

WORK-FAMILY BALANCE OF EMPLOYEES AT WORK: A REVIEW AND
CONSIDERATION OF FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS

A Thesis

by

GINA ESTELLE MUEGGE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Chair of Committee,	Olabisi A. Atoba
Committee Members,	Stephanie C. Payne
	Wendy Boswell
Head of Department,	Heather Lench

December 2019

Major Subject: Psychology

Copyright 2019 Gina Estelle Muegge

ABSTRACT

The present thesis addressed family supportive programs as a driver of employee work-family balance and examined their utility in organizations. The move towards dual-earners in many households today has led to an increase in interest in family supportive programs in organizations. This thesis examined family supportive programs as it relates to work-family balance and reviews research from three areas of Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychology: personnel psychology, organizational psychology, and methods and measurement. An extensive literature review was conducted to synthesize existing research results and conclusions concerning family supportive programs. To locate appropriate research investigating work-family balance and family supportive programs, a thorough search in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, PsycINFO, EBSCO, and JSTOR using the keywords “family supportive programs”, “work-life balance”, “work-family balance”, “work-family programs”, and “supportive supervisors” was conducted. The present literature review focused only on the journal articles, conference papers, dissertations, and book chapters that were most relevant to the topic of interest.

In the personnel section, previous research on selection, training, and performance appraisal and management were discussed as they relate to family supportive programs. Next, existing literature on leadership, organizational support, organizational climate and culture, social support, and work family enrichment, were considered through the organizational psychology lens. Additionally, in the methods and measurement section, some measurement approaches and difficulties in the measurement of family supportive programs were reviewed. Finally, a discussion of how three content domains of I-O Psychology examined intersect to provide a more complete framework for understanding family supportive programs was

presented. Taken together, when employees with families are supported, it results in improved job satisfaction and job performance and, ultimately, organizational success. Their implications for science and practice, limitations, and directions for future research on family supportive programs were discussed.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by the student's thesis committee chair, Dr. Olabisi A. Atoba, with Professor Stephanie C. Payne, of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, and Professor Wendy Boswell of the May's Business School as committee members. It also reflects feedback from Professor Winfred Arthur, Jr.

Funding Sources

There are no outside funding contributors to acknowledge related to this research and compilation of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: A PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY PERSPECTIVE.....	4
2.1 Improving Family Support Programs through Personnel Selection	4
2.2 Enhancing Family Supportive Programs through Training	8
2.3 Performance Appraisal and Management and its Contributions to Family Supporting Program.....	11
3. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: AN ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROSPECTIVE	14
3.1 Leadership and Family Supportive Programs	15
3.2 Organizational Support Portrayed through Family Supportive Programs	18
3.2.1 Providing Social Support to Employees with Families	20
3.2.2 Influence of Organizational Support on Job Attitudes	20
3.3 Promoting a Family Supportive Organizational Climate and Culture	22
3.4 Utilizing Work Family Enrichment as a Family Supportive Programs	24
4. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: A METHODS AND MEASUREMENT PERSPECTIVE	25
4.1 Measures of Work-Family Balance.....	25
4.2 Level of Analysis and Statistical Approaches.....	29
4.3 Boundary Conditions.....	31
4.4 Measurement Issues	33
5. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: AN INTERSECTION OF THREE CONTENT AREAS OF I-O PSYCHOLOGY.....	36
5.1 Selection and Measurement of Effective Family Supportive Leaders	36
5.2 Training Leaders to be Supportive of Employees with Families	38
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	40
6.1 Implications of the Literature Review.....	40
6.2 Limitations and Future Directions.....	42
6.3 Conclusion.....	44
REFERENCES	46

APPENDIX POTENTIAL TOPICS FOR FUTURE REVIEW OR RESEARCH..... 62

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Measures of Work-Family Balance	30

1. INTRODUCTION

The topic of work-family balance and the issues related to it has become of increasing interest to organizations today. Both employers and employees have to navigate this challenging relationship as many households consist of dual-earner couples (Blossfeld & Drobnic, 2001). This change has led to an increase in the number of employees with families in the workforce who are unable to optimally fulfill their work and family obligations (Blossfeld & Drobnic, 2001) and balance the work-family interface. Women now represent 49 percent of the labor force in the United States (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Protas, 2003); in fact, dual-earner couples have increased to 78 percent and couples with children now spend 91 combined hours at work each week (Bond et al., 2003). This change has resulted in increased interest in work-family balance (Acevedo, 2018).

Work family balance is “the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in and equally satisfied with his or her work role and family role” (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003, p. 513). Thus, work- and family-family balance are important for organizations to consider because employees who are unable to balance these two facets are less productive at work, less satisfied with their jobs, and have higher intentions of leaving the organization (Ode-Dusseau, Hammer, Crain, & Bodner, 2016). A number of positive outcomes of work-family balance for the individual employee include higher job satisfaction (Hammer, Kossek, Bodner, & Crain, 2013), reduced stress (Bresin, 1995), higher levels of life satisfaction (Zhang & Tu, 2018), and less depersonalization (Dacey, 2019). Reduced employee turnover intentions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and higher employee productivity (Bresin, 1995) are benefits organizations reap from work-life balance.

Because work-life balance is often defined as the lack of work-family conflict (Frone, 2003), it is necessary to briefly introduce work-family conflict. Work-family conflict is “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). This results when family and work roles conflict with one another.

Previous research also found that one common source of employee stress is the struggle to balance work demands with family demands (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). Work-family conflict has been shown to result in stress-related outcomes such as anxiety, depression, tension, and fatigue (Fiksenbaum, 2014). Employees who experience low work-family balance also report decreased physical health, decreased life satisfaction, and increased absenteeism (Hickson, 2008). They further report having decreased levels of family satisfaction due to work overload, inflexible work situations, and perceived lack of support from their organizations (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). Because low work-family balance ultimately jeopardizes the present and future success of organizations (Mesimo-Ogunsanya, 2017), it has warranted the attention of many organizations which have become preoccupied with how they can best support employees with families so that they can attract and retain talent (Acevedo, 2018).

Family supportive programs are organizational initiatives that are targeted at helping employees with families in order for them to achieve work-family balance (Kossek & Hammer, 2008). Benefits of family supportive programs to the individual results in improved work life balance which leads to higher job satisfaction (Hammer et al., 2013), reduced stress (Bresin, 1995), higher levels of life satisfaction (Zhang & Tu, 2018), and less depersonalization (Dacey,

2019). Benefits of family supportive programs to the organization include, but are not limited to, lower turnover intentions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and higher employee productivity (Bresin, 1995).

There are a number of ways in which work-family balance can be achieved through family supportive programs. These include dependent-care assistance (Cook, 2009), job sharing (Glass & Finley, 2002), leaves of absence (Glass & Finley, 2002), and flexible work arrangements (Arthur & Cook, 2003). Although such programs target employees with children, they also benefit other family arrangements such as married couples without children, pregnant employees, and single parent households. Such programs include compressed/alternative workweek, flextime, work-at home, and child-care assistance (Frone & Yardley, 1966).

Consequently, the objective of this literature review is to provide a comprehensive analysis of family supportive programs as a driver of work-family balance. Specifically, family supportive programs will be examined in the context of three areas of Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychology, namely personnel psychology, organizational psychology, and methods and measurement. Finally, the intersection of all three content domains, implications for science and practice, and directions for future research on family supportive programs are discussed.

2. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: A PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY PERSPECTIVE

Personnel psychology is one of the fields that makes up I-O Psychology and is concerned with individual differences in areas such as job performance and behavior and the methods to measure and predict these differences (Cascio & Aguinis, 2018). Typically, personnel psychology focuses on issues that are more focused on the individual such as recruitment, selection, training, and performance appraisal (Provenzano-Hass, 2017). It is important to look through the personnel psychology lens when examining family supportive programs because it provides insight into certain issues that organizations face when implementing family supportive programs. As such, this thesis considered how selection, training, and performance appraisal and management as components of personnel psychology contribute to the effectiveness of family supportive programs.

2.1 Improving Family Support Programs through Personnel Selection

Selection is “the process of collecting and evaluating information about an individual in order to extend an offer of employment” (Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick, 2016, p. 3). This involves deciding which applicant(s) will best fit organizational goals and, as a result, a job offer is extended to such candidate(s). Selection is crucial to the success of an organization because without a good selection system the organization will not have high performing employees (Gill, 2007). This is also true for organizations that are looking to enhance employees’ work-family balance through family supportive programs. Selection is a critical step toward bringing in employees or leaders who not only possess the skills necessary to balance work with life but who also will be supportive and understanding of other employees or subordinates with families and who will readily offer assistance to such employees. A good selection system is beneficial to

organizations that seek to implement family supportive programs because the selection system will contribute to a workforce that is more family-friendly through a more supportive workforce which will lead to employees with families, including other employees, having positive views of the organization (Kelly et al., 2008). It is to be noted that improving FSPs through personnel selection as proposed in this thesis is best applied to selection of leaders as leaders often have the task of not only managing FSPs but also employees with family obligations.

Given that organizations that have family supportive programs are more successful in their recruiting efforts for employees (Schmidt & Duenas, 2002), organizations can begin to foster their commitment to family supportive programs through the recruitment strategies they use to locate candidates. This typically occurs after organizations have conducted a thorough job analysis to determine the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) needed to balance work and family demands successfully and those needed to be supportive of others with families. Few examples of these individual characteristics or tendencies include work-family support, concern for others, and creative work-family management (Kwan, 2014). Targeting recruitment toward prospective applicants who are more likely to have the aforementioned KSAOs should complement the organization's plans for creating and promoting family supportive programs. The organization's interest in improving the work-family interface can be detailed on their website and portrayed on recruitment materials (Gatewood et al., 2015).

Another important factor that contributes to successful employee selection is the use of an appropriate method of selection (Gatewood et al., 2015). In order to successfully select for individuals who have the potential to balance work and family life independently and/or who will be supportive of employees with families, organizations will likely need to customize their selection system and use measures and selection methods (e.g., situational judgement tests) that

have been found to aid personnel decisions (McDaniel & Whetzel, 2005). A review of literature on family supportive programs revealed that selecting for personnel who will be understanding of and show empathy toward employees with families, even when they may not have one of their own, is not common practice. Thus, as stated earlier, it is important for organizations to select for employees using predictors such as work-family support, concern for others, and creative work-family management (Kwan, 2014).

Selection goes beyond the original hiring of external candidates into the organization as employees, it also includes the selection for promotion as well (Kwan, 2014). For example, employees' family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSBs) ratings, an aspect of family supportive programs, may inform the decision to select an internal candidate for promotion (Kwan, 2014). Family supportive supervisor behaviors are "behaviors exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of employees' family roles" (Hammer, Kossek, Bodner, & Crain, 2013, p. 285). Using these FSSB ratings during applicant review demonstrates that the organization values family-supportive behaviors (Johnson, 2014). This also emphasizes to the raters (i.e., employees) that the organization rewards their support of individuals with families. This emphasis on FSSBs when selecting for promotion should eventually lead to more supervisors exhibiting family-friendly behaviors, which leads to a more positive work environment for employees with families (Johnson, 2014).

When determining which employee is selected for promotion, it is important to consider the differences that appear between the women and men under consideration to ensure that women are not at a disadvantaged because of their previous and future use of family supportive programs. Typically, women are more likely to utilize family supportive programs than men, because research shows that women are the primary caretakers of their families (Hickson, 2008).

Women report completing 65 to 80 percent of the childcare responsibilities in their households (Sayer, 2001). This could inadvertently lead to women being evaluated as needing more help in order to fulfil their future leadership role, if promoted. Conversely, it could also lead to women being promoted into leadership roles because of their use of family supportive programs. Evaluating male and female candidates differently based on their usage of family supportive programs could lead to subgroup differences, adverse impact, and disparate or differential treatment.

Subgroup differences is the standardized mean differences between the majority and the minority class or subgroups (Outtz, 2009). It result from differential perceptions of competence between groups; in this case, women being perceived as less competent than men when making decisions to hire or promote (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004). These perceptions could eventually result in disparate treatment and/or adverse impact. Adverse impact is the result of differential outcomes associated with the use of an assessment tool as a function of a protected class variable such as age, sex, race, national origin, or color (Spector, 2008). For example, it results when female employees with families are not selected or promoted because they are women (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, & Deaux, 2004). Disparate treatment is illegal discrimination that occurs when subgroups are treated differently based to their membership in a protected class. In this case, this may result when male employees, who are parents, are not as negatively treated in employment decisions as female employees who are parents (Hickson, 2008). This is important for organizations to consider when reviewing candidates for a position because if decisions are made based on the use of family supportive programs relative to their sex, rather than their qualifications, it may lead to women being disproportionately screened out and this could potentially result in legal action against the organization.

2.2 Enhancing Family Supportive Programs through Training

Training is a “planned effort by a company to facilitate learning of job-related competencies, knowledge, skills, and behaviors by employees” (Noe, 2016, p. 8). This is used to close the knowledge and skill gaps crucial to employee’s successful performance on their jobs (Noe, 2016). The organization is responsible for identifying what the employees’ training needs are and designing a training program to address those needs. With regard to family supportive programs, training is not only used to inform employees with families about how to attain balance between work and family demands (Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011), it is also used to make other employees (e.g., peers, supervisors) aware of how to provide support to employees who are struggling with balancing work and family lives (Johnson, 2014). Organizations have found that helping employees learn to balance their work and family lives is cost effective (Gilbert, 1990).

To begin using training as a family-supportive program, the organization should first conduct a needs assessment to figure out where knowledge or skill gaps exist for either employees with families, their supervisors, or peers, depending on the goal of the training program. In addition to employees with families, it is important that supervisors know how to deal with employee work-family issues and appropriately administer the benefits of family supportive programs in order to ensure that employees with families are using these programs to the fullest extent (Allen, 2001).

Training employees can help supervisors exhibit more family-friendly behaviors (Johnson, 2014) in order for them to be more supportive and adaptable to the needs of employees with families. Such training often include topics such as time management skills, family support resource location, how to be sensitive to employees’ work-family issues, technical characteristics

of the job such as structure change, organization, and scheduling of work (Green & Skinner, 2005). Supervisors who have a more complete knowledge of these topics as well as know how to practically implement them exhibit more FSSBs (Johnson, 2014). Training supervisors to exhibit FSSBs and avoid unsupportive behaviors leads to a more engaged workforce (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009).

There are a number of training programs that have been designed to serve as family support programs. Employees with families are informed about how to balance their work and family lives through educational seminars that are intended to help employees manage their stress (Bresin, 1995). Training programs such as transformational leadership training also encourage supervisors to display FSSBs (Kwan, 2014). Another type of individual training that has been proposed to address the knowledge and skills gap is work family enrichment training. Work-family enrichment training focuses on helping employees see the positive side of their role and how they can apply their skills to other aspects of their lives (Heskiau, 2017). This training is needed because employees tend to focus on the negative aspects of their work while forgetting about the positive aspects, thus, work family enrichment training aims to adjust their perspective (Heskiau, 2017).

One method of training that is often recommended to improve the display of FSSBs is formal mentoring. According to Bozionelos and Wang (2006), mentoring is an interpersonal relationship between an individual with more experience (mentor) and an individual with less experience (protégé). This method is effective in getting employees to mimic the actions of their models or mentors (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012). Two theories, namely social identity theory and social learning theory, have been used to explain how mentoring programs work. Social identity theory states that the individual is defined by the social categories or groups that they

belong to such as nationality, gender, or religious affiliation (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), while social learning theory states that individuals learn by observing the actions of others around them (Bandura, 1977).

According to social identity theory, the actions of a leader FSSBs will directly affect the subordinate's self-concept (Pratt, 1988). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) emphasizes the importance of this relationship as the mentor can serve as a role model for the protégé on how to manage their work-family balance (Wang & Rode, 2010). Through mentoring programs, fellow employees with good work-family balance can be paired with others who are having trouble with achieving balance. Thus, experienced employees who excel at managing their work lives and their family lives have an opportunity to help newer employees with families or current ones who recently started a family.

Not only can protégés benefit from a mentoring relationship, there are positive outcomes for the mentor as well. Research shows that through the mentoring relationship, mentors can have increased job performance (Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2006), higher career success (Liu, Lui, Kwan, & Mao, 2009), and personal learning (Hirschfeld, Thomas, & Lankau, 2006). Through reflection on their experiences, the mentor will be able to better identify their strengths, values, as well as weaknesses (Higgins & Kram, 2001). Mentors will also be able to have more insight into their development, reactions, needs, and typical behaviors through the personal learning aspect of mentoring (Kram, 1996). The dual growth that is associated with mentoring improves the ability of both the mentor and the protégé in attaining work-family balance (Lian et al., 2012). Due to this growth or improvement, formal mentoring has been found to be a successful family supportive program (Lian et al., 2012).

2.3 Performance Appraisal and Management and its Contributions to Family Supporting Program

Performance management systems are a formal process that an organization uses to assess individual employees' performance, provide suggestions for performance improvements, and improve the performance of the organization as a whole (Grubb, 2007). Performance management is a system in which organization review the performance of employees and create a plan to improve in the future. Performance management is used to help employees and managers identify the areas of improvement that they could work on in order to improve for the future. This is a critical personnel system as 91 percent of organizations use performance management programs (American Society for Training and Development, 2003) and, therefore, it is important to consider how it relates to family supportive programs.

Job and family demands can affect the performance of an employee at work. The challenge of balancing work and family time could result in lower performance in the workplace and in turn lower performance appraisal ratings (Strachan, French, & Burgess, 2010). In a vignette study, Butler and Skattebo (2004) found a negative relationship between performance appraisal scores and family-to-work conflict. They also found a moderating effect of sex on this relationship as male employees received lower performance appraisal scores than female employees (Butler & Skattebo, 2004).

If a manager notices that there is a significant difference in the performance appraisal scores of their employees with families and others, then it would be important for them to investigate how much work-family imbalance exists in the organization. This could be achieved by using the Work-Family Balance Scale (Bell, Rajendran, & Theiler, 2012). The Work-Family Balance Scale measures how well an employee is able to balance the emotional, time, and

behavioral demands of work as well as their family (Bell et al., 2012). The results of this assessment would give the organization important information about their needs for family supportive programs, depending on the severity of the results.

Employees with families' perceptions of performance appraisal scores can affect their perceptions of the severity of a lack of work-family balance. Employees who have negative perceptions of their performance appraisal also have more negative perceptions of their work-family balance and vice-versa (Staines, 1980). This phenomena of perceptions influencing one another is called the spillover effect (Staines, 1980). Furthermore, employees who experience negative reactions to their performance experience more stress related to work, which in turn contributes to a lack of work-family balance (Ismail & Gali, 2017).

Given the reported difference in the performance appraisal scores of employees with families and those without (Butler & Skattebo, 2004; Judiesch & Lyness, 1999), organizations may need to redesign their appraisal forms to more fairly measure the performance of all employees, including employees with families. A job analysis is an important part of the development of a performance appraisal system for this purpose. Job analysis results serve as a starting point for organizations to assess their employees based on the requirements of the job (Smith-Teeter, 2007). It can facilitate differentiating high and low performers on different aspects of the job (Schippman et al., 2000). This may prompt the identification of alternative performance criteria, which avoid unintended consequences for employees who use family supportive programs. It is also important to give the employees the opportunity to have a voice in their performance appraisals as employees feel that the system is more fair when they get to have a voice in it (Dipboye & de Pontbraind, 1981). This input allows employees to give first-reports

of their circumstances, which is particularly important with employees who are utilizing family supportive programs (Hubley, 1999).

3. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: AN ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROSPECTIVE

Organizational psychology focuses on the group level dimensions of workplace issues (Provenzano-Hass, 2017) and addresses areas such as leadership, organizational climate and culture, job attitudes (e.g., organizational commitment and job satisfaction), perceptions of justice, and group dynamics in teams. In particular, organizational psychology examines the underlying issues that affect the organization as a whole. Family supportive programs are important to consider in an organizational context because the organization as a whole must be family-friendly in order to be the most successful in their family supportive initiatives. An organization's work-family initiatives affects employees' perceptions of the psychosocial work environment (Kelly et al., 2008). These increasingly positive perceptions, which result from work-family initiatives, further contribute to improved work-family balance, better organizational-level and individual-level outcomes, and increased work-family enrichment in organizations (Kelly et al., 2008). Morgeson and Hofmann (1999) found that programs targeted at supporting employees with families were most effective when they were reinforced by the organization's culture.

An examination of family supportive programs through an organizational lens involves focusing on the relevance of topics such as organizational support, social support, job satisfaction, work-family enrichment, perceptions of justice, organizational culture and climate, and organizational commitment. The sections that follow examines previous research on five of these topics.

3.1 Leadership and Family Supportive Programs

Leadership is the “process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2016, p. 6). It is important that individuals who are in leadership roles are supportive of employees with families as this helps such employees manage their responsibilities at work and improve work-family balance (Hammer et al., 2009). Family supportive supervisors empathize with employees who want to achieve a balance between their family and work responsibilities (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). With a focus on supportive leadership, an organization can better support employees who seek to balance their work lives with family obligations¹.

As mentioned in the previous section, an aspect of family supportive programs is family supportive supervisor behavior (FSSB). FSSB is defined as “behaviors exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of families” (Hammer et al., 2007, p. 182). These behaviors are a combination of four dimensions: emotional support, creative work-family management, role-modeling behaviors, and instrumental support (Hammer et al., 2007). Emotional support as a dimension of FSSB refers to how sensitive, respectful, understanding, and sympathetic a supervisor is towards the employee’s obligations to their family (Hammer et al., 2007). Creative work-family management are strategic ways that supervisors help employees creatively restructure their work to facilitate their need for success and effectiveness on the job and at home (Hammer et al., 2007). Role-modeling behaviors are ways that supervisors model effective time-management skills on the job so that the employees can emulate such skills in their own lives (Hammer et al., 2007). Finally, the instrumental support dimension of FSSB is the reactive response that a supervisor has towards the scheduling conflicts an employee with a family may have (Hammer et

¹ For the purpose of this review, supervisors are considered leaders.

al., 2007). If the family supportive program's goal is to increase FSSBs, this could result in a change in employee perceptions of the organization's environment as a whole (Kelly et al., 2008). Research by Kelly et al. (2008) shows that when supervisors are exhibiting more FSSBs, then their employees will have a positive job attitude and job performance.

When considering FSSBs, it is important to consider the influence of leaders at multiple levels (Mayer et al., 2009). Social identity theory explains this phenomenon as the FSSB of the highest level manager affects that of their direct reports and this trickles down the chain of command due to the connection with the highest leader (Wang & Rode, 2010). This emphasizes the need for FSSB across all levels of management to ensure the best outcomes.

The effectiveness of FSSB can also be affected by the perception of the availability of resources. Conservation of resources theory suggests that people are motivated to protect, gather, and build their resources (Hobfoll, 1989). The depletion or threat to these resources causes inter-role conflict (Johnson 2014). FSSB helps employees combat the stress that comes with the depletion of their resources such as time spent on the conflicting demands between work and family life (Hammer et al., 2007). FSSB is a boundary-spanning resource which can be used in helping employees manage and cope with the distress from the depletion of resources (Hammer et al., 2007). When the employees feel like they have the necessary resources to balance and cope with the conflict between work and family, they will experience increased positive job attitudes and increased job performance (Ode-Dusseau et al., 2012).

Research suggests that the moral principles of the supervisor is key to solving issues of work-family balance (Marchese, Bassham, & Ryan, 2002). Leadership that is ethical is crucial in the domains of work and family as well as life in general (Marchese et al., 2002). Ethical leaders

are those who focus more on the overall best interests of the employee rather than solely focusing on the employee's productivity and performance (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Ethical leadership has been found to improve satisfaction in both the home as well as life satisfaction overall (Zhang & Tu, 2018). It also has many positive effects on employees at work such as improved job performance (Bouckennooghe, Zafar, & Raja, 2015), organizational commitment (Hansen, Alge, Brown, Jackson, & Dunford, 2013), and extra role performance (Tu, Lu, & Yu, 2017).

Ethical leadership can improve the satisfaction of employees with their family life and overall life in two ways (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). First, resources that could help with a family as generated by ethical leaders can also be transferred to the family domain. Second, the promotion of ethical leadership could result in a positive effect on the job performance and life of the employee (Zhang & Tu, 2018). When FSSB is displayed by ethical leaders, there is even more sensitivity, understanding, support of employees' family responsibilities, and respect for employees (Zhang & Tu, 2018).

Leaders can provide social support to their employees in order to help them better cope with work-family balance issues. Two types of support that come from supervisors are emotional support and instrumental support (Sale, 2010). Instrumental support results from the supervisor providing tangible assistance to the employees such as physical aid, resources, flexible scheduling options, and knowledge in order to facilitate employees with families' job performance (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; Chou & Robert, 2008; Sale 2010). Emotional support results from the supervisor of an employee listening to them and showing empathy, concern, and respect for the issues that they are facing (Beehr et al., 2000; Chou & Robert, 2008; Sale, 2010).

3.2 Organizational Support Portrayed through Family Supportive Programs

Perceived organizational support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986) refers to employees' overall beliefs regarding the degree to which an employer values them, cares about their wellbeing, and supports their socioemotional needs by providing resources to assist with managing a demand or role. The development of perceived organizational support results from employees assigning human-like characteristics to the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Perceived organizational support can also be content-specific to a certain domain of an employee's life such as employees' family supportive organizational perceptions (FSOPs), that is how family supportive an organization is perceived to be (Allen, 2001).

FSOPs are important because the more the individual feels that the organization supports him/her, the less likely s/he is to turn over (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employees who rate their organization as supportive are more satisfied with their jobs, have less total stress, have less work stress, and have higher productivity (Breslin, 1995). Other improvements that occur when an employee feels like their organization supports them include organizational commitment, job-related affect, increased performance, decreased strains, desire to remain, and decreased withdrawal behavior (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This is especially the case for employees with families because of the added strain that results from managing their time. It has also been found that when supervisors feel that their organizations support them, they are more likely to support their employees, which ultimately leads to more positive employee outcomes (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

There are many work-family initiatives that an organization can implement to support their employees, which increases employees' perceptions of organizational support and, in turn, reduce their likelihood of turnover. These can be formal policies as well as informal support

through the organization's culture (Kossek, Lewis, & Hammer, 2010). Policies both informal and formal can be implemented at different levels in an organization for the initiatives to be successful (Kossek et al., 2010). Kelly et al. (2008) presented three categories of work-family initiatives, namely, initiatives that give employees' control over work time, initiatives aiming to foster support, and initiatives that give employees management over their workload.

Initiatives that give employees' control over work time could be achieved by providing the option for flexible work arrangements. This practice has been increasing in today's society (Rofcanin, Berber, Koch, & Sevinc, 2015). Supervisors are noticing the need for their employees and are working to meet them through individualized flexible work arrangements (Bal & De Lange, 2015). Flexible arrangements could include flexi-time, flexi-schedule, and flexi-location depending on the needs of the employee. All of these adjustments have been found to increase employee engagement and performance (Nielsen, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001; Rousseau, 2005). These arrangements also improved work-life balance and lowered work-life conflict (Purdy, 2017).

Organizations can provide employees with resources in order to achieve initiatives that will improve support such as providing referrals for childcare to their employees. Supervisors can be made aware of the resources that are available to their employees which will better prepare them to provide the assistance when needed (Muse & Pichler, 2011). By providing employees with these resources, they will be better prepared by the organization to balance their work and family demands (Bresin, 1995). The employees will also feel more supported by their organization. Providing employees with child-care resources in a family supportive environment improves their job satisfaction and productivity, while reducing stress, absenteeism, and tardiness (Bresin, 1995).

Through work-family initiatives, organizations can allow employees to have better management over their workload. This is practically implemented through programs such as compressed workweek (Day, 2005). Compressed workweeks allow employees to work a 40 hour work week in a shorter time frame than 5 days, allowing them to have a longer weekend period to spend with their families (Martinez, 1997). This type of family supportive program allows employees to better meet their personal, work, and family demands (Day, 2005). They also allow employees to decrease time away from the job, improve quantity and quality of their work, and decrease stress (Schmidt & Duenas, 2002; Sharpe, Hermsen, & Billings, 2002).

3.2.1 Providing Social Support to Employees with Families

Perceptions of organizational support can also be formed through access to social support in the organization. As a family supportive program, social support includes instrumental, appraisal, and emotional support (Cohen & McKay, 1984). It can come from multiple sources, including internal support groups, peers, and supervisors (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999; Chou & Robert, 2008; Ford et al., 2007). Given that social support helps employees feel more satisfied with their jobs (Greenberger, Goldberg, Hamill, O'Neil, & Payne, 1989), it is important for employees to have a social network of fellow employees within the organization and feel supported by their peers. Organizations where employees have a social network or support group that is focused on their balance of work and family had employees with families who were more satisfied with their jobs than those who did not (Sher & Fried, 1994).

3.2.2 Influence of Organizational Support on Job Attitudes

A number of job attitudes are improved as a result of family supportive programs; these include organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and perceptions of justice.

- *Organizational Commitment:* Employees with families could be especially sensitive to issues of support from the organization, which in turn could lower their organizational commitment. If the commitment levels of employees are low, then the likelihood of them leaving the organization is much higher than it otherwise would be. Family supportive programs fill the gap to mitigate potential organizational commitment issues. An employee's organizational commitment is improved through family supportive programs because the employee perceives that their organization supports them in their need to balance their competing lives (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2016). This is important to organizations because individuals who are more committed to their organizations are more likely to perform better and stay on the job (Hammer et al., 2011).
- *Job Satisfaction:* Job satisfaction is important to consider when addressing family supportive programs. Employees working in an organization that places priority on providing support for employees with families tend to have employees who are more satisfied with their job (Hammer et al., 2013). The benefits of job satisfaction include reduced absenteeism (Kehinde, 2011), improved health and well-being leading to lower costs for the company (Cass, Siu, Faragher, & Cooper, 2003), and improved employee performance (Bono & Judge, 2003). Research has shown that employees who are not satisfied with their jobs are more likely to leave the organization or be less productive at work (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2016). Both of these issues are potentially detrimental to the success of an organization as many employees in today's workforce have families (Blossfeld & Drobnic, 2001).
- *Justice Perceptions:* A key variable to consider when considering employees with families is perception of justice. Justice perceptions in organizational contexts are the

“fairness of outcome distributions or allocations and the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcome distributions or allocations” (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001, p. 425). Employees are less likely to display withdrawal behaviors if they have positive perceptions of justice (Colquitt, et al., 2001). There are four dimensions of justice perceptions: procedural, informational, distributive, and interactional justice. Procedural justice is the degree to which leaders are perceived to use fair decisions making processes (Greenberg, 1993). Informational justice relates to perceptions of the truthfulness in and justification for decisions made (Colquitt et al., 2001). Distributive justice relates to outcomes being perceived as fair (Colquitt et al., 2001). Interactional justice refers to how employees are treated by the organization in reference to respect, politeness, and dignity in the decision making process (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Employees who have family commitments outside of the normal workday could perceive justice differently than other employees. Perceptions of justice are important to an organization because employees with positive perceptions of justice are more committed to the organization and have lower turnover rates (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998). The more employees with families experience support from their organization, the more positive their perceptions of justice will be (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

3.3 Promoting a Family Supportive Organizational Climate and Culture

The climate of an organization is the outcome of employees perceptions of organizational values such as policies, practices, routines, and rewards (Jones & James, 1979) while organizational culture is linked to an organization’s underlying ideologies (Trice & Beyer, 1993) and assumptions (Schein, 1992) and describes why certain events occur. In terms of family supportive programs, employee perceptions of how the organization addressed their need for

achieving work-family balance (i.e., climate) and the reasoning behind how the organization addresses employees' needs (i.e., culture) contributes to the effectiveness of family support programs.

A work-family supportive culture is the “shared beliefs, assumptions, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999, p. 392). A work-family supportive culture in an organization consists of three components: organizational time demands, managerial support, and career consequences for using work-family benefits (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). Organizational time demands refer to the extent to which the organization expects its employees to work long hours and to prioritize their work over their family. Managerial support is how sensitive managers or supervisors are to detecting the needs for providing accommodation for employees with families. Finally, perceived career consequences is how many negative consequences employees feel like they will face for using family supportive benefits (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). This is particularly important because employees with families who use family supportive programs tend to have higher job satisfaction than those who do not use the programs (Bresin, 1995).

Organizations that care for their employees through family supportive programs communicate their value of employee well-being to employees, thus leading to positive climate perceptions that contributes to employee job satisfaction (Cook, 2009), increased productivity, high employee morale, and positive work climate (McDermott, 2010). The availability of work family benefits helps to promote a supportive work-family culture (Fiksenbaum, 2014). A family supportive work culture acknowledges employees with families and supports them and their unique situations while promoting flexibility, support of family needs, and tolerance (Allen,

2001). Employees who are in an organization that has a family supportive culture feel more comfortable when they devote time to their families and do not fear negative career consequences (Fiksenbaum, 2014).

3.4 Utilizing Work Family Enrichment as a Family Supportive Programs

Work-family enrichment occurs when experiences in one role improves the individual's quality of life in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). This is especially important in a work setting where the work experiences can enhance an employee's life at home with their families and vice-versa. Employees' work role can help them learn skills and increase positive mood or behaviors that can influence how they behave outside work in a positive manner (Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). A number of avenues through which organizations provide employees with enrichment opportunities include more job independence and variation in work (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005), increased learning opportunities for employees (Voydanoff, 2004), assistance in developing strategies to cope with their work-family balance problems (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), and building co-worker relationships between employees (Wayne et al., 2013). Job independence and variation in work allows employees to have more control over what activities they take part in at work, which could help them develop new skills. Increased learning opportunities could be ideas such as allowing employees to shadow incumbents on jobs that they are interested in or even allowing employees to attend conferences for continuing education credits and to bring their families along to help enrich their lives as well. Building co-worker relationships allows employees to develop better social support that they can transfer to their family lives (Barnett & Gareis, 2006).

4. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: A METHODS AND MEASUREMENT PERSPECTIVE

Although the methods and measurement perspective in behavioral sciences includes both research design and measurement, this thesis focuses on measurement perspective. Measurement in I-O Psychology is the way that psychological constructs, as they relate to organizations, are quantifiably analyzed. Some measurement characteristics include time horizon, research design, level of analysis, data collection methods, and data analytics strategies. Measurement of family supportive programs is important to employee selection and performance review and to determine the effectiveness of interventions and policies relating to family supportive programs. Ultimately, organizations need to know whether or not they are being successful in supporting their employees with families. If the result of data analyses shows that they are not successful, then further measurement may be necessary to identify exactly where the issues lie so corrective measures can be implemented. This section presents information on existing and related measures of work-family balance, level of analysis concerns, data analytical strategies, some boundary conditions, and measurement issues.

4.1 Measures of Work-Family Balance

A common way to measure work-family balance is to use the Work-Family Balance scale which was developed based on the spillover effect (Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001). The spillover effect refers to the impact of an individual's work life on their home life, and vice-versa (Zedeck, 1992). The 5-item Work-Family Balance scale measures how well an employee is able to balance the emotional, time, and behavioral demands of work as well as their family (Bell, Rajendran, & Theiler, 2012). A sample item reads: "How easy or difficult is it for you to balance the demands of your work and your personal and family life?" (Hill et al., 2001). An

adequate internal consistency estimate (i.e., Cronbach alpha = .83) was reported for the measure (Hill et al., 2001). It is recommended to use a rating scale with seven options in order to achieve maximum reliability for the measure (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 2005). High scores on the measure represent a high degree of work-family balance (Bell et al., 2012).

Carlson et al. (2009) also developed another measure of work-family balance. The measure consists of six items that are based on the conceptualization of work-family balance as how well an employee is able to meet the role-expectations of both their family and work (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007). Each item references how the individual expectations of the role and also includes what outside people expect from the individual. “I do a good job of meeting the role expectations of critical people in my work and family life” is a sample item. The measure is also reliable as Cronbach’s alpha of .93 was reported in one study (Carlson et al., 2009).

As stated in a previous section, work-family balance is often defined as the absence of work-family conflict (Frone, 2003) and work-family conflict is minimized through family supportive programs (Day, 2005). Work-family balance is a complex construct as it is a combination of different aspects of the family and work life spheres which combine to create balance. Organizations must be able to measure work-family balance successfully in order to determine if their family supportive programs are effective. Ideally, an organization will measure the work-family conflict levels of their employees before and after implementing a family supportive program to be able to tell if the goals of the program is being realized. If the organization sees little improvement post-implementation, this could indicate that alternative plans need to be made to support their employees. Given that the absence of work-family conflict and the presence of work–family enrichment, concluded through specific conflict measures, are

sometimes used as proxies for work-family balance (Frone, 2003), it is fitting to introduce the common measure for each construct, as presented in the next three paragraphs.

There are two common measures for assessing work-family conflict (Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connoly, 1983) and family-work conflict (Burley, 1989). The scale for work-family conflict contains four items and the scale for family work conflict parallels these items. High scores on the scales indicate high conflict. A sample item from the work-family conflict scale is “After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do” (Gutek, Searle, & Kleppa, 1991, p. 563). A sample item from the family-work conflict scale is “My personal demands are so great that it takes away from my work” (Gutek, Searle, & Kleppa, 1991, p. 563). Cronbach’s alpha for the work-family conflict scale ranges from .81 to .83 and the alpha for the family-work conflict scale ranges from .79 to .83.

Another common measure of assessing work family conflict is the Work-Family Conflict Scale (WFCS; Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). The WFCS measures both the family-to-work and work-to-family dimensions of work-family conflict (Dacey, 2019). The correlation between work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict is 0.48 (Byron, 2005). The WFCS measures conflict from the time-based, behavior-based, and strain-based perspectives. The time-based perspective of measurement addresses the result of time spent in one role negatively affecting participation in another (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The behavior-based perspective of measurement addresses the conflict that results from behaviors necessary for one role being incompatible with those of another role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Finally, the strain-based perspective of measurement looks at the conflict that results when the individual’s participation in one role interferes or negatively impacts their participation in another role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The WFCS is a particularly useful measure because it looks at work-family conflict from six different angles. These angles are the three different perspectives through both the family-work conflict and the work-family conflict dimensions (Dacey, 2019). This is a major advantage to using WFCS measure because other measures only quantify the construct from either the work-family conflict or family-work conflict lens (Carlson et al, 2000). If an organization wants to effectively measure work-family conflict, it is crucial that different angles are considered and a multi-dimensional approach is taken (Dacey, 2019). If an organization does not look at work-family conflict from a multi-dimensional approach, they risk not getting the entire understanding of the issues that employees are facing.

The WFCS is reliable, valid, and possesses content adequacy and dimensionality to measure work-family conflict (Carlson, et al., 2000). The reliability of each dimension using Cronbach's alpha for each perspective is as follows: time-based family-work conflict (FIW) = 0.79, time-based work-family conflict (WIF) = 0.87; behavior-based FIW = 0.85, behavior-based WIF = 0.78; strain-based FIW = 0.87, and strain-based WIF = 0.85 (Carlson et al., 2000). The correlation of the factors or dimensions ranges from 0.24 to 0.83, which contributes to its construct validity. The reliability of the WFCS as a whole using Cronbach's alpha is as follows for work-to-family conflict = 0.85 and family-to-work conflict = 0.84 (Vieira, Lopez, & Matos, 2013).

Another related measure is the Work-Family Enrichment Scale (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). This measure looks at resources that an individual gains in one part of their life, the transfer of that resource to another domain, and the success of the application to that aspect of their life, therefore, improving wellbeing (Carlson et al., 2006). This measure was created in reaction to limitations of previous measures intended to measure work-life enrichment

(Vieira et al., 2013). Cronbach's alpha for this measure in a study of Portuguese men and women was .70 (Vieira et al., 2013). A sample item from this measure is "My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member" (Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, & Thompson, 2014, p. 45). Table 1 below provides an overview of the measures outlined in this thesis.

4.2 Level of Analysis and Statistical Approaches

In terms of level of analysis, examining the effectiveness of family supportive programs lends itself to individual and multi-level data analysis, although the latter is often the case. When considering aspects of family supportive programs such as the selection or training of leaders, the individual-level of analysis is key to consider. This is due to the individualized nature of selecting specific leaders or training the existing individual leader to be more effective in their leadership roles. The individual level can also be considered when analyzing the data of certain candidates for their likelihood to be supportive of their subordinates or peers. However, multi-level approach to data analysis is more appropriate in other situations. Through a multi-level model, the organization is able to capture the various level factors (e.g., organizational climate) that influence individual perceptions of the effectiveness of work-family policies (Poelmans & Sahibzada, 2004). This multi-level framework facilitates the understanding of the contextual factors that influence how effective work-family policies are (Poelmans & Sahibzada, 2004). Utilizing a multi-level approach allows for a better understanding of work-life balance (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007).

Table 1: Measures of Work-Family Balance

Measure Name	Construct Measured	Dimension Labels	# of Items	Response Scale	Reliability Index	Scoring
Work-Family Balance Scale (WFBS)	Work-Family Balance	Work-Family Balance	5	Likert scale	$\alpha=0.83$	Higher scores indicate higher degrees of balance
Family Balance Measure	Work-Family Balance	Work-Family Balance	6	Likert scale	$\alpha=0.93$	Higher scores indicate higher degrees of balance
Work-Family Conflict Scale (WFCS)	Work-Family Conflict	Work-to-Family Conflict; Family-to-Work Conflict	18	Likert Scale	$\alpha=0.83-0.84$	Higher scores indicate higher degrees of conflict
Work-Family Enrichment Scale (WFES)	Work-Family Enrichment	Work-Family Enrichment	18	Likert Scale	$\alpha=0.70$	Higher scores indicate higher levels of work-family enrichment
Work-Family Conflict (Kopelman et al., 1983)	Work-Family Conflict	Work-to-Family Conflict	4	Likert scale	$\alpha=0.81-0.83$	Higher scores indicate higher levels of conflict
Family-Work Conflict (Burley, 1989)	Family-Work Conflict	Family-to-Work Conflict	4	Likert scale	$\alpha=0.79-0.83$	Higher scores indicate higher levels of conflict

An organization's family supportive initiative often includes a variety of interventions that are expected to address all work-family imbalance issues. This multifaceted approach to family supportive programs results in the need to use statistical analyses such as multiple regression to analyze the success of the multiple programs. Multiple regression allows for the organization to control for the effects of extraneous variables on family supportive programs (Cook, 2009). This permits the combination of different factors such as cultural, economical, or political factors to determine how people benefit from family supportive programs (Poelmans & Sahibzada, 2004). For example, if an organization established a flexible-work program and an on-site daycare program to help employees with families manage their time effectively, multiple regression makes it possible to analyze whether each program by itself or in combination with the other contributes to work-family balance.

4.3 Boundary Conditions

Work-home segmentation preference is important to consider when addressing family supportive programs as it serves as a boundary condition for the effectiveness of family supportive programs. Work-home segmentation is the degree to which employees prefer to separate their work and home lives (Kreiner, 2006). This is necessary to consider because it is especially important that employees with low work-home segmentation have exposure to family supportive programs so that they can better attain balance between their work and family lives. Employees who successfully segment work and home may not require participation in family supportive programs because their level of conflict between work and family is often low (Kwan, 2014). On the other hand, there is not a negative outcome associated with encouraging FSSB, even when employees already experience low conflict between work and family (Kwan, 2014).

Another way that measurement applies to family supportive programs is to address disparities in the performance ratings of male and female employees who utilize family supportive programs (Hickson, 2008). Female employees report spending 80 hours each week on completing home and work responsibilities (Cowan, 1983), which is not the case for their male counterparts. Despite the higher need for family supportive programs among women, men in the workplace who have work-family conflict receive lower performance ratings than women who experienced work-family conflict (Butler & Skattebo, 2004).

This difference could result from the tenets of social role theory (Eagly, 1987). It states that beliefs about groups of people in society result from their experiences with members of that particular group in their typical social roles (Eagly, 1987). Stereotypically, men are expected to be the breadwinners of the household and women are expected to be the caretakers (Butler et al., 2004). Heilman (1995) suggests that if employees do not have a large amount of information regarding a male employee's performance, then they are likely to use category membership to make performance judgements for the employee. Using this explanation, the men in an organization would receive a sex-biased performance rating due to their violation of the stereotyped male role in the family. This also results in a lower score because men utilizing family supportive programs do not fit into the category mold that society has placed around being the male figure in a family (Butler & Skattebo, 2004). Furthermore, both male and female raters have been found to give men who have work-family conflict lower performance ratings than men who do not have these conflicts (Butler & Skattebo, 2004). Measurement of perceived family-supportive programs may be used to parse out these nuances to ensure that inaccurate conclusions of ineffective family supportive initiatives are not the outcome of the lowered procedural justice perceptions of such male employees, for example.

4.4 Measurement Issues

When considering the measurement of the effectiveness of family supportive programs, it is important that organizations consider the potential measurement issues that can arise.

Organizations should be aware of these issues and put plans in place to address them in order to be successful in their measurement and to decide which family supportive program(s) is most appropriate for their employees. These measurement issues include threats to research validity and test and measurement validity.

Construct validity can be threatened when measuring the effectiveness of family supportive programs. Measuring work-family balance can be difficult and organizations need to take additional care when either developing a new measure or using an already existing one. Pichler (2008) emphasizes that it is difficult to write work-family balance items that are not leading. As such, determining the exact wording of items is vital to making sure that the results are the most representative of employees' standing on work-family balance. Measuring work-life balance can be difficult because there are many different definitions that are used or associated with work life balance (Casper, Vaziri, Wayne, DeHauw, & Greenhaus, 2018). Often times, it is easy for organizations to fall victim to writing biased items on their surveys and lead to inaccurate responses due to leading wording (Pichler, 2008).

Items on the measurement tools can also lead to the employees determining what the questionnaire is trying to measure (Dacey, 2019) when it was intended for them to be blind to the construct measured. This issue can lead to problems in construct validity and inaccurate conclusions and misrepresentations of the true perceptions or actual challenges that employees' experience. Furthermore, employees in very stressful jobs may also be less open or distrusting towards surveys that address personal matters such as the family life than those in less stressful

jobs (Balch, 1972). Some individuals may also have the tendency to deny their own stresses or problems leading them to respond to questionnaire items in a way that downplays the situation, which later results in inaccurate conclusions (Cheek & Miller, 1983).

Threats to research validity could result from extraneous variables such as external stressors outside of work and family, which adds to the employee's stress levels (Dacey, 2019). Additional alternative explanations could be threats to internal validity when you are trying to make inferences about relationships between family supportive programs and a specified outcome. As previously discussed, there are many issues that could result from a lack of balance in work and family life that needs to be addressed, such as organizational commitment or turnover intentions. Although these issues are highly important to family supportive programs, a lack of balance in work and family life may not be the only contributing factor to an employee's feelings towards their organization. For this reason, it is important for researchers and practitioners to be aware that external validity may be threatened by some additional factors such as variation in the environment in which the family supportive programs are implemented (Leviton & Trujillo, 2016), which may interfere with measuring the effectiveness of family supportive programs.

Another measurement issue is related to the measurement of employee performance. Typical performance appraisal forms assume that there is congruence across the working situations of members of a work unit. Additional alternative explanations could be threats to internal validity when you are trying to make inferences about relationships between family supportive programs and a specified outcome. This assumption can negatively affect employees who are benefiting from family supportive programs through the criteria measured on the performance appraisal form. This is especially true in situations in which the individual is taking

part in family supportive programs whereby the accommodations made for them are not considered in the creation of the performance appraisal criteria for evaluation. If people who have nontraditional working conditions, as a result of family supportive programs, are not considered in the creation of the performance appraisal form, then the risk for incorrect negative appraisals is heightened based on the variations in working conditions rather than the actual performance of the individual (White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, & Smeaton, 2003).

In sum, it is important to measure the effectiveness of family supportive programs in an organization. By doing this, the organization will be able to analyze whether or not their family supportive programs need to be adjusted to better meet the needs of the organization.

5. WORK-FAMILY BALANCE THROUGH FAMILY SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS: AN INTERSECTION OF THREE CONTENT AREAS OF I-O PSYCHOLOGY

There are many facets of the organization that must be considered when addressing family supportive programs in the workplace. In order to get the most comprehensive view of the issues and implement family supportive programs, it is vital that organizations consider three content areas of I-O Psychology (namely personnel psychology, organizational psychology, and measurement). This will result in organizations that are better able to execute effective interventions that support their employees with families. This section will discuss how three I-O psychology content domains intersect to facilitate a family supportive workplace.

5.1 Selection and Measurement of Effective Family Supportive Leaders

It is important to select supervisors who have the potential to be supportive of their subordinates with families, especially as some applicants for leadership roles are expected to be supportive of employees with families. Although, one would expect that leadership applicants who have families of their own will be more supportive of subordinates with families; however, it is illegal to select only applicants with families as this would not be considered a bona fide requirement for most leadership positions. Therefore, in order to identify leadership candidates who will be supportive of employees with families during the selection process, an organization should consider selecting for certain knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) that have been reported to be high in leaders who are supportive of employees with families. The organization must ensure that it is looking for leaders with characteristics or tendencies such as work-family support, concern for others, and creative work-family management (Kwan, 2014).

The role of measurement is also critical during the leadership selection process and later review of the effectiveness of a leader in supporting employees with families. Thus, selection tools and performance measures should be identified or created to select leaders and quantify their support of employees with families after assuming their respective leadership roles.

Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, and Hanson (2009) developed a multi-dimensional measure of FSSB that could be used to determine the level of FSSB that a supervisor is displaying when considering them for promotion to upper level management (Hammer et al., 2009). Finally, it is critical that all applicable measures are relevant and validated to ensure that the candidates selected or employees assessed after assuming leadership roles will be or is being supportive of employees with families in the organization, respectively.

In addition to others, the situational judgement test (SJT) can be used during leadership selection. SJTs provide useful information during the selection of employees (or leaders) who will be supportive of others with families (McDaniel & Whetzel, 2005). There are a number of steps to consider when developing an SJT that is to be used in selecting leadership candidates who will be supportive of employees with families. After identifying the necessary KSAOs, the organization should develop critical incidents that can serve as the basis for the situations or scenarios. Ideally, during this step they would consider leaders in the organization who are exceptionally supportive of employees with families and develop items based on how they react to work-family balance issues that arise. Once the situations, as well as the possible response options, have been developed, the organization should set a scoring key to use in the final selection decision. Ideally, the organization should have all candidates complete the SJT and those that score within a predetermined acceptable range can be expected to provide support to employees with families.

5.2 Training Leaders to be Supportive of Employees with Families

Training is an essential tool for educating current leaders about how to be supportive of employees with families without having to hire entirely new leaders through selection. Training can be used to teach the current leaders in an organization how to promote family supportive programs as well as exhibit FSSBs. Research has documented the success of training current supervisors the necessary skills to better exhibit FSSB (e.g., Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011). Some skills that can be trained include role-modeling behaviors of work-family balance, sensitivity to the needs of an employees' work-family interface, exhibiting FSSBs, providing support to subordinates, and designing jobs creatively to meet the needs of the employees' work-family integration (Hammer et al., 2011). Training can also serve as a way to make supervisors more aware of the resources available to people with families which can better prepare them for exhibiting FSSBs (Muse & Pichler, 2011). Hammer et al. (2011) found that employees who had their supervisor participate in a training intervention on increasing FSSBs reported lower intentions to leave the organization, higher job satisfaction, as well as improved physical health.

A specific training program that may be effective for leaders is empathy training. Empathy training is used to inform individuals about how to recognize emotions in other people, to try to see things from their perspective, and to show them empathy in social situations (Van Berkhour & Malouff, 2015). Empathy training often includes experiential components whereby trainers provide experiences such as role-play. The training also uses didactic or lecture-based forms, demonstrations and practice opportunities to sharpen skills, and other mixed methods (Lam, Kolomitro, & Alamparambil, 2011). Empathy training can be used to assist leaders, especially those without families, so that they can understand the struggles that their subordinates

with families are going through. Consequently, it can help them be more understanding with these employees so that they can provide the needed support for them.

Furthermore, ethical leadership can also be taught to current supervisors in an organization through a training or a mentoring program (Zhang & Tu, 2018). Training programs such as transformational leadership training also encourage FSSBs in supervisors (Kwan, 2014). Mentoring programs help leaders with good work-family balance teach employees how to navigate this balance.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This literature review summarizes research on family supportive programs as it contributes to work-family balance in organizations. Specifically, family supportive programs was examined from the three content domains of I-O psychology and the intersection of all three content domains was also discussed. This section presents the implications of this literature review for science and practice, delineates areas that limit the generalizability of this review, and provides directions for future research on family supportive program.

6.1 Implications of the Literature Review

In terms of scientific implications, there are a number of contributions that this thesis makes. First, this thesis contributes to our conceptual understanding of work-life balance through the discussion of the several constructs that fit into the structural model of work-family balance and family supportive programs. It also identified measures (e.g., work-life enrichment, work-family conflict) that have been used as proxies for work-family balance. Furthermore, the present literature review cites relevant theories (e.g., social identity theory, social learning theory, conservation of resources theory, social role theory) to connect work-family balance and family supportive programs. Second, this review looked beyond the independent effect of each relevant construct by taking an interactional psychology perspective, that is, one that considered the intersection of three domains of I-O psychology. Finally, this thesis provides additional directions for future family supportive programs and work-family balance research efforts.

Although a number of practical implications and recommendations were previously discussed in the sections above, additional contributions to practice are presented in this section. Family supportive programs could be improved through the development or revision of the performance appraisal form. This could include sections on goal setting to increase supervisors'

support in helping people with families better manage their conflict, especially if it is negatively affecting their performance at work. The organization could also include a personal reflection feedback section on the form, which allows the employees to reflect on their performance to help them identify ways in which their work family conflict is affecting their performance. This information could be used to develop plans that will help the individual cope with these issues in the future. Existing performance appraisal forms may also need to be revised to include a consideration for nontraditional working conditions such as flexible working arrangements.

Traditional appraisal forms may assess some areas of performance that may look different for employees with families who do not work in a traditional setting, for example due to teleworking/telecommuting, resulting in their supervisors' limited opportunities to observe their performance. To mitigate potential perceptions of justice concerns from low performance ratings, especially when promotions or other opportunities are available, it is critical that organizations review and update their performance appraisal forms to be more results oriented (Thompson, 2016). When conducting the job analysis, it is important to talk with several subject matter experts. In order to have the job analysis inclusive of employees with families, it is crucial to include them during the data collection phase. By doing this, the organization is more likely to create a performance appraisal system based on a comprehensive job analysis.

While organizations have the best intentions for their employees with families through family supportive programs, other employees could view these programs as an unfair accommodation that could make employees with families stand out, and stigmatization of employees with families by their peers could result. To mitigate this, it is recommended that the organizations makes family supportive programs available to all employees alike so all could learn from the programs. This universal learning approach has many benefits. In order to

encourage all employees to take part in learning how to better manage their time, regardless of whether or not they have a family, the organization can emphasize the benefits they will receive as these skills become enriching to other areas of their lives.

6.2 Limitations and Future Directions

Like most research efforts, there are shortcomings that limit the generalizability of the conclusions of this literature review. It is important to mention that majority of the limitations of this review revolve around the necessity to narrow the scope of this literature review due to a significant time-to-completion constraint. Review limitations include (a) lack of a systematic methodology for article inclusion or to minimize inclusion bias, (b) a primary focus on quantitative and empirical research studies, and (c) only including articles, dissertations, and book chapters that were available in the English language and indexed in electronic databases. The appendix contains a thorough list of constructs or methods that, if integrated into this review, may improve the comprehensiveness of the conclusions. However, there was either no existing literature for such constructs or methods as they relate to family supportive programs or they were deemed to be beyond the scope of this review, especially due to time constraints.

Recruitment and selection are important aspects of family supportive programs. One place for research growth is to explore the relationship between realistic job previews during the recruitment and future work-family conflict. It would be interesting to see if prospective applicants who have accurate realistic job previews about the time commitments of the job are better able to balance their work and family upon entry into the organization or whether they self-select out during the recruitment phase. This research results could help reduce the financial resources that organizations invest into family supportive programs. Furthermore, it will be informative to investigate the specific KASOs that should be assessed in order to bring in

candidates who will likely support others with families. Selecting for employees with these characteristics should improve the culture of support for employees who are balancing their work and family lives.

It will be interesting to further explore the concept of work-family enrichment. This occurs when skills learned at work helps with home-life and skills learned at home helps with work-life (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Although there is research in this area, however, it can be expanded upon to investigate further ways in which organizations can use this to incentivize their employees to learn the skills necessary to balance work and family lives. Further research can be done to specify the specific areas in which employees' home lives are positively affected through their work. The knowledge of these could help employees with families have a more positive outlook on the time spent at work.

Another future research direction is investigating the reasons why organizations implement family supportive programs as some organizations are more likely to create programs that will help employees with families than others. This research would help determine what adjustments organizations need to make in order to successfully integrate family supportive programs. In order to complete this research, it is critical to include organizations that vary in size as one could expect that larger organizations will be more likely to participate in these programs than smaller ones. This is because employees in larger organizations are more likely to demand for balance and such organizations need to keep their large workforce committed to their roles. Larger organizations also tend to have more resources available to employees than small organizations. Additionally, it would be informative to examine whether there was a difference in interests in providing family supportive programs across different types of organizations as it

is anticipated that organizations in industries that are more care-centric (e.g., medical) will be more likely to implement family supportive programs.

While much research has been done on family supportive programs, there is always more to be explored. With the importance of organizations assisting their employees in a changing workforce, this will be even more crucial in the coming years. With these directions for research, organizations will be better able to plan for the future and accommodate the needs of their employees with families.

6.3 Conclusion

The objective of this literature review was to provide a literature review of family supportive programs as a driver of work-family balance. Specifically, family supportive programs were examined from three areas of Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychology, namely personnel psychology, organizational psychology, and measurement. Finally, the intersection of all three content domains, implications for science and practice, and directions for future research on family supportive program were discussed.

It is important to consider not only the KSAOs on all applicants during selection but also how to fill leadership positions with leaders who will be supportive of their employees. This could be done through a variety of different selection methods such as SJTs. It is important to note that an organization does not necessarily need to select external candidates to fill vacant leadership roles if they are trying to move towards a more supportive work environment for employees with families. Alternatively, they can train their supervisors to be supportive of their subordinates. This training could range from direct trainings that focus on teaching the supervisor on how to be supportive to even informing them about the resources they can give or

refer their employees to in order to help them navigate the difficult balance. Once a plan is in place for an organization to work towards being more supportive of their employees with families, it must also assess the family supportive interventions to determine whether they are effective through performance management systems, validated measures, and statistical analyses.

Family supportive programs are becoming increasingly important for organizations to consider. More employees are having to navigate the difficult balance between their work lives and their family lives. This leads to the increased need for research and knowledge in how organizations can help these employees and ultimately the organization's bottom line. When employees with families are supported, it results in improved performance and satisfaction for the employees and, ultimately, organizational success.

REFERENCES

- Acevedo, V. (2018). *Correlations of work-life balance and job satisfaction and their relationship to generations* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 10750922).
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 414–435.
- American Society for Training & Development (2003). ASTD survey results. *Training and Development, 57*, 16-17.
- Arthur, M. M., & Cook, A. (2003). The relationship between work-family human resource practices and firm profitability: A multi-theoretical perspective. *Personnel and Human Resource Management, 22*, 219-252.
- Bal, P. M., & De Lange, A. H. (2015). From flexibility human resource management to employee engagement and perceived job performance across the lifespan: A multisample study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88*, 126–154.
- Balch, R. W. (1972). The police personality: Fact or fiction?. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology & Police Science, 63*, 106-119.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2006). Role theory perspectives on work and family. *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches* (pp. 209-221). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- 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.
- Bell, A.S., Rajendran, D., & Theiler, S. (2012). Job stress, wellbeing, work-life balance and work-life conflict among Australian academics. *Electronic Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 25-37.
- Blossfeld H. S., & Drobnic, S. (2001). *Careers of couples in contemporary society: from male breadwinner to dual earner families*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2003). *The 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: a review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 5-18.
- Bouckenooghe, D., Zafar, A., & Raja, U., (2015). How ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance: the mediating roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129, 251-264.
- Bozionelos, N. & Wang, L. (2006). The relationship of mentoring and network resources with career success in the Chinese organizational environment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, 1531–1546.
- Bresin, S. K. H. (1995). *The influence of family-supportive workplace programs on the employee and the organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 9609839)
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616.

- Butler, A. B., & Skattebo, A. (2004). What is acceptable for women may not be for men: The effect of family conflicts with work on job-performance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*, 553-564.
- Carlson D. S., Kacmar K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 131-164.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*, 249-276.
- Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L., (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: an examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, *25*, 513-540.
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2018). *Applied Psychology in Talent Management*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Casper, J. C., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 28-43.
- Casper, J. C., Vaziri, H., Wayne, J. H., DeHauw, S., & Greenhaus, J. (2018). The jingle-jangle of work-nonwork balance: a comprehensive and meta-analytic review of its meaning and measurement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*, 182-214.
- Cass, M. H., Siu, O. L, Fargher, E. B., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). A meta-analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and employee health in Hong Kong. *Stress & Health*, *19*, 79-95.

- Cheek, F., & Miller, M. (1983). The experience of stress for correctional officers: A double-blind theory of correctional stress. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 11*, 105-120.
- Chou, R. J.-A., & Robert, S. A. (2008). Workplace support, role overload, and job satisfaction of direct care workers in assisted living. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 49*, 208–222.
- Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1984). Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. In A. Baum, J. E. Singer, & S. E. Taylor (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and health* (pp. 253-267). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425–445.
- Cook, A. (2009). Connecting work-family policies to supportive work environments. *Group & Organization Management, 34*, 206-240.
- Cowan, R. S. (1983). More work for mother: The ironies of household technology from the open hearth to the microwave. New York: Basic Books.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T. & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*, 701-718.
- Dacey, L. (2019). *Work-family conflict, job burnout, and couple burnout in high stress occupations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (Order No. 13805406)
- Day, T. A. (2005). *Substitutes for job satisfaction: Family -supportive programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (Order No. 3197580)

- Dipboye, R. L. & de Pontbriand, R. (1981). Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*, 248-251.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eby, L.T., Durley, J. R., Evans S. C., & Ragins, B. R. (2006). The relationship between short-term mentoring benefits and long-term mentor outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 424–444.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500–507.
- Fiksenbaum, L. M. (2014). Supportive work-family environments: Implications for work-family conflict and well-being. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*, 653–672.
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 57–80.
- Frone, M. (2003). Predictors of overall and on-the-job substance use among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*, 39-54.
- Frone, M. R. & Yardley, J. K. (1966). Workplace family supportive programs: predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational Organizational Psychology, 69*, 351-366.
- Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: How gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*, 737-754.

- Gatewood, R., Feild, H. S., & Barrick, M. (2016). *Human Resource Selection*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Gilbert, E. (1990). Social change spurs child care. *National Underwriter*, 24, 15-22.
- Gill, D. S. (2007). *Employee selection and work engagement: Do recruitment and selection practices influence work engagement?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (Order No. 3291391)
- Glass, J. L., & Finley, A. (2002). Coverage and effectiveness of family-responsive workplace policies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 313-337.
- Green, P., & Skinner, D. (2005). Does time management training work? An evaluation. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9, 124-139.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79–103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Greenberger, E., Goldberg, W., Hamill, S., O’Neil, R., & Payne, C. (1989). Contributions of a supportive work environment to parents’ well-being and orientation to work. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17, 755- 783.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work– family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 510- 531.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work– family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72–92.

- Grubb, T. (2007). Performance appraisal reappraised: It's not all positive. *Journal of Human Resource Education, 1*, 1–22.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2005). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 97–109.
- Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 560–568.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E., Anger, K. W., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L., (2011)., Clarifying work-family intervention processes: The roles of work-family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 134-150.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E., Bodner, T., & Crain, T. (2013). Measurement development and validation of the Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior Short-Form (FSSB-SF). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*, 285–296.
- Hammer L., Kossek, E., Yragui, N., Bodner, T., Hanson, G. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *Journal of Management, 35*, 837–856.
- Hansen, S. D., Alge, B. J., Brown, M. E., Jackson, C. L., & Dunford, B. B., (2013). Ethical leadership: assessing the value of a multifoci social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 115*, 435-449.
- Heilman, M. E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10*, 3–26.
- Heskiau, R. (2017). *Work-family enrichment training: promoting transferability of resources across life domains* (Unpublished thesis). University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

- Hickson, K. C. (2008). *Work-family conflict and performance evaluations: Who gets a break?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Database. (Order No. 3377818)
- Higgins, M.C., & Kram, K.E. (2001) Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 264–288.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50, 49-54.
- Hirschfeld, R.R., Thomas, C. H., & Lankau, M. J. (2006) Achievement and avoidance motivational orientations in the domain of mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 524–537.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.
- Hubley, J. (1999). *Organizational justice and the perceived fairness of work-family programs and policy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 9924819)
- Ismail, H. N., & Gali, N., (2017). Relationships among performance appraisal satisfaction, work-family conflict, and job stress. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 23, 356-372.
- Johnson, D. A., (2014). *The effects of family supportive supervisor behaviors (fssb) on work and health related outcomes* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (Order No. 1554660)

- Jones, A. P., & James, L. R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23, 201-250.
- Judiesch, M., & Lyness, K. (1999). Left behind? The impact of leaves of absence on managers' career successes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 641-651.
- Kacmar, K. M., Crawford, W., Carlson, D. S., & Thompson, M. J. (2014). A short and valid measure of work-family enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 32-45.
- Kaplan, R. M. & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2005). *Psychological testing: Principles, applications and issues*, Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Kehinde, O. A. (2011). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Absenteeism: A Correlative Study. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1, 25-49.
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K.,... Kaskubar, D. (2008). Getting there from here: Research on the effects of work-family initiatives on work-family conflict and business outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 305-349.
- Kossek, E. E., & Hammer, L. B. (2008). Supervisor work/life training gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 36, 1-3.
- Kossek, E. E., Lewis, S., & Hammer, L. B. (2010). Work-life initiatives and organizational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream. *Human Relations*, 63, 3-19

- Kram, K. E. (1996). A relational approach to career development. In D.T. Hall and Associates (Eds), *The career is dead – long live the career: A relational approach to careers* (pp. 132–157). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Kreiner, G. E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: a person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 485-507.
- Kwan, H. K., (2014). *Antecedents and outcomes of family-supportive supervisor behaviors* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis Database. (Order No. 3626089)
- Lam, T. C. M., Kolomito, K., & Alamparambil, F. C. (2011). Empathy training: Methods, evaluation practices, and validity. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 7, 162-200.
- Leviton, L.C., & Trujillo, M.D., (2016). Interaction of Theory and Practice to Assess External Validity. *Evaluation Review*, 4, 436-471.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 107-123.
- Liu, D. J., Liu, H.K., Kwan & Mao, Y. (2009). What can I gain as a mentor? The effect of mentoring on the job performance and social status of mentors in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 871–895.
- Marchese, M. C., Bassham, G., & Ryan, J. (2002). Work–family conflict: A virtue ethics analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40, 145–154.
- Martinez, M. N. (1997). Work-life: Programs reap business benefits. *HR Magazine*, 42, 110.

- Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009) How long does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 1-13.
- McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. (2005) Situational judgment test research: Informing the debate on practical intelligence theory. *Intelligence*, 33, 515–525.
- McDermott, J. (2010). Work-life balance. *Media Planet*, 7, 1–8.
- Mesimo-Ogunsanya, E.A. (2017). Organizational support and employees' work-life quality. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Management & Technology*, 6, 74-77.
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B.B. (2011). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 689–725.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351–357.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (1999). The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24, 249-265.
- Muse, L. A., & Pichler, S. (2011). A comparison of types of support for lower-skill workers: Evidence for the importance of family supportive supervisors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79, 653–666.
- Nielson, T. R., Carlson, D. S., & Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 364 –381.

- Noe, R. A. (2016). *Training and development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Hammer, L. B., Crain, T. L., & Bodner, T. E. (2016). The influence of family-supportive supervisor training on employee job performance and attitudes: An organizational work–family intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*, 296–308.
- Outtz, J. L. (2009). *Adverse impact: Implications for organizational staffing and high stakes selection*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pichler, F. (2008). Determinants of work-life balance: Shortcomings in the contemporary measurement of WLB in large-scale surveys. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 449-469.
- Poelmans, S., & Sahibzada, K. (2004). A multi-level model for studying the context and impact of work-family policies and culture in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review, 14*, 409-431.
- Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be: Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten, & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations* (pp. 171-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Provenzano-Hass, N. (2017). The field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology: An early example of translational research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Research, 22*, 1-15.
- Purdy, E. B., (2017). *The relationship of quality of work life, work-life balance and flexible working arrangements on female physician's intent to leave their medical center* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Database. (Order No. 10690900)

- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 698-714.
- Rofcanin, Y., Berber, A., Koch, S., Sevinc, L. (2015). Job crafting and I-deals: a study testing the nomological network of proactive behaviors. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*, 1-32.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2005). *I-deals: Idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves*. New York, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Sale, B. (2010). *Predictors of family-supportive supervisor behaviors: Supervisor job stress and work-family climate* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/276
- Sayer, L. C. (2001). *Time use, gender, and equality: Differences in men's and women's market, non-market, and leisure time* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schippmann J.S., Ash R.A., Battista M., Carr L., Eyde L.D., Hesketh B., Kehoe, J. Pearlman, K. & Sanchez I. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel psychology, 53*, 703-740.
- Schmidt, D. E. & Duenas, G. (2002). Incentives to encourage worker-friendly organizations. *Public Personnel Management, 32*, 293-308.
- Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 689-695.

- Sharpe, D., Hermsen, J.M., & Billings, J. (2002). Factors associated with having flextime: A focus on married workers. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 23, 51-72.
- Sher, M. L., & Fried, M. (1994). *Child care options: A workplace initiative for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Smith-Teeter, S. L. (2007). *An examination of the validity of performance appraisal criteria produced by job analysis and personality-based job analysis* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (Order No. 1446568)
- Spector, P. E. (2008). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Staines, G. L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and non-work. *Human Relations*, 33, 111–129.
- Strachan, G., French, E., & Burgess, J. (2010). *Managing diversity in Australia: Theory and practice*. Sydney, Australia: McGraw-Hill.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- 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, R. J. (2016). Results-oriented work environment. In S. Rogelberg's (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Thompson, C., 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.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Tu, Y., Lu, X., & Yu, T. (2017). Supervisors’ ethical leadership and employee job satisfaction: a social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *18*, 229-245.
- Van Berkhout, E. T., & Malouff, J.M. (2015). The efficacy of empathy training: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *American Psychological Association*, *63*, 1-10.
- Viera, J. M., Lopez, F. G., & Matos, P. M. (2013). Further validation of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment scales among Portuguese working parents. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *22*, 329-344.
- Voydanoff, P. (2004). The effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 398–412.
- Wang, P., & Rode, J. C. (2010). Transformational leadership and follower creativity: The moderating effects of identification with leader and organizational climate. *Human Relations*, *63*, 1105-1128.
- Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to work–family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*, 108–130.
- White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C., & Smeaton, D., (2003). ‘High performance’ management practices, working hours, and work-life balance. *International Journal of Employee Relations*, *41*, 175-195.

- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 183- 200.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families and organizations* (pp. 1-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Zhang, S., & Tu, Y. (2018). Cross-domain effects of ethical leadership on employee family and life satisfaction: The moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152, 1085–1097

APPENDIX

POTENTIAL TOPICS FOR FUTURE REVIEW OR RESEARCH

Personnel Psychology	Organizational Psychology	Measurement Approaches	Theories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P-O Fit • Rewards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological Contract • Quality of Work Life (QWL) • Reciprocity • People-centered management • Communication Technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience sampling methodology • Ecological momentary assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job demand-control • Iso-strain model/hypothesis • Equity theory • Affective events theory • ASA model • Referent cognitions theory • Terror management theory