional item from the Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connelly (1983) measure is "After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to do." The implication of this example item could be that work pressure and work demands create fatigue and inhibit family role performance. The traditional type of measurement, although widely used and accepted, fails to clearly specify and assess the linkages between work and family. In addition, the majority of WFC literature has not specifically tested the different sources of conflict (i.e., time, strain, and behavior) even though the work of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) remains a cornerstone of theoretical assumptions. The current model seeks to address these issues by focusing on a time-based model of work and family linkages.

Forces that Give Rise to Time Allocation

Time dedicated to a role may be a choice, a requirement, or a moral obligation. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) suggest that one of the primary problems in WFC literature is a failure to specify the "forces that give rise to relationships between work and family" (p. 183). They offer three potential forces: intent, behavior of others, and societal expectations.

The first force is the *intent* of the person. Intent is examined within the present research by an assessment of psychological involvement in work and family roles. An individual may choose to spend a great deal of time in a particular role. For instance, being self-motivated, ambitious, and enjoying work may cause someone to work long hours and bring work home. The career development literature emphasizes that time spent in a role and emotional involvement are reflections of the importance of each role (Cook, 1994; Super, 1980). An individual is likely to spend more time engaged in and thinking about life roles that are more important to her.

The second potential force is the behavior of others in the person's work and family environments, defined within the current research as *role sets*. Role sets refer to close relationships that shape one's behavior (Merton, 1957). Members of a role set negotiate with the role holder to develop desired patterns of behavior. Role sets are explored within the present study by examining relationships with one's supervisor, coworkers, and family. People in our lives play a large role in determining how much time we will spend at work and at home. For example, a very inflexible boss is likely to require more time at work with little concern for family needs. A family that holds very traditional expectations for a mother is likely to expect her to do all the housework, requiring more time at home.

Lastly, the policies and practices attributable to organizations, governments, and society are explored within the present research through an examination of societal expectations at work and at home. The pressures imposed on people by society, via expectations, can significantly affect their time allocation. For instance, working in a

family-friendly workplace can allow greater flexibility to attend to family needs as they arise.

Regardless of why we spend a certain amount of time in a role, the impact is the same--unavailability for another life role. Although WFC literature has not examined outcomes through the specific time-based model presented here, there is evidence that WFC results in reduced job satisfaction (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), less life satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), lower quality of family life (Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992), increased depression, (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997) and more life stress (Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996). The current model examines the impact of time-based conflict on job performance, job satisfaction, family performance, and family satisfaction.

The focus of the present investigation is women with children. While anyone may experience time-based work family conflict, the experience is particularly troubling for working mothers. In addition to the career role, women maintain primary responsibility for housework and childcare (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000; Gjerdingen, McGovern, Bekker, Lundberg, & Willemsen, 2000; Kimmel, 1993). Societal expectations are likely to create intense time demands for working women, especially those with children.

In general, women spend more time with family and men spend more time at work (Parasuraman et al., 1996). Using a nationally representative sample, Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman (1996) found that 83% of working mothers were responsible for preparing family meals compared to 11% of working fathers. Women also spend an inordinate amount of time caring for children compared to men (Friedman & Greenhaus,

2000). While women must maintain the household, society rewards us for more time at work. Work offers more challenge, control, structure, and self-esteem than family and household responsibilities (Hoschschild, 1997). The pressures to fulfill the traditional family role compete with the pressure and rewards that the world of work offers.

Working mothers represent one of the most critical groups to study given the intensity of pressures imposed on them.

Hypotheses

The potential forces that give rise to work and family relationships, as identified by Edwards and Rothbard's (2000) framework, guided the selection of variables to include in the present study. Variables that are expected to impact work and family time allocation were identified. Although, many of the variables included in the current model have been explored in the WFC literature, none have been viewed through the proposed theoretical approach. Additionally, two variables that are relatively new to work-family research are explored in the current model, leader-member exchange and traditional gender role expectations. Predictors of work and family time are graphically displayed in Figures 1 and 2.

Time

The nature of time-based WFC would imply that time allocated to one role depletes available time for another life role. Therefore, work time and family time are in conflict for resources. The two widely accepted measures of WFC are work interference with family and family interference with work. These measures require participants to make a perceptual judgment regarding the extent that family life interferes with work life




Figure 1. Proposed predictors of work time.




Figure 2. Proposed predictors of family time.

and vice versa. Within the current model, this conflicting relationship is captured by the proposed negative relationships between work time and family time. Research shows that the number of hours worked per week leads to WFC (Burke, Weir, & Duwars, 1980; Fu & Schaffer, 2001; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Maume & Houston, 2001; Pleck et al., 1980). The more time an individual spends at work, the more likely work will interfere with family life (Frone et al., 1997; O'Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992). As family time increases, family tends to interfere more with work (Frone et al., 1997).

Hypothesis 1: Family time will be negatively related to the amount of time spent in the work role.

Hypothesis 2: Work time will be negatively related to the amount of time spent in the family role.

Forces that Give Rise to Time Allocation

Societal Expectations

The forces that give rise to work and family relationships are categorized as the policies and practices of organizations, governments, and society, the behavior of others, and the intent of the person (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Policies and practices play a significant role in how we manage work and family relationships. Within this category, we explore the role expectations held by employers and individuals in the nonwork lives of participants. The expectations that others hold for us at work and at home are an important part of our identity. In fact, identity theory suggests that we combine our own expectations with the expectations of significant others in our life to form our role identities (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). We have a natural tendency to seek approval for our behavior in life roles (McCall & Simmons, 1966). The people that we may seek approval from depend on the unique characteristics of each person's life. The expectations of our

boss, coworkers, spouse, friends, neighbors, or community group may play a significant role in each of our lives. The expectations that others hold for us should have a significant impact on our work and family identities and subsequent time allocation.

Traditional gender role expectations. The gender role expectations held by individuals in a woman's nonwork life are likely to impact family time allocation. Traditional gender role expectations would hold that women are primarily responsible for housework and childcare and these roles should take precedence over work. There is evidence that the traditional role expectations for women still hold. Recent research shows there are perceptual penalties when mothers deviate from role expectations. Etaugh and Folger (1998) found that, for parents of young children who are employed full-time, fathers are viewed as more professionally competent than mothers. The study also found mothers of young children who choose to work full-time are viewed as less nurturing. Employed mothers have been viewed as being less dedicated to families and more selfish than stay-at-home moms (Etaugh & Nekolny, 1990; Etaugh & Study, 1989). Covin and Brush (1991) found that women and men were more likely to hire an expectant father than an expectant mother. Although women today are encouraged and accepted in a career role, women still must maintain primary responsibility for housework and childcare (Bianchi et al., 2000; Gjerdingen et al., 2000).

Within the work-family literature, there is evidence that women succumb to the pressure of traditional gender role expectations. For instance, it is widely recognized that women spend more time in the family role than men (for example, Parasuraman et al., 1996). Women also allow more family interruptions in the workplace than men (Burley, 1991).

A career-oriented mother is likely to rely on individuals in her nonwork life to support her combination of work and family roles. The expectations held by others in a woman's nonwork life create pressure to conform to certain role expectations. Once again, identity theory suggests that our tendency is to seek approval for our behaviors (McCall & Simmons, 1966). "Because the cleanliness of one's home is a reflection on women's competence as a wife and mother but not men's competence as a husband and father, women may come to hold higher standards for household cleanliness and become more invested in the control and supervision of household work" (Bianchi et al., 2000, p. 195). If a woman is surrounded by traditional views in her nonwork life this is likely to influence the amount of time she spends focused on her family. For instance, it could lead to feelings that it would be inappropriate to hire a house cleaning service since this is a traditional role for a woman. On the other hand, women who are surrounded by egalitarian views are likely to minimize non-essential family time (i.e., cooking and cleaning) while still maintaining quality time necessary to foster relationships.

Hypothesis 3: A preponderance of traditional gender role expectations in a woman's nonwork life will be associated with more time spent in the family domain.

Family-friendly work culture. In the workplace, women with family requirements are often viewed as less effective employees. Research has shown that when a woman's family life intrudes upon her work, she is perceived as less committed to her job (Sobkowski, 1989). Employees who take advantage of flexible workplace policies to more effectively manage their family life are also viewed as less committed (Perlow, 1995). A 1994 survey found that 77% of the women in the sample felt taking maternity leave would hurt them professionally (Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994). This would imply

that employers revert to traditional gender role expectations when faced with a female employee's family "problems." In other words, employers may perceive a family-oriented mother to be less focused on her career and less productive than a non-parent. In contrast, a family-friendly workplace assumes that an individual can be successful at both work and family roles simultaneously. If women are to be perceived as committed to their work roles and capable of high performance, organizational representatives must believe that mothers are as capable as non-parents. It is important to note that these expectations could extend to both men and women. For instance, male and female employees feel that utilizing flexible work hours would cause them to be perceived less favorably (Rodgers, 1993).

Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) identified three components of family-friendly organizational cultures. First, managers are sensitive to family needs and issues. Second, a family-friendly organization does not overtly or covertly punish an individual for taking advantage of flexible policies. Lastly, a family-friendly workplace does not require an inordinate number of work hours for an employee to be viewed as dedicated. The authors (Thompson et al., 1999) found that a family-friendly work culture was associated with higher commitment to the organization, less work-family conflict, and fewer intentions to leave the organization.

Only in an environment that does not punish individuals for family time and family obligations will an individual be able to balance work and family without a detriment to career. An inflexible workplace causes individuals to spend more time in the work role (Parasuraman et al., 1996) and therefore experience more WFC (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose, Rabinowitz, & Beutell, 1989; Keith & Schafer, 1980; Pleck et

al., 1980). The present study proposes that an organizational culture characterized by family friendliness will allow and encourage women to spend less time in the work role leaving more available time for family. Indeed, researchers have found that family-friendly workplaces lead to less time at work and more time with children without any detrimental effects on job performance (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

Hypothesis 4: A family-friendly work culture, characterized by high managerial support and few career consequences, will be negatively related to work time.

Role Sets

The second category of forces that gives rise to work and family relationships is the behavior of others at work and at home (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Within the current research, the behavior of others is examined through role sets or relationships that an individual has with others that shape her work and family roles. WFC research has identified several critical people in the work and family realm including supervisors, coworkers, friends, and family. Within the immediate work environment, those most likely to affect an individual are supervisors and coworkers.

WFC researchers have shown that supervisor support is associated with less time at work (Frone et al., 1997) and less WFC (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Supervisors grow to expect certain behaviors from each employee. Supportive supervisors may allow more latitude in defining one's work role to include personal phone calls or time away from work to care for a sick child. Support can be characterized as either instrumental or emotional. Instrumental support refers to tangible assistance to help an individual fulfill role requirements. For example, a supervisor may assist an employee in networking with the right individuals to move a project forward more expeditiously. Emotional support

refers to the comfort or compassion provided to another individual which displays concern for the person's circumstances.

LMX. The present study expands the concept of supervisor support by exploring leader-member exchange (LMX). Compared to supervisor support, LMX more aptly captures the role relationship between an employee and supervisor. Employees who experience a high LMX relationship exchange increased expenditures of time and energy, as well as heightened responsibility for work duties for greater latitude, influence, and support (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Schriesheim, Neider, Scandura, & Tepper, 1992). LMX is rooted in social exchange theory, which purports a give-and-take relationship that is characterized by feelings of obligation, gratitude and trust (Blau, 1964). Those involved in an exchange experience a norm of reciprocity in which a recipient of support feels obligated to provide a comparable exchange in return (Gouldner, 1960).

LMX is traditionally viewed as a valuable relationship that is important for heightened career success (Wakabayashi & Graen, 1984). However, past research has shown that, although LMX reduces job stress, it is also associated with higher levels of work interference with family (Bernas & Major, 2000). The present research proposes that LMX leads to higher WFC primarily because of the increased time required to fulfill the expectations of a high quality exchange.

Hypothesis 5: A high LMX relationship will be positively related to time dedicated to the work role.

Coworker support. Support from coworkers would include sharing ideas, being understanding of work-family issues, and listening. Support from coworkers has received limited attention in the WFC literature. Coworker support has been linked to heightened

organizational commitment for married women (Greenberger, Goldberg, Hamill, O'Neil, & Payne, 1989) increased job satisfaction (Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992), and reduced strain resulting from work (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000). In a comprehensive model of WFC, Frone et al. (1997) found that coworker support was not predictive of work time commitments.

Nonetheless, the present model does include coworker support as a predictor of time allocation for two reasons. First, coworker support is recognized as one of the three primary forms of social support (King, Mattimore, King, & Adams, 1995). The other two forms are supervisor and extra-organizational (i.e., family and friends). By examining coworker support, the model is more comprehensive. Second, although coworker support has been explored in the WFC literature, it has not previously been examined as a predictor of work time.

Hypothesis 6: Coworker support will be negatively related to time allocated to the work role.

Work role overload. Organizational members also develop a climate for expected productivity and output at work. Some jobs are more demanding than others. The nature of the work environment and the amount of work that must be completed will dictate how much time is required in order to complete a job. Role overload is a type of work role stressor that refers to the extent to which work role expectations are overburdening. Although other work role stressors may be associated with WFC, role overload is a stressor that is particularly likely to impact time allocation. An overburdening work role will require increased time and energy to accomplish the tasks required of the job. Role overload is a likely predictor of increased work time and should be considered within a time-based model of conflict. Previous research confirms that role overload is a predictor

of work time (Frone et al., 1997) and time-based conflict for women (Greenhaus et al., 1989).

Hypothesis 7: Work role overload will be positively related to the amount of time devoted to the work role.

Family instrumental support. Within the family role, instrumental support is traditionally defined as tangible help offered by a spouse or partner in the form of housework or childcare (Parasuraman et al., 1996). Given the wide variability in family patterns, it is logical to expand this definition to include support offered by children, extended family and outside resources such as a cleaning service. Care giving resources have been defined as a partner who devotes time to the care giving role and relatives or friends willing to provide care (Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999).

The findings for instrumental support in the work-family literature have been equivocal. Some studies show instrumental support to be beneficial for women. For instance, instrumental support has been linked to less family interference with work (Adams et al., 1996), less parenting time, and less family distress (Frone et al., 1997). Other studies have shown instrumental support to have harmful effects including lower life satisfaction of women with helpful husbands (Baruch & Barnett, 1986) and increased time spent in family tasks (Parasuraman et al., 1996). Research suggests that women may feel pressure to be able to “do it all” and feel inadequate when assistance is needed (Wells & Major, 1997). It is anticipated that instrumental family support will decrease the amount of time required to fulfill family role obligations.

Hypothesis 8: Family instrumental support will be negatively related to the amount of time dedicated to the family role.

Children. Women with children are more likely to experience time-based WFC because of the intense requirements of the motherhood role. Past research confirms that, overall; mothers experience more distress than non-mothers (see Barnett, Marhsall, & Sayer, 1992 for a review). Women with children are also more likely to feel they must make compromises between life roles (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

Based on WFC literature, we know that the number and ages of children in the household are predictors of WFC (Bedeian, Burke, & Moffett, 1988; Fu & Shaffer, 2001; Lorech, Russell, & Rush, 1989; Voydanoff, 1988). Women with children in the home under the age of 18, and especially preschool children, experience the highest level of parenting demands. Previous research confirms that higher levels of parenting demands lead to greater time spent with the family (Frone et al., 1997; Parasuraman et al., 1996).

Hypothesis 9: Greater parenting demands (defined as the number of children and age of youngest child) will be linked to more time in the family role.

Intent

Intent refers to whether or not existing patterns of relationships between work and family variables were purposely established by the individual. For instance, if an individual enjoys family life more than work and is not the primary breadwinner, she may select a career with minimal time requirements. Intent of the individual is explored by examining job and family involvement in relation to work and family time.

Job involvement. Job involvement is defined as “the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one’s present job” (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994, p. 224). The role salience literature suggests that if one role is more important to an individual, she will dedicate more time and energy to that role (Amatea, Cross, Clark, & Bobby, 1986). Past research has shown that job

involvement is linked to the number of hours worked (Paterson & O'Driscoll, 1990) and to WFC (Adams et al., 1996; Duxbury and Higgins, 1991; Greenhaus et al., 1989).

Hypothesis 10: Job involvement will be positively related to the time dedicated to the work role.

Family involvement. Family involvement can be defined as the extent to which an individual is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with her family (see Paullay et al., 1994). Duxbury and Higgins (1991) suggested that most women must be involved and responsible for their children and family, whereas men can choose to be less involved. Family involvement has been identified as a predictor of WFC (Adams et al., 1996; Duxbury and Higgins, 1991; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992a; Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997). Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) suggest that high family involvement leads to more adjustment of the work schedule for family and lower career aspirations.

Hypothesis 11: Family involvement will be positively related to the time dedicated to the family role.

Outcomes

Successful fulfillment of role demands leads to heightened role performance and role rewards. Therefore, an important outcome to consider is role performance. Satisfaction with job and family roles is also an important area of exploration for women who are striving to have it all. Does high performance in one's job and family necessarily imply satisfaction with both roles? Can women truly have it all? Can women be satisfied and have mediocre performance in one or both life roles? In order to begin investigating these questions, the outcomes explored in the current study are job performance, family performance, job satisfaction, and family satisfaction. Figures 3-6 display the proposed predictors of each outcome variable hypothesized in the following sections.




Figure 3. Proposed predictors of job performance.




Figure 4. Proposed predictors family performance




Figure 5. Proposed predictors of job satisfaction.




Figure 6. Proposed predictors of family satisfaction.

Job performance

Job performance is defined as a woman's perception of her ability to successfully fulfill the demands of the work role. Research exploring the impact of WFC on job performance has shown mixed results (see Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 1999 for a review). The current research views WFC as the result of family time limiting work time, which is essential for job performance. Time dedicated to the work role is likely to provide an individual with the necessary focus to perform well in that role. The number of hours worked per week has been shown to be a predictor of income for men and women (Schneer & Reitman, 1993). Therefore, work time, which is viewed as a central cause of WFC, is predicted to be an important element of high job performance.

Hypothesis 12: Time devoted to work will be positively related to job performance ratings.

One of the components of a family-friendly work culture, as defined by Thompson et al. (1999), is referred to as career consequences which measures the extent to which employees face penalties for utilizing family-friendly benefits. Penalties might include being viewed as less committed (Perlow, 1995), receiving lower performance appraisal ratings, fewer promotions, or smaller salary increases (Judiesch & Lyness, 1999). The job performance of a working mother is likely to suffer in an organization that punishes those who take advantage of existing family policies or practices.

Hypothesis 13: Career consequences will be negatively related to job performance.

LMX is also predicted to impact job performance. A high LMX relationship is one characterized by instrumental support. High LMX bosses are likely to support an employee's success by removing obstacles and opening doors. Additionally, a high LMX

relationship develops when a supervisor learns that an employee can be trusted to do a good job. Past research shows that a high LMX relationship leads to higher supervisory ratings of job performance (see Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997 for a review).

Hypothesis 14: LMX will be positively related to job performance ratings.

Stress tends to inhibit one's ability to perform effectively at work (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986). Role overload is one type of stressor that employees might experience. Previous research has shown that work overload has a damaging effect on work performance (Frone et al., 1997).

Hypothesis 15: Role overload will be negatively related to job performance.

The findings for job involvement and job performance have been equivocal. A meta-analysis conducted by Brown (1996) suggested that there is not a relationship between these two variables. Other researchers have suggested that job involvement is predictive of certain aspects of job performance (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002). Lobel and St. Clair (1992) suggested that when an individual has a salient career identity, he/she is more willing to dedicate the time and energy necessary to be a high performer. The current researcher proposes that high job involvement will be linked to higher levels of job performance.

Hypothesis 16: Job involvement will be positively related to job performance ratings.

Family performance

Family performance is defined as the degree to which an individual feels she is able to successfully fulfill the demands of the family role. Researchers have shown that WFC has a detrimental impact on family performance (Frone et al., 1997). Although work time is considered an essential element for job performance, family time is not

predicted to be an essential element in family performance. Recent research has confirmed that the hours devoted to the family role do not affect how a mother feels about her performance as a parent (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Variables in the current study that are proposed to predict family performance include traditional gender role expectations, number of children, and family involvement.

Traditional gender role expectations are likely to create a very demanding atmosphere for working women. If important individuals in a women's nonwork life see family as the primary role for a woman, their expectations are going to be much higher for that role. For instance, a spouse with traditional gender role expectations might expect his wife to prepare each meal and always have a tidy home. For a woman with multiple roles, these expectations become more difficult to fulfill. When the preponderance of role messages received outside of work are traditional, career-oriented women are likely to feel inadequate in their family roles.

Hypothesis 17: Traditional gender role expectations will be negatively linked to family performance.

With more children in the household, the level of parenting demands rises. Researchers suggest that more children equates to overload (Voydanoff, 1988) and role strain (Katz & Piotrkowski, 1983). From a role theory perspective, individuals experience greater rewards when they are able to fulfill the demands of a role. With increased demands, it is more likely that a mother will have a more difficult time fulfilling the demands of that role.

Hypothesis 18: The number of children in the household will negatively associated with family performance.

Women who are highly involved in their families believe they are performing that role with greater competence (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 1999; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). The majority of women in society are highly involved and responsible for family (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). A woman who finds herself less involved in family is likely to feel she is not meeting societal expectations for that role.

Hypothesis 19: Women who are highly involved in their families will view themselves as high performers in that role.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction can be defined as the enjoyment and gratification one gains from participating in her work role. Meta-analytic results have confirmed that WFC is associated with lower levels of job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Within the present study, it is proposed that family time is essential for satisfaction in the family role. When family time is impacted by long work hours, an individual is likely to be less satisfied with her job. Work-family researchers have documented that when individuals perceive work to interfere with family life, they experience decreased job satisfaction (Adams et al., 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995) and a greater intent to leave the organization (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001). Therefore, it is proposed that available family time will significantly influence satisfaction with one's job.

Hypothesis 20: Time devoted to the family role will be positively related to job satisfaction.

A family-friendly workplace is also predicted to increase job satisfaction.

Organizations that are family-friendly (Allen, 2001; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000) and offer flexible career paths (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997) have more satisfied workers.

Within the present study, it is predicted that higher levels of managerial support and fewer career consequences will increase job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 21: A family-friendly workplace, characterized by managerial support and limited career consequences, will have a favorable impact on job satisfaction.

The role sets that are explored in the current investigation are also predicted to impact job satisfaction. Support offered by individuals in one's work role should create a more enjoyable atmosphere. Research shows that coworker support (King et al., 1995; Parasuraman et al., 1992) and LMX (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999) improve job satisfaction. Role overload has also been categorized within role sets in the current study. A role that is too demanding and overly burdensome is likely to decrease job satisfaction (Lambert, 1991).

Hypothesis 22: Coworker support will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 23: LMX will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 24: Role overload will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Lastly, individuals who are highly involved in life roles are likely to derive more satisfaction from those roles. Past research shows that higher job involvement is linked to higher job satisfaction (Adams et al., 1996, Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 1999, Parasuraman et al., 1996).

Hypothesis 25: Job involvement will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Family satisfaction

Family satisfaction is defined as the enrichment and enjoyment a woman receives from her family role. Findings in the WFC literature for family satisfaction have been equivocal (see Allen et al., 1999 for a review). Some studies have shown that WFC reduces family satisfaction (Aryee, 1992; Kopelman et al., 1983). Kossek and Ozeki

(1998) showed that WFC decreases overall life satisfaction. Research specifically exploring the relationship of family time and family satisfaction has shown that women experience greater family satisfaction when they spend more time in that role (Parasuraman et al., 1996).

Hypothesis 26: Time devoted to the family role will be positively related to family satisfaction.

Researchers have shown that more children in the household can be disadvantageous for women. Large numbers of children in the household has been linked to feelings of overload (Voydanoff, 1988) and role strain (Katz & Piotrkowski, 1983). More specifically, having more children has been shown to decrease family satisfaction (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 1999).

Hypothesis 27: Family satisfaction will be negatively related to the number of children in the household.

Expectations of family members to fulfill the traditional role obligations of a mother and homemaker while working full-time create a very demanding environment. According to identity theory, we have a natural tendency to seek approval for our behavior in life roles (McCall & Simmons, 1966). Families with traditional expectations have higher demands that are more difficult to meet thereby lessening opportunities for approval. If the expectations of family and friends are extremely demanding for the family role, women are likely to be less satisfied since it becomes more difficult to fulfill the role demands.

Hypothesis 28: Traditional gender role expectations will be negatively linked to family satisfaction.

Family instrumental support is proposed as an important predictor of family satisfaction. Family support has been shown to decrease WFC (Adams et al., 1996).

When a woman has assistance and support fulfilling the tasks and chores within the family role, she will have more time available for the enjoyable aspects of that role.

Hypothesis 29: Family instrumental support will be associated with higher levels of family satisfaction.

When one is more involved in a life role, she is likely to experience more satisfaction from that role. High family involvement is expected for women in our society. This suggests that a woman who is highly involved in family is likely to experience more approval from significant others in her life. Past research has shown that family involvement is linked to higher family satisfaction (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 1999).

Hypothesis 30: Family involvement will be positively related to family satisfaction.

Exploratory Variables

Data were collected on two additional variables that were not included in the primary investigation. These variables are referred to as work distractions and family distractions. Distractions refer to physical and mental interruptions from one role while engaged in another. Distractions would include phone calls from home while at work, thinking about children during the workday, and thinking about a work project while trying to enjoy dinner with the family. Distractions represent a new area of investigation, which is closely linked to role time.

Past research has suggested that alternatives to role time be taken into consideration. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) indicated that time-based WFC is not simply the result of extended time in a role, but may also be caused by preoccupation with a particular role even while fulfilling the requirements of another role. Friedman and

Greenhaus (2000) suggested that researchers look beyond time as a central cause of WFC and offer other variables to consider such as psychological involvement. As Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) argued, the time one spends thinking and worrying about a life role is just as significant, if not more so, than the number of hours spent engaged in a particular role. The following exploratory research questions will be examined.

Question a: Do participants experience more distractions from work or from family?

Question b: Are distractions helpful or harmful?

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

The sample of 176 full-time working mothers was drawn from various departments within a large mid-Atlantic city government. Participants in the study were working mothers with childcare responsibilities. Departments represented in the sample include Human Services, Human Resources, Finance, Information Technology, Legal, Development, Libraries, Utilities, and Parks and Recreation.

The majority of the sample was married (63%) and had more than one child at home (75%). The average age of participants was 41 and the average age of the youngest child in the home was 11. More than half of the participants had a Bachelor's degree or higher level of education. The average participant had been working for her employer 10½ years. The majority of the sample was African-American (58%). For a complete breakdown of the demographics for this sample, see Table 1.

Measures

Time variables

The measures of work time and family time differ significantly from the original proposed measures. First, work time and family time measures originally included physical hours and distractions (i.e., time spent thinking about one role while engaged in another). Second, the factors that were proposed to incorporate work and family time have been reduced for the final measures.

Distractions were originally included as part of the time measures. For instance, one's family time would include time spent in childcare, chores, errands, and time spent

Table 1
Demographic Data for Study Participants

Variables	
Age (mean / sd)	41 / 8.68
Marital status	
Single	62
Married or living w/ partner	111
Number of children (mean / sd)	2.23 / 1.25
Age of youngest child (mean / sd)	11 / 6.91
Number of years with current employer (mean / sd)	10.51 / 9.38
Ethnicity (frequency)	
African American	98
Asian	6
Caucasian	54
Hispanic	3
Other	7
Highest degree received (frequency)	
Less than high school	1
High school	50
Associates degree	30
Bachelor's degree	60
Master's degree	24
Doctorate	7
Annual Income (frequency)	
Under \$10,000	3
\$10,000 - \$19,999	5
\$20,000 - \$29,999	62
\$30,000 - \$39,999	51
\$40,000 - \$49,999	26
\$50,000 - \$59,999	15
\$60,000 - \$69,999	3
\$70,000 - \$79,999	3
\$80,000 - \$89,999	2

Note. Frequencies that do not total the sample size within each category are due to missing data.

thinking about one's family while at work. Participants were asked to gauge how many hours per week they felt distracted by family thoughts or interruptions while at work. An analysis of correlations for time measures with and without distractions suggested that distractions may be capturing very different relationships than time measures. Additionally, work distractions are significantly correlated with both work and family time measures, but family distractions are not. The conclusion was that distractions should be explored further before combining them with time measures. Thus, distractions were treated as exploratory within the present research.

Time measures originally included a number of different components. Family time included household chores, childcare, shopping and errands, yard/home maintenance, quality time, and miscellaneous family activities. Work time included time spent working at one's place of business, completing job-related tasks outside of work, attending class or studying, driving, and miscellaneous work activities.

In order to ensure that hours were not overestimated, family time and work time hours were totaled. Results showed that a number of participants had overestimated hours to a point where the combination would be physically impossible given the available waking hours in a week. As a result, the core components of work and family time were used in analyses. Core components for work time included work hours and job tasks completed outside of work. Core components of family time included chores and childcare. This simplified approach is consistent with past research by Friedman and Greenhaus (2000), Frone et al., (1997), and Parasuraman et al. (1996). Even using core components, some participants still overestimated work and family hours. In order to

remove the outliers the sample size was reduced from 210 to 176. The original time measures are presented in Appendixes A and B.

Work Time

Work time was assessed by asking participants to indicate the average number of hours per week, spent working at one's place of business and completing job-related tasks outside of one's place of work. Past researchers have measured work time in a similar fashion. Parasuraman et al. (1996) asked participants to indicate the average number of hours spent at the office, traveling, and working at home. Frone et al. (1997) asked participants to indicate the total number of hours spent on work tasks each week, including work taken home.

Family Time

Family time was assessed by summing the average weekly hours spent in housework and childcare tasks. This approach is similar to past research. For instance, Parasurman et al. (1996) asked participants to indicate the average weekly hours spent doing housework and childcare. Frone et al. (1997) assessed family time commitment with one item that asked about the time spent in parenting activities.

Work Variables

Job involvement

Job involvement was assessed with Kanungo's (1982) nine-item measure of job involvement. Internal consistency for the measure has been reported at $\alpha = .87$ (Kanungo, 1982) and was $.77$ in the present study. An example item is, "The most important things that happen to me involve my present job." Participants responded using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly

agree. Construct validity has been demonstrated by the distinction of this measure from job satisfaction and the number of hours worked weekly (Paterson & O'Driscoll, 1990). See Appendix C for a list of items.

Role Overload

Role overload was assessed with four items adapted from Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau (1975). An example item is, "There is a great deal to be done on my job." Researchers using the modified Caplan et al. (1975) items (see Appendix D) report the alpha level for the four-item scale at .83 (Greenhaus et al., 1989) and .84 (Parasuraman et al., 1992). Internal consistency for the present study was $\alpha = .73$. Participants rated their level of role overload on a 5-point scale.

Job Performance

Self-rated job performance was assessed utilizing a scale developed by Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997). This measure combines two items developed by Wayne and colleagues (1997) with two items from Tsui (1984) and two items developed by Heilman, Block, and Lucas (1992). Reported alpha for the combined six-item measure is .92. Originally, this measure was utilized to assess supervisor ratings of performance. The items were slightly modified to reflect a self-assessment for the present study (see Appendix E). An example item is, "In my estimation, I get my work done very effectively." Participants responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Based on reliability findings and an exploratory factor analysis, the last item of this measure was dropped. The resulting alpha for the five-item measure was .73.

Job Satisfaction

Following many WFC researchers (for examples see Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Kopelman et al., 1983; Parasuraman et al., 1992) job satisfaction was assessed using Hackman and Oldham's (1975) three-item measure (see Appendix F). An example item is "I am satisfied with my present job situation." Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) report alpha internal consistency of .87. Within the present study alpha was .83.

Leader-Member Exchange

LMX was measured using the seven-item scale developed by Scandura and Graen (1984). An example item is "Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use power to help you solve problems in your work?" The response scales for each item include four options that vary based on the item. This measure is considered the most robust and psychometrically sound instrument for assessing LMX (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Reliability for the seven-item scale in the present study was .90. LMX items are listed in Appendix G.

Family-Friendly Culture

The work-family culture scale developed by Thompson et al. (1999) was used to assess organizational work-family culture (see Appendix H). The authors developed the scale based on a literature review, input from subject matter experts, and pilot studies. The three subscales are managerial support, career consequences, and organizational time demands. In order to ensure the work-family culture scale does not overlap with time

measures, the third subscale of this measure was not used in analyses. Therefore, analyses were based on the managerial support and career consequences subscales. Alpha reliabilities for each of these two subscales have been reported at .91 for managerial support and .74 for career consequences (Thompson et al., 1999). An example item is “In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.” Response were recorded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Within the present study, the alpha level for 11-item managerial support subscale was .89 and for the five-item career consequences subscale was .74.

Coworker Support

Coworker support was assessed by adapting a scale developed by Shinn, Wong, Simko, and Ortiz-Torres (1989) to measure supervisor support. The measure lists nine different types of supportive work behaviors and is therefore easily adapted to assess coworker support by modifying the instructions (see Appendix I). Examples of supportive behaviors include switching schedules to accommodate family needs and problem solving. Participants were asked how often coworkers engage in specific supportive behaviors. The responses were assessed on a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Thomas and Ganster (1995) used this measure to assess supervisor support and report alpha internal consistency as .83. Based on the results of a reliability analysis and exploratory factor analysis, two items were dropped from this scale. Items 1 and 4 are more reflective of instrumental support, but appear to decrease the internal consistency of this measure. The resulting alpha for the seven-item measure was .74.

Family Variables

Family Involvement

Family involvement was assessed using a modified version of Kanungo's (1982) job involvement scale (see Appendix J). Family replaced the word job within each item to reflect family involvement. Internal consistency for the job involvement scale has been reported at $\alpha = .87$ (Kanungo, 1982) and was .82 for family involvement in the current study. An example item is "I consider my family to be very central to my existence." Participants responded using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

Parenting Demands

Consistent with past research (Aryee, 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1996) parenting demands were defined by the number of children living at home and the age of the youngest child. These two variables were used as individual predictors in the analyses.

Family Instrumental Support

Family instrumental support was assessed with an adapted version of the instrumental component of the Family Support Inventory for Workers (King et al., 1995). Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by King et al. (1995) to confirm the Instrumental and Emotional dimensions of this inventory. The alpha level for instrumental support was reported as .93. In addition, the developers of this instrument conducted convergent and discriminant validity analyses which further support the validity of the measure. Participants were asked to rate the extent that individuals in their personal lives assist with such things as running errands and helping around the house

when one must work late. Participants responded using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

Because this measure is focused primarily on immediate family and this is reflected in several of the items, only five items of the inventory were used (see Appendix K). These five items are more easily adapted to a broader scope of individuals in one's personal life (e.g., relatives, spouse, friends, cleaning service). King et al. (1995) suggested that the inventory be viewed as a pool of items to select from based on researchers needs. This suggestion was based on an analysis of the changes in internal consistency when shortening the number of items. The researchers reported that when shortening the 15-item instrumental scale to eight items, alpha dropped from .93 to .88, which is still in the highly acceptable range. In addition, the items were slightly modified to incorporate all individuals in one's nonwork life. Internal consistency for the five items used in the present sample was $\alpha = .91$.

Traditional gender role expectations

Traditional gender role expectations were assessed utilizing the Traditionalism of Attitudes Toward Mothering Scale developed by Schroeder, Blood, and Maluso (1992). The scale (see Appendix L) includes seven items that are concerned with traditional attitudes toward mothers combining work and family roles. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were used by Schroeder et al. (1992) to confirm the validity of the measure. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which individuals in their nonwork life hold the viewpoints expressed in each item. An example item is "A full time career and a happy, healthy family life are not possible for women simultaneously when children are under the age of six." Participants rated their responses on a 5-point Likert-

type scale ranging from (1) not at all to (5) very much. The internal consistency of the measure within the present study was $\alpha = .87$.

Family Satisfaction

Hackman and Oldham's (1975) job satisfaction measure was modified to assess family satisfaction following Kopelman et al. (1983), Parasuraman et al. (1992) and Parasuraman et al. (1996). An example item is "I frequently think I would like to change my family situation." Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) reported an internal consistency reliability estimate of .84. Coefficient alpha for the present sample was .83. The family satisfaction items are presented in Appendix M.

Family performance

Five items were used to assess family performance. Following Frone et al. (1997), several items were adapted from Williams and Anderson's (1991) measure of in-role job performance. The item used by Friedman and Greenhaus to assess parental role performance was also included. One additional item was added to assess performance managing the household. See Appendix N for a list of these five items. Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Internal consistency of this 5-item measure was found to be .84 within this study.

Distractions

Work distractions were assessed by asking participants to gauge the total number of hours, per week, they felt distracted by work thoughts or interruptions while spending time in the family role. Participants were given examples of work distractions including receiving calls from coworkers or thinking about a work project while at home. Family

distractions were assessed by asking participants to estimate the total number of hours, per week, they felt distracted by family while at work. Examples given included receiving a phone call from a spouse or child and thinking about family while working. Both measures are included in the original time measures (see Appendixes A and B).

Procedure

Participants were obtained during computer training classes and department meetings. Each employee group was provided with a brief overview of work-family conflict. Participants were also informed that the Human Resources Department was interested in creating a more family-friendly work culture and that the results of the survey would be provided to Human Resources. To protect anonymity, no names or department information was collected with the surveys and participants were ensured of the confidentiality of their individual responses. The Human Subjects Committee for the College of Sciences at Old Dominion University approved this study on July 12, 2001 and data collection began shortly thereafter.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Primary Analyses

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all study variables are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test the proposed hypotheses. Hierarchical regression allows for an examination of the amount of variance accounted for by role time exclusive of other variables of interest. Six separate regression analyses were conducted with the following dependent variables: work time, family time, job performance, family performance, family satisfaction, and job satisfaction. Age, race, and income were used as demographic control variables in each equation.

The first regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictors of work time. The regression results are displayed in Table 4. Each of the demographic control variables was found to have a significant impact on work time. Race, which was coded 1 for minority and 2 for non-minority, was found to have a significant negative effect on work time. These results show that minority participants in this sample spent more time at work than non-minority participants. Age was negatively related to work time suggesting that younger employees spent more time at work. Income also had a positive effect on work time suggesting that a higher income is associated with more time at work.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that family time would limit available time for work. To test this hypothesis, all potential predictors of work time were entered before family time. Family time did not account for any additional variance in the work time measure. It should be noted that even when examining this equation with work time entered before

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables

Variable	mean	sd
Work time	45.97	10.33
Work distractions	8.59	10.87
Managerial support	3.08	.70
Career consequences	2.83	.64
Leader member exchange	2.67	.77
Coworker support	3.66	.67
Role overload	3.63	.84
Job involvement	2.60	.63
Job performance	4.12	.54
Job satisfaction	3.12	1.07
Family time	23.00	13.80
Family distractions	4.98	6.76
Traditional expectations	2.64	.99
Number of children	2.23	1.25
Age of youngest	11.08	6.92
Instrumental support	2.86	1.00
Family involvement	3.76	.68
Family performance	3.80	.69
Family satisfaction	3.36	1.10

Table 3
Correlations and Internal Consistencies for Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1. Work time	---																			
2. Work distr.	.26*	---																		
3. Mgr. support	-.12	-.21*	.89																	
4. Career conseq.	.09	.15	-.51*	.74																
5. LMX	.00	-.09	.48*	-.24*	.90															
6. Cwrkr. sppt.	-.11	.01	.26*	-.25*	.09	.74														
7. Role overload	.19*	.17*	-.39*	.23*	-.20*	.04	.73													
8. Job inv.	.13	.04	.28*	-.03	.27*	-.04	.12	.77												
9. Job perf.	.02	-.10	.14*	-.16*	.11	.15	-.10	.03	.73											
10. Job sat.	-.05	-.10	.46*	-.32*	.37*	.09	-.41*	.20*	.11	.83										
11. Family time	.00	.28*	-.13	.02	.08	.03	.08	-.10	.02	-.08	---									
12. Family distr.	.04	.32*	.01	.06	-.06	.01	-.11	-.10	-.03	-.04	.03	---								
13. Trad. exp.	-.04	.02	-.23*	.34	-.06	-.01	.13	-.03	-.10	-.30*	.08	.14	.87							
14. No. children	.01	.00	.01	.12	.06	-.07	-.11	.01	.02	.05	.14	.03	.16*	---						
15. Youngest	-.02	-.16*	-.07	-.03	-.15	-.06	.09	.14	.06	-.08	-.23*	-.11	.03	-.04	---					
16. Instr. support	.08	-.02	.10	-.09	.14	-.01	-.09	.15	.07	.27*	-.07	.02	-.23*	.01	-.08	.91				
17. Family inv.	-.05	.08	-.11	.05	.03	.05	.23*	.01	.00	.02	.09	-.02	.02	.00	-.15	.24*	.82			
18. Family perf.	-.04	-.08	.04	-.18*	-.01	.07	.00	.03	.28*	.18*	.05	-.02	-.24*	-.04	.01	.15*	.17*	.84		
19. Family sat.	.05	-.08	.09	-.10	.04	-.02	.05	.04	.25*	.27*	-.04	-.13	-.25*	-.08	.12	.26*	.20*	.37*	.83	

Note. N = 162 –176.

* $p \leq .05$

Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Work and Family Time

Variables	β	t	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Criterion: Work time</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.233*	
Age	-.233	-2.965*		
Race	-.208	-2.709*		
Income	.554	6.593*		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.248*	.015
Managerial support	-.118	-1.130		
Career consequences	.003	.031		
Step 3: Role sets			.278*	.030
LMX	.063	.766		
Coworker support	-.146	-1.920		
Role overload	.041	.485		
Step 4: Intent			.286*	.008
Job involvement	.102	1.276		
Step 5: Time			.287*	.001
Family time	.030	.406		
<i>Criterion: Family time</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.015	
Age	.173	1.295		
Race	-.008	-.088		
Income	-.165	-1.599		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.021	.006
Traditional gender role expectations	.052	.629		
Step 3: Role sets			.096*	.075*
Number of children	.086	.946		
Age of youngest child	-.304	-2.583*		
Family instrumental support	-.075	-.884		
Step 4: Intent			.103*	.007
Family involvement	.097	1.157		
Step 5: Time			.107*	.004
Work time	.072	.803		

Note. Betas are reported for the last step of the equation.

* $p \leq .05$

other hypothesized predictors, the resulting beta still did not reach significance.

Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

The remaining hypothesized predictors of work time included managerial support, career consequences, LMX, coworker support, role overload, and job involvement. No significant effects were found for the impact of these variables on work time. Therefore, hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10 were not supported.

The second regression analysis, which is also presented in Table 4, tested the proposed predictors of family time. The demographic control variables did not have a significant impact on family time. The same strategy used to test work time as a dependent variable was also used for family time so that all proposed predictors were first entered into the regression equation. Hypothesis 2 was not supported since work time did not have an impact on family time.

Additional predictors of family time were proposed in hypotheses 3, 8, 9, and 11. Of these hypotheses, only hypothesis 9 received partial support. This hypothesis predicted that parenting demands, defined as the number of children and age of youngest child, would be associated with increased family time. Results show that women with younger children spent more time in the family role.

To test the remaining hypotheses concerning role performance and role satisfaction, four additional regression analyses were conducted. As shown in Table 5, the proposed predictors of job performance were not supported. Again, time was entered after all other predictors. Time did not account for a significant amount of variance in job performance. Hypothesis 13-16 predicted that career consequences, LMX, role overload, and job involvement would predict job performance. These hypotheses were not

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Job and Family Performance

Variables	β	t	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Criterion: Job performance</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.042	
Age	.087	.980		
Race	-.099	-1.147		
Income	.183	1.781		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.063*	.021
Career consequences	-.098	-1.186		
Step 3: Role sets			.081*	.018
LMX	.089	1.035		
Role overload	-.097	-1.136		
Step 4: Intent			.081	.000
Job involvement	.004	-.043		
Step 5: Time			.082	.001
Work time	-.032	-.356		
<i>Criterion: Family performance</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.040	
Age	-.009	-.098		
Race	-.174	-2.135*		
Income	.172	1.989*		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.092*	.052*
Traditional gender role expectations	-.227	-2.951*		
Step 3: Role sets			.093*	.001
Number of children	-.039	-.486		
Step 4: Intent			.131*	.038*
Family involvement	.201	2.581*		

Note. Betas are reported for the last step of the equation.

* $p \leq .05$

supported.

Also shown in Table 5 is the regression analysis for family performance. Of the control variables, race and income had a significant impact on family performance. Minority participants in this sample had higher family performance ratings than non-minority participants. Higher incomes were associated with higher family performance ratings. Hypothesis 17 predicted that traditional gender role expectations would be significantly and negatively related to family performance. This hypothesis was supported. Hypothesis 18 predicted that more children in the household would be associated with lower levels of family performance. Results did not support this hypothesis. The proposed relationship between family involvement and family performance was supported.

The regression results for job satisfaction are presented in Table 6. Of the demographic control variables, income and race had a significant impact on job satisfaction. The direction of beta coefficients suggests that non-minority participants and individuals with a higher income experienced a higher level of job satisfaction. Hypothesis 21 received partial support. Although managerial support did not have an impact on job satisfaction, career consequences did significantly effect job satisfaction. Hypotheses concerning LMX and role overload were supported. Hypothesis 22 was not supported since coworker support was not shown to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Hypothesis 25 predicted that job involvement would be associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. Support was not found for this hypothesis. Family time failed to show any significant relationship with job satisfaction.

Table 6
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Predicting Job and Family Satisfaction

Variables	β	t	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Criterion: Job satisfaction</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.043	
Age	-.103	-1.409		
Race	.149	2.082*		
Income	.158	2.021*		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.244*	.202*
Managerial support	.069	.703		
Career consequences	-.171	-2.168*		
Step 3: Role sets			.367*	.123*
LMX	.182	2.362*		
Coworker support	-.015	-.209		
Role overload	-.371	-4.751*		
Step 4: Intent			.380*	.012
Job involvement	.123	1.654		
Step 5: Time			.380*	.000
Family time	-.020	-.296		
<i>Criterion: Family satisfaction</i>				
Step 1: Demographic control variables			.032	
Age	.096	1.099		
Race	-.023	-.289		
Income	.124	1.428		
Step 2: Societal expectations			.089*	.057*
Traditional gender role expectations	-.186	-2.373*		
Step 3: Role sets			.136*	.047*
Number of children	-.107	-1.303		
Family instrumental support	.177	2.178*		
Step 4: Intent			.160*	.024*
Family involvement	.163	2.044*		
Step 5: Time			.160*	.000
Family time	.007	.087		

Note. Betas are reported for the last step of the equation.

* $p \leq .05$

The last regression analysis (presented in Table 6) tested the proposed predictors of family satisfaction. The number of children in the household did not have the hypothesized negative effect on family satisfaction. Hypotheses 28-30 received support. Traditional gender role expectations, family instrumental support, and family involvement each had a significant impact on family satisfaction in the proposed direction. Family time was entered in the last step of the equation and did not have a significant impact on family satisfaction, failing to support hypothesis 26.

A number of mediational relationships were originally proposed within the present study. These relationships were not tested since basic assumptions underlying those relationships were unmet. For instance, it was proposed that the predictors of work time would indirectly affect family time through work time. A basic assumption for work time as a mediator in this relationship is that variations in work time significantly account for variations in family time. Correlations show that there is no significant relationship between work time and family time. See Appendix O for a description of hypotheses that were originally proposed.

Distractions

The first exploratory questions asked whether participants experienced more distractions from work or from home. The variable means show that, on average, participants experience more distractions from work while at home than vice versa. In fact, participants appear to experience almost twice the amount of work distractions as family distractions. However, the large standard deviations suggest that there is a great deal of variance for distractions.

The second exploratory question asked whether distractions are helpful or harmful. Correlations suggest that work distractions are harmful, but family distractions have limited repercussions. Work distractions are correlated negatively with managerial support and positively with role overload. Family distractions are not significantly correlated with any of the study variables except work distractions. To further explore this question, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted. First, 15 outliers with extremely high distraction scores were removed. Then three separate groups for low, moderate, and high distraction levels were created using the cut point of $\frac{1}{2}$ standard deviation above and below the means for family and work distractions.

Four separate MANOVAs were conducted to assess the impact of work distractions and family distractions on family and work variables. Significant results were found only for the impact of work distractions on work variables. The overall MANOVA was significant, $F(16, 290) = 3.17, p < .001$, and as shown in Table 7 univariate F tests were significant for managerial support, career consequences, role overload, work time, and job satisfaction. Individuals experiencing higher work distractions while at home had less managerial support, more career consequences, higher role overload, less job satisfaction, and spent more time at work.

Post hoc comparison using Tukey's HSD correction found that individuals with the fewest work distractions experienced significantly more managerial support ($M = 3.33$) than individuals with moderate ($M = 3.00$) or low ($M = 2.91$) levels of distractions. Participants with higher distractions were more likely to have higher levels of career consequences ($M = 3.00$) than those with low distractions ($M = 2.62$). Individuals with low distractions had less role overload ($M = 3.30$) than those in the moderate ($M = 3.71$)

Table 7
Univariate F tests for Work Distractions

	Univariate F-tests						
	df	SS	MS	df _{error}	MS _{error}	F	η^2
Mgr support	2	5.24	2.62	152	.45	5.81*	.07
Career conseq.	2	4.07	2.04	152	.39	5.29*	.07
LMX	2	2.20	1.10	152	.59	1.87	.02
Cwkr. sppt.	2	.94	.47	152	.45	1.04	.01
Role overload	2	12.11	6.06	152	.61	9.91*	.12
Work time	2	1339.82	669.91	152	94.84	7.06*	.09
Job performance	2	1.02	.51	152	.30	1.71	.02
Job satisfaction	2	15.87	7.93	152	1.05	7.55*	.09

* $p < .05$

or high ($M = 3.97$) distraction groups. Work time also differed significantly across work distraction levels with those experiencing the highest level of distractions working more hours ($M = 49.77$) than those with low distractions ($M = 42.63$). Lastly, job satisfaction was significantly lower ($M = 2.65$) for individuals with high distractions than those in either the moderate ($M = 3.28$) or low distraction group ($M = 3.37$).

Additional Analyses

Given the findings of the present study, a number of additional analyses were conducted with job and family involvement. Greater detail regarding the need to conduct the following analyses is provided in the discussion section. In order to determine if levels of job and family involvement differentially affected variables included in the current investigation, MANOVAs were conducted. Since past research and the present findings show that most women are highly involved in family, those falling 1 standard deviation below the mean family involvement score ($N = 40$) were first eliminated. Therefore, all women in this analysis were classified as high family involvement. Next, three groups of high, moderate, and low job involvement were created using $\frac{1}{2}$ standard deviation above and below the mean as a cut-point. The sample size for the analysis was 136 with 49 classified as low job involvement, 43 as moderate, and 44 as high. The overall MANOVA results for the impact of life role priority on work variables was significant, $F(16, 254) = 2.49, p < .01$. As shown in Table 8, univariate F tests were significant for managerial support and LMX. Post hoc comparison using Tukey's HSD correction showed that women who place a high priority on work experience more managerial support ($M = 3.23$) than women who place a low priority on their work role ($M = 2.79$). Participants with a high priority on their jobs also had significantly higher

Table 8
Univariate F tests for Life Role Priorities

	Univariate F-tests						
	df	SS	MS	df _{error}	MS _{error}	F	η^2
Mgr support	2	4.73	2.37	133	.49	4.82*	.07
Career conseq.	2	.28	.14	133	.43	0.32	.01
LMX	2	7.07	3.54	133	.59	6.02*	.08
Cwkr. sppt.	2	.90	.45	133	.51	.89	.01
Role overload	2	2.14	1.07	133	.71	1.52	.02
Work time	2	183.89	91.93	133	102.36	.90	.01
Job performance	2	.18	8.97	133	.31	.29	.00
Job satisfaction	2	3.87	1.93	133	1.25	1.55	.02

* $p < .05$

LMX scores ($M = 2.96$) than those with a moderate ($M = 2.57$) or low job priority ($M = 2.42$). MANOVA results for the family variables were not significant.

MANOVAs were also conducted with groupings of study participants who reported *extremely* high or low levels of job and family involvement. In order to create groupings with similar numbers of participants, cut points were established at $\frac{1}{2}$ standard deviation above and below the mean for job and family involvement. Three groupings were created. Twenty-two participants met the criteria for the first group that was defined “high family” having very low job involvement (2.25 or less) and very high family involvement (4.11 and above). Only 13 participants met the criteria for the second group labeled “high career” with job involvement scores of 2.89 or higher and family involvement scores of 3.44 or less. Lastly, 19 participants were classified as “high both” with family involvement scores of 4.11 or higher and job involvement scores of 2.89 and higher.

Once again, MANOVA results were only significant for the work variables. $F(16, 90) = 2.02, p < .05$. As shown in Table 9, univariate F tests showed significance only for job satisfaction. Post hoc analysis revealed that participants in the “high both” group had significantly higher job satisfaction ($M = 3.61$) scores than those in the extremely high family involvement group ($M = 2.59$).

Table 9
Univariate F tests for Extreme Life Role Priorities

	Univariate F-tests						
	df	SS	MS	df _{error}	MS _{error}	F	η^2
Mgr support	2	3.17	1.58	51	.68	2.35	.08
Career conseq.	2	.43	.22	51	.56	.38	.02
LMX	2	1.78	.89	51	.57	1.56	.06
Cwkr. sppt.	2	1.44	.72	51	.58	1.24	.05
Role overload	2	1.35	.67	51	.80	.84	.03
Work time	2	180.50	90.25	51	153.60	.59	.02
Job performance	2	.10	5.09	51	.30	.17	.01
Job satisfaction	2	10.75	5.38	51	1.28	4.20*	.14

* $p < .05$

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to test certain theoretical assumptions about time spent in roles, which underlie WFC research. Early WFC researchers (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) proposed that one of the primary forms of WFC is time-based, referring to excessive hours in one role or incompatible time pressures. The results of this study suggest that the time spent in work and family roles has a very limited impact on WFC. Although some variables were significantly related to time spent in a particular role, family time and work time were unrelated to each other and failed to have any significant impact on performance and satisfaction in either work or family roles. Results suggest that role time alone provides an inadequate explanation for conflict experienced between family and work roles.

The findings for role time offer hope for women struggling with the task of being able to “do it all.” The results suggest that family time and work time do not compete for resources. This finding is similar to research suggesting that work and family commitment have either no relation (Barnett & Hyde, 2001) or a slightly positive relationship (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). The underlying assumption behind much research in WFC and family relations is that devotion to one role inhibits devotion to another. The current findings do not support this assumption. Rather, the research suggests that work and family time are unrelated and that role performance and satisfaction have little to do with the overall amount of time spent in either role.

Plausible Explanations

Several researchers have suggested that WFC literature move beyond time as a primary source of conflict (Barnett, 1998; Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Building on tenants posed by Edwards and Rothbard (2000) and role theory, the current research applied a true theoretical examination to the underlying assumptions of time-based conflict. The present research confirms the need to reconsider time as a primary cause of conflict. The following sections explore possible reasons why role time, in and of itself, is insufficient for predicting WFC.

Role Quality

There is evidence that the quality of a role may be more important than the quantity of time spent in that role. An important theory guiding research in the area of multiple roles is the expansionist theory (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), which was presented as an alternative to traditional theories about family relations. The expansionist theory proposes first and foremost that multiple life roles are beneficial. The theory also suggests that role quality is a more important predictor of the benefits of multiple life roles than time spent in a role and the number of roles. Barnett and Hyde (2001) suggest that an individual working long hours may still benefit from that role if the work is satisfying.

Recent research has shown that job role quality accounts for more variance in WFC than the number of hours worked (Hammer et al., 2002). Additionally, researchers have shown that the quality of a work role is a more important predictor of life satisfaction than the number of hours worked (Barnett & Gareis, 2000b). A role that is high in quality offers limited role concerns and high role rewards. Increased role quality

is related to well being (Stephens & Townsend, 1997) and lower stress (Barnett, Raudenbush, Brennan, Pleck, & Marshall, 1995). Undesirable outcomes of poor role quality include psychological distress (Barnett, Marshall, Raudenbush, & Brennan, 1993), depression, and anxiety (Greenberger & O'Neil, 1993).

Within the current study, participants did indicate the amount of time in the family role that could be classified as quality time (although this was not incorporated into analyses). The amount of quality time was shown to be positively correlated with family performance ($r = .18, p > .015$). No other aspect of family time was significantly correlated with family performance. Results within the present study reiterate the importance of role quality in understanding WFC and the need to consider role quality within related research.

One characteristic of a high quality work role is income. One could assume that higher income jobs are more complex and demanding on one's time, making it difficult to balance the demands of multiple life roles. Indeed, the current results show that a higher income was associated with more time spent at work. In order to show that income leads to WFC, results would also need to have shown that work time limits family time, job satisfaction, or job performance. Instead, the results suggest that a higher income is related to valuable outcomes including higher job satisfaction and family performance.

Rather than a contributor to WFC, a higher income appears to be an asset for juggling multiple life roles. Other researchers have suggested that a higher income is beneficial because more resources are generated that can be used to alleviate WFC (Barnett & Hyde, 2001, Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). For instance, with a higher income a family may be able to afford a better daycare or housecleaning services.

Additionally, individuals who work in higher status positions are more likely to have access to flexible policies and practices (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001). Recent research (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001) shows that individuals who are self-employed are more satisfied with their jobs due to the autonomy and flexibility of their schedules. Barnett (1998) suggests that individuals who put more time into work are more likely to have “good” jobs, which offer higher pay, better benefits, and work that is more complex.

Trade-offs

According to Barnett and Gareis (2000a) trade-offs can be defined as “a type of intrarole conflict in which the incumbent has to relinquish some aspects of the work role because they cannot all be performed in the reduced time now allocated to work” (p. 173). Certainly this definition could be expanded to incorporate interrole conflicts such that some aspects of the family role must be given up to accomplish everything required of the work role and vice versa. This would suggest that it is not the overall amount of time that matters, but the desirable activities that must be sacrificed.

Within the present data, there is evidence to support the hypothesis that trade-offs are a more important predictor of outcomes than the number of hours. For instance, family errands, which can be objectively viewed as a less desirable aspect of family time, were found to be negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = -.29, p < .001$) and family satisfaction ($r = -.18, p < .05$). The amount of time spent performing home maintenance, which might also be viewed as a less desirable task, was negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = -.30, p < .001$). The time spent driving to and from work was negatively correlated with family satisfaction ($r = -.22, p < .01$) and with job performance ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

Having more assistance performing household tasks might help women minimize the number of trade-offs that must be made. For instance, a woman can stay late for an important business meeting if she knows her husband will pick up the children from daycare and prepare dinner for them. In the present study, instrumental support was shown to be a predictor of family satisfaction and was positively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .25, p < .001$). While these results do not conclusively support the significance of trade-offs in predicting WFC, they offer some support for the need to examine this aspect in greater detail.

Life role priorities

Researchers have also suggested that psychological involvement in life roles may be more important than role time for understanding WFC. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) examined psychological involvement in career and family and identified various categories of individuals based on life role priorities. The researchers identified one group as those who are highly committed to both work and family. In contrast to much WFC research, which proposes limits on being able to accommodate the demands of both roles successfully, the researchers found this group to be satisfied with both realms of their lives.

Results from the present study confirm the importance of role involvement in predicting role performance and satisfaction. Participants in the current study who were highly involved in both family and career experienced more rewards in the work role than women who were highly involved in family but moderately or minimally involved in their careers. Rewards for these women included higher LMX relationships and greater levels of managerial support. Additionally, women who were very highly involved in

both roles were shown to have greater job satisfaction than women who were highly involved in only the family role.

Interestingly, life role priorities did not have significant effects on family variables. The findings suggest that women can place a high priority on work without a detriment to family outcomes. The results reiterate the notion that women can devote themselves fully to both roles with success, possibly more success than those who devote themselves only to family.

Implications of Specific Study Variables

Work Distractions & Family Distractions

Work distractions and family distractions were presented in the present study as a different way to consider aspects of work and family time. Distractions include *mental* interruptions such as thoughts of a work project at home and *physical* distractions such as a receiving a call from a child while at work. Distractions from work while at home were experienced at a higher level than family distractions at work. This finding is consistent with research showing that the family boundaries are more permeable than work boundaries (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992b). Individuals are more likely to permit work to interfere with family life than to allow family issues to affect their work life.

Although the sheer hours spent in a role do not appear to create WFC, the amount of time that an individual feels distracted by work is associated with some damaging outcomes at work. Results show that individuals with high work distractions have less managerial support, more career consequences, greater role overload, less job satisfaction, and spend more time at work. Although causality cannot be determined

based on the findings from the present study, results suggest that work distractions are associated with many unpleasant outcomes.

LMX

The results from the present study suggest that LMX is an extremely important component of a family-friendly workplace. The correlation of LMX with managerial support ($r = .48, p < .001$) and career consequences ($r = -.24, p < .01$) reiterates the significance that a supervisor has in establishing a culture that supports work-life balance. Policies alone are not likely to reduce WFC unless the work environment offers support for the utilization of those policies. Recent findings show that a family-supportive workplace mediates the relationship between available benefits and WFC (Allen, 2001).

A high LMX relationship suggests that the work role offers high rewards and fulfillment. In an earlier study, LMX was linked to greater experiences of WFC (Bernas & Major, 2000). The present study tested whether or not this relationship could be attributed to LMX increasing the amount of time that is required to successfully fulfill the work role. The results do not support this proposition and instead suggest that LMX is unrelated to role time. Further, LMX was negatively correlated with the amount of role overload experienced by participants. This could suggest that a high LMX relationship with the boss helps an individual manage her work role so that it is less demanding or overwhelming.

The role quality literature and “trade-offs” offer some insight into the earlier findings concerning LMX and WFC. A high LMX relationship would certainly be categorized as role that is high in quality. Women with a high LMX may be more likely to make trade-offs for family activities because the work role offers a fulfilling

relationship and role rewards. A high LMX relationship alone may be incomplete for understanding the resulting WFC. When a high LMX is coupled with a family role that is high in quality, trade-offs that are made would be more likely to result in WFC. Work interference with family would result only for those individuals with high quality work and family roles.

In general, individuals do not permit the family role to interfere with work as much as they allow work to interfere with family (Frone et al., 1992b). For individuals with a high LMX relationship this pattern may be exacerbated. For instance, a mother may choose not to be an active member in her son's PTA even though that is something she might enjoy. A new mother with a high LMX relationship might choose not to use all the maternity leave that is available to her. For someone with a high LMX relationship, these choices may be more desirable even though the family role is also high quality. As Hoschchild (1997) explained, the work role offers more rewards in our society including challenge, control, structure, self-esteem and social ties. Choices between two high quality roles are likely to be difficult and result in WFC. These suggestions warrant further consideration and imply that the relationship between LMX and WFC is more complicated than previously thought.

Expectations and support of family

Traditional gender role expectations were shown to be detrimental for the satisfaction and performance experienced in the family role. This finding suggests that for a woman to be able to "do it all" successfully, family members need to have realistic role expectations. Similarly, the instrumental support offered by family members was an important element of family satisfaction. The results suggest that having a family that

supports multiple roles either emotionally or physically (i.e., household chores) is critical for women managing those roles.

Jacobs and Gerson (2001) reviewed changes in work time between the years of 1970 and 1997. They found that changes in work time have resulted mostly from changes in the demographic composition of families. The authors suggest WFC can be attributed to changes in the demographic make-up of families resulting in less support at home. This suggestion further confirms the significance of family support in understanding WFC.

Outcome measures

Although time did not influence role performance and role satisfaction, a number of variables did have an impact on the study outcome measures. Family outcomes were impacted by traditional gender role expectations, family involvement, and family instrumental support. As described above, the expectations and support offered by family are a critical aspect for performance and satisfaction in that role. Consistent with the research of Friedman and Greenhaus (2000), family involvement was shown to be critical for performance and satisfaction in the family role.

While job performance was not well understood for the present sample, variables in the study accounted for 38% of the variance in job satisfaction. A position characterized by role overload appears to have a damaging impact on job satisfaction. Similarly, when an individual's workplace punishes employees for using family-friendly benefits, job satisfaction suffers. Consistent with much past research, LMX was shown to be a crucial element for job satisfaction.

The variables that were shown to predict satisfaction and performance offer additional support for relationships that have been examined by past researchers. Within the present study, these significant predictors showed what was more important than role time in predicting quality of life indicators. This does not necessarily suggest that the significant predictors cause WFC. Future research will need to examine these variables within models that describe the true nature of WFC.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS
Future Research

Future research in the area of work and family should be guided by theory. The present study offered a theoretically driven examination of time-based WFC. The failure of the results to support the theory draws into question assumptions that underlie a great deal of research. The present study used role theory and the tenants of interrole conflict, which were delineated by Edwards and Rothbard (2000) to build a testable model. Future researchers should continue to draw upon sound theoretical principles to examine the true nature of WFC. Models that clearly specify the type of conflict (i.e., time, strain, and behavior) are also necessary.

Traditional measures of WFC also warrant further consideration. Rather than measuring WFC through a self-report of the degree that conflict exists, the current study examined the specific variables that combine to create conflict and the expected outcomes. Self-reported measures of WFC should be examined more closely to determine what a self-reported assessment of conflict truly means. For instance, if one strongly agrees that work interferes with family life does this mean that work is stressful, time consuming, or psychologically involving? Further, does this suggest that work limits available energy for family, that stress from work is difficult to let go of at home, or that work distractions interfere with one's ability to focus on the family? The possibilities are numerous and warrant specific investigation.

Time

Future research is needed to confirm current findings regarding role time.

Although the results are promising, especially for working moms, the conclusion that role time has a limited impact on WFC is still surprising. Perhaps this is due to the fact that most people would be likely to respond “yes” if asked whether or not time at work interferes with family life. In fact, research shows that the majority of working people would prefer to work fewer hours (Saltzstein et al., 2001). It is possible that time spent at work has become a scapegoat for the stress and strain experienced in life. Previous researchers have suggested the possibility that “...employees experiencing stress ‘scapegoat’ their work in terms of work-related demands that spill over into family life” (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999, p. 344).

Role time may be consequential only for individuals with specific job and home characteristics. A chronically ill child, teenager with behavioral problems, or a controlling spouse could cause family time to be excessive. Work time may be important only for certain professions that are extremely demanding such as doctors or lawyers. According to the expansionist theory (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), there are limits to the amount of time that can be spent in a role without damaging results. Defining the acceptable limits for role time would be of great value within the literature. Important questions include: What are the individual differences that lead to extreme amounts of time in work and family roles? What constitutes extreme time in work or in family? What are the elements of family life that lead to extreme time in that role? Are there certain occupations that stretch one’s time to an extreme? What are the detrimental outcomes of extremely high hours in the work and family roles? Performance and satisfaction were

considered within the present research, but other outcomes such as health and fatigue might be more suitable. Answers to the above questions would offer guidance to women entering the workforce and organizations seeking to minimize work-family pressures.

The alternative explanations presented previously offer important areas of investigation for future research. The present findings reiterate the significance of studying role quality, trade-offs, and life role priorities. With respect to role quality, future research should consider which aspects of work and family roles are rewarding and which are harmful. Trade-offs should be examined to determine the frequency of trade-offs that must be made for working moms and the role responsibilities that are most likely to be sacrificed. More research is also needed to examine the characteristics of individuals who commit fully to work and family roles. The benefits of committing to both have been shown and variables that help women to embrace work and family roles simultaneously need to be explored.

Additional Areas of Future Research

Research with federal employees shows that the extent an organization supports and understands employees' family responsibilities has a much bigger impact on job satisfaction than formal policies (Saltzstein et al., 2001). The career consequences component of the family-friendly workplace measure was shown to be an important predictor of job satisfaction in the present study. Surprisingly, the managerial support component of the measure did not affect job satisfaction. Future research should continue to explore the impact of each component of family-friendly work culture on various quality of life measures. Additionally, in order to build a case for organizations to devote

time and money to developing a family-friendly culture, research should explore the impact on outcomes such as productivity, absenteeism, recruitment, and turnover.

Distractions represent an important contribution to the work-family literature and warrant further investigation. Future research is needed to confirm the results obtained in the present study regarding the differential effects of work and family distractions. Given that work distractions appear to be harmful, researchers should explore the characteristics of work roles and individuals that lead to increased distractions. The directionality of distractions and quality of life outcomes should also be clearly defined.

The expectations and support offered by family members needs further investigation. Since there are so many different ways to define a family today it is difficult to determine where an individual gathers expectations and support. Determining the primary sources of support and the significance of each source would be valuable. Additionally, the role of support in WFC needs to be clearly delineated. Results from the current study show that traditional gender role expectations are damaging for family performance and family satisfaction. Results also show that instrumental support increases family satisfaction. Defining how these variables combine with other variables to create or inhibit WFC is an important area for future investigation.

Lastly, findings in the present research suggest that WFC experiences may vary based on race. Results showed that minorities spent more time at work, had higher family performance, and lower job satisfaction. There is limited research on racial differences in the WFC literature. Although recent research has begun to explore racial differences in perceptions of and access to work-family benefits (Gerstel & McGonagle,

1999; Parker & Allen, 2001), more research is needed to understand the unique work-family pressures faced by men and women of different races.

Limitations

Several limitations to the present study warrant mention. Since all participants were from a single organization, the generalizability of results is questionable. The present sample consisted of employees from a municipal city government. In general, this type of work environment could be perceived as more family-friendly for employees. Time expectations for employees in this environment are likely to be less severe and less varied than private sector jobs. It is also likely that individuals who have selected a career with this employer have done so knowing that the environment is more family-friendly than other places of employment. Comparisons among professions and places of employment need to be completed in order to confirm that results obtained in the current study.

The sample was not a true random sample, but rather a convenience sample. Response rates were anticipated to be higher using this method as opposed to mail surveys since participants were given adequate time during their working hours to complete the study. Random sampling of employees would have been difficult given the demographic requirements for the study. Participants for the present study included only women with childcare responsibilities. Identifying women with children in the present organization before sampling would have threatened the privacy of participants since medical records would be the only way to identify parents.

The measures of job and family performance used within the present study were self-rated. Research shows that self-ratings of job performance produce different results

than supervisory ratings (Conway & Huffcutt, 1997). Although self-ratings of performance tend to be inflated (Bass & Yammarino, 1991; Holzbach, 1978), this was determined to be the best alternative to protect anonymity. Several options were originally considered for the job performance ratings. The performance appraisal score was initially considered as a reflection of job performance. However, the performance appraisal scores within this environment also tend to be inflated with limited variability. A rating completed by the supervisor as part of the study was also considered. This approach would have required identification of individual participants and their supervisors. The Institutional Review Board felt this approach would threaten the anonymity of subjects. For family performance, an alternative method would have been to request that family members complete a questionnaire. In the present study, there was no requirement that a participant have a spouse at home and family members could have included children of all ages. A participant's family might have included only an infant at home. Therefore, self-ratings of performance were used with the realization that this is type of rating may offer less accuracy and variability.

General Conclusions

Time-based WFC has long been assumed to be one of the primary forms of conflict experienced between family and work roles. Time-based conflict has been defined as excessive time demands from either role or incompatible time pressures. Results from the present study suggest that time-based conflict does not occur for the majority of working moms. The findings further suggest that the demands of work and family can be fulfilled successfully even for women who fully devote themselves to both roles. Alternative explanations that have been offered and explored with the present data

provide avenues for future theory and research. These alternative explanations need to be couched within models that fully describe the nature of WFC.

Organizational Implications

Interpreting the results of the present study to suggest that work hours do not matter would be an unfortunate assumption for organizations. Although normal fluctuations across individuals in the number of hours worked does not seem to create conflict, the present findings do not show whether or not excessive hours or particularly demanding jobs result in conflict. Further tests of the hypotheses presented are needed within occupations and organizational settings that are more diverse.

Past research and the present results do suggest that a high quality work role is an important element of job satisfaction. Organizations should explore ways to create higher quality work roles. Training for supervisors that is focused on developing a family-friendly culture could help improve the quality of work roles. Additionally, organizations should help supervisors learn to develop better relationships with employees and recognize the signs of work role overload.

Researchers need to continue to help organizations justify training programs centered around building family-friendly work cultures. Understanding the financial impact of supportive work environments would help organizations commit time and resources to building those environments. Variables that need further exploration are absenteeism, productivity, turnover, and recruitment.

Rethinking Conflict

The results from the present study offer support to researchers who have suggested reconsidering the label of “conflict.” For the past several years researchers

have suggested the need to reconsider work-family issues through different lenses.

Barnett (1998) suggested that focusing solely on the *conflict* between work and family is a bias in the literature. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) use the term “linking mechanisms” to define a number of different potential relationships between work and family variables including spillover, compensation, segmentation, resource drain, congruence, and conflict. The role quality literature suggests that holding multiple roles offers benefits as opposed to conflict.

Findings from the present study offer promising avenues for future researchers and practitioners. Failing to confirm time-based WFC is good news to any individual who has family and career responsibilities. Although it is valuable to explore the benefits of multiple roles, research has consistently shown that working parents perceive conflict between work and family. While the findings of the present study point to the need to examine the benefits of multiple life roles and alternative theories about work and family, a continued appreciation for nature of conflict is needed.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 414-435.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 278-308.
- Amatea, E. S., Cross, E. G., Clark, J. E., & Bobby, C. L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-oriented men and women: The life role salience scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 48*, 831-838.
- Aryee, S. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: Evidence from Singapore. *Human Relations, 45*, 813-837.
- 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., & Gareis, K. C. (2000a). Reduced-hours employment. *Work and Occupations, 27*, 168-187.
- Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2000b). Reduced-hours job-role quality and life satisfaction among married women physicians with children. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 358-364.
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*, 781-796.

- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., Raudenbush, S. W., & Brennan, R. T. (1993). Gender and the relationship between job experiences and psychological distress: A study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 794-806.
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Sayer, A. (1992). Positive-spillover effects from job to home: A closer look. *Women & Health, 19*, 13-41.
- Barnett, R. C., Raudenbush, S. W., Brennan, R. T., Pleck, J. H., & Marshall, N. L. (1995). Change in job and marital experiences and change in psychological distress: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 839-850.
- Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. C. (1986). Consequences of fathers' participation in family work: Parents' role strain and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 983-992.
- Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Congruence of self and others' leadership ratings of naval officers for understanding successful performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 40*, 437-454.
- Bedeian, A. G., Burke, B. G., & Moffett, R. G. (1988). Outcomes of work-family conflict among married male and female professionals. *Journal of Management, 14*, 475-491.
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 391-405.
- Bernas, K. H., & Major, D. A. (2000). Contributors to stress resistance: Testing a model of women's work-family conflict. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 170-178.

- Beutell, N. J., & Wittig-Berman, U. (1999). Predictors of work-family conflict and satisfaction with family, job, career, and life. *Psychological Reports, 85*, 893-903.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces, 79*, 191-228.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 235-255.
- Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & Duwars, R. E. (1980). Work demands on administrators and spouse well-being. *Human Relations, 33*, 253-278.
- Burley, K. A. (1991). Family-work spillover in dual-career couples: A comparison of two time perspectives. *Psychological Reports, 68*, 471-480.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Jr., Harrison, R. V. & Pinneau, S. R., Jr.. (1975). *Job Demands and Worker Health: Main Effects and Occupational Differences*. Washington, D.C. (NTIS No. 276-809)
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance, 10*, 331-360.
- Cook, E. P. (1994). Role salience and multiple roles: A gender perspective. *The Career Development Quarterly, 43*, 85-95.
- Covin, T. J., & Brush, C. C. (1991). An examination of male and female attitudes toward career and family issues. *Sex Roles, 25*, 393-411.

- Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 93-108.
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 60-74.
- Edwards, J. R. & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178-199.
- Etaugh, C., & Folger, D. (1998). Perceptions of parents whose work and parenting behaviors deviate from role expectations. *Sex Roles*, 39, 215-223.
- Etaugh, C., & Nekolny, K. (1990). Effects of employment status and marital status on perceptions of mothers. *Sex Roles*, 23, 273-280.
- Etaugh, C., & Study, G. G. (1989). Perceptions of mothers: Effects of employment status, marital status, and age of child. *Sex Roles*, 20, 59-70.
- Finkel, S. K., Olswang, S., & She, N. (1994). Childbirth, tenure, and promotion for women faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 17, 259-270.
- Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and Family – Allies or Enemies?* Oxford University Press: New York.

- 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., Yardley, J. K., & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 145-167.
- Fu, C. K., & Shaffer, M. A. (2001). The tug of work and family: Direct and indirect domain-specific determinants of work-family conflict. *Personnel Review, 30*, 502-522.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D. E. (1996). The role of employers in addressing the needs of employed parents. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*, 111-136.
- Gerstel, N., & McGonagle, K. (1999). Job leaves and the limits of the family and medical leave act (1999). *Work and Occupations, 26*, 510-534.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 827-844.
- Gjerdingen, D., McGovern, P., Bekker, M., Lundberg, U., & Willemssen, T. (2000). Women's work roles and their impact on health, well-being and career: Comparisons between the United States, Sweden and The Netherlands. *Women & Health, 31*, 1-20.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- 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.
- Greenberger, E., & O'Neil, R. (1993). Spouse, parent, worker: Role commitments and role-related experiences in the construction of adults' well-being. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 181-197.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Career involvement and family involvement as moderators of relationships between work-family conflict and withdrawal from a profession. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 91-100.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., Granrose, C. S., Rabinowitz, S., & Beutell, N. J. (1989). Sources of work-family conflict among two-career couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34, 133-153.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159-170.
- 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.

- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Johnson, J., Caubet, S. L., Cullen, J. C., & Steinberg, L. (2002). *The relationship between job role quality and work-family fit: A longitudinal study of the sandwiched generation*. Paper presented at academic conference for Persons, Processes, and Places: Research on Families, Workplaces and Communities, San Francisco, CA.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Lucas, J. A. (1992). Presumed innocent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 536-544.
- 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.
- Holzbach, R. L. (1978). Rater bias in performance ratings: Superior, self-, and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*, 579-588.
- 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.
- Hoschschild, A. R. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work becomes Home and Home becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 680-694.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families? *Work and Occupations, 28*, 40-63.

- Judiesch, M. K., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). Left behind? The impact of leaves of absence on managers career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 641-651.
- 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: Wiley.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 341-349.
- Katz, M. H., & Piotrkowski, C. S. (1983). Correlates of family role strain among employed black women. *Family Relations*, 32, 331-339.
- Keith, R., & Schafer, R. (1980). Role strain and depression in two job families. *Family Relations*, 29, 483-488.
- Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 337-346.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1993). What do men want? *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 50-63.
- 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.
- Kofodimos, J. R. (1995). *Beyond Work-Family Programs: Confronting and Resolving the Underlying Causes of Work-Personal Life Conflict*. North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.
- 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., Noe, R. A., & DeMarr, B. J. (1999). Work-family role synthesis: Individual and organizational determinants. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 10*, 102-129.
- 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.
- Lambert, S. J. (1991). The combined effects of job and family characteristics on the job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation of men and women workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 341-363.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management: Vol. 15*. (pp. 47-119). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.
- 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.
- Lorech, 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.
- Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 58*, 417-432.

- Maume, D. J., & Houston, P. (2001). Job segregation and gender differences in work-family spillover among white-collar workers. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 22, 171-189.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1966). *Identities and interactions*. The Free Press: New York.
- Merton, R. (1957). The role set: Problems in sociological theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 8, 106-120.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 618-629.
- 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.
- Parker, L., & Allen, T. D. (2001). Work/family benefits: Variables related to employees' fairness perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 453-468.
- Parsuraman, S., Greenhaus, J., & 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 well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 275-300.

- Parasuraman, S., & Simmers, C. A. (2001). Type of employment, work-family conflict and well-being: A comparative study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 551-568.
- Paterson, J. M., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (1990). An empirical assessment of Kanungo's (1982) concept and measure of job involvement. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 39*, 293-306.
- 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, L. A. (1995). Putting the work back into work/family. *Group and Organization Management, 20*, 227-239.
- Pleck, J., Staines, G., & Lang, L. (1980). Conflict between work and family life. *Monthly Labor Review, 103*, 29-32.
- Rodgers, C. S. (1993). The flexible workplace: What have we learned? *Human Resource Management, 31*, 183-199.
- Russo, N. F. (1976). The motherhood mandate. *Journal of Social Forces, 32*, 143-154.
- Saltzstein, A. L., Ting, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review, 61*, 452-466.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 428-436.

- Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. (1993). Effects of alternative family structures on managerial career paths. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*, 830-843.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., Scandura, T. A., & Tepper, B. J. (1992). Development and preliminary validation of a new scale (LMX-6) to measure leader-member exchange in organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *52*, 135-147.
- Schroeder, K. A., Blood, L. L., & Maluso, D. (1992). An intergenerational analysis of expectations for women's career and family roles. *Sex Roles*, *26*, 273-291.
- 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.
- Sobkowski, A. (1989, May/June). The mommy track controversy. *Executive Female*, pp. 40-68.
- Stephens, M. A. P., & Townsend, A. L. (1997). Stress and parent care: Positive and negative effects of women's other roles. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 376-386.
- Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and research example. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199-218.). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *16*, 282-298.
- Thomas, L. 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.
- Tsui, A. S. (1984). A role set analysis of managerial reputational effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*, 64-96.
- Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work role characteristics, family structure demands, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 749-761.
- Wakabayashi, M., & Graen, G. B. (1984). The Japanese career progress study: A 7-year follow-up. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 603-614.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*, 82-111.
- Wells, L. G., & Major, D. A. (1997, May). "Superwomen's" work-family conflict: The impact of perfectionism. Paper presented at the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.
- 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*, 601-617.

APPENDIX A
WORK TIME MEASURE

WORK TIME

Please estimate the total number of hours per week spent in each of the work-related activities listed. The goal is to determine the total number of hours you dedicate to work each week. Therefore, please make sure that the time you record in each task does not overlap with time spent in another task. This will ensure that a total can be obtained by adding the hours spent in each activity.

- _____ Working at your place of business
- _____ Completing job-related tasks outside your place of work (e.g., at home)
- _____ Attending class or studying coursework relevant to your career advancement outside of regular work hours
- _____ Driving to and from work
- _____ Other work related tasks
- _____ **Total work hours per week**

From time to time, we all get distracted from our work. For instance, while at work, you may get a call from your spouse or from your child. This is likely to draw you away from your work for a certain amount of time. You may also be distracted simply by thinking about one role while in another role. For instance, you may have a difficult time concentrating on your work because you're thinking about an argument you had with your spouse.

- _____ Estimate the total number of hours per week you feel distracted by **family/home** thoughts or interruptions while working.

APPENDIX B
FAMILY TIME MEASURE

FAMILY TIME

Please estimate the total number of hours, per week, spent in each of the family-related activities that are listed. The goal is to determine the total number of hours you dedicate to your family each week. Therefore, please make sure that the time you record in each activity does not overlap with time spent in another activity. This will ensure that a total can be obtained by adding the hours spent in each activity.

- _____ Household chores (i.e., laundry, cleaning, cooking)
- _____ Childcare (i.e., feeding, driving, disciplining)
- _____ Shopping and errands
- _____ Yard/home maintenance
- _____ Spending quality time with family (i.e., talking, playing with children, family meals)
- _____ Other family activities
- _____ **Total family time per week**

From time to time, we all get distracted from our family and household chores. For instance, while having dinner, you may get a call from a coworker. You may also be distracted simply by thinking about one role while in another role. For example, you may have a difficult time enjoying family dinner because you can't stop thinking about a work project.

_____ Estimate the total number of hours per week you feel distracted by **work thoughts or interruptions** while at home or with family.

APPENDIX C
JOB INVOLVEMENT MEASURE

JOB INVOLVEMENT

Please use the following scale to record your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your current job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.
2. _____ I am very much personally involved in my job.
3. _____ I live, eat, and breathe my job.
4. _____ Most of my interests are centered around my job.
5. _____ I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.
6. _____ Usually, I feel detached from my job.
7. _____ Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.
8. _____ I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
9. _____ I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

APPENDIX D
ROLE OVERLOAD MEASURE

ROLE OVERLOAD

Please use the following scale to record your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your current job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ My job requires me to work very fast.
2. _____ My job requires me to work very hard.
3. _____ My job leaves me little time to get all my work done.
4. _____ There is a great deal to be done on my job.

APPENDIX E
JOB PERFORMANCE SELF-RATING

JOB PERFORMANCE SELF-RATING

The following statements describe your level of effectiveness in your present job. Please rate your level of job performance using the scale provided.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ Overall, I feel I am performing my job the way my supervisor would like me to.
2. _____ If my supervisor had it his/her way, he/she would change the manner in which I perform my job.
3. _____ All in all, I am very competent.
4. _____ In my estimation, I get my work done very effectively.
5. _____ Overall, I effectively fulfill my work roles/responsibilities
6. _____ Rate your overall level of performance using the following scale:
 - (1) Very incompetent
 - (2) Incompetent
 - (3) Average
 - (4) Competent
 - (5) Very Competent

APPENDIX F
JOB SATISFACTION MEASURE

JOB SATISFACTION

Please use the following scale to record your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your current job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ I am satisfied with my present job situation.
2. _____ My job situation is very frustrating to me.
3. _____ I frequently think I would like to change my job situation.

APPENDIX G
LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE MEASURE

LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE

The following items are focused on your relationship with your supervisor. Please answer each question using the specific rating scale provided after each item.

1. _____ Do you usually feel that you know where you stand or do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?
 - (4) Always know where I stand
 - (3) Usually know where I stand
 - (2) Seldom know where I stand
 - (1) Never know where I stand

2. _____ How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor understands your problems and needs?
 - (4) Completely
 - (3) Well enough
 - (2) Some, but not enough
 - (1) Not at all

3. _____ How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential?
 - (4) Fully
 - (3) As much as the next person
 - (2) Some, but not enough
 - (1) Not at all

4. _____ Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use power to help you solve problems in your work?
 - (4) Certainly would
 - (3) Probably would
 - (2) Might or might not
 - (1) No chance

5. _____ Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, to what extent can you count on him or her to "bail you out" at his or her expense when you really need it?
 - (4) Certainly would
 - (3) Probably would
 - (2) Might or might not
 - (1) No chance

6. _____ I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if he or she were not present to do so.

(4) Certainly would

(3) Probably would

(2) Maybe

(1) Probably not

7. _____ How would you characterize your relationship with your immediate supervisor?

(4) Extremely effective

(3) Better than average

(2) About average

(1) Less than average

APPENDIX H
FAMILY-FRIENDLY WORK CULTURE MEASURE

WORK-FAMILY CULTURE

The following items describe your work environment. Please rate the extent that you agree or disagree with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Managerial Support

1. _____ In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs.
2. _____ Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees' family and personal concerns.
3. _____ Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' child care responsibilities.
4. _____ In the event of conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first.
5. _____ In this organization employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and family lives.
6. _____ Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities.
7. _____ This organization is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons.
8. _____ In this organization it is generally okay to talk about one's family at work.
9. _____ In this organization employees can easily balance their work and family lives.
10. _____ This organization encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins.

Career Consequences

11. _____ In this organization it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters.
12. _____ Many employees are resentful when men in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children.
13. _____ Many employees are resentful when women in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children.
14. _____ In this organization employees who participate in available work-family programs (e.g., flexible scheduling) are viewed as less serious about their careers than those who do not participate in these programs.

15. _____ To turn down a promotion for family-related reasons will seriously hurt one's career progress in this organization.
16. _____ In this organization employees who use flextime are less likely to advance their careers than those who do not use flextime.

Organizational Time Demands

17. _____ To get ahead in this organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home.
18. _____ Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends.
19. _____ Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their families.
20. _____ To be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives.

Note. Items 17 through 20 were not included in the analyses but are included in the survey for informational purposes.

APPENDIX I
COWORKER SUPPORT MEASURE

COWORKER SUPPORT

Please rate how often in the past 2 months your coworkers have engaged in the following behaviors:

- | Never | Very
infrequently | Sometimes | Often | Very
Frequently |
|----------|---|-----------|-------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. _____ | Switched schedules (hours, overtime hours, vacation) to accommodate your family needs | | | |
| 2. _____ | Listened to your personal problems | | | |
| 3. _____ | Were critical of your efforts to combine work and family | | | |
| 4. _____ | Juggled tasks or duties to accommodate your family responsibilities | | | |
| 5. _____ | Shared ideas or advice | | | |
| 6. _____ | Held your family responsibilities against you | | | |
| 7. _____ | Helped you to figure out how to solve a problem | | | |
| 8. _____ | Were understanding or sympathetic | | | |
| 9. _____ | Showed resentment of your needs as a working parent | | | |

Note. Items 1 and 4 were removed from the scale for analyses.

APPENDIX J
FAMILY INVOLVEMENT MEASURE

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Please use the following scale to respond to the questions pertaining to your family situation.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ To me, my family is only a small part of who I am.
2. _____ I am very much personally involved in my family.
3. _____ I live, eat, and breathe my family.
4. _____ Most of my interests are centered around my family.
5. _____ I have very strong ties with my family which would be very difficult to break.
6. _____ Usually, I feel detached from my family.
7. _____ Most of my personal life goals are family-oriented.
8. _____ I consider my family to be very central to my existence.
9. _____ I like to be absorbed in my family most of the time.

APPENDIX K
FAMILY INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT MEASURE

FAMILY INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT

The following items refer to specific helpful behaviors you might see in people in your personal life (i.e., those outside of your work role). Individuals in your personal life may include a spouse, family, friends, neighbors, or a cleaning service.

Please use the following scale to rate the extent that you are able to rely on someone in your personal life do the following:

Never	Very infrequently	Sometimes	Often	Very Frequently
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ Help you out by running errands when necessary
2. _____ Take on extra household responsibilities if your job gets very demanding
3. _____ Help you out when you're running late for work
4. _____ Help you out with routine household tasks
5. _____ Take care of everything at home if you have to work late

APPENDIX L
TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLE EXPECTATIONS MEASURE

TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLE EXPECTATIONS

The following statements describe opinions about working mothers. Please use the following scale to rate the extent that individuals in your personal life (i.e., spouse, family, friends, and community group members) hold the following opinions:

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Not at all | A little | Somewhat | A lot | Very Strongly |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
-
1. _____ If possible, families should get along with less material goods so the mother can stay at home with the children who are under the age of five.
 2. _____ Women with children under the age of five should only work outside the home if it is an absolute necessity.
 3. _____ Young children need their mothers with them at home full time until they enter school.
 4. _____ A full time career and a happy, healthy family life are not possible for women simultaneously when children are under the age of six.
 5. _____ Working full time causes too many problems for mothers of young children and their family members to make it worthwhile.
 6. _____ Women who are wives, mothers of young children, and have careers may experience guilt, fatigue, marital problems, dirty homes, poor meals, children with problems, etc.
 7. _____ Today, women with children can be successful and fulfilled mothers and full time workers.

APPENDIX M
FAMILY SATISFACTION MEASURE

FAMILY SATISFACTION

The following statements are about you and your family. Please rate the extent that you agree or disagree with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ I am satisfied with my present family situation.
2. _____ My family situation is very frustrating to me.
3. _____ I frequently think I would like to change my family situation.

APPENDIX N
FAMILY PERFORMANCE MEASURE

FAMILY PERFORMANCE

The following items describe you and your family life. Please rate the extent that you agree or disagree with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. _____ Overall, I feel that I am a good parent.
2. _____ Overall, I feel that I do a good job managing my household.
3. _____ I feel I adequately fulfill my family responsibilities.
4. _____ I believe that I perform the tasks that my family expects me to perform.
5. _____ I neglect some of my family responsibilities.

APPENDIX O
ORIGINALLY PROPOSED MEDIATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

ORIGINALLY PROPOSED MEDIATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Factors which give rise to work time allocation are expected to affect family time indirectly through work time. For instance, a family friendly work culture directly influences the amount of time a woman must be present in the work role to be viewed as an effective employee. Because, a woman in this situation is required to work less, this frees available time for family. A mediational relationship is also proposed for family time allocation predictors. For instance, a woman with several young children must spend a great deal of time fulfilling the obligations of her role as a mother. The time required within the family role absorbs extra time that might be used to read work related journals or stay late at work to finish a project.

Hypothesis: The relationship between work time predictors (i.e., intent, role sets, and societal expectations) and family time will be mediated by work time.

Hypothesis: The relationship between family time predictors (i.e., intent, role sets, and societal expectations) and work time will be mediated by family time.

Time devoted to work is proposed to be positively related to job performance.

One of the premises of this research is that family time competes for work time. Time allocated to the family role should decrease available time for work. Therefore, family time should also affect job performance indirectly.

Hypothesis: Family time will be negatively related to job performance, but this relationship will be mediated by work time.

The more time spent in the family role, the more satisfied women tend to be with that role (Parasuraman et al., 1996). The nature of WFC experienced in this relationship results from an inability to spend the desired amount of time with family due to work obligations.

Hypothesis: Work time will be negatively related to family satisfaction, but this relationship will be mediated by family time

Work-family researchers have documented that when individuals perceive work to interfere with family life, they experience decreased job satisfaction (Adams et al., 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Work interference with family in the present model is represented by work time decreasing available time for family.

Hypothesis: Work time will be negatively related to job satisfaction, but this relationship will be mediated by family time.

VITA

Karyn Hofler Bernas
Department of Psychology
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA 23529

Karyn Bernas received her Bachelors degree in psychology from Virginia Commonwealth University in 1994. She began her graduate work at Old Dominion University in the fall semester of 1994. As a graduate student, she taught undergraduate psychology for several semesters and conducted data analysis and reporting for the Institutional Research department. Karyn's research interests have been focused primarily in the area of work and family balance. Her Master's degree, which was completed in 1996, examined a model of work-family conflict for working women. This research, entitled *Contributors to Stress Resistance: Testing a Model of Women's Work-Family Conflict*, was published in *Psychology of Women Quarterly* in 2000 and recognized as a top 20 finalist for the 2001 Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research. The study also received a great deal of media attention and was cited in *Working Mother*, *The Chicago Tribune*, and the *Virginian-Pilot*. Additional presentations and publications include: *Another Look at the Prevalence of Data Sharing*, *The Hardy Woman's Advantage: Effects on Stress and Conflict*, and *Work Interference With Family (W→F) and Family Interference with Work: Antecedents and Mediators*.

After completing her doctoral coursework, Karyn began her professional career as a Training Consultant with Alpha Solutions Corporation in Virginia Beach. While with Alpha she developed a training evaluation model for a National Navy maintenance training program. This experience offered opportunities to develop her skills in the areas of survey development, small group facilitation, and working with executive stakeholders. Currently, Karyn is employed as an Analyst with the City of Norfolk, Department of Utilities. Areas of responsibility include benchmarking, training, survey development and administration, and grant writing. Karyn's work experience also includes large-scale change management, focus group facilitation, employment test validation, and 360-degree feedback.