This is the author's version published as:

An extended measure of work-life balance culture: Development and confirmation of the measure

This paper extends the work of Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999) to develop a more comprehensive measure of work-life balance culture. Thompson et al. developed a survey based on three sub-dimensions which examine work-family culture. We have extended this to incorporate extra dimensions, and to broaden the measure to encompass life aspects beyond the family. Two studies were conducted in order to test and refine the measure. Over 700 participants in the first study completed the survey, and the Confirmatory Factor Analysis results show that the extended measure is robust. Further, a second study with a sample of 629 participants confirmed the general measure, with slight adaptations. The results are discussed in relation to the use of the measure for work-life balance research.

Keywords: work-life balance, culture

An extended measure of work-life balance culture: Development and confirmation of the measure

This paper extends and examines a measure of an organization's work-life balance (WLB) culture. Existing measures of a balanced culture (eg, Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness, 1999) do not comprehensively assess dimensions of organization culture specific to work-life balance. Thompson et al.'s measure identifies 3 sub-dimensions which are important components of work-family balance culture, and we propose additional sub-dimensions, and an extension of the measure to encompass life beyond family responsibilities. This will provide an extended measure which more comprehensively assesses work-life balance culture. There is a large amount of literature about the importance of work-life balance, and what organizations need to do to provide an environment that allows employees to balance their work and non-work lives. We have combined that literature and built upon the existing measure of work-family balance culture to develop a more comprehensive measure of work-life balance culture.

The aim of this study is to extend the measure of work-family balance culture to incorporate the three existing dimensions, plus new ones, and to extend the measure to incorporate broad issues of life (beyond family responsibilities) outside the work domain. This extended measure will be tested empirically to look for support for its underlying structure. It will then be modified, and tested again with an independent sample.

This paper will first discuss the existing conceptualization of work-life balance, and then the original Thompson et al (1999) measure of WLB culture will be introduced. A justification for the need for an extended measure will be provided, followed by a description of the extended measure. Study 1 will report the analysis of the properties of the new measure, which will then be modified if needed. Study 2 results will then be reported, followed by a discussion of the new measure, and it's utility.

Work-Life balance

We will use the term 'work-life balance' rather than 'work-family balance', or 'work-non-work balance' as we believe it is more encompassing, and more accurately describes, the reality of most people's lives. The concept started out as work-family, as it originated with an emphasis on women returning to work after the birth of children (Wise & Bond, 2003), thereby focusing on the balance between work and family. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) integrated previous research and proposed that work-family conflict existed when there was interrole conflict between the work and the family domain. Interrole conflict was described as situations where an individual's work responsibilities were made more difficult by one's involvement in the family, and vice versa (pg 77). Much research since then has examined work and family conflict, but it was later recognised that people had responsibilities outside of work beyond family (Wise & Bond, 2003), and so the term work-life or work-non-work balance became popular.

The concept is about balancing the multiple roles, demands and responsibilities that an individual has, so we believe that 'work- life balance' is a term which accurately reflects this. Evidence for the need for a more encompassing term is the recent focus on elements of people's lives that explicitly <u>exclude</u> the family. Casper, Weltman and Kwesiga (2007) developed a measure of family-friendly culture exclusively aimed at people who did <u>not</u> have families. They argued that evidence suggests singles are disadvantaged in some family-friendly organizations because they do not have children. Their results showed that singles reported "less equal treatment with respect to nonwork support than employees with families" (pg 495). This further demonstrates how important it is to consider the non-family aspects of life as well.

However, we argue that a focus only on family, or only on non-family, is limited. Most people have multiple aspects to their lives, be it children, partners, parents, pets,

involvement in sports, religion, hobbies or study, and these activities may all create demands that need to be managed. We propose that an inclusive conception of work-'life' balance (where life can be any aspect of life beyond the work domain) has more utility. It can include all aspects which may be important to a person, without excluding any one aspect. It allows people to psychologically choose for themselves what they consider to be their 'non-work' life. This is the concept we utilise in the extension of the measure proposed below.

Work-life balance culture

We build on the definition of culture proposed by Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999) for work-family culture. They define work-family culture as "the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees' work and family lives" (pg394). To the best of our knowledge, they were the first to propose a measure of this concept. Allen (2001) also proposed a measure of 'family supportive organizational perceptions'. This concept is distinct from measures of work-family balance per se, as they assess someone's perception of their own balance. However, work-life balance culture is a measure of the perceptions of the culture of the organization in relation to balancing work and family. Therefore, a person could report a high level of perceived work-family balance culture (meaning they believe the organization is supportive of people balancing their work and family lives) without actually having good work-family balance themself.

Thompson et al. (1999) showed that culture was an important concept that was related to work attitudes above and beyond what is accounted for by the availability of flexible work arrangements. The use of organizational work-life programs has been shown to have a number of individual and organizational benefits including the reduction of work-family conflict (Allen, 2001; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1994; Thiede & Ganster, 1995), absenteeism and turnover (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, & Wright, 1999), improved life satisfaction

and well-being (Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), and higher

organizational performance and productivity (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Perry-Smith & Blum,

2000). However, the availability of even extensive and generous work-life policies does not

necessarily result in widespread utilization by employees (Fried, 1998; Hochschild, 1997).

A growing body of empirical literature identifies that it is the nature of organizational

environment and its supportiveness of work-life policy use that accounts for the gap between

policy provision and utilization (e.g., Campbell, 2001; Sherer & Coakley, 1999; Soonhee,

2001; Wise & Bond, 2003). Behson (2002) studied the impact of the particular organizational

context related to work-family culture compared with the impact of broader perceived

organizational support. Behson found the specific work-family context was related to work-

family conflict beyond what was explained by the broader context. Together this evidence

shows how organizational work-life balance culture is crucial to employees' success in

balancing their work and non-work lives. It is therefore important to examine and be able to

measure this culture concept, as will now be discussed.

Measuring work-life balance culture

We propose an extended measure of work-life balance culture which is more

comprehensive in that we substitute non-work aspects in place of 'family'. That is, we allow

respondents to incorporate aspects of their lives beyond family which may compete for

attention with work. We also consider additional dimensions of culture itself beyond the

three proposed by Thompson e al (1999). Thompson et al.'s results suggested that theirs was

a reliable measure (with overall $\alpha = .92$) and that the three dimensions were uniquely

important. We build upon these and include additional dimensions in order to develop a

comprehensive measure of WLB culture. These dimensions will now be discussed.

Their first dimension of work family culture proposed by Thompson et al. (1999)

measured time demands, defined as the extent to which an organization expected an

employee to put work before their family responsibilities ($\alpha = .82$). A supportive work-life culture in terms of work-time commitment has been found to reduce work-family conflict (Frone, Yardley & Markel, 1997), improve job satisfaction (Rothausen, 1994) and increase productivity (Solomon, 1994).

The second dimension measured the perceived negative career consequences of using work-family benefits, or from prioritising family demands ($\alpha = .74$). Negative career consequences are thought to arise when a lack of physical presence in the workplace is associated with a lack of commitment to the organization, resulting in fewer opportunities for promotion and a lesser likelihood of receiving other organizational rewards. The most salient example of this problem is for people working part-time. Schwartz (1989) was one of the first to identify the career disadvantages inherent in part-time employment, arguing they were paid less, received less training and advanced more slowly because employers attach a higher risk to investing in them. Similarly, Kirby and Krone (2002) found that working part-time is incompatible with promotion and access to a range of higher status male-dominated occupations. Even beyond part-time workers, Allen and Russell (1999) reported that employees who utilized family-friendly policies were allocated fewer organizational rewards, including advancement opportunities and salary increases, than employees who did not use the policies. Further, Rogier and Padgett (2004) used a vignette study to show that women were rated as having high performance, but if they were utilising a flexible work schedule, they were rated as having lower motivation for advancement and less dedication to their career. Perceptions of these negative career consequences and how likely they are to occur are part of the organization's work-life balance culture.

The third dimension measured support from management and sensitivity to employees' family demands ($\alpha = .91$). It has been argued that managers play an important role in the success of work-life programs because they are in a position to actively encourage

or discourage employees' efforts to balance their work and non-work lives (see for example, Perlow, 1995; Thompson, Thomas & Maier, 1992). Where supervisors enthusiastically support the integration of paid work and other responsibilities, employees will be more likely to utilize available work-life balance options (Bardoel, 2003) and subsequently experience less associated work-life conflict (Allen, 2001; Thomas and Ganster, 1995). Conversely, even in 'family friendly' organizations, managers may send negative signals indicating that the use of flexible benefits is a problem for them and the organization as a whole (Rapoport & Bailyn, 1996)

The three dimensions proposed by Thompson et al. (1999) are crucial, but we expand the concept and the measure to include 2 additional dimensions: gendered expectations and co-worker support. We propose that for a WLB culture measure to be comprehensive it needs to incorporate the additional dimensions. Gender beliefs are strongly tied to the concept of WLB and so need to be examined at a cultural level. Co-workers are an important part of the workplace and significantly affect culture so also need to be included. The rationale for including each of these two new dimensions will now be presented.

These new dimensions were first proposed in McDonald, Brown and Bradley (2005) as explanations for why work-life balance policy usage was low. **'**Gender expectations' refers to the idea that, although work-life policies are ostensibly gender-neutral, in practice they revolve around facilitating the working conditions of women (Haas & Hwang, 1995; Strachan & Burgess, 1998). Indeed, notions of work-life balance are highly gendered. Women with dependent children have been by far the largest demographic group to utilize work-life arrangements (Charlesworth, 1997) and despite increased awareness and public rhetoric about men's use of workplace flexibility, utilization rates have changed little in the past twenty years.

Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, and Rosner (2005) examined work-family conflict in a sample of 203 teachers in the United States. Their results indicated that there was a tendency for women to be more easily able to access the policies which assist balancing work and family than men were. Thus, the gender expectations dimension of the work-life culture instrument measures the extent to which, in practice, the work environment supports work-life balance, including the use of flexible work policies, for both men and women. The dimension we propose does not look at gender per se, but the expectations around policy use for both men and women. This is particularly important as we are looking at non-work aspects beyond merely family.

The final dimension we propose as important in a comprehensive measure of work-life culture is co-worker support. There is some evidence, based on theories of organizational justice (Hegtvedt, Clay-Warner & Ferrigno, 2002; Young, 1999) that resentment by some employees may contribute to a work environment where the utilization of work-life policies is not encouraged. This resentment can be seen through a lack of support from co-workers, and we propose this is part of a workplace culture that does not support work-life balance. A study by Kirby and Krone (2002) for example, found that both micro and macro level structures impacted on the system of how work-family benefits were constructed. Micro structures included co-worker interactions, such as comparisons of expectations of business travel for employees with and without family responsibilities (Kirby & Krone, 2002). Thus, women who utilized the policies felt resentment from co-workers and were cognizant of needing to balance "use" versus "abuse" so as not to be seen, and treated, as a less committed worker. Co-worker support is therefore an important dimension of work-life balance culture.

In summary, this study is proposing an extension to the measure proposed by Thompson et al. (1999), to measure five dimensions of work-life balance culture, and will test the dimensional structure underlying the overall work-life balance culture concept. The

measure has also been broadened beyond family non-work aspects and this study will empirically test the success of this. Study 1 will test the established dimensions, plus our new proposed dimensions. Based on the empirical results, modification will be made to the measure, and it will be tested again with an independent sample in Study 2. The items will be discussed in relation to their statistical properties, as well as their theoretical link to the dimensions.

STUDY 1

METHOD

Pre-testing. All of the items were presented to several academics who research in this area, as well as several human resource specialists who worked in the sample organization for feedback. Slight modifications were made, but the feedback suggested the items had acceptable face validity.

Sample

The sample consisted of 717 employees from a large state government department in Australia. The organization is predominantly male, which is reflected in the gender split in the sample (457 male, 253 female). The average age was 41 with the range from 17 to 75. The sample were contracted to work between 7 and 50 hours per week (mean = 36.4 hours). Eighty percent were permanent full-time workers. Approximately 40% of the sample supervised staff and 12.6% respondents identified with one Equal Employment Opportunity target group (19 Disability, 6 Aboriginal, 8 Torres Strait Islander, 59 from a Non-English Speaking Background). In terms of employment classification, 398 (56%) respondents were employed in administrative officer bands, 90 (13%) in professional officer bands, 130 (18%) in technical and operational officer bands and 18 (2.5%) in senior levels. Four respondents (0.5%) were employed in the senior executive service. Sixty-six classification responses were

missing or could not be coded. Respondents had been employed to work in the public sector between 1 and 45 years with a mean length of service of 11 years.

Procedure

The paper-based survey was sent to a stratified, random sample (stratified by gender, business unit and seniority) of 2,200 employees, resulting in a response rate of 33%. Surveys were sent via the organization's internal mail system, with reply paid envelopes attached. Surveys were mailed directly back to the university researchers. Participation was voluntary and respondents were assured of anonymity and that results would only be reported as an aggregate.

Questionnaire

5 dimensions of culture

Items for the first 3 dimensions came from Thompson et al. (1999). Items were re-worded to more broadly encompass non-work lives beyond the family. For example, the item "In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of *non-work* needs" was changed from "…quite accommodating of *family-related* needs". Further, the term 'executive' was changed to 'senior managers' to better suit the Australian context where the survey was being used. All item responses were measured via Likert scale responses, with strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) as anchor points. Items are listed in full in Appendix 1.

Management support. This dimension consisted of 11 items from Thompson et al. (1999) and measured perceptions of how supportive managers were in enabling employees to balance their multiple life roles. Items included questions such as "In the event of a work and non-work conflict, managers understand when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first".

Career consequences. This dimension consisted of 5 items from Thompson et al. (1999), all of which were reverse scored. The dimension measured perceptions of the negative consequences for an employee's career if they didn't always put their job first. Items included questions such as "To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will seriously hurt one's career progress in this workplace".

Time expectations. This dimension consisted of 4 items from Thompson et al. (1999) plus 2 original items. The dimension examined how the culture of the organization was perceived to be in relation to work vs. non-work time demands. Items included questions such as "Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends". The two original items were "Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace" and "When people work at home they do not work as hard as when they are at work".

Co-worker support. This dimension consisted of 4 items original to this study and measured how supportive co-workers were perceived to be of other workers' attempts to balance their work and non-work lives. An example item is "In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers".

Gender expectations. Five items were written by the authors for this dimension which measured the extent to which the work environment supported both male as well as female employees in their efforts to balance multiple roles. An example item is "Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this workplace".

RESULTS

Testing the dimensions of 'work-life balance' culture

Each of the 5 dimensions as originally proposed were tested through Confirmatory Factor Analysis using AMOS (SPSS 16.0). The results for each dimension will be presented, with discussion and results for any changes made. Initially, one factor congeneric models

were tested. To set the scale, factor variances were set to 1. The ML estimation method was used.

Career consequences. The original model has 5 items from Thompson et al. The original CFA statistics are chi-square = 186.5, p = .000, df = 5, CFI = .750, TLI = .500, and RMSEA = .225. This was not a very good fit, so based on the results, and an examination of the items, and the residuals, a 2 factor model was tested. The two factors were allowed to co-vary freely. The first factor had 2 items which asked about feelings of resentment when others took leave. This will subsequently be referred to as Career 1. The second factor had 3 items which directly asked about certain career consequences of choices (Career 2). This new model was tested via CFA and the results were much more positive. Chi square = 16.125, p = .003, df = 4, CFI = .983, TLI = .959, and RMSEA = .065. These 2 factors, which correlated at r =. 323 are therefore kept for further analysis.

Co-worker support. The original model had 4 items which we wrote ourselves. They were measured on a 7 point, strongly disagree to strongly agree scale. All were reverse scored. This model seemed to fit well. Chi square = 8.11, p = .017, df = 2, CFI = .995, TLI = .984, RMSEA = .065. All 4 items were therefore used in future analyses.

Gender expectations. The original model had 5 items which were written for this study. All were reverse scored. The model seemed to fit well as is. Chi square = 16.691, p =.005, df = 5, CFI = .979, TLI = .959, RMSEA = .057. All 5 items were therefore used in future analyses.

Manager support. The original model had 11 items from Thompson et al., but this did not fit well. Feedback from the organization, plus an examination of the results, suggested there were 2 sets of questions. One set (the first 5 items) seemed to be asking directly about managers (from now on referred to as Manager support); whereas the other set (items 6 – 11) referred more to the workplace more generally (from now on referred to as Organizational

support). We tested this model and found it fit well. Chi square = 167.321, p = .000, df = 43, CFI = .967, TLI = .958, and RMSEA = .064.

Time expectations. There were 6 items in total – 4 from Thompson et al., and 2 we added. All were reverse scored. The complete model did not fit well chi-square = 257.528, p = .000, df = 9, CFI = .877, TLI = .796, and RMSEA = .196. Item 6 had a low correlation with the others, and two items (1 and 2) were highly correlated with each other. We therefore ran the model again with item 6 removed and item 1 removed. We then ran it again with item 6 and item 2 removed, and compared the results from these last 2 models. The second model showed a better fit. Chi square = 24.356, p = .000, df = 2, CFI = .984, TLI = .952, and RMSEA = .125. Further, the two removed items seemed a little theoretically different from the maintained items as they directly asked about working from home, whereas the other questions asked more about balancing work and home time. Items 1, 3, 4 and 5 are therefore suggested for future research.

Complete model

The complete model fit well with the modifications described above. Chi-square = 982.468, p = .000, df = 356, CFI = .931, TLI = .922, and RMSEA = .050. Correlations, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1, and the standardised regression weights are detailed in Table.

_____
Insert Table 1 about here
_____
_____
Insert Table 2 about here
_____

To ensure the goodness of this model, we compared it to other models. We put all the original items from the scales in one model, and it did not fit very well Chi-square = 1609.349, p = .000, df = 419, CFI = .863, TLI = .848, and RMSEA = .063.

Further, we considered that there may be a single, higher order factor, but this model did not fit as well either. Chi-square = 1249.011, p = .000, df = 370, CFI = .904, TLI = .894, and RMSEA = .058. We therefore believe the suggested modifications result in the best measure. See Appendix 1 for all items.

DISCUSSION

The results showed that most of the items in the survey worked well, and that the identified dimensions were parsimonious. The evidence supports that the survey can be used to measure the broader concept of 'non-work' rather than 'family' exclusively. However, two of the dimensions were broken down into 2 separate sub-scales, resulting in a total of 7 overall dimensions. Further, it is recommended that some of the items are deleted in future research.

One of the initial dimensions from Thompson et al. (1999) is about manager support but the results showed that it consisted of two separate dimensions. When the questions were examined, it seemed clear that one of the dimensions reflected the support of supervisors and managers. This included items such as "In the event of a work and non-work conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first" and "In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of non-work needs". The second dimension appeared to reflect the supportiveness of the workplace more generally. Items included "In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and personal lives" and "In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives". These questions referred to 'the workplace' and 'work environment' whereas the previous set referred directly to supervisors and managers.

It seems reasonable then, to consider the original Thompson et al. (1999) Manager Support dimension as two separate subscales. This was also suggested by Allen (2001) who

identified these same two subscales of this dimension. While these two subscales will be related to each other, intuitively they are distinct concepts. For example, there may be high organizational support in their provision of flexi-time policies, however, when an individual employee tries to use this, their direct manager may make it difficult. This would therefore mean there was low manager support, but high organizational support. Even in so-called 'family friendly' organizations, managers may send negative signals indicating that the use of flexible benefits is a problem for them (Rapoport & Bailyn, 1996).

The career consequences dimension also appeared to consist of 2 sub-dimensions but we suggest considering keeping only one of these. Of the original five items, 3 were cohesive and were directly related to the perceived career consequences of using work-life balance initiatives. A sample item is "In this workplace employees who do not participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. job-sharing, part time work) are more serious about their careers than those who do participate". There were, however, 2 items which did not belong. They were related to perceptions of how other people in the organization felt when employees utilised work-life arrangements. The 2 items were the same as each other; though in each one the gender was changed. The question was "Many employees are resentful when men (women) in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children". This question is neither the same theoretically as the other items, nor is it statistically loading with the remaining questions. Therefore, our recommendation is to remove those items, however further research on this dimension is warranted. Further, another dimension asks more directly about co-worker support for utilising work-life balance initiatives and thus, the question may be redundant when this extra dimension is added.

All the items in the gender expectations and the co worker support dimensions work well and are recommended for future research. The final sub-scale where some changes are recommended is the time expectations dimension. The results indicated that two items from

the original 6 should be removed, as they are conceptually distinct. The four items maintained relate directly to balancing work and non-work responsibilities, such as "Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace". The 2 removed items: "Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends" and "When people work at home they do not work as hard as when they are at work", are more closely related to working from home specifically. The full list of items used in study 1, plus suggested deletions can be found in Appendix 1. Results from Study 2 will now be reported, testing the suggested modifications.

STUDY 2

METHOD

Sample

The survey was sent to 2000 employees in a non-government organization that provided a range of care services. Six-hundred twenty nine respondents successfully completed and returned the survey (a 32% response rate). There were 89 men and 531 women (9 did not identify gender) and the average age was 43 years (range 17 – 68). Respondents reported being employed to work an average of 59 hours per fortnight, ranging from 10 hours, up to 110. Most respondents were permanent employees with 40 % being full time and 51% part-time. Others were employed as contractors or as casual or temporary workers. Staff had worked in the organization from one month, up to 30 years (average tenure was 4 years).

Procedure

The paper-based surveys were sent via the organization's internal mail system, with reply paid envelopes and chocolate attached. Surveys were mailed directly back to the university researchers. Participation was voluntary and respondents were assured of

anonymity and that results would only be reported as an aggregate. The research had approval from the first author's university ethics committee.

Survey

The survey was modified based on the findings from study 1. Each of the dimensions and the changes that were made will now be discussed.

Management support. As noted from study 1, this dimension was considered in this new study as 2 separate dimensions. One is focussed on management/supervisor support and the second on broader *organizational support*, each with five items. One question was removed which had a low regression weight for the dimension (.328). It was also qualitatively different to the other questions in the dimension which focussed on support from the organization broadly, whereas this question asked about one specific behaviour. The excluded item was:

In this workplace it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters.

Career consequences. In study 1 we had split this conceptually into 2 sub-dimensions. For study 2, we have removed one of these sub-dimensions as it was only 2 items, and neither fit statistically with the other items, nor were they in theoretical alignment. They were about very specific examples of a work-life balance policy (parental leave):

Many employees are resentful when women in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children

Many employees are resentful when men in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children

For the remaining dimension of career consequences we changed the items to be positively worded and less cognitively complex (the bold indicates removed words, underlining indicates new words).

*In this workplace employees who (**do not**) participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. job sharing, part-time work) are (**more**) <u>less</u> serious about their careers than those who participate*

*In this workplace employees who (**do not**) use work-life arrangements are (**more**) <u>less</u> likely to advance in their careers than those who do not use work-life arrangements*

In the third item, the word 'seriously' was removed from before 'hurt…' as the regression weigh was slightly lower than the other items, and we felt the word 'seriously' was unnecessary (any amount of hurt is a consequence – not just serious hurt). The item therefore read:

To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will hurt one's career progress in this workplace

A fourth item was written new for this dimension to provide greater reliability of the dimension, and greater construct validity:

Developmental opportunities are less likely to be offered to employees who use work-life balance arrangements

Co-worker support. Examination of the statistics from study 1and the items themselves led to this dimension being significantly modified. One item was kept, and 3 others added. This new sub-dimension focussed on the support **attitudes** of co-workers. The original item is:

In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers
The new items are:

In this workplace, co-workers are supportive of their colleagues' use of work-life balance arrangements.

If an employee is away from work due to a work-life balance arrangement, co-workers resent having to help.

My co-workers feel positively about employees using work-life balance arrangements

It was felt the other original 3 items actually reflected a concept regarding co-worker consequences, rather than co-worker support. This has therefore been made into a separate dimension – _co-worker consequences_.

Co-worker consequences. The 3 items in this dimension are:

Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week

Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies

Employees in this workplace have to travel for work more because of others working flexible arrangements or reduced hours

An additional item was also included

Some employees have to cover other people's work because they are using work- life balance arrangements

Time demands. Two items from this 6 item dimension have been removed as they related specifically to working from home, whereas the other items were about time demands generally. The two removed items were:

Employees are expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends

When people work at home they do not work as hard as when they are at work

Gender expectations. All five items in this dimension worked well statistically and were conceptually similar and related to the overall dimension. All five items were therefore retained.

The full survey with the modified items for Study 2 is in appendix 2.

RESULTS

Each of the 5 dimensions as originally proposed were tested through Confirmatory Factor Analysis using AMOS (SPSS 16.0). The results for each dimension will be presented, with discussion and results for any changes made. Initially, one factor congeneric models

were tested. To set the scale, factor variances were set to 1. The ML estimation method was used.

Management support.. The 5 items from the original scale worked well together. Chi-square = 20.5, p = .000, df = 5, CFI = .994, TLI = .998, and RMSEA = .070.

Organizational support. The remaining 5 (from 6) items worked well. Chi-square = 59.4, p = .000, df = 5, CFI = .963, TLI = .926, and RMSEA = .132.

Career consequences. Chi-square = 6.73, p = .035, df = 2, CFI = .993, TLI = .980, and RMSEA = .061.

Co-worker support. Chi-square = 107.21, p = .000, df = 2, CFI = .798, TLI = .395, and RMSEA = .289.

Co-worker consequences. Chi-square = 21.88, p = .000, df = 2, CFI = .983, TLI = .950, and RMSEA = .126.

Gender expectations. Chi-square = 37.73, p = .000, df = 5, CFI = .979, TLI = .957, and RMSEA = .102.

Time demands. Chi-square = 15.34, p = .000, df = 2, CFI = .991, TLI = .972, and RMSEA = .103.

A multifactor CFA was then conducted with all factors estimated simultaneously. All factors were permitted to freely covary. The complete model exhibited adequate fit with no modifications. Chi-square = 1401.39, p = .000, df = 418, CFI = .916, TLI = .907, and RMSEA = .061. Correlations, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. The results show there are not large correlations between any of the dimensions, other than organizational and manager support, which were originally one dimension. The standardised regression weights are detailed in Table 4.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

The predictive validity of each of the dimensions was also examined. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and well being were all examined as dependent variables. Multiple regression was conducted with each of the original culture dimensions (manager support, organizational support, time demands and career consequences) entered in the first block, followed by the 3 new dimensions (co-worker support, co-worker consequences, and gender expectations). Each model was significant (job satisfaction: $R^2_{adj} = .495$, p = .000, F = 84.12, p = .000; organizational commitment: $R^2_{adj} = .280$, p = .000, F = 34.34, p = .000: well being: $R^2_{adj} = .122$, p = .000, F = 21.525, p = .000). The extra dimensions added significantly to the variance explained, although only small percentages (job satisfaction $R^2_{change} = .017$, p = .000; Organizational commitment $R^2_{change} = .010$, p = .041; well-being $R^2_{change} = .029$, p = .000. Table 5 shows the significant standardised beta coefficients for each of the models, indicating that organizational support was always a significant predictor and co-worker support and co-worker consequences (both new dimensions) were significant twice each. Manager support was also significant twice. The other dimensions were not significant predictors.

_____

Insert Table 5 about here

_____

DISCUSSION

Most of the dimensions worked well. The management support and organizational support scales from the original measure, with the small modifications we made, were well supported. In both studies the fit indices once modifications were made were good. While the correlations between the 2 dimensions were relatively high (.65 in Study 1 and .77 in Study 2) this was not surprising given they were originally conceptualised as one measure. However, the correlations were not high enough to warrant going back to one dimension, nor were the model fit indices better when they were one dimension. The modified time demands

scale and the gender expectations scale both worked well with very good fit indices. Career consequences and co-worker consequences had pretty good model fit. While the career consequences dimension was also from the original measure, co-worker consequences was new. The co-worker support scale was also new, but was not as strong as desired. Examination of the fit indices indicated there were likely correlated errors. Examination of the standardised regression weights indicated that all four items were neither strong nor poor – there was no obvious item to be removed. Future research will need to further examine this dimension. Finally, the correlations indicated that none of the dimensions were too highly correlated with each other.

Overall, the confirmatory factor analysis information indicates that on the whole the 31 item measure worked well, indicating that this modified version has good utility. This is particularly important as the modified measure is designed to measure aspects of life beyond family, so can theoretically cover a broader conceptualisation.

Further, the predictive validity information showed that the extra dimensions added significantly to the variance explained (after the original dimensions were accounted for) even if only by small percentages. The dimensions of co-worker support and co-worker consequences were each significant with 2 out of the 3 dependent variables. Together, this information indicates that the new dimensions are beneficial to the overall scale, and add conceptually new and useful information. These results as a whole support the new measure as proposed.

In summary, the proposed extended measure is supported by this research. The evidence from these studies suggests that the measure can be broadened conceptually to include aspects of life beyond family when examining work and non-work balance. This is important for use with people who do not have families, and for people with families, who have responsibilities beyond their family responsibility. Further, the extra dimensions have

been shown to be useful for inclusion. In particular, the focus on co-workers – both their support and the consequences for them – is particularly important to be included in a cultural measure of work-life balance. We propose this extended measure of work-life balance be used in future research.

Conclusion

There was one main aim for this paper. This was to extend and empirically test a comprehensive measure of work-life balance culture. The extension included two elements: three extra dimensions, plus an extension of the concept to include all non-work aspects rather than family exclusively. The confirmatory factor analysis has shown strong support for the extended measure, with slight modifications. The evidence shows both that the added dimensions are important, and that the measure still works well when the concept is broadened. These results contribute both empirically, in the presentation of an extended scale that can be used by other researchers in different workplace settings, and also theoretically by expanding the measure beyond the realm of family and to include other important aspects of workplace cultures which have not been explored previously.

REFERENCES

Allen, T.D. 2001. Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational

perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 58: 414-435.

Allen, T. D. & Russell, J. E. 1999. Parental leave of absence: Some not so family friendly

implications, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1): 166- 191.

Bardoel, E. A. 2003. The provision of formal and informal work-family practices: The

relative importance of institutional and resource dependent explanations versus

managerial explanations, *Women in Management Review*, 18(1/2): 7-19.

Baltes, B., Briggs, T., Huff, J. & Wright, J. 1999. Flexible and compressed workweek

schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria, *Journal of Applied

Psychology*, 84: 496-513.

Behson, S.J. 2002. Which dominates? The relative importance of work-family organizational

support and general organizational context on employee outcomes. *Journal of

Vocational Behavior*, 61: 53-72.

Bragger, J.D., Rodriguez-Srednicki, O., Kutcher, E., Indovino, L., & Rosner, E. 2005. Work-

family conflict, work-family culture, and organizational citizenship behavior among

teachers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2): 303-324.

Campbell S. 2001. Work cultures and work/family balance, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,

58: 348-365.

Casper, W.J., Weltman, D., & Kwesiga, E. 2007. Beyond family-friendly: The construct and

measurement of singles-friendly work culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 70:

478-501.

Charlesworth, S. 1997. "Enterprise Bargaining and women workers: The seven perils of

flexibility", *Labour & Industry*, 8(2): 101-115.

Cleveland, J.N., Cordeiro, B., Fisk, G., & Mulvaney, R.H. 2005. The role of person, spouse, and organizational climate on work-family perceptions. *Irish Journal of Management,* 229-253.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S. & Sowa, D 1968. Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 71: 500-507.

Fried, M. (1998). *Taking time: Parental leave policy and corporate culture.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

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.

Greenhaus, J, H. & Beutell, N.J. 1985. Source of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review,* 10(1): 76-88

Greenhaus, J. & Parasuraman, S. 1994. Work-family conflict, social support and well-being. In Davidson, M. and Burke, R. (Eds.) *Women in management: Current research issues.* London: Paul Chapman.

Haas, L. & Hwang, P. 1995 "Company culture and men's usage of family leave benefits in Sweden", *Family Relations,* 44 (1): 28-36.

Hegtvedt, K. A., Clay-Warner, J. & Ferrigno, E. D. 2002 "Reactions to injustice: Factors affecting workers' resentment toward family-friendly policies", *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 65 (4): 386-401.

Hochschild, A. with Anne Machung. (1997). *The time bind: when work becomes home and home becomes work.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kirby, E. L. & Krone, K. J. 2002. "The policy exists but you can't really use it", Communication and the structuration of work-family policies, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 30(1): 50-72.

Konrad, A. & Mangel, R. 2000. The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 1225-1237.

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(2): 139-149.

Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Piitulainen, S. 2005. Work-Family culture in four organizations in Finland: Examining antecedents and outcomes. *Community, work and family*, 8(2): 115-140.

Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Pyykko, M. 2005. Does work-family conflict mediate the relationship between work-family culture and self-reported distress? Evidence from five Finnish organizations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78: 509-530.

McDonald, P. , Brown, K and Bradley, L., 2005. Explanations for the provision-utilsation gap in work-life policy. *Women in Management Review*, 20(1): 37-55.

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. 2004. Development and validation of work-family and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 400-410.

Noar, S.M. 2003. The role of structural equation modelling in scale development. *Structural Equation Modelling*, 10(4): 622-647.

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

Perry-Smith, J. & Blum, T. 2000. Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 1107-1117.

Rapoport, R. & Bailyn, L. 1996. *Relinking life and work: Toward a better future*. New York: The Ford Foundation.

Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. 2002. Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 689-714.

Rogier, S.A. & Padgett, M.Y. 2004. The impact of utilizing a flexible work schedule on the perceived career advancement potential of women. *Human resource Development Quarterly*, 15(1): 89-106.

Rothausen, T. J. 1994. Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44: 317-336.

Scwartz, F.N. 1989. Management women and the new facts of life. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1): 65-76.

Sherer, P. D. & Coakley, L. A. 1999. Questioning and developing your part-time employee practices, *Workforce*, October, 4-18.

Solomon, C. M. 1994. Work/family's failing grade: Why today's initiatives aren't enough, *Personnel Journal*, 73: 72-87.

Soonhee, K. 2001. Perceived impacts of family leave policy: Do organizational factors matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 30(2) : 221-239.

Strachan, G. & Burgess, J. 1998. 'The "family friendly" workplace: Origins, meaning and application at Australian workplaces', *International Journal of Manpower*, 19(4): 250-265.

Thiede T. L. & Ganster, D. C. 1995. Impact of family-supportive work variables on work, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 6-15.

Thompson,, C., Beauvais, L., & Lyness, K. 1999. When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54: 392-415.

Thompson, C. A., Thomas, C. C. & Maier, M. 1992. Work-family conflict and the bottom line: Reassessing corporate policies and initiatives. In Sekaran, U. and Leong, F. T.

(Eds.) *Woman-power: Managing in times of demographic turbulence.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 59-84.

Warr, P., Butcher, V., & Robertson, I. 2004. Activity and psychological well-being in older people. *Aging and Mental Health,* 8(2): 172-183.

Wise, S. & Bond, S. 2003. Work/life policy: Does it do exactly what it says on the tin? *Women in Management Review,* 18(1/2): 20-31.

Young, M. B. 1999. "Work-family backlash: Begging the question, what's fair?", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 562: 32-46.

Appendix 1.
All items from culture measure[1]

Dimension	Item
Management support	**In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of non-work needs**…………………………………………………….......
	Senior management in this workplace encourage supervisors to be sensitive to employees' personal concerns……………………………………
	Middle and senior managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' childcare responsibilities……………………………………………
	In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first………………………….......
	Middle and senior managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities…………………………………….......
Organizational support	In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and personal lives……………………………………...
	This workplace is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons……………………………………
	In this work environment it is generally okay to talk about one's non-work activities………………………………………………………………...
	In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives…………………………………………………………
	This workplace encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins………………………………………………
	In this workplace it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters……………………………………………..
Career 1	**Many employees are resentful when men in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children**
	Many employees are resentful when women in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children
Career 2	In this workplace employees who do not participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. job sharing, part-time work) are more serious about their careers than those who do participate
	To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will seriously hurt one's career progress in this workplace
	In this workplace employees who do not use work-life arrangements are more likely to advance in their careers than those who do use work-life arrangements

Time expectations	**To get ahead in this workplace, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at work or at home**
	Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends
	Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their non-work / personal responsibilities
	To be viewed favourably by senior management, employees in this workplace must constantly put their jobs ahead of their personal lives
	Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace
	When people work at home they do not work as hard as when they are at work
Co-worker support	In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers
	Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week
	Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies
	Employees in this workplace have to travel for work more because of others working flexible arrangements or reduced hours
Gendered expectations	**It would be strange or odd for a man in this workplace to work part-time or job-share**
	Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this workplace
	In this workplace, men are more reluctant than women to ask for time off to deal with their family and non-work responsibilities
	In this workplace, men who put their non-work responsibilities before their jobs are thought of more negatively than women who do this
	In this workplace, the use of flexible work and reduced hours arrangements is mainly a women's issue

[1]Shaded items are suggested deletions for study 2

Appendix 2
Study 2 Questions

Manager support	**In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of non-work needs**
	Management in this workplace encourage supervisors to be sensitive to employees' personal concerns
	Managers in this workplace are sympathetic towards employees' childcare responsibilities
	In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first
	Managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities
Organizational support	In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and personal lives
	The workplace is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons
	In this work environment it is generally okay to talk about one's non-work activities
	In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives
	The workplace encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins
Career consequences	**In this workplace employees who participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. working from home, part-time work) are less serious about their careers than those who do not participate**
	To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will hurt one's career progress in this workplace
	In this workplace employees who use work-life arrangements are less likely to advance in their careers than those who do not use work-life arrangements
	Developmental opportunities are less likely to be offered to employees who use work-life balance arrangements
Time demands	To get ahead in this workplace, employees are expected to work well beyond their designated hours in a week, whether at work or at home
	Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their non-work/personal responsibilities
	To be viewed favourably by senior management, employees in this workplace must constantly put their jobs ahead of their personal lives
	Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace
Co-worker support	**In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers**
	In this workplace, co-workers are supportive of their colleagues' use of work-life balance arrangements

Co-worker consequences	**If an employee is away from work due to a work-life balance arrangement, co-workers resent having to help**
	Co-workers in this workplace feel positively about employees using work-life balance arrangements
	Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week
	Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies
	Some employees in this workplace have to travel for work more because of others' working flexible arrangements or reduced hours
	Some employees have to cover other people's work because they are using work-life balance arrangements
Gender expectations	**It would be strange or odd for a man in this workplace to work part-time or job-share**
	Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this workplace
	In this workplace, men are more reluctant than women to ask for time off to deal with their family and non-work responsibilities
	In this workplace, men who put their non-work responsibilities before their jobs are thought of more negatively than women who do this
	In this workplace, the use of flexible work and reduced hours arrangements is mainly a women's issue

Table 1.

Means, standard deviations and correlations between all variables – Study 1

	Mean (s.d)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Career 1	5.19 (1.26)						
2.Career 2	4.12 (1.17)	.323**					
3.Manager support	4.24 (1.22)	.176**	.169**				
4.Organizational support	4.24 (0.92)	.256**	.210**	.657**			
5.Coworker support	4.77 (1.22)	.376**	.321**	.248**	.287**		
6.Gender expectations	4.11 (1.14)	.320**	.370**	.341**	.362**	.472**	
7.Time expectations	4.56 (1.36)	.266**	.380**	.439**	.514**	.350**	.423**

**correlation is significant at the 0.01 level
*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 2.
Standardised regression Weights – Study 1

Manager support	In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of non-work needs……………………………………………………………..	.807
Manager support	Senior management in this workplace encourage supervisors to be sensitive to employees' personal concerns………………………………	.765
Manager support	Middle and senior managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' childcare responsibilities…………………………………………	.838
Manager support	In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first…………………………...	.812
Manager support	Middle and senior managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities……………………………………..	.799
Organizational support	This workplace is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons……………………………………	.711
Organizational support	In this work environment it is generally okay to talk about one's non-work activities…………………………………………………………….	.549
Organizational support	In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives………………………………………………………	.756
Organizational support	This workplace encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins……………………………………………	.663
Organizational support	In this workplace it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters…………………………………………..	.328
Organizational support	In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and personal lives…………………………………….	.767
career 1	Many employees are resentful when men in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children	.808
career 1	Many employees are resentful when women in this workplace take extended leave to care for newborn or adopted children	.796
Time expectations	To get ahead in this workplace, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at work or at home	.667
Time expectations	Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their non-work / personal responsibilities	.846
Time expectations	To be viewed favourably by senior management, employees in this workplace must constantly put their jobs ahead of their personal lives	.878
Time expectations	Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace	.738
gender expectations	It would be strange or odd for a man in this workplace to work part-time or job-share	.500
gender expectations	Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this workplace	.652
gender expectations	In this workplace, men are more reluctant than women to ask for time off to deal with their family and non-work responsibilities	.622
gender expectations	In this workplace, men who put their non-work responsibilities before their jobs are thought of more negatively than women who do this	.737
gender expectations	In this workplace, the use of flexible work and reduced hours arrangements is mainly a women's issue	.612
coworker support	In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers	.519
coworker support	Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week	.845
coworker support	Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies	.895
coworker support	Employees in this workplace have to travel for work more because of others working flexible arrangements or reduced hours	.679
career 2	In this workplace employees who do not use work-life arrangements are more likely to advance in their careers than those who do use work-life arrangements	.661

| career 2 | To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will seriously hurt one's career progress in this workplace | .627 |
| career 2 | In this workplace employees who do not participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. job sharing, part-time work) are more serious about their careers than those who do participate | .524 |

Table 3
Means, standard deviations and correlations between variables in study 2

	Mean (s.d)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Manager support	5.09 (1.28)						
2. Organizational support	4.76 (1.24)	.774**					
3. Career consequences	3.33 (1.16)	-.258**	-.273**				
4. Time demands	3.47 (1.54)	-.412**	-.514**	.565**			
5. Coworker support	4.72 (1.07)	.417**	.441**	-.508**	-.539**		
6. Co-worker consequences	3.38 (1.43)	-.300**	-.329**	.417**	.485**	-.505**	
7. Gender expectations	2.97 (1.41)	-.165**	-.230**	.386**	.389**	-.388**	.463**

**correlation is significant at the 0.01 level
*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

11944

Table 4. Standardized regression weights – study 2

Manager support	In general, managers in this workplace are quite accommodating of non-work needs	.835
	Management in this workplace encourage supervisors to be sensitive to employees' personal concerns	.865
	Managers in this workplace are sympathetic towards employees' childcare responsibilities	.857
	In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their non-work responsibilities first	.881
	Managers in this workplace are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities	.844
Organizational support	In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and personal lives	.829
	The workplace is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons	.790
	In this work environment it is generally okay to talk about one's non-work activities	.514
	In this work environment, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives	.814
	The workplace encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins	.761
Career consequences	In this workplace employees who participate in available work-life arrangements (e.g. working from home, part-time work) are less serious about their careers than those who do not participate	.369
	To turn down a promotion or transfer for personal reasons will hurt one's career progress in this workplace	.684
	In this workplace employees who use work-life arrangements are less likely to advance in their careers than those who do not use work-life arrangements	.824
	Developmental opportunities are less likely to be offered to employees who use work-life balance arrangements	.794
Time demands	To get ahead in this workplace, employees are expected to work well beyond their designated hours in a week, whether at work or at home	.774
	Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their non-work/personal responsibilities	.872
	To be viewed favourably by senior management, employees in this workplace must constantly put their jobs ahead of their personal lives	.919
	Being seen at work after hours is an important way of getting ahead in your career in this workplace	.635
Co-worker support	In this workplace, employees who use work-life policies are perceived negatively by their co-workers	.583

	In this workplace, co-workers are supportive of their colleagues' use of work-life balance arrangements	.693
	If an employee is away from work due to a work-life balance arrangement, co-workers resent having to help	.514
	Co-workers in this workplace feel positively about employees using work-life balance arrangements	.654
Co-worker consequences	Workloads are not shared equally in this workplace because some employees are not around for part of the week	.750
	Some employees in this workplace have to do more than their fair share to compensate for the people using work-life policies	.855
	Some employees in this workplace have to travel for work more because of others' working flexible arrangements or reduced hours	.747
	Some employees have to cover other people's work because they are using work-life balance arrangements	.796
Gender expectations	It would be strange or odd for a man in this workplace to work part-time or job-share	.613
	Flexible work arrangements and policies are available mainly for women in this workplace	.720
	In this workplace, men are more reluctant than women to ask for time off to deal with their family and non-work responsibilities	.847
	In this workplace, men who put their non-work responsibilities before their jobs are thought of more negatively than women who do this	.850
	In this workplace, the use of flexible work and reduced hours arrangements is mainly a women's issue	.757

Table 5.
Predictive validity - Significant standardised beta results

	Job satisfaction	Organizational commitment	Wellbeing
Manager support	.306**	.236**	NS
Organizational support	.332**	.250**	.170**
Career consequences	NS	NS	NS
Time demands	NS	NS	NS
co-worker support	NS	.110*	.126*
Co-worker consequences	.136**	NS	.119*
Gender expectations	NS	NS	NS

* significant at .05
** significant at .01