



Public Health
Agency of Canada

Agence de santé
publique du Canada

Who Is at Risk?

Predictors of Work–Life Conflict



*Report
Four*

Canada

Our mission is to promote and protect the health of Canadians through leadership, partnership, innovation and action in public health.

Report Four: Who Is at Risk? Predictors of Work–Life Conflict was prepared by **Dr. Linda Duxbury**, Professor, Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, and **Dr. Chris Higgins**, Professor, Richard Ivey School of Business, University of Western Ontario, for the Healthy Communities Division, Public Health Agency of Canada. The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada.

Funded by the Population and Public Health Branch of Health Canada (now the Public Health Agency of Canada).

Également disponible en français sous le titre : *Rapport 4 : Qui sont les personnes à risque? Les variables prédictives d'un haut niveau de conflit entre le travail et la vie personnelle*

Report Four:

Who Is at Risk? Predictors of Work–Life Conflict

**Dr. Linda Duxbury, Professor,
Sprott School of Business,
Carleton University**

**Dr. Chris Higgins, Professor,
Richard Ivey School of Business,
University of Western Ontario**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	vi
Foreword	vii
The Report Series	vii
Theoretical Framework	viii
Organization of Report Four	viii
Executive Summary	ix

Chapter One

<i>Introduction</i>	1
1.1 Who Is More Likely to Report High Levels of Work–Life Conflict?	1
1.2 Objectives of the Research	2
1.3 Relevance of This Study	2
1.4 Approach Taken in This Report	2

Chapter Two

<i>Methodology</i>	4
2.1 Who Responded to the National Work–Life Conflict Study?	4
2.2 Methodology	5
2.3 Statistical Analysis	6
2.3.1 Controlling for Job Type	7
2.3.2 The Role of Gender	7
2.4 Reporting Protocols Used in This Report	8

Chapter Three

<i>Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Socio-demographic Circumstances</i>	9
3.1 Family Predictors	9
3.1.1 Lifecycle Stage	9
a. Adult roles	10
b. Age of Children in the Home	12
3.1.2 Family Type	13

3.2 Community	17
3.3 Characteristics of Work	20
3.4 Socio-economic Status.	23
3.5 Conclusions.	24

Chapter Four

<i>Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Demands</i>	28
4.1 Work Demands	28
4.2 Non-Work Demands.	32
4.3 Conclusions.	35

Chapter Five

<i>Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Work Culture</i>	37
5.1 Work Culture	38
5.2 Conclusions.	41

Chapter Six

<i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	43
6.1 Research Question 1	43
6.2 Research Question 2	51
6.3 Research Question 3	53
6.4 Recommendations.	55

References	59
----------------------	----

List of Tables

Table 1: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Adult Roles	11
Table 2: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Age of Children in the Home	13
Table 3: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Family Type Analysis.	14
Table 4: Relationship Between Region of the Country, Rural/Urban Status and Family to Work Interference	19
Table 5: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Region of the Country	19
Table 6: Relationship Between Work to Family Interference and Region of the Country	20
Table 7: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Sector of Employment	21
Table 8: Summary of Regression Results: Characteristics of Work.	22
Table 9: Summary of Regression Results: Socio-economic Status	23

Table 10:	Summary of Regression Results: Work and Non-Work Demands	30
Table 11:	Summary of Regression Results: Work Culture	37
Table 12:	Summary of MANCOVA Results	44
Table 13:	Summary of Regression Results	45

List of Appendices

Appendix A:	Reports Coming the 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study.	63
Appendix B:	Statistical Analysis	64
	1. MANCOVA	64
	2. Regression	65
	2.1 Controlling for Job Type	66
Appendix C:	Summary of MANCOVAs.	67
	1. Impact of Lifecycle Stage: Adult Roles.	67
	Table C1: Sample Size for Lifecycle Stage (Adult Role) Analysis	67
	Table C2: Statistics for Adult Roles Analysis: Men	68
	Table C3: Statistics for Adult Roles Analysis: Women	69
	Table C4: Relationship Between Adult Roles and Work–Life Conflict: Men.	70
	Table C5: Relationship Between Adult Roles and Work–Life Conflict: Women	70
	2. Impact of Lifecycle Stage: Age of Children at Home.	71
	Table C6: Sample Size for Lifecycle Stage (Age of Children in Home) Analysis.	71
	Table C7: Statistics for Age of Children in Home Analysis: Women.	71
	Table C8: Relationship Between Age of Children at Home and Work–Life Conflict: Women	72
	3. Impact of Family Type	72
	Table C9: Sample Size for Family Type Analysis	72
	Table C10: Statistics for Family Type Analysis: Men	73
	Table C11: Statistics for Family Type Analysis: Women.	74
	Table C12a: Relationship Between Family Type, Role Overload and Role Interference: Men	75
	Table C12b: Relationship Between Family Type and Caregiver Strain: Men	75
	Table C13a: Relationship Between Family Type, Role Overload and Work to Family Interference: Women.	76
	Table C13b: Relationship Between Family Type, Family to Work Interference and Caregiver Strain: Women	76
	4. Impact of Community	77
	Table C14: Statistics for Geographic Area Analysis	77
	Table C15: Statistics for Region of the Country by Urban/Rural Analysis	79

5. Impact of Sector of Employment	80
Table C16: Sample Size for Analysis of Sector of Employment	80
Table C17: Statistics for Analysis of Sector of Employment	80
Table C18: Relationship Between Sector of Employment and Work–Life Conflict	81
Appendix D: Impact of Characteristics of Work on Work–Life Conflict	82
Table D1: Regression Results: Role Overload	82
Table D2: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference	82
Table D3: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference	83
Table D4: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain	83
Appendix E: Impact of Socio-economic Status on Work–Life Conflict	84
Table E1: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men.	84
Table E2: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women	84
Table E3: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Men	85
Table E4: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Women.	85
Table E5: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Men	86
Table E6: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Women.	86
Table E7: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Men	86
Table E8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Women	86
Appendix F: Impact of Work and Non-Work Demands on Work–Life Conflict.	87
1. Work Demands	87
Table F1: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men	87
Table F2: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women	88
Table F3: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Men	89
Table F4: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Women	90
Table F5: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Men	91
Table F6: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Women	91
Table F7: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Men.	91
Table F8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Women	91
2. Non-Work Demands	92
Table F9: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men	92
Table F10: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women	92
Table F11: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Men	92
Table F12: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Women	92
Table F13: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Men	93
Table F14: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Women	93
Table F15: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Men.	94
Table F16: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Women	94

Appendix G: Impact of Characteristics of Work Culture on Work–Life Conflict	95
Table G1: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men	95
Table G2: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Men	96
Table G3: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Men	97
Table G4: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Men.	98
Table G5: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women	98
Table G6: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Women	99
Table G7: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Women	100
Table G8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Women	100

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by the Population and Public Health Branch of Health Canada (now the Public Health Agency of Canada). Without its generous support, this research would not have been possible. The authors would like to acknowledge the efforts of the 100 employers who participated in this research and the 31,571 employees who filled out the survey. We would also like to thank our contact people at each of the participating organizations. We are also grateful to the various individuals and groups

at Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada who provided feedback on various aspects of the research. In particular, we would like to thank Jane Corville-Smith, Sophie Sommerer and Kelley Powell at the Public Health Agency of Canada for their support and guidance throughout the long and arduous research process. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the support of our families throughout the data collection, data analysis and report-writing processes.

Foreword

We all play many roles: employee, boss, subordinate, spouse, parent, child, sibling, friend and community member. Each of these roles imposes demands on us which require time, energy and commitment to fulfill. Work–family or work–life conflict occurs when the cumulative demands of these many work and non-work life roles are incompatible in some respect, so that participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other role.

The issues associated with balancing work and family are of paramount importance to individuals, the organizations that employ them, the families that care for them, the unions that represent them and governments concerned with global competitiveness, citizen well-being and national health. Although much has been written about the topic, only a handful of “high-impact” studies have been conducted on this subject in Canada.¹

The 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study was conducted to address this gap in our knowledge by providing a rigorous empirical look at the issue of work–life conflict. The research study was undertaken with the following objectives in mind, to:

- provide a clearer picture of the extent to which work–life conflict is affecting employees and employers in Canada,
- help organizations appreciate why they need to change how they manage their employees by linking conflict between work and life to the organization’s “bottom line,”
- expand the overall knowledge base in this area, and
- suggest appropriate strategies that different types of organizations can implement to help their employees cope with multiple roles and responsibilities.

This research study, and the reports it has generated to date have given business and labour leaders, policy makers and academics an objective “big picture” view on what has happened in this area in Canada in the last decade, the current situation with respect to this issue, and the costs associated with not addressing the challenges working Canadians have combining work and non-work roles and responsibilities.

The Report Series

This report is the fourth in a series of six as noted below:

Report One:	<i>The 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study:</i> puts the series into context by describing the sample of employees who participated in the research and examining the various “risk factors” associated with work–life conflict.
Report Two:	<i>Work–life Conflict in Canada in the New Millennium: A Status Report:</i> makes the business case for change by looking at how high levels role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference, caregiver strain and spillover from work to family) affect employers, employees and their families.
Report Three:	<i>Exploring the Link Between Work–Life Conflict and the Use of Canada’s Health Care System:</i> focuses on how work–life conflict affects Canada’s health care system (i.e. quantifies the system demands associated with high work–life conflict and attempts to put some kind of dollar value on how much it costs Canada to treat the health consequences of such conflict).
Report Four:	<i>Who Is at Risk? Predictors of High Work–Life Conflict:</i> addresses who is at risk with respect to high levels of work–life conflict.
Report Five:	<i>Reducing Work–Life Conflict: What Works? What Doesn’t?:</i> examines what employers, employees and their families can do to reduce work–life conflict.
Report Six:	<i>Work–Life Conflict in Canada in the New Millennium: Key Findings and Recommendations from the 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study:</i> provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations coming from this research study.

¹ See, for example, MacBride-King & Paris, 1989; Duxbury et al., 1991; Higgins et al., 1992; Duxbury & Higgins, 1998; Duxbury et al., 1999; MacBride-King & Bachmann, 1999.

It is hoped that the production of six specialized reports rather than one massive tome will make it easier for the reader to assimilate key findings from this rich and comprehensive research initiative. Each report has been written so that it can be read on its own. Each begins with an introduction which includes the specific research questions to be answered in the report, a summary of relevant background information and an outline of how the report is organized. This is followed by a brief outline of the research methodology employed. Key terms are defined and relevant data presented and analyzed in the main body of the report. Each report ends with a conclusion and recommendations chapter that summarizes the findings, outlines the policy implications and offers recommendations.

Theoretical Framework

There is a vast academic literature dealing with the issue of work–life conflict. A complete review of this literature is beyond the purview of this series of reports and counter to our primary objective which is to get easily understood and relevant information on work–life conflict to key stakeholders (governments, policy makers, employees, employers, unions). That being said, readers who are interested in the theoretical underpinnings of this research are referred to the Theoretical Framework which is shown in Reports One to Three of this series.²

Organization of Report Four

Report Four is broken down into six main chapters. Chapter One provides an introduction to this report, defines key terms and delineates the research objectives. Details on the methodology used in the study are covered in Chapter Two. Included in this chapter is information on the sample, the measurement instrument, the data analysis undertaken in this phase of the research, and the reporting protocols followed. Chapters Three, Four and Five are each devoted to a different set of possible predictors of work–life conflict. Chapter Three looks at the link between various demographic variables (i.e. lifecycle stage, adult roles, age of children in the home, family type, community, sector of employment, characteristics of work and socio-economic status) and work–life conflict. Chapter Four examines the association between work and non-work demands (i.e. time in work, time in child care, time in elder care) and work–life conflict. The relationship between organizational culture and work–life conflict is explored in Chapter Five. Each of the results chapters is structured as follows. First, relevant literature justifying the link between these constructs and work–life conflict is summarized. This is followed by empirical data quantifying the association between the various predictors of work–life conflict and the four measures of work–life conflict included in this analysis (i.e. role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain). Key findings are summarized at the end of each chapter. Conclusions, policy implications and recommendations are presented in Chapter Six, the final chapter of the report.

² See Appendix A for a complete list of the reports that have been published using data from the 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study.

Executive Summary

The previous reports in this series have demonstrated that work³–life balance is important to individual employees, the organizations that they work for, the families that support and rely on them, and the society in which they live. They have also established that the proportion of the Canadian workforce reporting high levels of work–life conflict increased substantively between 1991 and 2001.

The increase in the proportion of the Canadian workforce at risk of high work–life conflict can be attributed to widely documented demographic and structural changes in the work and family domains. The fact that most Canadians now live in dual-income and single-parent families rather than the traditional male breadwinner family means that most working Canadians have dual responsibilities—to their employer and their family. Our data indicate, in fact, that most employees today (both men and women) have substantive responsibilities at home (i.e. responsibility for child care, elder care or both) that they have to satisfy while simultaneously fulfilling duties associated with paid employment. Demographic factors that have also been linked to more work–life conflict include increased female participation in the labour force, increased divorce rates, increased life expectancy, more dual-income and single-parent families, more families with simultaneous child care and elder care demands, and a redistribution of traditional gender role responsibilities. On the work front, globalization, sophisticated office technology, the need to deal with constant change, the movement toward a contingent workforce, and a growth in atypical forms of work have also been linked to increases in work–life conflict.

Who is more likely to report high levels of work–life conflict? The answer is, quite simply, unknown at this time. The key objective of this report is to rectify this situation by identifying factors that are associated with the incidence of four forms of work–life conflict: role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain.

This report uses data collected for part of the 2001 National Study on Balancing Work, Family and Lifestyle to answer the following questions:

1. What are the most important predictors of role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain?
2. Can we identify a set of factors that places employees at risk of all forms of work–life conflict? Can we identify a set of risk factors that is unique to each of the four forms of work–life conflict?
3. What impact does gender have on the prediction of work–life conflict?

The following steps were followed to address these questions. A literature review was conducted first to allow us to identify a number of possible predictors of work–life conflict. These predictors were then categorized into three main groups describing an employee’s socio-demographic circumstances, their work and non-work demands, and the organizational culture in which the employee worked. MANCOVA and regression techniques were then used to determine how effective the various predictors were at forecasting the four different forms of work–life conflict examined in this study.

What demographic conditions and life circumstances place an employee at risk with respect to the various forms of work–life conflict? It is difficult to answer this question at this time as much of the empirical research linking key demographic variables, such as education, income and family type, with the incidence of work–life conflict is dated, limited in nature, and has yielded inconsistent or non-significant findings. This report provides a more comprehensive look at this issue by exploring the link between lifecycle stage, family type, age of children, socio-economic status, the employee’s community (i.e. rural/urban, size of community, region of Canada), and characteristics of work (i.e. sector of employment, work arrangement, employment status, years with organization, union membership) and work–life conflict.

This report also seeks to increase our understanding of the relationship between the various demands that employees face (at work and outside of work) and the different forms of work–life conflict. Work demands have generally been defined as referring to a set of prescribed tasks that a person performs while occupying a position in an organization. Work hours is one of the most widely studied

³ Throughout this report, the term “work” refers to paid employment.

structural aspects of employment in the work–life literature. It is generally agreed that the number of hours worked contributes to the experience of job demands (pressures arising from excessive workloads and workplace time pressures), a major workplace stressor. Why do employees devote long hours to work if such activities increase work–life conflict? There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon, including the following:

- In the modern workplace, there are fewer people and more work to accomplish, so higher workloads are inevitable.
- Knowledge work is more absorbing and satisfying than other forms of work.
- Managers positively influence long hours by overtly valuing and rewarding those who come in early, stay late and extend their day by taking work home with them.

There is much less of a consensus on what should be included within the umbrella of non-work demands. Non-work may refer to activities and responsibilities associated with the family domain, as well as activities and obligations that go beyond one’s own family situation. Social roles typically included within this category include leisure (interpreted to mean “spare time”) obligations and responsibilities associated with family membership (i.e. household activities, caregiving) as well as social obligations (i.e. volunteer activities, community activities).

The final goal of this study is to explicate the link between workplace culture and work–life conflict. Workplace culture refers to a deep level of shared beliefs and assumptions, many of which operate below the conscious level of those who are members of the culture. A supportive work culture has been defined as “the shared assumptions, beliefs and values regarding the extent to which organizations value and support the integration of work and family lives for women and men.” There is often a gap within organizations between formal work–life policies and informal practices which make balance more difficult. Research in this area has identified several sets of norms that may make work–life balance more difficult. The first, what we refer to in this report as a culture of “work **or** family,” are cultural expectations that an employee who wants to advance will put work ahead of family. The second, what we call “the culture of hours,” refers to organization expectations and pressures that steer workers who value job security and/or promotion to put in long hours or take work home. In such organizations, employees who reject the culture of “long hours” are less likely to be valued or promoted.

Relevance of This Research

The findings presented in this report offer policymakers, academics and practitioners a better understanding of what contributes to work–life conflict in Canada. Separation of work–life conflict into its four parts allows us to identify unique and overlapping risk factors associated with the various forms of work–life conflict. Such an examination will improve our understanding of the sources of work–life conflict which will, in turn, enable policymakers and organizations to target their interventions, policies and programs at the appropriate factors. By taking a multidimensional approach to our conceptualizations of both work demands and work–life conflict, this research helps us to identify exactly which work demands contribute to what sorts of problems for which groups. Such specificity, which is currently not available to either policymakers or organizations (most research has focused on hours of work per week and either a global measure of work–life conflict or role interference), should help interested parties to identify specific interventions to ease the different forms of work–life conflict. Finally, the examination of the impact of organizational culture on the incidence of the various forms of work–life conflict should increase our understanding of why employees working for organizations which are “best practice” with respect to their policy platform still report high levels of stress and conflict between work and family.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The sample consists of 31,571 Canadian employees who work for medium to large (i.e. 500 or more employees) organizations in three sectors of the economy: public (federal, provincial and municipal governments), private, and not-for-profit (defined in this study to include organizations in the health care and educational sectors). In total, 100 companies participated in the study: 40 from the private sector, 22 from the public sector and 38 from the not-for-profit sector. The sample is distributed as follows:

- 46% of the respondents work in the public sector; 33% work in the not-for-profit sector; 20% are employed by a private sector company.
- 55% of the respondents are women.
- 46% of the respondents work in managerial and professional positions while 54% work in “other” positions (e.g. clerical, administrative, retail, production, technical).

- 56% of the respondents have dependent care responsibilities (i.e. spend an hour or more a week in child care, elder care or both).

The 2001 survey sample is well distributed with respect to age, region, community size, job type, education, personal income, family income, and family's financial well-being. The mean age of the respondents is 42.8 years. About half of the respondents are highly educated male and female knowledge workers (i.e. managers and professionals). One in three is a clerical or administrative employee; one in five holds a technical or production position. Most respondents (75%) are married or living with a partner and 69% are part of a dual-income family. Eleven percent are single parents. Twelve percent live in rural areas. One quarter of the respondents indicate that money is tight in their family; 29% of respondents earn less than \$40,000 per year. One in three of the respondents has a high school education or less.

The majority of respondents have responsibilities outside of work. Seventy percent are parents (average number of children for parents in the sample is 2.1); 60% have elder care responsibilities (average number of elderly dependents is 2.3); 13% have responsibility for the care of a disabled relative; and 13% have both child care and elder care demands (i.e. are part of the "sandwich generation"). The fact that the demographic characteristics of the sample correspond closely to national data provided by Statistics Canada suggests that the findings from this study can be generalized beyond this research.

Sample Profile: Levels of Work–Life Conflict

Role overload is having too much to do in a given amount of time. This form of work–life conflict occurs when the total demands on time and energy associated with the prescribed activities of multiple roles are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably. Most employees in our sample (58%) are currently experiencing high levels of role overload. Another 30% report moderate levels of role overload. Only 12% of the respondents in this sample report low levels of overload. Our research suggests that the proportion of the workforce experiencing high levels of role overload has increased substantially over time (i.e. an 11% increase in 2001 compared to 1991).

Work to family interference occurs when work demands and responsibilities make it more difficult for an employee to fulfill family role responsibilities. One in four of the Canadians in this sample reports that his or her work responsibilities interfere with the ability to fulfill

responsibilities at home. Almost 40% of the respondents report moderate levels of interference. The proportion of the Canadian workforce with high levels of work to family interference has not changed over the past decade.

Family to work interference occurs when family demands and responsibilities make it more difficult for an employee to fulfill work role responsibilities. Only 10% of the Canadians in this sample report high levels of family to work interference. Another third report moderate levels of family to work interference. Our data suggest that the percentage of working Canadians who give priority to family rather than work has doubled over the past decade.

Approximately one in four of the individuals in this sample experiences what can be considered to be high levels of caregiver strain: physical, financial or mental stress that comes from looking after an elderly dependent. While most respondents to this survey (74%) rarely experience this form of work–life conflict, 26% report high levels of caregiver strain.

Research Question One: Important Predictors of Role Overload

The following conclusions about the occurrence of role overload can be drawn from this study.

1. Work culture and work demands are the key determinants of role overload for male and female employees in Canada.
2. Objective facts about an employee's family, community or work situation do not help us predict the amount of role overload the person will experience.
3. Work culture is the most powerful predictor of role overload. For both men and women, the single most important aspect of work culture with respect to the prediction of role overload was the extent to which the employee believed the organization promoted a culture that was supportive of work–life balance. The results indicate that supportive work cultures serve a protective function within the organization, as the more supportive the environment, the lower the levels of role overload reported. Two other types of work cultures prove to be predictive of increased levels of role overload: a culture of hours and a culture of work **or** family. With respect to the culture of hours, employees who perceive that it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work and that an inability to work long hours would limit their career advancement are more likely to report higher levels of role overload regardless of their gender.

Working for an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. employees perceive that family responsibilities limit career advancement) is also linked to higher role overload—perhaps because employees in such circumstances try to “do it all.”

4. Work demands are strongly associated with role overload. The data indicate that the most important determinants of role overload are the amount of time spent in unpaid overtime a month and the total number of hours spent in work per week.
5. Role overload is more about demands generated from the work domain than from the non-work domain. Non-work demands, such as time in child care, elder care and home chores, are not substantive predictors of role overload.
6. With relatively few exceptions, the key predictors of role overload hold across gender.

Research Question One: Important Predictors of Work to Family Interference

The following conclusions with respect to the prediction of work to family interference can be drawn from the data:

1. Organizational culture is the most important predictor of work to family interference for both men and women. The power of the work culture to predict work–life conflict can be appreciated when one considers that our measures of work culture explain 35% of the variation in work to family interference for the men in the sample and 33% of the variation for the women.
2. Men and women who work for an organization that promotes a culture that supports balance were more likely to report lower levels of this form of work–life conflict, whereas employees who work for organizations without supportive policies in place report higher work to family interference. This would suggest that organizations that wish to reduce this form of work–life conflict for their employees need to promote a culture that supports work–life balance and introduce supportive policies within the organization.
3. Employees who work in organizations that have a culture of hours (i.e. a workplace in which employees perceive that it is not acceptable to say no to more work, that their career advancement will be limited if they do not work long hours) report higher work to family interference.
4. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel they have to choose between their family and career advancement and that family responsibilities and taking family leave restrict career advancement) report higher levels of work to family interference.
5. Demands at work were the second strongest predictor of work to family interference for both men and women. This form of work–life conflict is not, however, linked to the amount of time spent in work per week but rather a function of work demands that either physically remove the employee from the family domain (i.e. job-related travel) or take time that is typically reserved for the family (unpaid overtime, supplemental work at home [SWAH]).
 - Employees who spend more time in job-related travel (i.e. spend more week nights and weekend nights away from home) report higher levels of work to family interference.
 - Employees who devote more time to work (particularly supplemental work hours at home and unpaid overtime) are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference.
6. Work to family interference is more strongly associated with the unwritten rules, norms and expectations placed on an employee at work (i.e. workplace culture) than with employees’ work and family circumstances (i.e. family type, lifecycle stage) or the actual amount of time they spend in work or family roles. Employees with higher work expectations and whose jobs require that they extend their work hours into times typically reserved for family are more likely to report high work to family interference.
7. If we have information on where people live, their family situation, where they work (i.e. their sector of employment) and their socio-demographic circumstances, we will have some understanding of the amount of work to family interference they will experience. This would indicate that an employee’s life circumstances (i.e. the person’s work and life situation) have more of an influence on the juggling aspect of work–life conflict than they do on the demand side of this phenomenon. Higher levels of work to family interference are reported by employees in the not-for-profit sector, those with higher incomes (likely because of the association between income and job type), those who supervise others or work shifts, and those who work in Western Canada.

8. Work to family interference has the same underlying root causes for both men and women (i.e. the same work-related behaviours and organizational cultural norms are problematic for both genders).

Research Question One: Important Predictors of Family to Work Interference

Data supporting the following conclusions with respect to the prediction of family to work interference are outlined in this report:

1. Organizational culture is the most important predictor of family to work interference for both men and women.
2. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of hours (i.e. employees perceive that their career advancement will be limited if they do not work long hours) report higher family to work interference.
3. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel that family responsibilities and taking family leave limits advancement) report higher family to work interference.
4. Family to work interference occurs when the types of behaviour the work culture rewards with respect to career advancement (i.e. long hours, putting work first) are at odds with the types of behaviours one would associate with being a suitable parent/elder caregiver (i.e. spending time in family activities, taking family leave, putting family first).
5. Employees with higher levels of family to work interference spend more time per week providing child care and/or elder care. They are also more likely to have primary responsibility for child care in their family.
6. Employees with higher levels of family to work interference spend fewer hours per week in leisure activities. This suggests that these employees may be trying to cope with this form of interference by devoting time they would normally spend on themselves to their work and/or family roles.
7. This form of work–life conflict is linked to what an employee has to do at home (i.e. non-work demands) and how easy it is for them to fulfill these responsibilities given the expectations imposed at the level of the organization (i.e. organizational culture). It is not associated with the demands an

employee faces at work (i.e. work circumstances, sector of employment), nor is it associated with where one lives.

8. Time in home chores, education and volunteer work are not significant predictors of family to work interference for either gender.

Research Question One: Important Predictors of Caregiver Strain

The following conclusions can be drawn with respect to the circumstances associated with caregiver strain:

1. Caregiver strain can be predicted with some degree of confidence if you know an employee's lifecycle stage and non-work demands. None of the other factors considered in this analysis is predictive of this form of work–life conflict.
2. For both men and women, caregiver strain is positively associated with the time demands associated with looking after an elderly dependent (most important predictor) and having this form of responsibility (second most important predictor).
3. Employees with both child care and elder care responsibilities (i.e. those in the sandwich group) and those with just elder care responsibilities report higher levels of caregiver strain than employees in other roles. The greater the responsibility one has for elder care (i.e. employee is an only child, the parent lives in the home, siblings do not assume concomitant share, lack of community support), the higher the level of this form of conflict.
4. This type of work–life conflict can be substantively predicted by knowing an employee's lifecycle stage. Employees who are older and in a lifecycle stage that involves elder care are more likely to report high levels of caregiver strain, regardless of where they live, where they work, their income, job type, etc. This finding is not a surprise given that caregiver strain is defined as a strain due to care of an elderly dependent. It also, however, indicates that caregiver strain issues are endemic within the Canadian population (i.e. no one province stands out as having addressed this issue).
5. Caregiver strain has a very different etiology than the other forms of work–life conflict examined in this study (i.e. it has a very different set of predictors). It is, for example, the only form of work–life conflict examined in this study that was not substantively associated with organizational culture.

Research Question Two: Common Predictors of Work–Life Conflict

Examination of the data leads to other key conclusions with respect to the prediction of the various forms of work–life conflict:

1. None of the predictors examined in this study substantively related to all four forms of work–life conflict for both men and women.
2. Organizational culture is a substantive predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference. Employees who work in an organization with a culture of hours and a culture of work **or** family report higher role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference while employees who work for an organization with a culture supportive of work–life balance report lower levels of these three forms of work–life conflict.
3. Role overload and work to family interference are strongly predicted by circumstances at work.

Organizational culture and work demands are the two most important predictors of role overload and work to family interference. With respect to work demands, both role overload and work to family interference are positively associated with hours per month in unpaid overtime, hours spent in work per week, hours per week in SWAH and time away from home in job-related travel. Organizational cultures that focus on hours (i.e. advancement limited if you do not work long hours or if you say no to more work), emphasize work **or** family (i.e. family responsibilities and family leave are perceived to limit advancement) and are non-supportive of balance are also linked to higher levels of role overload and work to family interference.

4. Family to work interference and caregiver strain are more likely to be determined by family circumstances.

The most important predictors of caregiver strain and family to work interference are associated with the family domain (i.e. non-work demands, family type, adult role responsibilities). While family to work interference appears to be primarily a function of demands associated with child care, caregiver strain seems to be driven by elder care issues. Both of these forms of work–life conflict are positively associated with hours per week providing elder care, hours per week delivering child care and

responsibility for elder care. Caregiver strain is strongly associated with the provision of elder care.

5. Work to family interference is the only dimension of work–life conflict that can be predicted by sector of employment, income, job type, work arrangement, and place of residence in Canada.

The following predictors of work to family interference are unique to this form of work–life conflict:

- sector of employment (employees in the not-for-profit sector report higher interference than those in the public and private sector);
- income (income is positively associated with work to family interference, probably because of the strong positive association between income and job type);
- employees who supervise the work of others report higher work to family interference,
- employees who work shifts report higher work to family interference; and
- employees who live in Western Canada report higher work to family interference, while employees who live in Quebec report lower interference.

Research Question Three: Gender Differences in the Prediction of Work–Life Conflict

The following conclusions with respect to gender differences in the prediction of work–life conflict can be drawn from this study:

1. Organizational culture is a key predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference for both men and women.

There is no set of factors that places both male and female employees at risk of all four forms of work–life conflict. If we limit ourselves to an examination of the predictors of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, however, we are able to identify one factor that places both male and female employees at risk of increased work–life conflict—the culture of the organization in which the employee works. The following types of cultures are problematic (i.e. positively associated with role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference) for both men and women:

- a culture of hours where employees believe that if they do not work long hours they will not advance in their organization, and
- a culture of work **or** family where employees perceive that family responsibilities and taking family leave limit advancement.

On the other hand, both men and women who work for an organization whose culture is supportive of work–life balance report lower levels of these forms of work–life conflict (i.e. supportive culture is negatively associated with role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference).

2. Role overload has a different etiology for men than women. Job-related travel is associated with increased role overload for women but not men. Management positions are associated with higher levels of role overload for men but not women.

Job-related travel appears to be more problematic for women than men. This conclusion is supported by the following factors that are important predictors of role overload for women but not men: hours commuting to work per week, week nights away from home per month on business, and weekend nights away from home on business. For the men in the sample, role overload is a function of being a manager and engaging in work extension activities (i.e. taking work home to complete in the evening, engaging in SWAH).

3. Supportive organizational policies are associated with lower levels of role overload and work to family interference for women but not men.

Working for an organization that has supportive policies in place is predictive of reduced role overload for women but not men. It may be that women, more than men, need work–life policies to be in place before they can take positive action with respect to balance (i.e. such policies give their actions legitimacy and give them the “courage” to push back). This interpretation of the data is consistent with the fact that women (but not men) who feel that they cannot say no to overtime work are more likely to report high work to family interference.

4. Family type and adult roles are predictive of role overload and work to family interference for women but not men.

For the men in the sample, family type has no strong association with either role overload or work to family interference. That is, men in traditional families and single men with dependent care responsibilities report the same levels of both of these forms of work–life conflict as dual-income fathers and men in dual-income families with elderly dependents. For the women in the study, on the other hand, family type is strongly associated with role overload and work to family interference. Women in non-traditional families (i.e. those with a stay-at-home husband) report lower levels of role overload and family to work interference but higher levels of work to family interference than other women. In other words, the women in this family type manifest work–life conflict patterns that are more typically reported by men.

5. Responsibility for child care is the most important predictor of family to work interference for men. For women, on the other hand, family to work interference is more strongly associated with the amount of time spent providing child and elder care.

While non-work demands predict family to work interference and caregiver strain for both men and women, the order of importance of the predictors suggests that there is a gender difference about the link between non-work demands and work–life conflict. For women, it is the amount of time that they have to spend looking after children and elderly dependents that is more problematic. Responsibility for these roles is of secondary importance with respect to the prediction of family to work interference. For men, on the other hand, having primary responsibility for child care appears to cause more of a problem than the amount of time spent in the role. This finding is consistent with the fact that the women in this sample spend more time providing child and elder care than men—time that can be expected to increase the extent to which family to work interference affects this group of employees.

6. Women with multiple caregiving demands (i.e. both child care and elder care) report lower levels of family to work interference than women with only child or elder care.

This finding suggests that multiple caregiver roles offer some form of protective function to women with respect to this form of work–life conflict.

7. Age of children in the home is predictive of family to work interference and caregiver strain for women but not men.

The data indicate that, for the women in the sample, two forms of work–life conflict (family to work interference and caregiver strain) are substantively associated with the age of their children. Caregiver strain is positively associated with children's age, while family to work interference is negatively associated with children's age. These relationships were not significant for men. The following picture emerges from these data. As women age, the amount of care required by their children declines (as does family to work interference) as they too get older. At the same time, the amount of care required by the parents and in-laws of these women increases (as does caregiver strain) as they age. Women with adolescent children and parents who are younger and still independent report lower levels of both forms of work–life conflict. This result can be explained by the fact that, for women, biological limitations provide an upper limit on the age at which a woman can have children. These work–life findings indicate that employers and policymakers need to consider both child care and elder care roles when looking at conflict for women between work and life.

8. Work demands are associated with caregiver strain for women but not men, suggesting that they change their behaviour at work to cope with elder care responsibilities at home.

Work demands have a stronger association with caregiver strain for women than men. Examination of the data indicates that caregiver strain is positively associated with time per week performing SWAH and negatively associated with hours per week in work. It would appear from these data that women with this form of work–life conflict try to fit their work demands around their caregiving obligations by leaving the office early (fewer hours in work per week) and taking work home to complete (higher SWAH).

Recommendations

The data reviewed in this study leave little doubt that there is no “one size fits all solution” to the issue of work–life conflict and that different policies, practices and strategies will be needed to reduce each of the four components of work–life conflict. That being said, the data indicate that there are a number of strategies and approaches that the various stakeholders in this issue can use to reduce work–life conflict. Three sets of recommendations are offered in this report. The first set of recommendations relates to work demands and organizational culture. These recommendations have the broadest applicability (i.e. work demands and organizational culture are predictive of three out of four forms of work–life conflict, caregiver strain being the exception). This is followed by recommendations that should help employees cope with family to work interference and caregiver strain.

Recommendations That Deal with Work Demands

To reduce role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, employers need to focus their efforts on making work demands and work expectations realistic. Work demands, rather than demands from outside work, are the key predictors of role overload and work to family interference, the two most common forms of work–life conflict in Canada at this time. While employers often point with pride to the many “programs” available in their organization to help employees meet family obligations, these programs or options do not diminish the fact that most people simply have more work to do than can be accomplished by one person in a standard work week. Therefore, employers and governments need to recognize that the issue of work–life conflict cannot be addressed without dealing with the issue of workloads. Employers can also help employees deal with heavy work demands by introducing initiatives that increase an employee's sense of control. The recommendations listed below are, we feel, critical with respect to addressing the issue of demand and control:

1. Employers need to identify ways of reducing employee workloads. This is especially true for not-for-profit sector employers. Special attention needs to be given to reducing the workloads associated with being in management.
2. Employers need to examine workloads within their organizations. If they find that certain employees are consistently spending long hours at work (50 + hours per week), they need to determine why this is occurring (e.g. ambitious staff, unbalanced and unrealistic work expectations, poor planning, too many priorities, lack of tools and/or training to do the

job efficiently, poor management, organizational culture focused on hours not output). Once they have determined the causal factors, they need to determine how workloads can be made more reasonable.

3. Employers need to recognize that unrealistic work demands are not sustainable over time and come at a cost to the organization which is often not recognized or tracked. Accordingly, we recommend that the employer start recording the costs of understaffing and overwork (i.e. greater absenteeism, higher prescription drug costs, greater employee assistance program use, increased turnover and hiring costs), so they can make informed decisions with respect to this issue.
4. Employers need to identify ways to reduce the amount of time employees (especially women) spend in job-related travel (e.g. increase their use of virtual teams and teleconferencing technology). In particular, they need to reduce their expectations that employees will travel on their personal time and spend weekends away from home to reduce the organization's travel costs.
5. Employers need to analyze workloads and hire more people in those areas where the organization is overly reliant on unpaid overtime.
6. Employers need to track the amount of time employees spend working paid and unpaid overtime and capturing the number of hours it actually takes to get various jobs done. They should also collect data which reflect the total costs of delivering high quality work in various areas on time (i.e. paid and unpaid overtime, subsequent turnover, employee assistance program use, absenteeism). Such data should be longitudinal in nature as many of the consequences of poor people management do not appear until 6 to 12 months after the event. This type of data should improve planning and priority setting, as well as allow senior executives to make better strategic, long-term decisions.
7. Employers have to develop an etiquette around the use of office technologies such as e-mail, laptops and cell phones. They need, for example, to set limits on the use of technology to support after-hours work and make expectations regarding response times realistic.
8. Employers need to provide employees with more flexibility around when and where they work. The criteria under which these flexible arrangements can

be used should be mutually agreed upon and transparent. There should also be mutual accountability around their use (i.e. employees need to meet job demands, but organizations should be flexible with respect to how work is arranged). The process for changing hours of work or the location of work should, wherever possible, be flexible. The increased use of flexible work arrangements would have the added benefit of reducing the amount of time spent commuting to and from work—an important predictor of role overload for women.

9. It is very difficult (if not impossible) to implement flexible work arrangements in organizations where the focus is on hours rather than output and presence rather than performance. This means that organizations that want to increase work-life balance need to introduce new performance measures that focus on objectives, results and output (i.e. move away from a focus on hours to a focus on output). To do this, they need to reward output, not hours, and reward what is done, not where it is done. They also need to publicly reward people who have successfully combined work and non-work domains and not promote those who work long hours and expect others to do the same.
10. Employers need to give employees the right to refuse overtime work. Saying no to overtime work should not be a career-limiting move. Some organizations may want to give management limited discretion to override the employee's right to refuse overtime (i.e. because of an emergency situation, due to operational requirements) but this should be the exception not the rule.
11. Employers should implement time off arrangements in lieu of overtime pay.
12. Employers should provide a limited number of days of paid leave per year for child care, elder care or personal problems.
13. Employers should provide appropriate support for their employees who work rotating shifts. What is an appropriate support should be determined by consulting with employees who work rotating shifts. Policies that have been found to be effective in this regard include limits to split shifts, advanced notice of shift changes, and permitting shift trades (i.e. allowing employees to change shift times with one another).

14. Employers should implement “cafeteria” benefits packages which allow employees to select those benefits which are most appropriate to their personal situation on a yearly basis.
15. Employees need to say no to overtime hours if work expectations are unreasonable.
16. Employees need to try to limit the amount of work taken home to be completed in the evenings. Employees who do bring work home should make every effort to separate time in work from family time (i.e. do work after the children go to bed, have a home office).
17. Employees need to try to limit the amount of time spent in job-related travel.

Recommendations That Deal with Organizational Culture

To reduce role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, employers need to deal with their organization’s culture. Work–life policies are a necessary first step, but they are not sufficient in that they will not be implemented or used in a culture that is non-supportive of work–life issues. The findings from this study identified three different organizational cultures which are associated with increased work–life conflict: a culture of hours, a culture of work **or** family and a non-supportive culture (environment is non-supportive of balance). The importance of addressing the issue of organizational culture cannot be over-emphasized. Culture was the single strongest predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference for both men and women. A policy approach on its own will not fix what is wrong in many organizations. To address the issue of work–life conflict, employers need to create supportive work cultures. This means changing reward structures and accountability and measurement systems.

While the preceding recommendations will all act to make the work environment more supportive, we recommend that the following specific steps be taken by organizations that wish to focus their efforts on cultural change:

18. Work with employees to identify the types of support they would like (i.e. diagnose the situation) and which types could be accommodated within the organization. Not all supportive policies are feasible and practical in every context.
19. Develop and implement appropriate supportive policies. The development phase should include an analysis of the potential problems associated with the implementation of each policy and suggestions on how these problems could be addressed.
20. Communicate to employees the various policies that are available. Indicate how these policies can be accessed and any restrictions to their use. Repeat these communications on a regular basis (e.g. every couple of months). Publish these data on the company’s Intranet.
21. Encourage employees to use the policies by having senior management model appropriate behaviours, conducting information sessions on the policies and how they can be used (e.g. through lunch and learns), communicating how these policies are being used successfully in this organization and others (e.g. communicate best practices), etc. Employees must be made to feel that their career will not be jeopardized if they take advantage of supportive policies.
22. Measure the use of the different supportive policies and reward those sections of the organization that demonstrate best practices in these areas. Investigate those areas where use is low.
23. Change accountability frameworks and reward structures. Stop rewarding long hours and unpaid overtime work and instead focus on rewarding accurate work plans and sound human resource management.
24. Employees need to take advantage of the supportive policies and flexible work arrangements available within their organization.
25. Employees and managers alike need to model the type of behaviour that is associated with organizational support of work–life balance, as actions speak louder than words in this arena (i.e. do not call meetings late in the day or early in the morning, do not expect employees to travel on personal time or save money for the organization by travelling for business on the weekend).
26. Culture change is considered to be transformational in nature. Organizations need to offer training to senior managers on the critical success factors necessary for transformational change, provide training to managers on how to manage a change of this nature, and ensure that several people on the organization’s senior leadership team have the necessary competencies to lead and manage this type of change.

Recommendations That Deal with Family to Work Interference and Caregiver Strain

Unique predictors of family to work interference and caregiver strain include non-work demands and responsibilities associated with child care and elder care. To reduce these forms of work–life conflict will require a partnership among governments, employees, unions and employers. We would recommend the following actions to reduce these forms of work–life conflict:

27. Governments need to take the lead with respect to the issue of child care. In particular, they need to determine how to best help employed Canadians deal with child care issues (i.e. develop appropriate policies for parents of children of various ages, identify and implement relevant supports).
28. Governments need to take the lead with respect to the issue of elder care. In particular, they need to determine how to best help employed Canadians deal with elder care issues (i.e. develop appropriate policies, identify and implement relevant supports).
29. Employers should offer child and elder care referral services.
30. Employers should extend their employee assistance program to cover the families of their employees (e.g. offer an employee family assistance program instead).
31. Employees need to educate themselves on how they can best deal with the issues of elder care. Things such as financial planning courses and nurturing an

awareness of what types of community resources are available for those with elder care issues are likely to help employees increase the amount of control they have over these issues.

32. Employees with caregiving responsibilities should self-identify so that their employer can try to respond. This is particularly true with respect to issues surrounding elder care where the employer does not know that the employee is facing challenges outside work. It is difficult for an employer to assist if he or she does not know there is a problem.

Finally, the findings outlined in this study are somewhat disturbing in what they say about Canadian values. Why is caring for our seniors and our children causing so much strain? Why are Canadian men and women foregoing having families or reducing the number of children that they have? Has there been a change in values in Canada? Do Canadian organizations with cultures of work or family and hours reflect what is important to Canadians? Do such cultures give us a competitive advantage globally or are we hurting our chances of future success by focusing on short-term gains? Are we asking too much of families? Are we asking too much of employees? The data outlined in this study suggest that Canadians need to take a step back and reassess these issues. Canadian employees and employers “survived” the 1990s. Our ability to thrive in this millennium may well depend on how we move forward on the issues outlined in this report.

Chapter One

Introduction

One would be hard pressed to find an explicit definition of the phrase “work–life balance” or what it means for work and life to be “in balance” in the research literature (Frone, 2002, p. 145). The most widely held meaning of work–life balance defines this construct as a lack of conflict or interference between work and family/life roles (Frone, 2002) which reflects the assumption that work–life conflict and work–life balance can be conceptualized as anchoring opposite ends of a continuum. Work–life conflict, on the other hand, has typically been defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which the demands of work and family/life roles are incompatible in some respect so that participation in either the work or family/life role⁴ is more difficult because of participation in the other role (Voydanoff, 1988, p. 749).

The previous reports in this series have demonstrated that:

- the majority of Canadian employees do not experience work⁵ and life as separate domains, and
- that the proportion of the Canadian workforce reporting high levels of work–life conflict increased substantively between 1991 and 2001.

They have also established that work–life balance is important to individual employees, the organizations that they work for, the families that support and rely on them and the society in which they live.

The increase in the proportion of the Canadian workforce at risk of high work–life conflict can be attributed to a number of widely documented demographic and structural changes in the work and family domains (Barnett, 1998; Frone, 2002; Hammer et al., 2002). Demographic factors that have been linked to the increased incidence of work–life conflict include increased female participation in the labour force, increased divorce rates, increased life expectancy, more dual-income and single-parent families, more families with simultaneous child care and elder care demands, and a redistribution of traditional gender role responsibilities. On the work front, globalization, sophisticated office technology, the need to deal with constant change, the movement toward a contingent workforce, and a growth in atypical forms of

work have also been linked to increases in work–life conflict.

The fact that the majority of Canadians now live in dual-income and single-parent families rather than the traditional male breadwinner family means that the majority of working Canadians have dual responsibilities—to their employer and their family. Our data indicate, in fact, that the majority of employees today (both men and women) have substantive responsibilities at home (i.e. responsibility for child care, elder care, or both) that they have to satisfy while simultaneously fulfilling duties associated with paid employment.

1.1 Who Is More Likely to Report High Levels of Work–Life Conflict?

The answer is, quite simply, we do not know. While a large body of literature exists to inform our understanding of the antecedents of work–life conflict, much of what exists in this area is limited by methodological issues (Barnett, 1998; Westman & Piotrkowski, 1999; Frone, 2002; Hammer et al., 2002; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Key concerns noted by these authors are summarized below.

First, while current conceptualizations posit that each dimension of work–life conflict has a unique set of domain-specific antecedents, little research has been done in this area (Frone, 2002). Most studies on work–life conflict done before 1990 used global measures of work–life conflict that combined work to family interference and family to work interference or assessed only work to family conflict. Virtually no research exists examining the antecedents of caregiver strain and role overload.

Second, the multidisciplinary nature of the research in this domain has several important ramifications for researchers and practitioners which often make it impossible to compare findings across studies and groups. Key limitations that have been attributed to this cause include the following:

4 From the 1970s through to the early 1990s, researchers studied work–family conflict. In the later part of the 1990s, the term was changed to “work–life” conflict in recognition of the fact that employees’ non-work responsibilities can take many forms, including volunteer pursuits and education, as well as the care of children or elderly dependents.

5 Throughout this paper, the term “work” refers to paid employment.

- knowledge is fragmented,
- there is no clear consensus with respect to the key questions and issues that define the field,
- a wide variety of different discipline-specific measures have been used to examine work–life conflict, its antecedents and its outcomes, and
- there is no agreement on unifying theories or terminology.

Third, most research in this area has focused on selected groups of employees (i.e. typically highly educated, professional knowledge workers or female employees). This focus has limited our ability to generalize findings to the working population in general and may be responsible for many of the inconsistencies in findings observed in the literature.

Finally, it is likely that many of the earlier studies done in this area may no longer be relevant as the environment in which they were undertaken has shifted dramatically. The past several decades have seen significant social change. There is a need to examine the various sources of work–life conflict within this new context.

1.2 Objectives of the Research

Guerts and Demerouti (2003) recommended that one of the first steps required with respect to the application of theory-guided research in the area is a study which identifies the main antecedents of work–life conflict. To be influential, this study needs to conceptualize work–life conflict as a multifaceted phenomenon in which work and non-work domains mutually influence each other in both a positive and negative way. Such a study should assess the home situation “with the same precision as the workplace” and include employees in various occupations and family situations. Such a study is, they contend, important for reasons of generalization and estimation of effects.

Accordingly, the key objective of this report is to identify factors that are associated with the incidence of four forms of work–life conflict: role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain. Three sets of work–life predictors will be examined in this report:

- socio-demographic predictors: lifecycle stage, adult roles, age of children in the home, family type, community, sector of employment, characteristics of work and socio-economic status;
- demands: work demands and non-work demands; and

- organizational culture.

Specifically, this research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the most important determinants of role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain?
2. Can we identify:
 - a set of factors that places employees at risk of all forms of work–life conflict?
 - a set of risk factors that is unique to each of the four forms of work–life conflict?
3. What impact does gender have on the prediction of the four forms of work–life conflict? Specifically, can we identify:
 - a set of factors that places employees at risk of the various forms of work–life conflict regardless of their gender?
 - a set of risk factors that is unique to female employees?
 - a set of risk factors that is unique to male employees?

1.3 Relevance of This Study

Separation of work–life conflict into its four component parts (i.e. role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain) will allow for the identification of unique and overlapping risk factors associated with the various forms of work–life conflict. Such an examination will improve our understanding of the sources of work–life which will, in turn, enable policy makers and organizations to target their interventions, policies and programs at the appropriate causal factors (Westman & Piotrkowski, 1999).

1.4 Approach Taken in This Report

This study seeks to identify what places Canadian employees at risk with respect to four forms of work–life conflict. Frone (2002) provided a good place to start with respect to identifying possible factors to include in our study. He grouped predictors of work–life conflict into two categories: role environment and personality. The focus of this study is on this first set of predictors rather than the second (i.e. the topic of personality is not explored in this study).

Role environment predictors as conceptualized by Frone (2002) include:

- **Behavioural involvement:** This represents amount of time devoted to work and non-work roles. It is expected that as more time is devoted to one role, there is less time available to meet the demands of the other.
- **Psychological involvement:** This is defined as the degree to which individuals identify with a social role and see it as important to their self-concept. It is hypothesized that “high levels of psychological involvement in a given role (e.g. work) may cause one to be mentally preoccupied with that role while in the physical role space of a second role (e.g. family)” (Frone, 2002, p. 150).
- **Role-related stressors:** These encompass role characteristics in the work and family domains that contribute to work–life conflict by either leading to cognitive preoccupation with the source of the distress or to reduced levels of psychological and physical energy.
- **Role-related resources:** Social supports found in the work and/or family domain that may potentially reduce work–life conflict (e.g. supportive manager, supportive culture).

In subsequent chapters, the predictors selected for inclusion in this study are presented and studies supporting their inclusion provided. It should be noted, however, that an exhaustive review of the research that has been done in this area in the past three decades is beyond the scope of this report. Research in the area of work–life conflict has its roots in a wide variety of disciplines (e.g. psychology, sociology, social work, occupational health, nursing, gerontology, family studies, gender studies, industrial psychology, organizational behaviour). A comprehensive review of this literature is further complicated by the fact that “Over the past 20 years there has been a virtual explosion of research on the relationship between work and family life, as economic and social factors have combined to change work and family roles” (Westman & Piotrkowski, 1999, p. 301). The existence of such an extensive work–life literature makes it impossible to provide an exhaustive review of this research in a short paper (Frone, 2002). The strategy employed in this report, therefore, is to be selective and to establish the link between work–life conflict and the predictors examined in this study through the citation of a few key studies and recent reviews in this area.

Chapter Two

Methodology

The methodology section is divided into three parts. Information on the sample is presented first. This is followed by a brief discussion of the procedures used to collect the data in section 2.2. The statistical techniques used in this report are covered in section 2.3.

2.1 Who Responded to the National Work–Life Conflict Study?

The sample for the “National Work–Life Conflict Study” was drawn from 100 Canadian companies with 500+ employees. Forty of these organizations operated in the private sector, 22 were from the public sector and 38 were from the not-for-profit sector. Private-sector companies from the following sectors were included in the sample: telecommunications, high technology, retail, transportation, pharmaceutical, financial services, entertainment, natural resources and manufacturing. The public-sector sample included 7 municipal governments, 7 provincial government departments, and 8 federal public service departments/agencies. The not-for-profit sector sample consisted of 15 hospitals/district health councils, 10 school boards, 8 universities and colleges, and 5 “other” organizations that could best be classified as not-for-profit/greater public service (e.g. social service, charity, protective services).

A total of 31,571 employees responded to the survey. The sample is distributed as follows:

- Just under half (46%) of the respondents work in the public sector. One in three works in the not-for-profit sector and 20% are employed by a private-sector company.
- Just over half (55%) of the respondents are women.
- Just under half (46%) work in managerial and professional positions, 40% work in non-professional positions (e.g. clerical, administrative, retail, production) and 14% work in technical jobs.
- Just over half (56%) of the respondents have dependent care responsibilities (i.e. spend an hour or more a week in either child care or elder care). The rest (44%) do not.

A full description of the sample can be found in Reports One, Two and Three in this series (see Appendix A for bibliographic details). Key details which may be of interest to the readers of this report are given below.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The 2001 survey sample is well distributed with respect to age, geographic area of residence, community size, job type, education, personal income and family income. The mean age of the respondents is 42.8 years. Approximately half of the respondents are highly educated knowledge workers (i.e. managers and professionals). One in three works in clerical or administrative jobs and one in five holds a technical or production position. The majority of respondents (75%) are married or living with a partner and are part of a dual-income family (69% of the sample). Eleven percent are single parents. Twelve percent live in rural areas. One quarter of the respondents indicate that money is tight in their family, and 29% of respondents earn less than \$40,000 per year. One in three of the respondents has a high school education or less.

Most respondents have responsibilities outside of work. Seventy percent are parents (average number of children for parents in the sample is 2.1); 60% have elder care responsibilities (average number of elderly dependents is 2.3); 13% have responsibility for the care of a disabled relative; 13% have both child care and elder care demands (i.e. are part of the “sandwich generation”). The fact that the demographic characteristics of the sample correspond closely to national data provided by Statistics Canada (see Report One) suggests that the findings from this study can be generalized beyond this research.

Sample Profile: Levels of Work–Life Conflict

Four types of work–life conflict are examined in this study: role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and role overload. Role overload occurs when the total demands on time and energy associated with the prescribed activities of multiple roles are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably. The majority of employees in our sample (58%) are currently experiencing high levels of role overload. Another 30% report moderate levels of role overload. Only 12% of the respondents in this sample report low levels of overload. Our research suggests that the proportion of the workforce experiencing high levels

of role overload increased substantially from 1991 to 2001 (i.e. by approximately 11%).

Work to family interference occurs when work demands and responsibilities make it more difficult for an employee to fulfill family role responsibilities. One in four Canadians in this sample reports that work responsibilities interfere with his or her ability to fulfill responsibilities at home. Almost 40% of respondents report moderate levels of interference. The proportion of the Canadian workforce with high levels of work to family interference has not changed appreciably from 1991 to 2001.

Family to work interference occurs when family demands and responsibilities make it difficult for an employee to fulfill work-role responsibilities. Only 10% of the Canadians in this sample report high levels of family to work interference. Another third report moderate levels of family to work interference. Our data suggest that the percentage of working Canadians who experience this form of interference has doubled over the past decade.

Approximately one in four individuals in this sample experiences what can be considered to be high levels of caregiver strain: physical, financial or mental stress that comes from looking after an elderly dependent. While most respondents to this survey (74%) rarely experience this form of work–life conflict, 26% report high levels of caregiver strain.

Who has more problems balancing work and family responsibilities? The evidence from this research is quite clear—employed Canadians with dependent care responsibilities. Employees who have child and/or elder care responsibilities report higher levels of role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain than their counterparts without dependent care. The fact that employed parents and elder caregivers have greater difficulty balancing work and family is consistent with the research in this area and can be attributed to two factors: greater non-work demands and lower levels of control over their time.

Job type is associated with all but one of the measures of work–life conflict explored in this study. Managers and professionals are more likely than those in “other” jobs to experience high levels of overload and work to family interference. This finding is consistent with the fact that the managers and professionals in this sample spent significantly more time in paid employment and were more likely to perform unpaid overtime than colleagues who worked in clerical, administrative, technical and production jobs. Those in “other” jobs, on the other hand, are more likely to report higher levels of caregiver strain from the financial stresses associated with elder care.

Women are more likely than men to report high levels of role overload and high caregiver strain. This is consistent with the finding that the women in this sample devote more hours per week than men to non-work activities such as child care and elder care and are more likely to have primary responsibility for non-work tasks.

2.2 Methodology

A 12-page survey produced in a mark-sensitive format with a unique bar code given to each organization participating in the study was used to collect the data. This survey was divided into nine sections: your job; your manager; time management; work, family and personal life; work arrangements; work environment; family; physical and mental health; and “information about you.” Virtually all of the scales used in the questionnaire are psychometrically sound measures that have been well validated in other studies. Definitions for the four components of work–life conflict included in this study are given in Box One while the measures used to quantify work–life conflict are summarized in Box Two. The measures used to quantify the various predictors examined in this study are provided in Chapters Three, Four and Five along with the research literature justifying their inclusion in this study.

Box One

Defining Work–Life Conflict

Work–life conflict is conceptualized broadly in this study to include role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain. The working definition of each of these constructs is given below.

Role Overload is having too much to do in a given amount of time. This form of work–life conflict occurs when the total demands on time and energy associated with the prescribed activities of multiple roles are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably.

Role Interference occurs when incompatible demands make it difficult, if not impossible, for an employee to perform all roles well. Role interference is conceptualized as having two distinct facets:

- ▲ **Work to Family Interference: This type of role interference occurs when work demands and responsibilities make it more difficult to fulfill family role responsibilities.**
- ▲ **Family to Work Interference: This type of role interference occurs when family demands and**

responsibilities make it more difficult to fulfill work role responsibilities.

Caregiver Strain: Caregiver strain is an outcome which may arise due to responsibility for the care of an elderly or disabled dependent. Caregiver strain is a multidimensional construct which is defined in terms of “burdens” or changes in the caregiver’s day-to-day lives which can be attributed to the need to provide care (Robinson, 1983). Four types of caregiver strain resulting from stress have been identified: emotional strain (i.e. depression, anxiety, emotional exhaustion), physical strain, financial strain and family strain. It should be noted that research on caregiver strain has typically focused on strains associated with the provision of elder care or care for a disabled dependent rather than those linked to child care itself.

objective (rather than subjective) burden in four areas. Respondents were asked to indicate (using a five-point Likert scale) how often they had difficulty in caring for an elderly relative or disabled dependent because of physical strains, financial strains or because it left them feeling completely overwhelmed. Options given included never, monthly, weekly, several days per week or daily. Total caregiver strain was calculated as the summed average of these three items. Higher scores indicate greater strain. This measure has been used in a number of studies with good results (Robinson reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.91). In this study, the Cronbach alpha was 0.78.

Box Two

Measurement of Work–Life Conflict

Role overload was assessed in this study using five items from a scale developed by Bohlen and Viveros-Long (1981). Role overload was calculated as the summed average of these five items. High scores indicate greater role overload. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was 0.88.

Work to family interference was measured by means of a five-item Likert scale developed by Gutek, Searle and Kelpa (1991). Work to family interference was calculated as the summed average of these five items. High scores indicate higher levels of perceived interference. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was 0.92.

Family to work interference was assessed by means of a five-item Likert scale developed by Gutek, Searle and Kelpa (1991). Family to work interference was calculated as the summed average of these five items. High scores indicate higher levels of perceived interference. In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was 0.87.

Caregiver strain was quantified using a modified three-item version of Robinson’s (1983) Caregiver Strain Index (CSI) (family strain, a key family outcome, was assessed separately). This index measures

2.3 Statistical Analysis

Two statistical procedures were employed in this report to meet the research objectives outlined above: MANCOVA (multiple analysis of co-variance) and regression. To assist the reader, key statistical terms are defined briefly in Box Three while details on each of these techniques are given in Appendix B.

MANCOVA was used in the following analyses:

- assessment of community variables,
- lifecycle stage (i.e. adult roles, parental status) by gender,
- family type by gender,
- assessment of sector of employment

In all cases, the co-variate that we controlled for was job type.

A series of regression models⁶ were run for the following independent variable models:

- socio-economic status
- characteristics of work
- work demands
- non-work demands
- organizational culture

Job type was included in all of the above regression equations as a control variable.

⁶ The dependent variables used in these regression analyses included role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain.

Box Three

Terms Used in Discussing Statistical Analysis

Multiple Analysis of Co-variance (MANCOVA): a technique that can be used to assess differences in means between groups while controlling for the possible impact of other factors (co-variates) which might affect the relationship.

Regression: a technique where one group of variables (called independent variables) is used to predict a dependent variable. In this report, we look at four dependent variables: role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain.

F-test: statistic used to evaluate whether the predictive power of the regression model is null. If we reject the null model, we say we have a significant regression (i.e. the independent variables included in the regression are significantly able to predict our dependent variable).

Wilks' lambda: multivariate version of the F-test used to determine if the differences in means between groups is significant (i.e. in the MANOVA and MANCOVA).

p-value: level of statistical significance. Traditionally, p-values of 0.05 or less are considered to be statistically significant.

R² (R-squared): the percent of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables. This statistic is used to determine the strength of the association between dependent and independent variables and ranges from 0 to 1. The closer R² is to 1, the stronger the association.

Pratt's Measure/Co-efficient: Statistic which is calculated to determine the relative importance of each independent variable in the regression equation.

Bonferroni adjustment: This is a more conservative approach to hypothesis testing which is done to control for what researchers call a type 1 error (i.e. the error of rejecting a hypothesis when it is true). It is a simple procedure where the p-value of 0.05 (the common rejection level) is divided by the number of dependent variables included in the analysis to get a more conservative rejection level.

2.3.1 Controlling for Job Type

Empirically, the previous reports in this series determined that the four dependent variables included in this analysis, as well as many of the independent variables (i.e. socio-economic status, work demands, non-work demands) were significantly associated with job type. Theoretically, job type has been shown to influence the nature of an individual's participation in work and family roles (i.e. demands) and shape the meaning that individuals give to family and work, the identities they develop and their work environment (see Duxbury & Higgins, 2001; Higgins & Duxbury, 2002 for a review of the relevant theory). It is, therefore, highly likely that job type will confound most of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables considered in this analysis. To minimize the impact of this confound on the findings and make it easier to interpret the findings, we decided to control for job type in all the statistical analyses done for this study (see Appendix B).

2.3.2 The Role of Gender

Gender constitutes the socio-demographic characteristic most frequently examined with respect to the prevalence of the various forms of work-life conflict (Hammer et al., 2002; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Haas (1995, p. 115) defined gender as a "system of socially constructed boundaries that define what is considered to be appropriate masculine and feminine behaviours, attitudes, values, personalities, roles and occupations." Similarly, Milkie and Peltola (1999) defined gender as a hierarchical structure that "infuses everyday relations in the family and the workplace." Both of these definitions assume that employed women and men have different role expectations and demands (both felt and actual).

It was widely predicted that women's participation in the labour force would enhance gender equality in the home by challenging the role of the man as the family provider. Researchers offer two quite disparate views of how this influx of women into the paid labour force may have affected work-life balance. Lewis and Cooper (1999, p. 387) offered the first of these views—that gendered family role responsibilities remain remarkably resilient and "tend to be reinforced and recreated by gendered organizational cultures and practices." Westman and Piotrkowski (1999, p. 301) espoused an alternative scenario and noted that

“the assumption that the study of work–family relations is relevant only for women and their families has given way to the recognition that men also have families and that they, too, must balance the obligations to their employers and their families.”

To increase our understanding of the relationship between gender and the four forms of work–life conflict included in this study, we elected to do most of the data analysis outlined above twice: once for men, and once for women. In the cases in which such an approach was not warranted, we controlled for gender in the analysis (see Appendix B). This data analysis strategy gave us a greater appreciation of how gender is related to the various indicators of work–life conflict explored in this study.

2.4 Reporting Protocols Used in This Report

For all perceptual measures (i.e. work climate, perceived demands), we used an R^2 of 5% as an arbitrary determination of substantiveness (i.e. an indicator that we are able to predict work–life conflict in a meaningful way). When reporting regression results where the R^2 is less than 5%, only significant items in the regression equation are shown and Pratt's co-efficient was not calculated. For objective measures such as income, family type, etc., we relaxed this assumption somewhat and considered R^2 of 4% or greater to be worthy of note.

Chapter Three

Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Socio-demographic Circumstances

What demographic conditions and life circumstances place an employee at risk with respect to the various forms of work–life conflict? It is difficult to answer this question with any degree of certainty at this time because much of the empirical research linking many key demographic variables (i.e. age, education, income, family type) with the incidence of work–life conflict is dated, limited in nature (i.e. deals with a limited range of family types), and has yielded inconsistent or non-significant findings (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). This study was designed to provide a more comprehensive exploration of this issue. Chapter Three looks at the link between the following demographic variables and work–life conflict: lifecycle stage, adult roles, age of children in the home, family type, community, characteristics of work and socio-economic status.

The chapter is divided into five main sections. Demographic factors associated with the family (i.e. lifecycle stage, family type) are considered first. This is followed in section 3.2 by an examination of the impact the employee’s community (i.e. region of Canada, rural/urban, size of community) has on work–life conflict. Characteristics of work (i.e. sector of employment, work arrangement, employment status, years with organization, union membership) are addressed in section 3.3. Socio-economic circumstances (i.e. income, education) are evaluated in section 3.4. Key findings are provided in section 3.5.

3.1 Family Predictors

Employed Canadians spend a good part of their time outside of work and many live in and are supported by families. Family circumstances (i.e. how families are structured, the presence or absence of various family role responsibilities and demands, lifecycle stage) can be expected to be associated with work–life conflict. This expectation is based on “the assumption that family structure characteristics and responsibilities, accompanied by physical unavailability for work, preoccupation with family activities, and energy depletion, will be positively related to work–life conflict” (Voydanoff, 1988, p. 749).

Sound empirical research linking key family context variables, such as lifecycle stage and family type to the incidence of the various forms of work–life conflict, is sparse (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Those studies that are available have yielded inconsistent or non-significant findings. The lack of focus on the family end of the equation means that researchers and practitioners know more about the relationship between work–role characteristics and work–life conflict than they do about the relationship between family characteristics and conflict (Voydanoff, 1988).

This analysis seeks to fill some of these gaps in our knowledge by looking at the link between two critical dimensions of the family environment and work–life conflict: lifecycle stage and family type.

3.1.1 Lifecycle Stage

The concept of lifecycle stage (Keith & Schafer, 1991) is used to consider the variations in work and family–role demands encountered during adulthood. Lifecycle stage has historically been determined by the presence and age of children in the home (Haas, 1995). Typical research in the area has looked at five stages: childlessness, new parenting, parenting school-aged children, parenting adolescents and parenting young adults. As people live longer, however, other family stages have become possible. The median age of the workforce is increasing and will continue to do so, contributing to an increased probability that workers will be faced with elder care as well as care for dependent children (Hammer et al., 2002). Little is known about the relationship between work–life conflict and elder care. Most of the research in this area has focused on child care (Haas, 1995; Buffardi et al., 1999). Often, the research on elder care that is available has taken a gerontological perspective (i.e. examined the impact of caregiver’s employment on caregiving). The work–life issues of the caregiver remain largely unexplored (Buffardi et al., 1999). Furthermore, sound empirical research on the effects of multigenerational caregiving (i.e. sandwich group) is quite limited (Buffardi et al., 1999). The increasing prevalence of employees who must juggle work–role demands with

caregiving responsibilities has increased our need to understand more fully the relationship between lifecycle stage and work–life conflict. This study provides data on just these issues.

To reflect the literature noted above, lifecycle stage is operationalized in two ways in this research:

- by looking at the full range of adult roles that employees in today’s workforce perform, and
- by examining the age of children in the home.

a. Adult roles

To determine the impact of lifecycle stage on work–life conflict, we divided the sample into the following five major groupings:

- **Single:** not married/living with a partner, no dependents,
- **Dual-income, no children:** married/living with a partner, no dependents,
- **Dual-income parents:** married/living with a partner, spend at least one hour a week providing child care,
- **Sandwich group:** married/living with a partner, spend at least one hour a week providing child care and at least one hour per week giving elder care,
- **Elder care:** married/living with a partner, spend no time per week delivering child care (typically empty nesters) but spend at least one hour per week providing elder care.

To increase our ability to interpret the impact of lifecycle stage, we restricted our sample to respondents who worked full time and who, if they were in a committed relationship, had a partner who also worked full time. Following the definitions of lifecycle typically given in the literature, we chose not to include employees who had sole responsibility for the care of a dependent (i.e. single parents, single elder care provider) in our analysis of lifecycle stage and instead chose to look at these groups in our examination of family type.⁷ To ensure that we had individuals in our sample who had to cope with responsibilities and demands associated with child care and elder care, we restricted our sample to only those employees who spent time in these roles. Finally, to explore the impact of gender on the relationship between

adult role and work–life conflict, we did the analysis twice: once for men and once for women.

The link between adult roles and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Westman and Piotrkowski (1999) in their extensive review of the literature in this area identified lifecycle stage as an important moderator of work–life conflict. Research has determined that employees with significant dependent care responsibilities (e.g. employees who have responsibilities caring for young children, employees with large families, employees who care for dependent elders, employees with multigenerational responsibilities) tend to report higher levels of work–family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Scharlach & Boyd, 1989; Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992b; Hammer et al., 2002).

The link between adult roles and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Two five (adult roles) by four (types of work–life conflict) MANCOVAs—one for men and one for women—were calculated to examine the link between lifecycle stage and work–life conflict. Job type was the co-variate. Key findings from this analysis are discussed below. The data are presented in Appendix C1.

Work–life conflict is significantly associated with lifecycle stage

Data analysis indicates that lifecycle stage is significantly associated with work–life conflict for both men and women.⁸ Follow-up analysis (see Table 1) shows that lifecycle stage is a significant predictor of all four forms of work–life conflict for both genders (see Appendix C).

Only a small proportion of the variation in role overload and role interference is explained by lifecycle stage

A relatively small proportion of the variation in three of the four forms of work–life conflict examined in this study can be explained by knowing an employee’s lifecycle stage. Consider the following:

- 2% of the variation in role overload in men and 3% of the variation in women can be explained by their adult lifecycle stage,

⁷ Conceptually, lifecycle stage reflects a progression through time/aging. We typically begin our life as an adult with no responsibilities for the care of others. As we get older, we typically get involved in a committed relationship/marry, have children, care for both children and aging parents, and finally perform elder care only as the children leave the “nest.”

⁸ The co-variates representing job type were significant at $\alpha < 0.0001$ in both sets of analysis.

Table 1: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Adult Roles

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 7.85, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.019	F = 19.72, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.031
Work to family interference	F = 6.19, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.024	F = 4.67, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.044
Family to work interference	F = 14.37, $\alpha < 0.0001$ *	0.033	F = 37.78, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.042
Caregiver strain	F = 87.27, $\alpha < 0.0001$ *	0.133	F = 94.26, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.104

Note: * means that neither job type co-variate is statistically significant.
 Unless otherwise denoted, both job type co-variables are significant at $\alpha < 0.0001$.
 The Bonferroni adjustment means that only α of 0.0125 (i.e., 0.05 divided by 4) or lower are considered significant.

- 2% of the variation in work to family interference in men and 4% of the variation in women can be explained by their adult lifecycle stage, and
- 3% of the variation in family to work interference in men and 4% of the variation in women can be explained by their adult lifecycle stage.

Employees with dependent care responsibilities are more likely to experience work–life conflict

Several specific observations with respect to the link between adult lifecycle stage and these three forms of work–life conflict are worthy of note. First, lifecycle stage appears to be a better predictor of work–life conflict in women than in men. Second, it is clear from the data that adult lifecycle stages that involve dependent care responsibilities (i.e. child care and/or elder care) are associated with higher levels of role overload, work to family interference, and family to work interference for both men and women. Employees without dependents, on the other hand, are less likely to report high levels of work–life conflict. These findings are not surprising given the analysis in Report One which showed that employees with dependent care responsibilities had additional demands on their time (see Report One).

Elder care responsibilities, in particular, place employees at higher risk of work–life conflict

Dual-income employees with elder care responsibilities report significantly higher levels of role overload than their counterparts with child care or dual caregiving responsibilities (i.e. both child care and elder care). This finding is somewhat surprising as one would expect the

highest levels of this form of work–life conflict to be reported by employees with dual caregiving responsibilities because they have the greatest number of potentially competing commitments on their time. This finding is, however, consistent with the expansion approach of multiple role theory espoused by Barnett and Baruch (1987). This theory takes the view that activity in one domain creates energy and knowledge for use in that role or in other roles. The exact mechanism whereby this occurs is difficult to ascertain from these data. Plausible explanations for these findings include the following. First, it may be that older children are able to assume some of the elder care responsibilities, thereby reducing the burden on their parents. Alternatively, it may be that having dual dependent care responsibilities forces employees to spend less time providing child care or elder care than their counterparts with only one role to contend with (i.e. they have to spread a finite amount of time between two roles). These findings are also consistent with the idea that employees with both child care and elder care responsibilities are able to apply strategies and techniques that they have found to work with respect to caring for their children to the care of elderly dependents, or vice versa. This would suggest that transference of key learnings from one family role to another helps one cope more effectively. Finally, it is possible that employees with dual caregiving demands cope by lowering their standards.

Lifecycle stage is an important predictor of caregiver strain

A substantive proportion of the variation in caregiver strain⁹ can be explained by knowing an employee’s

⁹ 13% of the variation for the men in the sample and 10% for the women.

lifecycle stage. Closer examination of the data indicate that two groups in particular are at higher risk of caregiver strain: those with sandwich responsibilities and those with elder care commitments.

Caregiver strain appears from the data to have a different etiology than the other three forms of work–life conflict. For example:

- This form of work–life conflict has a much stronger association with lifecycle stage than the other types of work–life conflict.
- The relationship between the different lifecycle roles and caregiver strain is associated with gender. The men in the sample in the sandwich lifecycle stage report significantly higher levels of caregiver strain than their counterparts with elder care responsibilities; for women, both sandwich and elder care stages are equally problematic.
- Dual-income parents report very low levels of caregiver strain although their levels of role overload and role interference are relatively high. This finding is likely because this group is younger and caregiver strain is, by definition, associated with elder care, not child care.

b. Age of Children in the Home

To determine the impact of children’s age on the various types of work–life conflict, we divided the sample into three major groupings. These consisted of:

- **Preschoolers:** All children in the home are less than five years of age.
- **School-aged children:** All children in the home are between five and 12 years of age inclusive.
- **Teenagers:** All children in the home are older than 12 years of age but less than 20.

To better appreciate the impact of age of children on work–life conflict, we restricted our sample to these three groups (i.e. we removed employees who had children in two or three of these groups¹⁰). We also ran the analysis twice, once for men and once for women.

The link between age of children in the home and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Many studies indicate that employees with greater responsibility for child care report higher conflict between work and family (see Buffardi et al., 1999 for a review of

this literature). Parents of young dependent children (especially mothers) have higher family demands than those with older children (Hochschild, 1989; Higgins, Duxbury & Lee, 1994). These higher, often unpredictable demands (e.g. arrangement of child care, daycare pick-up and drop-off, care of sick child) result in lower levels of control over the work and family interface and thus in higher levels of work–family conflict. As the children get older, however, the demands, especially those related to child care, should decrease, resulting in increased levels of control and lower stress for the parents.

The evidence that is available (see, for example, Higgins et al., 1994; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003) supports a link between being in the full-nest stage of the lifecycle stage (i.e. have young children at home) and increased levels of work to family interference. Women with young children at home appear to be particularly at risk with respect to this form of work–life conflict. Higgins et al. (1994) for example, found role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference to be negatively associated with the age of the children at home. Employees with older children reported less conflict than their counterparts with younger children. These relationships were more profound for women than for men.

Voydanoff (1988) reported that having preschool and school-age children has consistently been found to be related to work–life conflict and time shortage. She also made the link between increased work–life conflict and heavy child-rearing responsibilities. Both large numbers of children and young children in the home have, she felt, the potential to increase work–life conflict through the following mechanisms: physical unavailability for work, preoccupation with child-rearing activities and overload.

The link between age of children in the home and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

To further explore the link between the role of parent and work–life conflict, we selected from our data a sub-sample of parents with children in three age groupings—preschoolers, school-aged children and teenagers, and ran two separate three (age of children in the home) by four (types of work–life conflict) MANCOVAs—one for men and one for women. Job type was the co-variate. The results of this analysis are shown in Appendix C2.

¹⁰ For example, a respondent who had a three-year-old and a nine-year-old at home was not included in this analysis.

Work–life conflict is significantly associated with age of children in the home for mothers but not fathers

Multivariate data analysis indicates that the age of children in the home is significantly associated with work–life conflict in women but not men. Further examination of the data (see Table 2) indicates that age of children in the home is significantly associated with two forms of work–life conflict for women: family to work interference and caregiver strain. The R² data indicate that, for women, the age of their children explains an appreciable amount of the variation in family to work interference (5%) and caregiver strain (4%). It is interesting to note, however, that the relationship between these two forms of work–life conflict and children’s age is diametrically opposed. Women with preschoolers report the highest levels of family to work interference and the lowest levels of caregiver strain. Women with teenage children, on the other hand, report the lowest levels of family to work interference but the highest levels of caregiver strain. This is consistent with the data reported in conjunction with adult roles and indicates that the type of work–life conflict women experience changes as they age and progress through life stages.

3.1.2 Family Type

Too often, work–life research focuses on the individual as the unit of analysis. While this research also takes this approach, our examination of family type as a predictor of work–life conflict extends the inquiry and provides support for calls to look at the family as the unit of analysis. To explore the link between family type and work–life conflict, we divided the sample into the following seven major groupings:

- **Single:** not married/living with a partner, no dependents
- **Single with dependents:** not married/living with partner, spend an hour or more a week providing child care, elder care, or both
- **Dual-income, no dependents:** married/living with a partner, no dependents
- **Dual-income parents:** married/living with a partner, spend at least one hour a week giving child care
- **Dual-income sandwich:** married/living with a partner, spend at least one hour a week supplying child care and at least one hour per week providing elder care
- **Dual-income elder care:** married/living with a partner, spend no time per week providing child care (typically empty nesters) but spend at least one hour per week offering elder care
- **One breadwinner/One partner at home:** one partner is employed full time outside the home while the other partner does not work outside the home and spends at least one hour a week engaged in child care or elder care. Depending on the gender of the respondent, this group consists of:
 - traditional family: male breadwinner/female stay-at-home caregiver
 - non-traditional family: female breadwinner/male stay-at-home caregiver.

While five of the family types considered in the analysis are identical to those examined in conjunction with lifecycle stage, three family types are unique: single caregivers (i.e. single parents, single individuals with elder

Table 2: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Age of Children in the Home

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 0.15, α = 0.86 *	0.003	F = 0.55, α = 0.58	0.014
Work to family interference	F = 0.82, α = 0.44 *	0.004	F = 0.51, α = 0.60	0.039
Family to work interference	F = 0.72, α = 0.49 *	0.001	F = 17.29, α < 0.0001 *	0.045
Caregiver strain	F = 0.28, α = 0.76 *	0.001	F = 6.19, α = 0.002 *	0.039

Note: * means that neither job type co-variate is statistically significant.
 Unless otherwise denoted, both job type co-variables are significant at α < 0.0001.
 The Bonferroni adjustment means that only α of 0.0125 (i.e., 0.05 divided by 4) or lower are considered significant.

care responsibilities), traditional families and non-traditional families. The addition of these three groups, and the fact that we looked at men and women separately, provides us with a better understanding of how family circumstances outside of work may make work–life balance more or less problematic. This conceptualization of family type also addresses a major concern expressed by Westman and Piotrkowski (1999, p. 305), who noted that we may not appreciate the full impact that work–life conflict has on families because researchers have used a restricted definition of “family.”

The link between family type and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

There is very little empirical research looking at family structure. Some studies have noted, not surprisingly, that employees who are single report lower levels of role interference (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), while employees with children at home report higher levels of role interference (Netemeyer et al., 1996; Kinnunen & Maunao, 1998; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Others have observed that work–life balance is more difficult in families with fewer adults (i.e. single parent, single elder care provider) (Duxbury & Higgins, 1992; Haas, 1995).

The link between family type and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Two separate seven (family type) by four (types of work–life conflict) MANCOVAs—one for men and one for women—were run to determine the relationship between family type and work–life conflict. Job type was used as

the co-variate in both of these MANCOVAs. The results of this analysis are shown in Appendix C3 and Table 3.

Family type is a significant predictor of work–life conflict for both men and women

The multivariate analysis indicates that family type is significantly associated with work–life conflict for men and women. The co-variables representing job type were significant in both sets of analysis.

Family type explains a substantive proportion of the variation in caregiver strain

The results with respect to family type are very similar to those observed for lifecycle stage—which is not surprising, given the high degree of overlap between these two constructs. The following observations can be made from the data:

- The relationship between family type and work–life conflict depends on the type of work–life conflict being considered and the gender of the employee.
- Family type explains a substantive proportion of the variation in caregiver strain of employed men and women.
- Family type explains a substantive proportion of the variation in the amount of role interference reported by employed women (i.e. work to family interference and family to work interference).
- Although the relationship between family type and role overload is statistically significant, knowing an individual’s family circumstances does not tell us much about their levels of role overload.

Table 3: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Family Type Analysis

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 5.15, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.018	F = 13.26, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.028
Work to family interference	F = 3.81, $\alpha = 0.001$	0.024	F = 3.17, $\alpha = 0.004$	0.045
Family to work interference	F = 12.73, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.032	F = 17.29, $\alpha < 0.0001$ *	0.045
Caregiver strain	F = 48.82, $\alpha < 0.0001$ *	0.110	F = 64.62, $\alpha = 0.002$ *	0.090

Note: * means that neither job type co-variate is statistically significant.
 Unless otherwise denoted, both job type co-variables are significant at $\alpha < 0.0001$.
 The Bonferroni adjustment means that only α of 0.0125 (i.e., 0.05 divided by 4) or lower are considered significant.

Other observations relating to the data presented in Appendix C3 are presented below.

Men in families with dependent care report significantly higher role overload and work to family interference

Significantly higher levels of role overload and work to family interference are reported by men who live in the following types of families:

- dual-income families with child and/or elder care responsibilities,
- men in traditional families (i.e. bread-winning fathers with a stay-at-home spouse), and
- unmarried men with child and/or elder care responsibilities.

Dependent care responsibilities are a risk factor for men, regardless of their family type

It is interesting to note that single-parent fathers do not report higher levels of role overload and work to family interference than their counterparts in dual-income families with dependent care responsibilities; nor do fathers in traditional families report lower levels of these forms of conflict. This would suggest that it is the need to provide some form of dependent care that places men at risk of role overload and work to family interference rather than the amount of support (or the lack of support) one receives from one's partner with respect to the provision of dependent care. These data also suggest that the amount of time men devote to the provision of dependent care and the priority they give work (as opposed to family) is fairly constant and independent of:

- the amount of support provided by their partner,¹¹
- the type of care that is required (i.e. child care vs. elder care), and
- whether or not family demands are associated with several, potentially conflicting roles (i.e. sandwich group) or with one role only.

Men with no dependent care responsibilities report less work–life conflict, regardless of their family type

Single men and men who are in dual-income families with no children report significantly lower levels of all four forms

of work–life conflict examined in this study. While the findings with respect to single employees is not surprising (this group has fewer role responsibilities and competing demands on their time and energy), it is interesting to note that marriage does not appear to affect work–life conflict for men. It would appear that adding the role of spouse to a man's set of family responsibilities has little effect on work–life conflict; only roles associated with the provision of dependent care make a difference.

Men in families with sandwich care responsibilities report higher family to work interference

The relationship between family type and family to work interference is different from the relationship observed between family type and role overload/work to family interference. Which group of men is more likely to report that their family demands interfere with their ability to fulfill work responsibilities? The data indicate that men in families with both child and elder care responsibilities (i.e. those in the sandwich group) report the highest levels of family to work interference. Unmarried men with dependent care responsibilities are next in line, followed by fathers in dual-income families and men in traditional families. Those with elder care responsibilities report lower levels of family to work interference than parents but more conflict than those with neither child nor elder care commitments. Again, we note that men who are single or married without children report very low levels of this form of conflict.

These findings indicate that the incidence of family to work interference for men is positively associated with the number of family roles that one is required to assume. For men, having two different sets of dependent care responsibilities (i.e. those in the sandwich group) appears to increase the risk that their family will interfere with their work. Similarly, unmarried men with dependent care responsibilities who have fewer sets of support at home are also more likely to have family take precedence over work.

Less of a risk factor for men, but still an important factor with respect to family to work interference, is the presence of children in the home. Again, it is interesting to note that, for men, being in a family situation which includes children who require some form of care increases the risk of family to work interference—what the spouse does or does not do appears to make little difference.¹² These data can be interpreted in two ways:

¹¹ Men in traditional families can be assumed to receive more support from their families while women can be presumed to receive less.

¹² Men with a spouse who works full time outside the home report the same levels of family to work interference as men who have a wife who has assumed the caregiver role within the home full time.

- that having a wife at home full time does not reduce the amount of family to work interference for men; or
- that men expect that their wives will look after family matters that could potentially interfere with their ability to work, regardless of their wives' employment status.

The fact that men in traditional and dual-income families report lower levels of family to work interference than unmarried men with dependent care responsibilities supports the second interpretation of the data.

The fact that men without children but with elder care responsibilities report lower family to work interference than fathers is interesting as it suggests this role is less problematic than parenting. Again, we can only speculate why this might be the case, but it seems plausible that most elderly dependents require the kind of care that would interfere with work only sporadically (e.g. when they are ill, when they need medical tests, when they fall). The rest of the time, their care (i.e. shopping, banking, visiting) could be fit in around work hours.

Finally, these data clearly show that men without dependent care (the data indicate that men with spouses/partners can be put in this category) do not suffer family to work interference.

For women, the form of work–life conflict they report depends on their family type

The data indicate that for women, the type of work–life conflict experienced is associated with family type. Dual-income women with both child care and elder care responsibilities are at the highest risk with respect to role overload and family to work interference. Women in non-traditional families (e.g. those with a husband at home full time) are significantly more likely to experience work to family interference. Finally, single caregivers and women with elder care responsibilities are significantly more likely to report high caregiver strain. The relationship between family type and work–life conflict for the women in our sample is explored in more detail in the section below.

For women, higher role overload is associated with a greater number of family roles

For the women in the sample, there was a significant, positive association between the number of family roles held and levels of role overload. Consider the following:

- women in dual-income families with both child and elder care duties reported significantly higher levels of role overload than
- single caregivers, dual-income mothers and dual-income elder caregivers—who in turn reported significantly higher levels of role overload than
- mothers in a non-traditional family—who in turn reported significantly higher levels of role overload than
- women who were in a dual-income family with no children—who in turn reported significantly higher levels of role overload than
- single women without dependents.

This pattern differs in several important ways from men and leads to a number of important observations on how family roles and demands have a different impact on men than women. For example:

- Adding the role of spouse increases role overload for women but not men. This seems to hold regardless of whether or not the women remain married to their partner or not.
- Having a stay-at-home spouse reduces role overload for women but has no impact on role overload for men. Women with a stay-at-home spouse spend less time providing child care and have fewer demands associated with this role.
- Having two sets of dependent care demands (child care and elder care) is associated with higher levels of role overload for women but not for men (i.e. it increases demands on the family side for women but not for men).

These data are consistent with the idea that family demands and responsibilities have a stronger association with role overload for women than men. The data also support the idea that gender differences in socialization (i.e. women have the primary responsibility for all family roles) still exist and contribute to work–life conflict for women. It should be noted that data on responsibility for child and elder care collected as part of this study (see Report One) are consistent with this interpretation as they indicate that most of the men and the women in our sample perceive that the women in their family have primary responsibility for the family roles.

Women in non-traditional families report greater work to family interference

Employed mothers who live in non-traditional families (i.e. have a “homemaker” husband) report significantly higher

levels of work to family interference than women in any other family type. These data suggest that having a husband at home full time looking after dependent care issues allows/enables/encourages (it is hard to say actually which from these data) women to meet work demands at the expense of their family. As noted previously, the fact that no such relationship exists for the men in our sample (men in traditional families report the same levels of work to family interference as men in other types of families) may be because men are more likely than women to meet work demands at the expense of their family regardless of their family situation. This interpretation of the data is consistent with the fact that men typically report higher levels of this form of work–life conflict than women.

Women with dual caregiving responsibilities also report higher work to family interference

Women who are part of families with dependent care responsibilities report significantly higher levels of work to family interference than their counterparts without caregiving duties. Furthermore, women with both child and elder care duties report higher levels of work to family interference than women with only one set of family demands. This pattern was also observed for the men in the sample and supports the idea that the greater the responsibilities one has outside work, the higher the probability that work and family domains will collide—and that work demands will be met at the expense of time with family.

For women, as for men, the greater the number of family responsibilities the higher the likelihood that family will interfere with work

With one exception (single-caregiver families), the relationship between family type and family to work interference observed for the women in our sample is the same as that reported by the men. For both genders, being in a family with sandwich responsibilities is associated with the highest levels of family to work interference while being single or in a dual-income family without dependent care responsibilities is associated with the lowest levels. Those with elder care have fewer problems with respect to family to work interference than working parents but significantly more concerns in this area than those without any form of dependent care.

For men in the sample, the family type associated with the second highest levels of this form of work–life conflict is being a single caregiver. Fathers in traditional and dual-income families, while also reporting higher levels of

this form of interference, report significantly fewer problems than men without a partner. For women, on the other hand, the amount of interference encountered is more strongly associated with dependent care responsibilities than family type. This contention is supported by the fact that women in single- or dual-income families with child and/or elder care commitments report similar levels of this form of interference. What does appear to reduce this form of interference for women (though not for men) is having a spouse at home looking after the family domain (i.e. women in non-traditional families report lower levels of this form of work–life conflict).

Caregiver strain is a function of elder care—regardless of gender

Men and women with elder care responsibilities report significantly higher levels of this form of work–life conflict than their counterparts in any other type of family. In fact, only two other family forms are associated with this form of work–life conflict: single caregivers and members of the sandwich group. These data are consistent with how caregiver strain is measured in this study (e.g. stresses associated with providing elder care).

3.2 Community¹³

Three dimensions of community were considered in this study: location of the community in Canada, rural/urban status, and population. At this point in time, we have little understanding about how the ability to balance work and life varies across the country. While we know that social policies that may affect work–life conflict vary by province, we do not know to what extent these policies manifest themselves in terms of lower or higher levels of stress, conflict, etc. Similarly, while we know that Canadian communities can be grouped in several ways (e.g. rural/urban, population of community) we do not know how these community characteristics are associated with work–life balance. Such information is critical to policy makers who are responsible for designing appropriate work–life interventions and supports. They are also of interest to employees and employers who are deciding in which region of Canada to locate. This study seeks to fill some of these gaps by exploring the link between the qualities of the communities where Canadians live and their quality of life—assessed in this study as their ability to balance work and family.

¹³ Readers who are interested in more information on the link between community and work–life conflict are directed to Duxbury, L. and Higgins, C. (2003). *Where to Work in Canada? An Examination of Work–Life Practices*, B.C. Council of the Family, Vancouver.

Community was identified in this study by asking respondents to indicate their postal code (used to determine province of residence and whether the individual lived in an urban or rural area) and the approximate population of the community in which they lived (under 1,000; 1,000 to 24,999; 25,000 to 49,999; 50,000 to 99,999; 100,000 to 499,999; and 500,000 or higher). Postal code data were used to group respondents into five locations: Atlantic Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies and British Columbia.¹⁴

The link between community of residence and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Virtually no empirical research could be found linking work–life conflict and the various aspects of community considered in this study. Furthermore, it is very difficult to speculate *a priori* on these relationships as one could argue both for and against a positive association between work–life conflict and community size (i.e. people who live in larger communities have more difficulties in balancing work and family). For example, while some factors would support the idea that people who live in smaller communities are more able to balance work and family (i.e. greater system of social support, shorter commute distances, better quality of life, lower cost of living), a similar set of factors can be identified that would suggest that people who live in smaller communities will report greater work–life conflict (i.e. less likely to have easy access to high quality day care, special education, elder care support, reduced job mobility). The data from this study should help provide some insights into these relationships.

The link between community of residence and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

A five (region of the country) by two (rural/urban) by six (population of community) by four (work–life conflict) MANOVA was run to determine the relationship between community of residence and work–life conflict. Gender and job type were controlled for by including them as variables within the analysis. The results of this analysis are shown in Appendix C4. Significant findings are discussed below.

Employees living in rural communities in the Prairies and Ontario and urban communities in

British Columbia and Ontario report higher levels of family to work interference

Examination of the rural/urban status by region of the country interaction indicates that only one of the four dimensions of work–life conflict considered in this analysis was significantly associated with both of these dimensions of community—family to work interference.¹⁵ Data showing the mean level of family to work interference reported by employees living in rural and urban communities in the different regions of Canada are shown in Table 4. The following observations can be drawn from these data:

- Employees living in rural communities in the Prairies and urban communities in British Columbia report the highest levels of family to work interference.
- Employees living in urban communities in Quebec and rural communities in British Columbia are significantly less likely than employees in other areas in Canada to report that their family interferes with their work.
- Employees living in rural communities in the Prairies report significantly higher levels of this form of work–life conflict than their counterparts in Ontario, who report significantly higher levels of family to work interference than rural employees living in the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec. Employees living in rural communities in British Columbia report levels of family to work interference that are significantly lower than those reported by their counterparts in other rural regions of the country.
- Employees living in urban areas in British Columbia report significantly higher levels of family to work interference than employees living in urban communities in Ontario. Employees living in urban areas in Ontario, in turn, report significantly higher levels of this form of work–life conflict than employees living in urban communities in the Atlantic Provinces and the Prairies. Employees living in urban communities in Quebec report levels of family to work interference that are significantly lower than those of their peers living in urban areas in other parts of the country.
- Employees living in rural areas in the Prairies and Ontario report higher levels of family to work interference than their counterparts in urban communities in these regions.

¹⁴ Note: Just under 2% of the sample lived in Canada's North (i.e. Yukon, Northern Territories, Nunavut). These individuals were removed from the sample for this phase of the analysis.

¹⁵ $F = 10.13, \alpha = .012$.

- Employees living in urban areas in British Columbia and the Atlantic Provinces report higher levels of family to work interference than employees who live in rural communities in these regions.
- Family to work interference is not associated with where one lives in Quebec (i.e. there are no differences between rural and urban employees with respect to this form of work–life conflict).

Table 4: Relationship Between Region of the Country, Rural/Urban Status and Family to Work Interference

	Rural	Urban
Atlantic Provinces	2.19	2.34
Quebec	2.28	2.23
Ontario	2.52	2.41
Prairies	2.70	2.35
British Columbia	2.07	2.68
Total sample	2.38	2.41

Further research is needed to determine what it is about living in these various types of communities that promotes or impedes work–life balance.

Employees living in Western Canada (i.e. Prairies, British Columbia) report substantively more work to family interference

Examination of the data in Tables 5 and 6 show that only one form of work–life conflict, work to family interference, is significantly associated with where one lives in Canada. A substantive proportion of the variation in this form of work–life conflict can be predicted by knowing where in Canada the respondent lives and works. Further examination of the data indicates the following:

- Employees in Western Canada (British Columbia and the Prairies) report the highest levels of work to family interference.
- Employees in Quebec report the lowest levels of work to family interference.
- Employees in the Atlantic Provinces report higher levels of work to family interference than those in Ontario but lower levels than their counterparts in Western Canada.

Again, further research is needed to explain these differences.

Table 5: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Region of the Country

	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 0.46, α = 0.77	0.039
Work to family interference	F = 5.71, α < 0.0001	0.048
Family to work interference	F = 1.38, α = 0.25	0.014
Caregiver strain	F = 0.85, α = 0.49	0.009

Note: Unless otherwise denoted, both job type co-variates are significant at α < 0.0001. The Bonferroni adjustment means that only α of 0.0125 (i.e., 0.05 divided by 4) or lower are considered significant. Gender controlled for in the analysis.

Table 6: Relationship Between Work to Family Interference and Region of the Country

	W to F
Prairies	3.29
British Columbia	3.26
Atlantic Provinces	3.20
Ontario	2.96
Quebec	2.66
Total sample	3.01

3.3 Characteristics of Work

An examination of the literature in this area reveals that there are two quite different ways to conceptualize characteristics of work: at the macro level (i.e. sector of employment) and at the micro level (i.e. objective criteria that describe individual employee's work contracts).

At the macro level, there are several fundamental differences between organizations that are established to provide a commodity and earn a return on investment (i.e. the private sector) and organizations whose goals include meeting community needs and serving the public with respect to the provision of health care, education and public policy (government and the greater public service). Cardinal Joseph Bernardin¹⁶ perhaps said it best when he noted that:

“Government can consider that it has discharged its task when its policies are effective. The private sector is considered successful when a customer buys its product and is satisfied with it, and when it consistently provides stakeholders with a reasonable return on investment. The not-for-profit sector has a more difficult task defining success but generally it has done its job when it successfully provides programs that the community needs.”

Research in this area¹⁷ further reveals that public, private and not-for-profit sectors vary with respect to the

following: types of jobs, working conditions, use of alternative and shift work arrangements, level of unionization, consequences of a strike, public accountability, forms of recognition, importance of customer satisfaction, consequences of failure, decision-making processes, pace of change, dependence on technology, emphasis on hierarchy, organizational structures, financing, budgeting processes, security of employment, educational requirements, occupational concentration, occupational groups, regulatory frameworks, definitions of success, goals, ability to strike, measurement of performance and productivity, and willingness to take risks. This study extends the research in this area by examining how work–life conflict varies with organizational sector.

Several research studies have also sought to identify work–role characteristics that can affect work–family conflict. A review of the literature suggests that the following features should be included in any examination of the impact of micro-level work characteristics on work–life conflict: supervisory responsibilities, union membership, and the scheduling of work time (Voydanoff, 1988; Frone, 2002; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003).

The above literature suggests that to fully appreciate the impact of work on work–life conflict, one needs to take both a macro- and a micro-level view of the situation. Accordingly, two different sets of analysis were done in this study to assess the impact that an employee's work has on work–life conflict. The first set of analyses takes a macro-level view and looks at the impact that sector of employment (defined as private, public and not-for-profit) has on work–life conflict. The second takes a micro-level view and looks at characteristics of work at the individual level of analysis. Included in this analysis are a number of key characteristics of a person's job that were suggested from the research literature:

- work arrangement (flextime, compressed work week, regular work day, shift work),
- supervisory status (i.e. whether one supervises the work of others),
- union membership (yes or no),
- years spent working in current organization, and
- employment status (full-/part-time; contract/permanent).

¹⁶ www.acponline.org/chapters/il/northern/card011295.html

¹⁷ A web search using the words “employment sector” and “characteristics” was done to increase our understanding of the impact of sector. The International Labor Organization's website—<http://www.ilo.org>—was particularly helpful in this regard.

The link between characteristics of work and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

The concept of fit as proposed by Barnett and colleagues (see Barnett, Gareis & Brennan, 1999) can be used to link employees’ work schedules (i.e. distribution of the work day) and work–life conflict. When “fit” is good (i.e. the work schedule permits the employee to meet non-work obligations and preferences), conflict is assumed to be lower. When schedules make it more difficult for employees to meet non-work obligations, however, conflict is assumed to be higher. Work by Voydanoff (1988) indicates that employees who perform shift work, who work an inflexible work schedule, who work full time and who perform contract work are less likely to have a high level of fit between their work and their non-work activities. She postulated that this is because employees in these types of positions are more likely to have to perform evening or weekend work which makes it more difficult for them to be available for family activities that occur at specific times (e.g. school-related activities and family gatherings). Finally, in their recent review of the literature, Guerts and Demerouti (2003) noted that there is a vast amount of research linking having to work an unfavourable work schedule (defined as a schedule that offers insufficient spare time during the week or the weekend, or that disturbs one’s regular sleep/wake rhythm) with higher role interference.

Very little literature could be found linking sector of employment or union membership with the different facets of work–life conflict. This study will fill that void.

The link between sector of employment and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

One three (sector of employment) by two (gender) by four (types of work–life conflict) MANCOVA was run to determine the relationship between sector of employment and work–life conflict. Job type was included as a co-variate. The results of this analysis (see Appendix C5) indicate that work–life conflict is associated with the gender of employee and the sector of employment. The co-variate, job type, was significantly associated with work–life conflict at a significance level of 0.0001.

Sector of employment is significantly associated with work–life conflict

Examination of the data in Table 7 shows that all but one of the forms of work–life conflict examined in this study (the exception being caregiver strain) is significantly associated with sector of employment.

The link between sector of employment and the incidence of work to family interference is substantive as sector of employment accounts for 6% of the variation in this form of work–life conflict. The amount of variation in role overload (2%) and family to work interference (3%) explained by sector of employment is not, however, substantive. Finally, it is important to note that caregiver strain is not significantly associated with sector of employment.

Table 7: Test of Between-Subject Effects: Sector of Employment

	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 16.02, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.016
Work to family interference	F = 43.66, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.062
Family to work interference	F = 20.30, $\alpha < 0.0001^*$	0.026
Caregiver strain	F = 2.83, $\alpha = 0.06^*$	0.001

*Note: * means that neither job type co-variate is statistically significant. Unless otherwise denoted, both job type co-variables are significant at $\alpha < 0.0001$. The Bonferroni adjustment means that only α of 0.0125 (i.e., 0.05 divided by 4) or lower are considered significant. Gender controlled for in the analysis.*

Employees in the not-for-profit sector report higher levels of role overload and work to family interference

As can be seen from examining the data in Appendix C5, employees working within the not-for-profit sector report the highest levels of both role overload and work to family interference. Respondents in the private sector sample, on the other hand, report the lowest levels of both of these forms of work–life conflict. Public sector employees are significantly less likely than those in the not-for-profit sector to experience high levels of both of these forms of work–life conflict but more likely than those in the private sector to report high levels of role overload. The differences in work to family interference between public and private sectors were not significant.

These findings are consistent with the fact that the majority of those included in the not-for-profit sector sample work in health care and education—sectors that

received more than their fair share of downsizing and restructuring throughout the 1990s.

Public sector employees report higher levels of family to work interference

A different pattern can be observed if one looks at the link between sector of employment and family to work interference. Significantly higher levels of this form of work–life conflict can be observed in the public sector. These support our contention that the predictors of the various forms of conflict should be examined if one is to get a complete picture of how Canadian employees balance work and family.

The link between characteristics of work and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Four regression equations were run (one for each of the four forms of work–life conflict) to determine the link between a number of key characteristics of work and work–life conflict. The following seven independent variables were considered in this phase of the analysis:

- work arrangement (flextime, compressed work week, regular work day),
- work shifts (yes or no),
- supervisory status (i.e. whether one supervises the work of others),
- union membership (yes or no),
- years spent working in current organization,
- employment status (full- or part-time), and
- employment situation (contract or permanent).

Gender was also controlled for in this analysis. Regression results are provided in Appendix D and highlighted below.

Characteristics of work are important predictors of work to family interference

Regression results (see Table 8) indicate that while the seven characteristics of work were able to significantly predict role overload, family to work interference and caregiver strain, the relationship is not substantive.¹⁸ In other words, work factors such as union membership, tenure, employment status, supervisory status and work arrangement are, on their own, not important predictors of these three forms of work–life conflict. These work characteristics do, however, explain a substantive proportion of the variance (5%) in the fourth form of

work–life conflict under investigation—work to family interference.

Table 8: Summary of Regression Results: Characteristics of Work

	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 37.37, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.013
Work to family interference	F = 12.81, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.046
Family to work interference	F = 2.20, $\alpha = 0.008$	0.004
Caregiver strain	F = 5.54, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.006

Supervising the work of others is a key predictor of work to family interference

Examination of the Pratt measure data (see Appendix D) shows that although all seven of the work characteristics included in this analysis were significant predictors of work to family interference, two are particularly important predictors of increased susceptibility to this form of work–life conflict—supervising the work of others (most important predictor) and working shifts (second most important predictor). The data also suggest that the relationship between union membership and work to family interference is worthy of note.

Shift work is likely problematic as it means that the routine of the employee is out of synch with that of the family (i.e. sleeps during the day, works at night). The link between supervision and work to family interference may be related to the fact that supervisors are often expected to work longer hours, be available to work during non-work hours, and take work home in the evening—circumstances which can be expected to increase the likelihood that they will meet work demands at the expense of time in family roles. Finally, the data suggest that unionized employees fare better than their non-unionized counterparts when it comes to this form of work–life conflict. Again, we can only speculate as to why this is the case. It may be that unionized employees are more likely to feel that they can say “no” to demands such as overtime and weekend work. Alternatively, it may be that those levels of the organization that are particularly susceptible to work to family interference (i.e. those who direct the work of others) are less likely to be unionized.

¹⁸ Regression equations explain 1% or less of the variance in these types of work–life conflict.

3.4 Socio-economic Status

There are a number of variables that can act as buffers between work and family conditions and positive or negative outcomes. One such variable is socio-economic status. Three highly intercorrelated aspects of socio-economic status are considered in this analysis: education, personal income and family income.¹⁹ Research suggests that higher levels of education and income are positively associated with an increased ability to balance work and life demands. With respect to education, studies have linked years in formal education to more positive coping, increased job mobility and job security, higher job quality and increased perceived control. Higher incomes, on the other hand, have been linked to an increased ability to purchase goods and services which are associated with increased balance (i.e. high quality, flexible child and elder care; cleaning services; meals out).²⁰

The link between socio-economic status and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Little direct evidence could be found linking education, income and the various forms of work–life conflict. That which is available suggests that the relationship is not straightforward. While some studies, for example, report a negative association between components of socio-economic status such as family income and work–life conflict (Neal et al., 1993) and education and work–life conflict (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), others (Frone et al., 1997a) did not observe an association between education and income and work to family

interference and family to work interference. Again, it is hoped that this study will help bring some clarity to this issue by examining the impact of socio-economic status for men and women separately and looking at family and personal income.

The link between socio-economic status and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Two sets of regression equations (one for men and one for women) were run to examine the relationship between socio-economic status and work–life conflict. The four forms of work–life conflict were used as the dependent variables. Independent variables included education, income before taxes and family income before taxes. Regression results for these analyses are provided in Appendix E and highlighted below.

Socio-economic status has little impact on family to work interference and caregiver strain

Examination of the data shown in Table 9 indicates that socio-economic status is not an important predictor of two of the four forms of work–life conflict: family to work interference and caregiver strain.²¹ The fact that higher incomes are not associated with lower forms of caregiver strain or family to work interference suggests that money does little to protect employees from these forms of work–life conflict. It may be that supports needed to cope with these forms of conflict are not available (i.e. one cannot buy a service that does not exist). Alternatively, it may be that certain sets of circumstances (i.e. dying

Table 9: Summary of Regression Results: Socio-economic Status

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 30.45, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.016	F = 55.59, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.022
Work to family interference	F = 88.73, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.045	F = 209.62, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.077
Family to work interference	F = 14.39, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.008	F = 17.19, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.007
Caregiver strain	F = 3.22, $\alpha = 0.002$	0.005	F = 10.54, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.012

¹⁹ While job type is often considered in any analysis of socio-economic status, its high correlation with income and education makes its inclusion in this analysis unnecessary.

²⁰ A review of this literature can be found in Higgins and Duxbury, 2002.

²¹ While the regression results show that socio-economic status was a significant predictor of both these types of work–life conflict for both men and women, the fact that these variables were able to explain only a small percent of the variation in these constructs suggests that the relationship is relatively unimportant.

parents, a sick child) require the presence of the employee, not a paid surrogate.

Socio-economic status not strongly linked to role overload

While the relationship between role overload and socio-economic status is significant and more substantive than observed for family to work interference and caregiver strain (2% for both men and women), knowing an employee's socio-economic status will not provide us with much information about their levels of role overload.

Socio-economic status is an important predictor of work to family interference for women

The relationship between socio-economic status and work to family interference is both significant and substantive. Socio-economic status appears to be more closely associated with this form of work–life conflict for the women in the sample than for the men.²² Pratt's measure indicates that men and women who earn higher incomes are more likely to experience higher levels of this form of work–life conflict than employees with more modest incomes. This is consistent with the data on supervision reported earlier and suggests that employees in higher paying management/supervisory positions are more likely to engage in behaviours (e.g. working late, extending their work hours, bringing work home, travelling for work) that interfere with their ability to meet family obligations and role responsibilities. It is difficult to determine the direction of causality from these data. Do higher paid managers work longer hours because they love their work and are committed to the organization that has promoted them? Alternatively, does the culture of the organization apply pressure on employees who have reached management positions to give priority to work at the expense of their family? The data on the relationship between work–life conflict and work culture, discussed in Chapter Five, will help shed some light on these issues.

3.5 Conclusions

What do we know about the link between an employee's socio-demographic circumstances and his or her risk with respect to the four forms of work–life conflict considered in this analysis? Key findings, organized by form of work–life conflict, are provided below.

Role Overload

The following conclusions with respect to the prediction of role overload can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter. First, none of the socio-demographic or socio-economic factors examined in this analysis was able to predict more than 3% of the variation in role overload. From this we can conclude that knowing objective facts about an employee's family, community or work circumstances does not tell us much about the amount of role overload that person is likely to face.

Second, age of children in the home and community of residence are not significant predictors of role overload for either men or women. This finding challenges many of the assumptions made with respect to the risk factors of role overload (e.g. that mothers are more overloaded).

Third, an employee's lifecycle stage, family type, sector of employment, socio-economic circumstances and work characteristics are all significant, but not substantive, predictors of role overload. In other words, while these factors are all significantly associated with this form of work–life conflict, they do not explain a great deal (i.e. less than 3%) of the variation in role overload that we observe in the sample.

Fourth, the data reviewed in this chapter indicate that employees who occupy roles that require more time and energy, be they work roles (e.g. supervisor, employee in the not-for-profit sector) or non-work roles (e.g. elder caregiver, parent), will experience higher levels of role overload. The data support the following predictions with respect to who will experience high role overload:

- Employees in the lifecycle stage involving elder care are significantly more likely than employees in any other lifecycle stage to report high levels of role overload; employees in lifecycle stages that involve care of children (parent and sandwich stages) are significantly more likely to report high levels of role overload than those without any form of dependent care.
- Men and women who have both children and elderly dependents to care for (those in the sandwich group) are significantly more likely to report high levels of role overload; employees who are in families with just one form of dependent care (child care or elder care; it makes no difference) are significantly more likely to report high role overload than employees with no caregiving responsibilities.

²² Socio-economic status explains 8% of the variance in work to family interference for women compared to 5% of the variance for men.

- Employees who work in the not-for-profit sector are significantly more likely to report high role overload than employees in the public or private sector.
- Employees who earn higher incomes are significantly more likely to report greater role overload.
- Employees who supervise the work of others are significantly more likely to report higher role overload.

Fifth, with one main exception (occupational status of spouse), the key predictors of role overload hold across gender. There are, however, two important caveats to this conclusion. First, we are able to explain slightly more of the variation in the role overload levels of women by knowing about their life circumstances than we are of men. Second, for the men in our sample we can conclude that the amount of support they receive (or do not receive) from their spouse has very little impact on the levels of role overload experienced (i.e. fathers in traditional families and single-parent fathers have the same levels of overload as fathers in dual-income families and men in dual-income families with elderly dependents). For women, on the other hand, having a spouse who stays at home for dependent care (women in non-traditional families) is predictive of lower levels of role overload.

Work to Family Interference

The following conclusions with respect to the prediction of work to family interference can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter.

First, it would appear that an employee's socio-economic and socio-demographic circumstances can be used to predict this form of work–life conflict. All but one of the factors we looked at (the exception being age of children in the home) were substantive predictors of work to family interference for women; all but three (age of children in the home, lifecycle stage and family type) were important predictors for men. These findings imply that if we have some very basic demographic information about an employee (where they live, their family situation, their income, etc.), we will have some knowledge of their risk of experiencing work to family interference.

Second, there is a stronger link between family circumstances (i.e. lifecycle stage, family type and socio-economic status) and work to family interference for women than men. For example:

- Lifecycle stage is a substantive predictor of work to family interference for women but not men.

- Family type is a substantive predictor of work to family interference for women but not men.
- Socio-economic status explains a higher proportion of the variance in work to family interference in women.

Third, there are important gender differences with respect to the link between family type and work to family interference. For men, the relationship between family type and work to family interference is similar to what was observed for role overload (i.e. having sandwich responsibilities is the most problematic, being responsible for either elder care or child care poses the second greatest challenge, those with no form of dependent care report very little interference). In other words, for men, it appears that it is having caregiving responsibilities that poses the problem with respect to balance, not what one's spouse does to help or not help in this regard. This conclusion is supported by data which show that men in traditional families report the same levels of this form of interference as men with a spouse who works full time or a single man with dependent care responsibilities.

A quite different phenomenon was observed for the women in the sample. The highest levels of work to family interference were reported by the women in non-traditional families. The second highest levels of this form of interference were reported by women in families with sandwich responsibilities who had more challenges than women with just one form of dependent care (i.e. child care or elder care). Women with no dependent care responsibilities have very little of this form of interference. Similar to what was reported with the male sample, being a single caregiver does not seem to increase one's risk for this form of work–life conflict.

Fourth, the relationship between work to family interference and many of the demographic variables considered in this analysis is very similar to that observed with respect to role overload, but the predictive ability is stronger for this form of conflict. This would suggest that role overload and work to family interference have the same underlying causative factors.

Finally, the data reviewed in this chapter support the following predictions with respect to who will experience high work to family interference:

- Employees in lifecycle stages that entail dependent care responsibilities report the highest levels of work to family interference; employees with no dependent care responsibilities report very low levels of this form of interference.
- Employees with higher incomes report greater interference.

- Employees who live in Western Canada report higher levels of work to family interference than those who live in the Atlantic Provinces, who report higher levels than those in Ontario. Employees in Quebec report the lowest levels of this form of work–life conflict.
- Employees in the not-for-profit sector report higher work to family interference than employees in the private or public sectors.
- Employees who supervise the work of others and who work shifts are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference; employees who belong to a union are less likely to report high levels of interference.

Taken as a group, these data suggest that employees with higher work demands (e.g. managers, those in higher income jobs, not-for-profit sector employees, those who live in areas of Canada that expect work to be given priority) will have problems when family demands and obligations are also higher.

Family to Work Interference

The following conclusions with respect to the prediction of family to work interference can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter. First, the lack of a substantive relationship between family to work interference and community of residence, sector of employment, characteristics of work and socio-economic circumstances indicates that this form of work–life conflict has little to do with circumstances at work or within the community for either gender.

Second, we are not able to substantively predict family to work interference for men by knowing their socio-demographic or socio-economic circumstances. From this we can conclude that family to work interference has relatively little to do with men’s circumstances at home or at work.

Third, we are able to predict women’s levels of this form of work–life conflict with some degree of confidence if we know about their family circumstances (i.e. lifecycle stage, family type, age of children at home). This indicates that, for women (but not men), this type of conflict is associated with occupation of certain family roles. These findings support the conclusion that family to work interference has a different etiology for men than women. Which women are more likely to report this form of conflict? Our findings identify the following groups of women are at higher levels of risk.

- Those with elder care (though it should be noted that employees of both genders with elder care responsibilities are at higher risk for family to work interference).
- Women with younger children: family to work interference is negatively associated with age of children at home as women with younger children (i.e. under five) have significantly higher levels of this form of interference and women with teenage children have significantly lower levels.
- Women who have child care responsibilities only have more problems with this form of interference than women with dual caregiving responsibilities (i.e. both child care and elder care); women with no dependent care responsibilities do not report substantive levels of this form of conflict.
- Women who are in non-traditional families report lower levels of this form of interference than other mothers.

These data indicate that many working women in Canada experience family to work interference because they still have responsibility for the traditional family roles of mother (especially of younger children) and elder caregiver. When these role expectations are reduced (e.g. children are older and/or the spouse has assumed the role of caregiver), this form of interference is reduced, suggesting that this form of conflict is linked to traditional gender role expectations with respect to who should care for children and elderly dependents.

Caregiver Strain

Several strong conclusions are supported with respect to this type of work–life conflict. First, this form of work–life conflict can be predicted with a great deal of certainty if we know an employee’s lifecycle stage and family type.²³ Who can be expected to have the most problems with respect to the caregiver role? The data from the family type and lifecycle stage analyses identify three groups of employees who can be considered to be at higher risk: those with elder care responsibilities, those in the sandwich group (i.e. multigenerational caregiving responsibilities) and single caregivers. In other words, older employees who are more advanced with respect to lifecycle stage are more susceptible to have this form of work–life conflict.

Second, this form of work–life conflict has little to do with the other socio-economic or socio-demographic predictors examined in this analysis. From this we can conclude that factors such as place of residence, income and job type

²³ Lifecycle stage explains 13% of the variation in caregiver strain for men and 10% for women; family type explains 11% of the variation in caregiver strain for men and 10% for women.

have little to do with the amount of caregiver strain an employee will experience. Rather, it would appear that it is a function of the passage of time—and that employees will face this challenge when they reach a certain point in their lives when their parents require care, regardless of their other life circumstances.

Third, lifecycle stage and family type are better predictors of caregiver strain in men than women. For men, having elder care duties is what seems to make the difference with respect to this form of work–life conflict.

Finally, the data indicate that knowing the age of our female employees will give us valuable information with respect to the incidence of two forms of work–life conflict: family to work interference and caregiver strain. The following picture for female employees in Canada emerges

from these data. As working women age, the amount of care required by their children declines (as does family to work interference) as they too get older. At the same time, the amount of care required by one’s parents and in-laws increases with the age of the female worker (as does caregiver strain). These data indicate that women experience lower levels of conflict when their children are school-aged and their parents are still young enough to be independent. These findings also indicate that employers and policy makers need to consider both child care and elder care roles when looking at work–life conflict for women.

Chapter Four

Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Demands

Employees have multiple obligations and responsibilities to others, both at work (i.e. to their employer, their superior, their colleagues, their subordinates) and outside of work (i.e. to their spouse, their children, their parents, their friends, their community) that are likely to have an impact on their levels of work–life conflict. Within the work–family literature, in fact, a major assumption is that work demands (often conceptualized as work hours) interfere directly with family life and vice versa (Barnett, Gareis & Brennan, 1999). This chapter focuses on the relationship between these various demands and the different forms of work–life conflict. While we have chosen to consider work and family demands separately in this analysis, such a distinction may not be one that is easy for employees to make. As Guerts and Demerouti (2003) pointed out, the question of what constitute work and non-work demands has become more complicated over the past decade as a result of some irreversible changes in the context of work, including an increase in the number of people who:

- work overtime (at the workplace or not, with more or less “freedom of choice”),
- work at a location other than a central office building (i.e. telework, unpaid overtime work at home outside office hours, mobile work at client sites), and
- work hours outside a traditional 9 to 5 schedule (i.e. during evenings, on the weekend).

They also note a similar phenomenon with respect to non-work demands. For example:

- personal activities brought into the workplace by different kinds of employee benefits (i.e. fitness or daycare centre at work, concierge service offered by the employer), and
- working hours spent on family or personal activities (i.e. personal phone calls and e-mail).

Lewis and Dyer (2002) offered a similar argument. They noted that office technology (e.g. e-mails, laptops and the shift to a knowledge economy) has, in many cases, meant that the boundaries between work and non-work domains have become blurred. Knowledge workers have “increasingly more permeable temporal and spatial boundaries between their work and their personal lives, as

technology allows them to work any time, anywhere.” This study, which offers a comprehensive look at demands at both the work and family end, should help to clarify which demands are most difficult for employees to cope with and balance. By taking a multidimensional approach to our conceptualizations of both work demands and work–life conflict, this research will enable us to identify exactly which work demands contribute to what sorts of problems for which groups. Such specificity, which is currently not available to either policy makers or organizations (most research has focused on hours of work per week and either a global measure of work–life conflict or role interference), should help interested parties identify specific interventions to ease the different forms of work–life conflict.

This chapter is divided into three sections. Work demands are considered first. This is followed by an examination of non-work demands. Key findings are summarized in the final section of the chapter.

4.1 Work Demands

Work demands have generally been defined as referring to a set of prescribed tasks that an individual performs while occupying a position in an organization (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Work hours is one of the most widely studied structural aspects of employment in the work–life literature (Barnett, Gareis & Brennan, 1999). It is generally agreed that the number of hours worked contributes to the experience of job demands (pressures arising from excessive workloads and workplace time pressures), a major workplace stressor (Barnett, Gareis & Brennan, 1999).

Research suggests that when job demands require “too much” effort and time (i.e. deadlines are too tight, resources are insufficient to allow the employee to fulfill responsibilities at work during regular hours), energy and time resources are depleted. Over time, high job demands have been found to build up and hamper one’s ability to function outside of work (i.e. to fulfill one’s obligations to spouse, children, elder parents, community) (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003).

The recognition of a link between work demands, hours in work and work–life conflict is not a recent development. In

1977, Kanter pointed out that the amount of time occupied by the job is one of the most obvious ways in which work can contribute to work–life conflict and observed: “The amount of time demanded by occupations is ... among the most obvious and important ways that occupational life affects family” (Kanter, 1977, p. 3). In 1985, Greenhaus and Beutell recognized this link between time in work and work–life conflict by identifying a form of work–life conflict that they referred to as time-based work–life conflict. Voydanoff (1988) postulated a causal link between work demands and work–life conflict and observed that working long hours limits the extent to which workers are physically available for family activities which, in turn, increases conflict between work and family.

Why do employees devote long hours to work if such activities increase work–life conflict? Lewis and Dyer (2002) offered a number of possible explanations, including the following:

- In the modern workplace, there are fewer people and more work to accomplish, so higher workloads are inevitable.
- Knowledge work is more absorbing and satisfying than other forms of work.
- Managers positively influence long hours by overtly valuing and rewarding those who come in early, stay late and extend their day by taking work home with them.

The following dimensions of work demands were included in our analysis:

- total hours spent in work per week,
- hours spent commuting to and from work per week,
- hours spent outside of regular work hours in work-related educational activities per week,
- hours per week in supplemental work at home (SWAH),
- hours spent per month in paid overtime work,
- hours spent per month in unpaid overtime work,
- travel demands (operationalized as week nights spent away from home on work per month and weekend nights spent away from home on work per month),
- hours per month spent driving to and from client sites, and
- having more than one job for pay (i.e. moonlighting).

The link between work demands and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

The amount of time required by the job (i.e. working hours per week, working overtime) has been often studied as an antecedent of work–life conflict (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). One of the most consistent findings in the empirical literature is the strong positive association between weekly hours devoted to work and the incidence of work to family interference, higher level of work–life conflict, higher role overload and negative spillover from work to family. Different studies operationalized work–life conflict in different ways. Recent examples include Gutek, Searle & Kelpa (1991), Frone et al. (1992b), O’Driscoll, Ilgen & Hildreth (1992), Netemeyer et al., (1996), Frone et al. (1997b), Wallace (1997), Grzywacz & Marks (2000), Van Der Hulst & Geurts (2001), and Guerts & Demerouti (2003). Voydanoff (1988) provided citations for a number of earlier studies that have been done using diverse samples which also found a direct relationship between the number of hours worked and greater work–life conflict.

Barnett (1998), on the other hand, contended that the effect of long work hours is not straightforward (i.e. the relationship might be confounded by other variables such as degree of flexibility in/or control over work schedule, and the type of job being performed) and that working long hours may be a risk factor for specific groups under specific conditions. This study should help clarify this issue.

Support for our inclusion of SWAH as a work demand variable comes from work done by Lewis and Cooper (1999), which found that people who spend more time working at or from home are more likely to report that the boundary between work and non-work life has become blurred.

Our inclusion of time spent in job-related travel as a work demand reflects the fact that the need for employees to travel for work has increased as organizations expand globally. Such travel has been linked in the literature with strained family relationships and increased work–life conflict (Shaffer & Harrison, 1998, Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

Finally, the link between moonlighting and increased work–life conflict has been reported by Voydanoff (1988), who found that employed parents with more than one job perceived a severe time shortage.

The link between work demands and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Two sets of regression equations (one for men and one for women) were run to examine the relationship between work demands and work–life conflict. The four forms of work–life conflict were used as the dependent variables. Independent variables included in the regression consisted of several direct measures of work demands (i.e. hours per week in work, commuting to and from work, SWAH, paid and unpaid overtime, educational activities, and driving to and from client sites) as well as two surrogate measures of demand (having more than one job for pay, supervising the work of others). Job type was controlled for in this analysis. A summary of the regression results for these analyses are found in Table 10, while details are given in Appendix F. Key findings are highlighted below.

Work demands key predictor of role overload and work to family interference

The data are unequivocal—work demands are a key predictor of two of the four forms of work–life conflict considered in this study: role overload and work to family interference. While all eight regression equations were significant, the data show that work demands are more closely linked to role overload and work to family

interference than to family to work interference and caregiver strain.

Role overload strongly linked to work demands—especially for men

Our measure of work demands predicts a significant amount of the variation in role overload for both the men and the women in the sample.²⁴ The key predictor of role overload for both genders (Pratt’s measure identified it as the most important predictor) was the amount of time spent in unpaid overtime a month. There was only one other predictor of role overload that was important for both men and women—the total number of hours spent in work per week (the second most important predictor of overload for men, fourth most important predictor for women).

From these two sets of findings, we can conclude that overload is not just a function of the amount of time spent working at the office per week—it is also a function of work demands and expectations that must be fulfilled outside of regular work hours. In other words, it is not just the official work week that is the problem—it is work extension activities that contribute to role overload. This seems to be particularly true for the men in our sample where the number of hours spent in SWAH was the fourth most important predictor of role overload.

Table 10: Summary of Regression Results: Work and Non-Work Demands

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Work Demands				
Role overload	F = 35.24, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.134	F = 17.41, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.085
Work to family interference	F = 58.85, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.206	F = 45.41, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.196
Family to work interference	F = 2.20, $\alpha = 0.008$	0.011	F = 2.53, $\alpha = 0.002$	0.013
Caregiver strain	F = 2.57, $\alpha = 0.002$	0.033	F = 2.53, $\alpha = 0.002$	0.042
Non-Work Demands				
Role overload	F = 6.36, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.038	F = 7.51, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.041
Work to family interference	F = 6.48, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.038	F = 4.86, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.027
Family to work interference	F = 11.65, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.064	F = 14.05, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.078
Caregiver strain	F = 26.06, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.156	F = 22.14, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.127

²⁴ 13% of the variation in role overload for men and 9% of the variation for women.

Men who supervise the work of others are prone to high role overload

For the men in the sample, holding a supervisory position was the third most important predictor of high levels of role overload. This suggests that, for men, there is a strong association between being a manager and engaging in types of behaviour (i.e. working long hours, the performance of unpaid overtime, taking work home to complete in the evening) that lead to role overload. It is hard to determine the direction of causality from these data. Do they indicate that the workloads and the work expectations associated with being a manager encourage men to engage in types of behaviours that contribute to role overload? Alternatively, can it be that men who work long hours and work a lot of unpaid overtime are more likely to be promoted into management positions? In either case, the data from this research support the following conclusion: men who work longer hours (paid and unpaid) will pay the price in terms of increased levels of role overload.

Job-related travel more problematic for women

Three of the five most important predictors of role overload for women (time spent commuting to work, week nights away from home per month on business-related travel, weekend nights away from home per month on business-related travel) were not strongly associated with role overload for men. In fact, two of these constructs (week nights and weekend nights away from home on business-related travel) were not significant predictors of this form of work–life conflict for men. These data suggest that while role overload for male employees appears to be a function of being a manager and engaging in work extension activities, role overload for women is a function of being away from home on business and business-related travel. They also suggest that role overload has a different etiology for men than women.

What is it about business-related travel that contributes to role overload for women? Again, we can only speculate as to why this strong relationship exists. It may be that women who do a lot of business-related travel try to get things ready at home before they leave so that their absence will cause fewer problems for their family (i.e. get the meals ready in advance, do preparatory shopping, arrange for baby sitting). Alternatively, it may be that women who travel on business spend a lot of their time on the road engaged in work-related activities rather than relaxing. Finally, it may also be that the activities associated with travel (i.e. packing, getting things ready at work and at home, travel itself, catching up when one gets

back) are more problematic for women than men, perhaps because they have fewer people to help them cope with these extra demands (i.e. support staff at work, spouse at home).

The link between time spent commuting to and from work and role overload for women (but not for men) is also interesting. Again, it is difficult to know with certainty why this relationship exists. Since the women in the sample are not more likely than the men to live in large urban centres, it would appear that this difference cannot be attributed to where the employee lives. It may be that women, more than men, are expected to combine family chores with the commute to and from work (i.e. to pick up children, drop off children), and this adds to the stress of the commute. Alternatively, it may be that women make different use of public transit than men or that women have less access to flexible work arrangements than men and hence are more likely to have to commute to and from work during the rush hour. Future research should focus on determining the causal mechanisms behind this finding.

Work to family interference is strongly linked to work demands for men and women

Regression analysis indicates that work demands are an important predictor of work to family interference for both men and women.²⁵ Pratt's measure indicates that the key predictor of work to family interference for both genders is the amount of time spent in unpaid overtime a month—the same type of behaviour associated with high role overload.

Work-related travel and unpaid overtime main precursors to work to family interference

While the key predictors of role overload were associated with the gender of the employee, no such differences were observed for the predictors of work to family interference (although the order of importance of the predictors did vary somewhat between the genders). The results show that employees who:

- spend more time in job-related travel (i.e. spend more week nights and weekend nights away from home),
- perform SWAH,
- work unpaid overtime, and
- work longer hours per week

are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference. This is not surprising. There are only so many

²⁵ 21% of the variation in work to family interference for men and 20% of the variation for women.

hours in the day, and hours devoted to work are, by necessity, not available for other activities. The strong association between job-related travel and this form of work–life conflict is likely because these employees are more likely to be unavailable for family activities that are scheduled on week nights and on the weekend, which has traditionally been considered by many to be time for the family. It is also interesting to note that employees who bring work home to complete in the evenings and on weekends are also more likely to perceive that their work interferes with their family. The direction of causality in this case is hard to determine. It could be that people with heavier work demands are more likely to bring work home to try to balance competing demands, and their levels of work to family interference would be even higher if they could not engage in such behaviour. Alternatively, it may be that people who bring work into their home to complete are more aware of what they are missing out on and feel guilty about their work intruding on their family life.

Several strong conclusions can be drawn from these data regardless of the causal direction of the link. The first is that job-related travel is a strong predictor of work to family interference. The second is that employees who put in more hours (particularly overtime hours at home) are more likely to report this form of conflict. Third, it is important to note that this form of work–life conflict is not just a function of workload but work demands that either physically remove the employee from the family domain, or take time that is typically reserved for family. Finally, it is important to note that the key predictors of this form of work–life conflict are the same for both men and women.

Family to work interference and caregiver strain only weakly associated with work demands

The regression results indicate that the relationship between work demands and family to work interference is not substantive for either men or women. Nor is the relationship between work demands and caregiver strain substantive for men.²⁶ Work demands do, however, explain 4% of the variation in the form of work–life conflict for women.

Only two of the work demands included in this study were significant predictors of family to work interference for men: total hours in work per week (fewer hours, less family to work interference) and holding more than one job for pay (more jobs, more interference).

Only one of the work demands was a significant predictor of family to work interference for women—weekend nights

away from home for work. In this case, however, the relationship is opposite to what was observed with work to family interference as women who spend less time away from home in job-related travel report higher family to work interference. These data suggest that women who put their family demands ahead of work minimize the extent to which they travel for work. Alternatively, it can mean that women with heavier demands at home related to child and/or elder care responsibilities are less able to travel for work.

Women with higher levels of caregiver strain spend more time working from home

The number one predictor of caregiver strain for women is time per week performing SWAH. Women with higher levels of caregiver strain also devote fewer hours to work per week and are more likely to work paid overtime. It appears from these data that women with this form of work–life conflict try to fit their work demands around their caregiving obligations by leaving the office early (fewer hours in work per week) and bringing work home to complete (higher SWAH).

4.2 Non-Work Demands

There is much less of a consensus on what should be included within the umbrella of non-work demands. Non-work may refer to activities and responsibilities associated with the family domain as well as activities and obligations that go beyond one's own family situation (Guerts & Demerouti, 2003). Social roles typically included within this category include leisure (interpreted to mean “spare time”) obligations and responsibilities associated with family membership (i.e. household activities, caregiving), as well as social obligations (i.e. volunteer activities, community activities) and education (Frone, 2002; Guerts & Demerouti, 2003).

Frone et al. (1992a) defined family demands as time pressures associated with tasks such as housekeeping and child and elder care. Family demands have been found to be associated with family characteristics such as number of dependents and family size (Frone, Russell & Cooper 1992a), the amount of time spent in family roles, and the number and age of children (Voydanoff, 1988). Time spent in family work (i.e. time in housework, child care and elder care activities) is expected to be related to work–life conflict. Child care activities may interfere with work schedules and the total amount of family work may

²⁶ Work demands explain approximately 1% of the variation in family to work interference in both male and female samples and 3% of the variation in caregiver strain for men.

contribute to overload and energy depletion (Voydanoff, 1988).

In considering the division of labour within the home, a distinction should be made between time spent in family activities, such as child care and home chores, and responsibility for family roles. A parent who is responsible for child care, for example, is accountable within the family for the children's supervision and well-being. Such a parent has been found to experience significantly greater stress and tension than the parent who "helps out" with child care (Higgins et al., 1992; Duxbury & Higgins, 1998). This increase in stress is associated with the greater number of worries connected with responsibility (e.g. worries about choosing and maintaining child care arrangements, purchasing children's clothing, overseeing children's homework).

In response to the above literature, we defined non-work demands very broadly in this study to include:

- hours per week in home chores,
- hours per week in child care,
- hours per week in elder care,
- hours per week in leisure,
- hours per week in volunteer activities,
- responsibility for child care, and
- responsibility for elder care.²⁷

Again, such a broad conceptualization of non-work demands should give us a clear picture of which sorts of demands place the greatest strain on role holders with respect to the different forms of work–life conflict.

The link between non-work demands and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Little empirical research exists on the connection between work–life conflict and specific non-work roles other than those associated with the family (Frone, 2002). Several studies have found the number of weekly hours devoted to family activities and chores to be positively associated with family to work interference (Gutek et al., 1991; Frone et al., 1992b; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1997b; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Frone et al. (1992a, 1997b) determined that parental workload (hours spent in the parental role) was positively associated with family to work interference. Hours devoted to family activities was also found to be positively related to family to work interference (Gutek et al., 1991; Frone et al., 1997b; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). This analysis should give

us a more complete picture of the impact of different family and non-work demands.

The link between non-work demands and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

Two sets of regression equations (one for men and one for women) were run to examine the relationship between non-work demands and work–life conflict. The four forms of work–life conflict were used as the dependent variables. Independent variables in the regression included a number of direct measures of non-work demands (i.e. hours per week in home chores, child care, elder care, leisure, volunteer activities), as well as two surrogate measures of demand (responsibility for child care and elder care). Job type was controlled for in these analyses. Regression results for these analyses are provided in Appendix F and Table 10. Key findings are highlighted below.

Non-work demands are strongly associated with family to work interference and caregiver strain

Two forms of work–life conflict included in this study can be predicted using our conceptualization of non-work demands: family to work interference and caregiver strain. For both men and women, the relationship between non-work demands and these two forms of work–life conflict was highly significant. A substantive proportion of the variation in these constructs could be explained by considering non-work demands. While the relationships between non-work demands and role overload, and non-work demands and work to family interference, were also significant, non-work demands were not as powerful a predictor of these two forms of work–life conflict as work demands.

Caregiver strain linked to time in elder care and responsibilities for elder care

Two of the measures of non-work demands (hours per week providing elder care, responsibility for elder care) explained 16% of the variation in caregiver strain in men and (with the addition of time spent in child care to the equation) 13% of the variation in women. In other words, caregiver strain is a result of spending time looking after elderly dependents (first) and having this form of responsibility (second). The fact that hours per week providing child care was also found to be an important predictor for women likely reflects the fact that women with caregiver strain are often part of the sandwich group (i.e. responsible for both child care and elder care). These data suggest that this form of work–life conflict is largely

²⁷ Responsibility for child care and elder care was operationalized as shared with partner, respondent has primary responsibility, respondent's partner has primary responsibility.

the consequence of the responsibilities employees assume for aging parents. The greater the responsibility (i.e. only child, parent lives in the home, siblings do not assume concomitant share, community support is lacking), the higher the level of this form of conflict.

Family to work interference is more closely linked to time in child care and responsibility for child care

Non-work demands explained a substantive proportion of the variation in family to work interference for both men and women.²⁸ The same four non-work demands were significant predictors of family to work interference for men and women: responsibility for child care, time in child care per week, time providing elder care per week, and time in leisure. For both men and women, this form of conflict was associated with greater responsibility for child care, more time providing both child care and elder care, and fewer hours in leisure. Time in home chores and volunteer work, on the other hand, were not significant predictors of family to work interference for either gender. Finally, while responsibility for elder care was not a significant predictor of family to work interference for men, it was for women. This is consistent with our findings on caregiver strain and supports the idea that multigenerational issues are problematic for women.

Family responsibilities are problematic for men while time in family roles causes conflict for women

Having primary responsibility for child care appears to be more of a challenge for men than women with respect to family to work interference.²⁹ Time providing child care, on the other hand, appears to be more problematic for women than men (primary predictor of family to work interference for women, second strongest predictor of this form of interference for men). In fact, the two strongest predictors of family to work interference for women both related to time spent per week performing family roles (child care first, elder care second). This would suggest that the higher the non-work demands (and for men these higher demands seem to come from greater responsibility), the more one's obligations at home hamper their performance at work.

Overloaded individuals spend less time in leisure

The relationship between non-work demands and role overload, while significant, was not as substantive as that observed between work demands and role overload. Two of the measures of non-work demands were significant predictors of overload for both men and women: hours per week in home chores (those who were overloaded spent more time in home chores) and time in leisure (employees who report higher overload devote fewer hours per week to leisure activities). Men with higher levels of role overload also spend more time in volunteer activities.

Employees who spend time upgrading educational qualifications report higher work to family interference

Similar to what was observed with role overload, the relationship between non-work demands and work to family interference, while significant, was not as substantive as that between work demands and this construct. Two of the measures of non-work demands were significant predictors of this form of interference for both men and women: hours per week in education (those who spent more time each week in educational activities were more likely to report that work activities interfered with their family) and time in leisure (employees who report higher work to family interference devote fewer hours per week to leisure activities).

There were two other significant predictors of work to family interference for the men in the sample: responsibility for child care (men who had a spouse who assumed responsibility for child care were more likely to say their work interfered with their family) and hours per week in volunteer work. This would suggest either that having a spouse who assumes the responsibility for child care allows men to give priority to work or that this family type was adopted to help the family cope with this heavier set of work demands. These data also suggest that many employees consider the volunteer activities they perform to be a work obligation.

²⁸ 6% of the variation in family to work interference for men and 8% for women.

²⁹ Number one predictor of this form of work-life conflict for men; fourth most important predictor for women.

4.3 Conclusions

Key conclusions about the link between work and non-work demands and work–life conflict are presented below. Role overload is addressed first, followed by sections on work to family interference and family to work interference. Caregiver strain is covered in the final part of this section.

Role Overload

The data examined in this chapter support the following conclusions:

- Role overload is a function of work demands first, and non-work demands second. Our measure of work demands predicts 13% of the variation in role overload for men and 9% of the variation for women. Our conceptualization of non-work demands, on the other hand, explains only 4% of the variation in role overload for both genders.
- The amount of time spent in unpaid overtime a month and the total number of hours spent in work per week are key predictors of role overload for both men and women.
- The amount of time spent in unpaid overtime is a more important predictor of role overload than time spent working at the office or work site.
- Hours per week in home chores and time in leisure were key predictors of role overload for both men and women. Employees who were overloaded spent more time in home chores and fewer hours per week in leisure activities.
- If one knows how much time an employee spends per week in both paid and unpaid work, all factors considered, then one will be able to predict with a fair degree of confidence the amount of role overload that employee will experience.

There are several key gender differences with respect to the types of work demands that are associated with high levels of role overload. The following set of conclusions can be drawn with respect to the links between gender, work and non-work demands and role overload:

- Work demands are a better predictor of role overload for men than for women. No such difference was observed with respect to non-work demands.
- For male employees, role overload is a function of being a manager and engaging in work extension activities. Men with higher levels of role overload also spend more time in volunteer activities.

- For women, role overload is a function of being away from home on business and business-related travel. Three of the five most important predictors of role overload for women (time spent commuting to work, week nights away from home per month on business-related travel, weekend nights away from home per month on business-related travel) were not associated with role overload for men.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the relationship between role overload and work demands has a slightly different etiology for men than women.

Work to family interference

The data linking work to family interference and non-work demands support a number of strong conclusions. These include the following:

- Work to family interference is a function of work rather than non-work demands. Our measure of work demands predicts 21% of the variation in work to family interference for men and 20% of the variation for women. In contrast, non-work demands were able to explain only 3% of the variance in work to family interference for women and 4% for men.
- While the key predictors of role overload were associated with the gender of the employee, no such differences were observed about the predictors of work to family interference. Employees who spend more time in job-related travel (i.e. spend more week nights and weekend nights away from home), perform SWAH, work unpaid overtime and work longer hours per week are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference, regardless of their gender.
- This form of interference is not so much a function of workload, but work demands that either physically remove the employee from the family domain or take time that is typically reserved for family.
- Employees who report higher work to family interference devote fewer hours per week to leisure activities.

Family to work interference

The findings with respect to family to work interference were very different than what was observed with respect to role overload. Work demands explain very little of the variation in family to work interference in both male and female samples. Non-work demands, on the other hand, were able to predict 6% of the variation in family to work

interference for men and 8% for women. From these data, we can advance the following conclusions:

- Family to work interference is a function of demands outside of work—not work demands. In other words, this type of conflict occurs when obligations at home hamper one’s performance at work.
- While non-work demands are more able to predict family to work interference in women than in men, the data indicate that the basis of this type of interference does not vary by gender. For both men and women, this form of conflict is associated with greater responsibility for child care, more time in both child care and elder care and fewer hours in leisure.
- The primary predictors of family to work interference do, however, vary with gender as follows:
 - For men, having primary responsibility for child care is the most important predictor of family to work interference.
 - For women, time spent per week providing child care and elder care and a lack of time for leisure (i.e. fewer hours per week in leisure) were the most important predictors of this form of work–life conflict.

This suggests men and women experience non-work demands somewhat differently. For men, higher demands seem to result from greater responsibility; for women, it is more about time spent meeting family role responsibilities with a corresponding drop in time for leisure.

- Time in home chores and volunteer work were not significant predictors of family to work interference for either gender.

Caregiver strain

The linkage between work/non-work demands and caregiver strain is similar to that observed for family to work interference, suggesting common causal factors are at play for these two forms of work–life conflict. In both cases, work demands are relatively unimportant predictors of this form of conflict while non-work demands explain substantive proportions of the variance for both men and women. The following conclusions can be drawn from the data examined in this chapter about the link between demands and caregiver strain:

- Non-work demands are a key predictor of caregiver strain (i.e. explain 16% of the variation in caregiver strain in men and 13% of the variation in women).
- Caregiver strain arises when employees assume responsibility for aging parents or other family members. The greater the responsibility (i.e. if they are an only child, if the parent lives in their home, if their siblings do not do their share, if community support is lacking), the higher the level of this form of conflict.
- Non-work demands are a more powerful predictor of caregiver strain for men than for women.
- Work demands are not an important predictor of caregiver strain for men. They do, however, explain a substantive proportion of the variance in this form of work–life conflict for women.
- Women with higher levels of caregiver strain spend fewer hours in work per week and more hours performing SWAH. These data suggest that women with high levels of this form of work–life conflict try to fit their work demands around their caregiving obligations by leaving the office early (fewer hours in work per week) and bringing work home to complete (higher SWAH).

Chapter Five

Predictors of Work–Life Conflict: Work Culture

Workplace culture refers to a deep level of shared beliefs and assumptions, many of which operate below the conscious level of those who are members of the culture (Lewis & Dyer, 2002). Excessive work demands are rarely a formal part of the employment contract (Lewis & Cooper, 1999). Rather, they often reflect the informal job expectations that are part of the organizational culture.

Schein (1985) identified three operational levels of organizational culture: artifacts, values and assumptions. Formal policies can be considered as artifacts—the surface level indicators of an organization’s intentions. Unfortunately, these formal intentions may be blocked by “counterproductive” values and assumptions (Lewis & Dyer, 2002) and the supportive policies in place within the organization remain unused. Some researchers have made note of this phenomenon. Raabe (1990, p. 483), for example, contended that “unsupportive supervisor and organizational cultures can counteract formal policies.” Starrels (1992, p. 261) observed that “Corporate culture may either advance or thwart the development and effectiveness of work–family programs. Friedman (1990, p. 86) asserted that policies and programs “are not going to have their desired effects if they are implemented in a culture hostile to families.” Frankel (1998) identified an adverse work–family culture as an obstacle to the adoption of family-supportive programs or policies by employees and as a barrier to the use of such policies by employees (Hammer et al., 2002).

Guerts and Demerouti (2003) noted that although research evidence is scarce, what is available suggests a link between having a “family-friendly” culture and being able to balance competing work and family demands. The authors distinguished between having family-friendly policies (i.e. formal arrangements that are provided) and actually being “family friendly” (i.e. the supportive attitude of supervisors and colleagues toward the use of these arrangements). The missing link, they contended, is the organizational culture. They noted that for “family-friendly” policies to have their desired impact with respect to promoting work–life balance, the use of these policies must be respected and accepted within the organization. In other words, the unwritten rules and norms of the organization must support balance for the policies to succeed.

This chapter looks at the link between organizational culture and work–life conflict. It is divided into two parts. The first part reviews what we know about the link between work culture and work–life conflict. The second provides a summary of key findings from this part of the research.

Table 11: Summary of Regression Results: Work Culture

	Men		Women	
	F	R ²	F	R ²
Role overload	F = 146.39, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.198	F = 161.51, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.171
Work to family interference	F = 320.01, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.349	F = 388.16, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.330
Family to work interference	F = 50.38, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.078	F = 76.76, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.089
Caregiver strain	F = 5.52, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.028	F = 5.97, $\alpha < 0.0001$	0.022

5.1 Work Culture

Lewis and Dyer (2002, p. 304) defined a supportive work culture as “the shared assumptions, beliefs and values regarding the extent to which organizations value and support the integration of work and family lives for women and men.” They go on to note that there is often a gap within organizations between formal work–life policies and informal practice (Lewis & Dyer, 2002). This distinction between formal organizational support of work–life balance (i.e. supportive policies or programs) and informal support (i.e. supportive workplace culture and climate) for work and family has been made by a number of researchers (Raabe, 1990; Kossek & Ozeki, 1999; Hammer et al., 2002).

Research in this area has identified several sets of norms that may make work–life balance more difficult. The first, what we refer to in this report as a “culture of work or family,” was also identified by Kelloway, Bottlieb and Barham (1999), who noted that the organizational norm that individuals are expected to keep their family lives out of the workplace is widespread at this time.

The second, to which we refer here as the “culture of hours,” was also recognized by Lewis and Cooper (1999), who observed that in organizations with a “long hours culture,” workers felt that they needed to put in substantial “face time” to demonstrate their commitment.

The disconnect between policies and culture is particularly evident in those workplaces in which what Lewis and Dyer (2002) also referred to as a “long hours culture” and Duxbury and Higgins (2002) referred to as a culture of hours is in place. Lewis and Dyer (2002) noted that this culture is particularly pervasive in white collar, managerial and professional jobs where long hours spent visibly at the workplace (i.e. face time) are valued as it is assumed that these reflect high levels of commitment, loyalty and productivity. Lewis and Dyer (2002) contended that the long hours culture is an example of the ways in which culture can undermine work–life policies.

They noted that, for knowledge workers, the temporal boundaries between work and non-work are controlled by organizational culture (Lewis & Dyer, 2002). A culture that is focused on hours applies nebulous pressures and subtle expectations that lead to workers putting in long hours or taking work home (Lewis & Dyer, 2002). This hypothesis is consistent with the fact that these researchers found that highly skilled employees with higher levels of flexibility and autonomy are the most likely to work long and intensive hours. It is further supported by the fact that research in the area suggests that

professionals who reject the culture of “long hours” are less likely to be valued or promoted at work.

A number of indicators of work culture were included in this analysis. A complete list can be found in Box Four.

Box Four

Measurement of Work Culture

Thirteen items were used in this survey to examine culture in the participating organizations with respect to work–life balance. These items came from two sources: An Organizational Culture questionnaire which is used in a major North American private sector organization, and The Michigan Organizational Assessment Scale developed by Cammann et al. (1979). With one exception, a five-point Likert scale was used for this measure ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

A factor analysis revealed two dimensions of culture. The first factor, which we label Culture Supportive of Work–life Balance, consists of eight items which measure employee perceptions of how supportive the culture is in relation to work/family issues. The Cronbach’s alpha for this sub-scale was 0.85. The second dimension of culture was labelled Culture of Hours. This sub-scale consists of five items. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.74. Items included in each of these sub-scales are given below.

Work Culture Supportive of Work–Life Balance

- ▲ **This organization promotes an environment that supports a balance between work and personal life.**
- ▲ **My co-workers are supportive of my personal/family responsibilities.**
- ▲ **This organization’s policies are supportive of my needs.**
- ▲ **My manager is supportive of my personal/family responsibilities.**
- ▲ **My manager gives me enough flexibility to arrange my work schedule to meet personal/family needs.**
- ▲ **There are open and respectful discussions of work/family issues in this organization.**
- ▲ **I feel comfortable using the work–life supports offered by this organization.**
- ▲ **This organization does not encourage the use of policies and practices designed to support employees (e.g. personal days, flex time, telework) (reverse coded).**

Culture of Hours

- ▲ If I were unable to work long hours, it would limit my career opportunities.
- ▲ It is not acceptable in this organization to say no to more work.
- ▲ If I were to take a leave of absence for family reasons, it would limit my career advancement.
- ▲ Family responsibilities make it difficult for people to advance in this organization.
- ▲ Are you able to refuse overtime if you choose? (yes, sometimes, no)

The link between work culture and work–life conflict—what does the literature say?

Only a small amount of empirical work has investigated work–family culture (i.e. Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999; Clark, 2001; Hammer et al., 2002). That research indicates that perceptions of organizational support for work and family is related to increased work–life balance. This body of research also suggests that the organizational climate around work–life balance may be an important factor in determining whether individuals make use of formal work–family supports and whether the formal policies have the intended positive effects.

The link between work culture and work–life conflict—what do our data say?

To determine the link between work culture and work–life conflict, we ran eight regression equations: four for men and four for women. The four measures of work–life conflict were used as the dependent variables in this analysis and the 13 indicators of work culture were used as the independent variables (see Box Four). The results of these analyses can be found in Appendix G and Table 11. The key observations from these data are reviewed below.

Work to family interference is largely a function of the organizational culture

The relationship between work culture and work to family interference is highly significant for both the men and the women in this sample. Eleven of the 13 variables chosen to represent work culture were significant predictors of work to family interference (the exception being manager's support of balance and the organization's support of the use of work–life policies). The power of the work culture to predict work–life conflict can be appreciated when one

considers that our measures of work culture explain 35% of the variation in work to family interference for the men in the sample and 33% of the variation for the women. These data suggest that this form of work–life conflict is a function of the unwritten rules, norms and expectations placed on an employee, rather than their objective circumstances at work (i.e. job type, position) or home (i.e. family type, lifecycle stage) or the actual amount of time they spend in work or family roles.

Organizational actions with respect to balance are a key indicator of work to family interference

The number one predictor of work to family interference for both men and women is the extent to which the employee perceives that the organization promotes an environment that supports balance. There was a very strong negative association between this perception and this form of work–life conflict, with employees who indicated that their organization promoted balance reporting significantly lower levels of work to family interference.

Employees whose organization promotes a culture of hours are more likely to report high work to family interference

For both the men and the women in the sample, working for an organization that promotes a culture of hours (i.e. employees perceive it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work, and that if they did not work long hours it would limit their ability to advance) was a significant predictor of work to family interference. The data, however, suggest that this culture is more problematic for men than women. While these two indicators were the second and third most important predictors of this form of work–life conflict for the men in the sample, only one of these indicators of culture (the perception that if one does not work long hours it would limit advancement) was an important predictor for women. The fact that it is the second most important predictor for women, however, suggests that this type of climate is problematic for them as well.

Employees who work for organizations that force them to choose between work or family report higher interference from work to family

For both the men and the women in this sample, working within an organizational culture whose norms appear to force an employee to choose between their job and their family³⁰ also predicts higher levels of work to family

³⁰ Defined as a culture in which employees believe that family responsibilities make it difficult for them to advance and that taking a family leave will limit their opportunities for advancement.

interference. In this case, however, the data indicate that this culture is more of a problem for women than men. While these two cultural indicators were the third and fourth most important predictors of work to family interference for women, only one of these indicators (leave of absence for family reasons would limit advancement) was an important predictor for men (ranked fourth in importance). These findings are not surprising as these cultural norms could be expected to conflict with the way that many women have been socialized (to put family first) and their biological imperative (need to take maternity leave). These findings are also consistent with the drop in Canada's fertility rate (which has been dropping steadily since 1971 and is now at 1.5). They are also compatible with the data from our survey which showed that 45% of the female managers and professionals in our sample had attempted to cope with competing work and family demands by delaying parenthood and one in three had coped by having fewer children. Taken as a whole, these results would suggest that this organizational culture is having an impact on family size in Canada.

Women who feel they can refuse overtime report less work to family interference

There was one other important predictor of work to family interference for women (but not men). Women who felt that they were able to refuse overtime work were significantly less likely to report this form of work–life conflict than women who did not feel that they could say no.

Culture of the organization is also strongly linked to role overload for both men and women

The regression data also indicate that work culture is an important predictor of role overload. Seven of the 13 indicators of work culture were significantly associated with role overload for men and explained 20% of the variation in this form of work–life conflict. All but three of the measures of culture were significant predictors of role overload for women and were able to explain 17% of the variation in this form of work–life conflict.

For both men and women, the single most important predictor of role overload was the extent to which the employee believed the organization promoted a culture that was supportive of work–life balance—the more supportive the environment, the lower the levels of role overload reported. The fact that this item was also the most important predictor of work to family interference illustrates how important organizational actions are in this regard.

Culture of hours is linked to increased role overload for men and women

Employees who perceive that it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work and that an inability to work long hours would limit career advancement are more likely to report higher levels of role overload regardless of their gender. These two items were the second and third most important predictors of role overload for both men and women.

Working for an organization that expects employees to place work before family is also linked to role overload

The belief that family responsibilities are perceived to make advancement difficult is the fourth most important predictor of role overload for both men and women. It may be that employees who work for such an organization try to do it all—have a family but make no changes to their work behaviour for fear that it would hurt their career. Such a strategy could be expected to increase role overload.

Culture of the organization is also strongly linked to family to work interference

The regression data also indicate that work culture is an important predictor of family to work interference. Four of the 13 indicators of work culture were significantly associated with family to work interference for men. Eight of the measures of culture were significant predictors of family to work interference for women. These indicators of culture explained 8% of the variation in this form of work–life conflict for men and 9% of the variation for women.

An organizational culture that expects employees to place work before family is predictive of family to work interference for both men and women

Three of the four predictors of this form of work–life conflict were identical for men and women. Employees who work for an organization in which family responsibilities make it difficult to advance, where a leave of absence for family reasons makes it difficult to advance, and where an inability to work long hours is perceived to limit career advancement are more likely to report high levels of family to work interference. It is interesting to note that all three of these indicators suggest that family to work interference occurs when the types of behaviour the work culture rewards with respect to career advancement (i.e. long hours, putting work ahead of family) are at odds

with the types of behaviours one would associate with being an appropriate parent/elder caregiver.

Working for an organization with family-friendly policies in place reduces family to work interference for women

There was one other important predictor of family to work interference that was observed for women but not men. Women who agreed that their organization had implemented policies that were supportive of their employees were significantly less likely to report this form of work–life conflict than women who worked for organizations where such policies were not in place. These data, when considered in conjunction with the findings about being able to say no to overtime, suggest that supportive policies are more important to women than men—perhaps because they give women the “courage” to push back.

There is no strong link between caregiver strain and organizational culture

Very little of the variation in caregiver strain could be explained by considering organizational culture. While the relationship between culture and caregiver strain was significant, only one out of 13 culture items (the perception that family responsibilities make it difficult to advance) was significantly associated with increased levels of this form of work–life conflict.

5.2 Conclusions

A number of key conclusions and observations can be made from the data in this chapter regarding the link between organizational culture and work–life conflict. These conclusions are grouped into four parts in the section below which correspond to the various forms of work–life conflict examined in this report.

Role Overload

The regression data indicate that work culture is a very important predictor of role overload for both men and women. Examination of the regression data supports the following conclusions:

- The unwritten rules, norms and expectations placed on an employee by the organization in which he or she works (i.e. organizational culture) is a better predictor of role overload than objective circumstances at work (i.e. job type, position), circumstances at home (i.e. family type, lifecycle

stage) or the actual amount of time spent in work or family roles.

- Employees who work for an organization that promotes a culture supportive of work–life balance will report lower levels of role overload. The perception that the culture is not supportive of balance is the number one predictor of role overload for both men and women.
- Employees who work for an organization with a culture of hours (i.e. one in which employees perceive that it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work, and that an inability to work long hours would limit career advancement) are more likely to report higher levels of role overload.
- Employees who work for an organization with a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel they have to choose between their family and career advancement—that family responsibilities and taking family leave limit advancement—are more likely to report higher levels of role overload.
- There are no gender differences in these findings. Organizational cultures which are non-supportive of balance, emphasize hours and being present, and link career advancement to putting work first are linked to increased role overload for both men and women.
- The association between role overload and organizational culture is stronger for men than women.

Work to Family Interference

The relationship between work culture and work to family interference is highly significant for both men and women in this sample. The power of the work culture to predict work–life conflict can be appreciated when one considers that our measures of work culture explain 35% of the variation in work to family interference for the men in the sample and 33% of the variation for the women. The following conclusions can be drawn with respect to the link between organizational culture and work to family interference:

- Organizational culture is a better predictor of work to family interference than work factors (i.e. job type, position), family conditions (i.e. family type, lifecycle stage) or work and non-work demands.
- The number one predictor of work to family interference for both men and women is the extent to which the employee perceives that the organization promotes an environment that supports balance. There was a very strong negative

association between this perception and this form of work–life conflict, with employees who indicated that their organization promoted balance reporting significantly lower levels of work to family interference.

- Men and women who work for an organization with a culture of hours (i.e. employees perceive that it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work, and that an inability to work long hours would limit career advancement) are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference.
- Men and women who work for an organization with a culture of work **or** family (i.e. cultural expectations are that an employee who wants to advance within the organization will have to put work ahead of family) are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference.
- The link between organizational culture and work–life conflict depends to some extent on the gender of the employee (i.e. men and women find different dimensions of an organization’s culture to be particularly problematic).
- Working for an organization with a culture of hours presents more of a problem with respect to work to family interference for men than for women.
- Working for an organization with a culture of work **or** family presents more of a problem with respect to work to family interference for women than men.
- Women who feel that they are able to refuse overtime work are significantly less likely to report high levels of work to family interference than women who do not feel that they can say no to overtime. Ability to say no to overtime is not predictive of work to family interference for men.

Family to Work Interference

While work culture is not as powerful a predictor of family to work interference as it is of role overload and work to family interference, it still explains a substantive amount of the variation in this form of work–life conflict. From the regression data, we can make the following conclusions:

- This form of work–life conflict will be higher in men and women who work for organizations that promote a culture of work **or** family (i.e. employees perceive that family responsibilities, a leave of absence for family reasons and an inability to work long hours will limit their career advancement).
- Policies with respect to work **and** family are more important in preventing this form of work–life conflict in women than men (i.e. women who agreed that their organization had implemented policies that were supportive of their employees were significantly less likely to report this form of work–life conflict than women who worked for organizations where such policies were not in place; no such difference was observed for the men in the sample).

Caregiver Strain

The relationship between work culture and caregiver strain is significant but not substantive. This finding supports our earlier conclusion that this form of work–life conflict is largely a result of an employee’s progress through the lifecycle stage (i.e. it has little to do with work culture or demands).

Chapter Six

Conclusions and Recommendations

At the beginning of this research report, we posed three questions:

1. What are the most important determinants of the four forms of work–life conflict (i.e. role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference, caregiver strain)?
2. Can we identify a set of factors that places employees at risk of all four forms of work–life conflict? Is there a set of risk factors that is unique to each of the four forms of work–life conflict?
3. What impact does gender have on the prediction of the four forms of work–life conflict?

The following steps were followed to address these questions. A literature review was conducted first to allow us to identify a number of possible predictors of work–life conflict. These predictors were then categorized into three main groups describing an employee’s socio-demographic circumstances (i.e. lifecycle stage, sector of employment, community of residence, socio-economic status), their work and non-work demands, and the organizational culture in which the employee worked. MANCOVA and regression techniques were then used to determine how effective the various predictors were at forecasting the four different forms of work–life conflict examined in this study.

This chapter summarizes the key findings with respect to each of the three research questions posed above and offers some recommendations about how each form of work–life conflict can be addressed, given what we know from this research. The chapter is organized into four sections. Sections 6.1 to 6.3 deal with research questions one, two and three, respectively. Key recommendations are listed in the final part of the report.

To assist the reader, we also include in this chapter two summary tables (Table 12: Summary of MANCOVA Results and Table 13: Summary of Regression Results) which bring key findings together in one place.

6.1 Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked:

“What are the most important determinants of role overload, work to family interference, family to work interference and caregiver strain?”

The protocol used to answer this research is outlined in Box 5. Key findings are outlined in the section below.

Box Five

Research Protocol Used to Answer Research Questions

The following protocol was used in this report to identify the most important determinants of the four forms of work–life conflict. To be considered important, the determinant had to be a significant and substantive predictor of work–life conflict.

Statistical significance was looked at first and variables that were not significantly associated with the form of work–life conflict being considered were removed from contention.

R² values were then examined to see which associations were substantive. Objective characteristics that explained 4% or more of the variation in work–life conflict and perceptual measures that explained 5% or more of the variation were deemed to be substantive.

Pratt’s coefficient was then used to identify the most important predictors of the different types of work–life conflict for those regression equations for which the findings were significant and substantive.

Table 12: Summary of MANCOVA Results

Men				Women			
Role Overload	Work to Family	Family to Work	Caregiver Strain	Role Overload	Work to Family	Family to Work	Caregiver Strain
Impact of Adult Roles							
R ² = 0.019	R ² = .024	R ² = 0.033	R ² = 0.133 Dual sandwich > dual elder care > other family types	R ² = 0.031	R ² = 0.004 those in families with child and/or elder care > families with no dependents	R ² = 0.042 dual elder care > dual children > dual sandwich > other family types	R ² = 0.104 Dual sandwich and dual elder care > other family types ▪ Rest have very low levels of strain
Impact of Age of Children at Home							
Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	R ² = 0.045 children under 5 > children 5 to 12 > children over 12	R ² = 0.039 children over 12 > children 5 to 12 > children under 5
Impact of Family Type							
R ² = 0.018	R ² = 0.024	R ² = 0.032	R ² = 0.11 Dual elder care > dual sandwich, single caregiver > other family types	R ² = 0.028	R ² = 0.045 mothers in non-traditional families > dual sandwich > dual children, single caregiver, dual elder care > other family types	R ² = 0.045 dual sandwich > dual children, single caregiver > other family types	R ² = 0.09 Single caregiver, dual elder care, dual sandwich > non-traditional > other family types ▪ Rest have very low levels of strain
Impact of Community (done for total sample - gender controlled for in the analysis)							
Not significant	R ² = 0.048 Prairies and BC > Atlantic > Ontario > Quebec	Not significant	Not significant				
Impact of Sector of Employment (done for total sample - gender controlled for in the analysis)							
R ² = 0.016	R ² = 0.062 NFP > Private, Public	R ² = 0.026	Not significant				

Table 13: Summary of Regression Results

Men			Women				
Role Overload	Work to Family	Family to Work	Caregiver Strain	Role Overload	Work to Family	Family to Work	Caregiver Strain
Impact of Work Demands							
R ² = 0.134 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Unpaid OT/mo. (1) ■ Hrs/wk work (2) ■ Supervise others (3) ■ Hrs/wk SWAH (4) 	R ² = 0.206 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Unpaid OT/mo. (1) ■ Weekend nights/mo. away on business (2) ■ Hrs/wk (3) ■ Hrs/wk SWAH (4) ■ Week nights/mo. away on business (5) 	R ² = 0.01	R ² = 0.033	R ² = 0.085 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Unpaid OT/mo. (1) ■ Hrs. commuting/wk (2) ■ Weekend nights/mo. away on business (2) ■ Week nights/mo. away on business (3) ■ Hrs/wk SWAH (4) ■ Hrs. in work/week (5) 	R ² = 0.196 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Unpaid OT/mo. (1) ■ Weekend nights/mo. away on business (2) ■ Week nights/mo. away on business (3) ■ Hrs/wk SWAH (4) ■ Hrs. in work/week (5) 	R ² = 0.013	R ² = 0.042
Impact of Non-Work Demands							
R ² = 0.038	R ² = 0.038	R ² = 0.064 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Resp. child care (1) ■ Hrs/wk child care (2) ■ Hrs/wk leisure (3) ■ Hrs/wk elder care (4) 	R ² = 0.156 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hrs/wk elder care (1) ■ Resp. elder care (2) 	R ² = 0.041	R ² = 0.027	R ² = 0.078 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hrs/wk child care (1) ■ Hrs/wk leisure (2) ■ Hrs/wk elder care (3) ■ Resp. child care (4) 	R ² = 0.127 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hrs/wk elder care (1) ■ Resp. elder care (2) ■ Hrs/wk child care (3)
Impact of Work Culture							
R ² = 0.198 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Org. promotes env. supports balance (1) ■ No long hours limits advancement (2) ■ Not acceptable to say no to work (3) ■ Family resp. limits adv. (4) 	R ² = 0.349 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Org. promotes env. supports balance (1) ■ No long hours limits advancement (2) ■ Not acceptable to say no to work (3) ■ Family leave limits adv. (4) ■ Org. has supportive policies (5) 	R ² = 0.078 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Family resp. limits adv. (1) ■ Family leave limits adv. (2) ■ No long hours limits adv. (3) 	R ² = 0.028	R ² = 0.171 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Org. promotes env. supports balance (1) ■ Not acceptable to say no to work (2) ■ No long hours limits adv. (3) ■ Family resp. limits adv. (4) ■ Org. has supportive policies (5) 	R ² = 0.330 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Org. promotes env. supports balance (1) ■ No long hours limits adv. (2) ■ Family resp. limits adv. (3) ■ Family leave limits adv. (4) ■ Perceive can refuse OT (5) 	R ² = 0.089 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Family resp. limits adv. (1) ■ No long hours limits advancement (2) ■ Family leave limits adv. (3) ■ Org. has supportive policies (4) 	R ² = 0.022
Impact of Socio-economic Factors							
R ² = 0.016	R ² = 0.045 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Income (1) 	R ² = 0.008	R ² = 0.005	R ² = 0.022	R ² = 0.077 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Income (1) 	R ² = 0.007	R ² = 0.012
Impact of Work Characteristics (done for total sample - no examination of gender)							
R ² = 0.013	R ² = 0.046 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supervise others (1) ■ Work shifts (2) ■ Union member (3) 	R ² = 0.004	R ² = 0.006				

Key: OT = Overtime; SWAH = Supplemental Work at Home

Work culture and work demands are the key determinants of role overload for both men and women

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 allows us to identify two important determinants of role overload for both men and women:

- **Work culture:** For both genders, the most important predictors of role overload were working for an organization that promotes a culture that supports balance (negative association), the belief that if one did not work long hours it would limit his or her advancement, the perception that it is not acceptable to say no to more work, and the perception that family responsibilities limit advancement (positive association).
- **Work demands:** While work demands were strongly associated with role overload for both genders, the types of demands that were associated with increased role overload depended on the gender of the employee. For the men in the sample, the most important predictors were the number of hours spent in unpaid overtime per month, the number of hours spent per week in work, supervising the work of others, and the number of hours per week spent in SWAH. For women, the most important predictors were hours per week spent commuting to and from work, weekend nights away from home per month on business, week nights away from home per month on business, hours per month in unpaid overtime, and hours per week in work. All of these factors were positively associated with role overload.

None of the other determinants examined could be considered substantive predictors of role overload for either men or women, although non-work demands were close.³¹ Age of children in the home and community factors were not significantly associated with role overload for either gender. The relationship between adult roles, family type, sector of employment and socio-economic circumstances, and role overload, while significant, was not substantive.

What conclusions can we draw with respect to the occurrence of role overload?

The following conclusions about the occurrence of role overload can be drawn from this study.

1. Objective facts about an employee's family, community or work situation do not help us predict the amount of role overload they will experience.
2. Work culture is a powerful predictor of role. For both men and women, the single most important aspect of work culture with respect to the prediction of role overload was the extent to which the employee believed the organization promoted a culture that was supportive of work–life balance (supportive cultures serve a protective function, as the more supportive the environment, the lower the levels of role overload reported). Two other types of cultures prove to be predictive of role overload: a culture of hours and a culture of work **or** family. With respect to the culture of hours, employees who perceive that it is not acceptable for them to say no to more work and that an inability to work long hours would limit their career advancement are more likely to report higher levels of role overload regardless of their gender. Working for an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel they have to choose between their family and career advancement—that family responsibilities and taking family leave limit advancement) is also linked to higher role overload, perhaps because employees in such circumstances try to do it all.
3. Work demands are strongly associated with role overload. Pratt's measure indicates that the most important determinants here are the amount of time spent in unpaid overtime a month (the most important predictor of role overload for both men and women) and the total number of hours spent in work per week (second most important predictor of overload for men, fourth most important predictor for women).
4. Role overload is more about demands generated from the work domain than from the non-work domain. The relationship between non-work demands and role overload, while significant, is not as substantial as that observed between work demands and role overload. Two of the measures of non-work demands were significant predictors of overload for both men and women: hours per week in home chores (those who were overloaded spent more time in home chores) and time in leisure (employees who report higher overload devote fewer hours per week to leisure activities). Men with higher levels of role overload also spend more time in volunteer activities.

³¹ Non-work demands explained 4% of the variation in role overload.

5. With relatively few exceptions, the key predictors of role overload hold across gender. That being said, it is important to note that:

- We are able to explain slightly more of the variation in the role overload levels of women than men by knowing about their life circumstances.
- We are able to explain slightly more of the variation in the role overload levels of men than women by knowing about their work demands and their work culture.

Work culture and work demands are the key determinants of work to family interference for both men and women

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 allows us to identify a number of determinants of work to family interference. Six of the factors examined in this study can be considered to be important determinants of work to family interference for both men and women. From most to least important, the key determinants of work to family interference are:

- **Work culture:** The most important predictors of work to family interference for both genders were working for an organization that promotes a culture that supports balance (negative association), the belief that if one did not work long hours it would limit career advancement, the perception that it is not acceptable to say no to more work, the perception that family responsibilities limit advancement, and the presence of supportive policies (negative association).³²
- **Work demands:** Key predictors of work to family interference for both genders include the number of hours spent in unpaid overtime per month, the number of weekend nights spent away from home on business per month, the number of hours per week spent in work, the number of hours per week spent in SWAH, and the number of week nights spent away from home on business per month.
- **Sector of employment:** Employees working in the not-for-profit sector reported higher interference than their counterparts in the private and public sectors.
- **Socio-economic circumstances:** Data analysis shows that interference from work to family is positively associated with income. This finding is

consistent with the results obtained with respect to characteristics of work.

- **Work characteristics:** Examination of the data shows that work to family interference is positively associated with the supervision of others and working (i.e. managers and those who work shifts report higher levels of interference).
- **Community:** The data indicate that employees who live in the Prairies and British Columbia report higher levels of work to family interference than those who live in the Atlantic Provinces who, in turn, report higher levels than their counterparts in Ontario. Employees who live in Quebec report lower levels of this form of work–life conflict than any other group in Canada.

Two other factors, family type and adult roles, were substantive predictors of work to family interference for women but not men. The data predict that mothers in non-traditional families (i.e. those with a stay-at-home husband) will experience higher levels of work to family interference than women in any other family type. Women with responsibilities for both child and elder care (i.e. the sandwich group) report the second highest levels of interference, followed by women with a single form of dependent care (i.e. child care or elder care). Women with no dependent care responsibilities report very low levels of this form of work–life conflict. The data with respect to adult role responsibilities were very similar as they predict that women in families with child care and/or dependent care responsibilities will report higher levels of interference than counterparts without such responsibilities.

Again, we note that non-work demands and the age of children in the home were not substantive predictors of this form of work–life conflict.

What conclusions can we draw with respect to the occurrence of work to family interference?

The following conclusions with respect to the prediction of work to family interference can be drawn from these data:

1. If we have information on where people live, their family situation, where they work (i.e. their sector of employment) and their socio-demographic circumstances, we will have some understanding of the amount of work to family interference they will experience. This would indicate that an employee's life circumstances (i.e. their work and life situation) have more of an influence on the “juggling” aspect of

³² It should be noted that the association between work to family interference and the perception that family to work interference is stronger for women while the negative association between the presence of supportive policies and this form of conflict is stronger for men.

work–life conflict than on the demand side of this phenomenon.

2. Organizational culture is an important predictor of work to family interference for both men and women. The power of the work culture to predict work–life conflict can be appreciated when one considers that our measures of work culture explain 35% of the variation in work to family interference for the men in the sample and 33% of the variation for the women.
3. Organizations that wish to reduce this form of work–life conflict for their employees need to promote a culture that supports work–life balance and introduce supportive policies within the organization.
4. Employees who work in organizations that promote a culture of hours (i.e. in which employees perceive that it is not acceptable within their organization to say no, that their career advancement will be limited if they do not work long hours) will report higher work to family interference.
5. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel they have to choose between their family and career advancement—that family responsibilities and taking family leave limit advancement) will report higher levels of work to family interference.
6. Demands at work are a key determinant of work to family interference for both men and women.
7. Job-related travel is an important predictor of work to family interference. Employees who spend more time in job-related travel (i.e. spend more week nights and weekend nights away from home) are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference.
8. Organizational culture and work demands are better predictors of work to family interference than role overload (i.e. explain a higher proportion of the variance in work to family interference than in role overload).
9. Employees who devote more time to work (particularly SWAH and unpaid overtime) are more likely to report high levels of work to family interference.

10. This form of work–life conflict is not just a function of workload but work demands that either physically remove the employee from the family domain (i.e. job-related travel) or take time that is typically reserved for the family (unpaid overtime, SWAH).
11. Work to family interference is more strongly associated with the unwritten rules, norms and expectations placed on an employee at work than with the employee's work and family circumstances (i.e. family type, lifecycle stage) or the actual amount of time the person spends in work or family roles.
12. Work to family interference is positively associated with organizational level (i.e. managers are more likely to experience high levels of this form of work–life conflict).
13. Work to family interference has the same underlying root causes for both men and women (i.e. the same work-related behaviours and organizational cultural norms are problematic for both genders).
14. Family circumstances (i.e. family type, adult roles) are better predictors of work to family interference for women than men.
15. Work to family interference is the form of work–life conflict that can be most effectively predicted using the variables considered in this analysis.

Work culture and non-work demands are the key determinants of family to work interference for both men and women

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 indicates that work culture and non-work demands are important predictors of family to work interference for both men and women. For example:

- **Work culture:** This study determined that the following dimensions of organizational culture increased family to work interference for both genders: the perception that family responsibilities limit advancement, the perception that family leave limits advancement, and the perception that career advancement will be limited if one is not able to work long hours. An additional factor was important to women—the perception that the organization promotes a culture that supports work–life balance (negative association with family to work interference).
- **Non-work demands:** The following non-work demands were found to predict higher levels of

family to work interference for both men and women: responsibility for child care, hours per week in child care and hours per week in elder care. The data also indicate that there is a strong negative association between family to work interference and time in leisure activities for both men and women.

Family to work interference associated with conditions within the home for women

Three of the other determinants examined in this study (family type, age of children at home, adult roles) were substantive predictors of family to work interference for female (but not male) employees. The data support the following conclusions:

- **Age of children at home:** Women with younger children at home are more likely to report high family to work interference.
- **Adult roles:** Our data indicate that women with elder care responsibilities are substantively more likely to report high levels of family to work interference. Women with children report the second highest levels of interference followed by those with both child care and elder care responsibilities (i.e. those in the sandwich group). Women without dependent care responsibilities do not suffer from this form of work–life conflict.
- **Family type:** The findings with respect to family type were very similar to those observed for adult roles as married women with elder care responsibilities reported the highest levels of family to work interference followed by married women with children, single caregivers, and mothers with both child care and elder care responsibilities. Again, we note that women without dependent care responsibilities report very low levels of family to work interference.

Family to work interference not associated with conditions at work

Sector of employment, community, socio-economic circumstances, work demands and work characteristics were not substantive predictors of family to work interference for either gender. These findings indicate that this form of work–life conflict has a very different etiology than work to family interference.

What conclusions can we draw with respect to the occurrence of family to work interference?

The data reviewed in this chapter support the following conclusions with respect to the prediction of family to work interference:

1. We are not able to explain as much of the variation in family to work interference as we could explain work to family interference and role overload. This suggests that there are factors other than those we have considered (based on our review of the literature) in this analysis that are key predictors of this form of work–life conflict.
2. This form of work–life conflict is linked to what an employee has to do at home (i.e. non-work demands) and how easy it is to fulfill these responsibilities given the expectations imposed at the level of the organization (i.e. organizational culture). It is not associated with the demands an employee faces at work (i.e. work circumstances, sector of employment). Nor is it associated with where one lives.
3. Organizational culture is an important predictor of family to work interference for both men and women.
4. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of hours (i.e. employees perceive that their career advancement will be limited if they do not work long hours) will report higher family to work interference.
5. Employees who work in an organization that promotes a culture of work **or** family (i.e. one in which employees feel that they have to choose between their family and career advancement) will report higher family to work interference.
6. Family to work interference occurs when the types of behaviour the work culture rewards with respect to career advancement (i.e. long hours, putting work first) are at odds with the types of behaviours one would associate with being a suitable parent/elder caregiver (i.e. spending time in family activities, taking family leave, putting family first).

Non-work demands are a key determinant of family to work interference for both men and women

7. Family to work interference is positively associated with hours per week spent in providing child care and elder care and having responsibility for child care.
8. Family to work interference is negatively associated with hours per week spent in leisure activities. This suggests that these employees may be trying to cope with this form of interference by devoting time they would normally spend on themselves to their work and/or family roles.
9. Time in home chores, education and volunteer work are not significant predictors of family to work interference for either gender.
10. Family to work interference has a different etiology for men than women. For men, this type of work–life conflict has relatively little to do with their circumstances at home (i.e. what family roles they occupy). For women, on the other hand, family to work interference is substantively associated with family circumstances (i.e. lifecycle stage, family type, age of children at home). This suggests that if we have information on what roles employed women occupy, we will be able to predict to what extent they will experience family to work interference. No such prediction can be made for men.
11. Women with multiple caregiving demands (i.e. both child care and elder care) report lower levels of family to work interference than women with only child or elder care. This finding supports Barnett's (1998) Multiple Role Hypothesis and suggests that multiple caregiver roles offer some form of protective function to women with respect to this form of work–life conflict.

Employees with elder care responsibilities report higher levels of caregiver strain

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 indicates that there are three key determinants of caregiver strain which are shared by male and female employees: non-work demands, family type and adult roles. All these factors point to the same underlying cause of caregiver strain—elder care. Consider the following:

- **Non-work demands:** Two indicators predict higher levels of caregiver strain for both men and women: hours per week in elder care, and responsibility for elder care. For the women in the sample, caregiver

strain is also predicted by hours per week in child care.

- **Adult roles:** Employees with both child care and elder care responsibilities and those with just elder care responsibilities report higher levels of caregiver strain than employees in other roles.
- **Family type:** Findings with respect to family type were virtually identical to those observed with adult roles and support the idea that employees with elder care responsibilities (whether they are the only caregiving responsibilities held by the employee or are held in conjunction with child care as part of a sandwich family type) report higher caregiver strain.

Caregiver strain linked to age of children in the home for women

One of the other determinants examined in this study (age of children at home) was a substantive predictor of caregiver strain for female (but not male) employees. The data support the following conclusions:

- **Age of children at home:** Women with older children at home are more likely to report high caregiver strain. This finding can be explained by the fact that for women, biological limitations provide an upper limit on the age at which a woman can have children.

Caregiver strain is not associated with work demands or organizational culture

Sector of employment, community, socio-economic circumstances, work demands and work characteristics were not substantive predictors of caregiver strain for either gender. Also of interest is the fact that caregiver strain is the only form of work–life conflict examined in this study that was not substantively associated with organizational culture.

What conclusions can we draw with respect to the occurrence of caregiver strain?

The following conclusions can be drawn with respect to the circumstances associated with caregiver strain:

1. Caregiver strain can be predicted with some degree of confidence if you know an employee's lifecycle stage and his or her non-work demands. None of the other factors considered in this analysis is predictive of this form of work–life conflict.

2. Caregiver strain is positively associated with the time demands associated with looking after an elderly dependent (first) and having this form of responsibility (second). Family demands are a substantive predictor of caregiver strain. The greater the responsibility (i.e. only child, parent lives in home, siblings do not assume concomitant share, lack of community support), the higher the level of this form of conflict.
3. This type of work–life conflict can be substantively predicted by knowing an employee’s lifecycle stage. Employees who are older and in a lifecycle stage that involves elder care are more likely to report high levels of caregiver strain, regardless of where they live, where they work, their income, job type, etc. This finding is not a surprise given that caregiver strain is defined as a strain from caring for an elderly dependent.
4. Age of children at home provides a useful indicator of lifecycle stage for women but not men.
5. Non-work demands are a better predictor of caregiver strain in men than women.
6. Caregiver strain has a very different etiology than the other forms of work–life conflict examined in this study (i.e. it has a very different set of predictors).

6.2 Research Question 2

Research question 2 was divided into two parts:

- 2a. Can we identify a set of factors that places employees at risk of all forms of work–life conflict?
- 2b. Can we identify a set of risk factors that is unique to each of the four forms of work–life conflict?

What conclusions can we draw with respect to the risk factors of work–life conflict?

Examination of the data lead to some key conclusions with respect to the prediction of the various forms of work–life conflict:

- No set of factors could be identified that substantively predicted all four forms of work–life conflict.
- Organizational culture is a substantive predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference.

- Employees who work in an organization with a culture of hours and a culture of work **or** family report higher role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference.
- Employees who work for an organization with a culture supportive of work–life balance report lower levels of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference.
- Role overload and work to family interference are strongly predicted by work-related factors while family to work interference and caregiver strain are predicted by family factors.
- Work to family interference was the only dimension of work–life conflict predicted by sector of employment, income, job type, work arrangement, union membership and place of residence in Canada.
- Employees with higher work expectations and whose jobs require that they extend their work hours into times typically reserved for the family are more likely to report high work to family interference.
- Caregiver strain is strongly associated with the provision of elder care.

Details on each of these conclusions are given below.

No set of factors could be identified that substantively predicted all four forms of work–life conflict

The data analysis done in this study supports the following conclusion with respect to the prediction of work–life conflict: None of the factors included in this research was substantively associated with all four types of work–life conflict for both men and women.

Organizational culture is a substantive predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference

One factor, organizational culture, is a substantive predictor of three of the four forms of work–life conflict examined in this research (caregiver strain being the exception). What types of cultures are problematic? The research is unequivocal:

- Employees who work for an organization that promotes a culture that supports balance are less likely to experience high levels of role overload and work to family interference.

- Employees who work for an organization with a culture of hours (i.e. employees perceive that their career advancement will be limited if they do not work long hours or if they say no to more work) are more likely to report high levels of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference.
- Employees who perceive that family responsibilities make career advancement more difficult are more likely to report high levels of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference.
- Employees who feel that their career advancement will be limited if they take family leave report higher levels of work to family interference and family to work interference.

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 reveal a number of other interesting patterns in the data, including the fact that role overload and work to family interference have a number of key predictors in common as do family to work interference and caregiver strain. A similar relationship has been reported by Frone and colleagues (1992a; 1997a,b; 2002) with respect to work to family interference (associated with conditions at work) and family to work interference (associated with conditions at home).

Role overload and work to family interference both strongly associated with work demands and organizational culture

Organizational culture and work demands are the two most important predictors of role overload and work to family interference. With respect to work demands, both role overload and work to family interference are positively associated with hours per month in unpaid overtime, hours spent in work per week, hours per week in SWAH and time away from home in job-related travel. Organizational cultures which focus on hours (i.e. advancement limited if you do not work long hours or if you say no to more work), emphasize work **or** family (i.e. family responsibilities and family leave are perceived to limit advancement) and are non-supportive of balance are also linked to higher levels of role overload and work to family interference.

Family to work interference and caregiver strain are both linked to non-work demands, adult roles and family type

The most important predictors of caregiver strain and family to work interference are associated with the family domain (i.e. non-work demands, family type, adult role responsibilities). Both of these forms of work–life conflict

are positively associated with hours per week providing elder care, hours per week delivering child care and responsibility for elder care.

None of the predictors of role overload is unique to this form of work–life conflict

The main predictors of role overload are organizational culture and work demands—predictors that they share in common with work to family interference. Non-work demands, which also predict role overload, are also important predictors of family to work interference. There were no other substantive predictors of this form of work–life conflict.

Several predictors of work to family interference are unique to this form of work–life conflict

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 allows us to identify some factors which uniquely predict this form of work–life conflict, including:

- sector of employment (employees in the not-for-profit sector report higher interference than those in the public and private sector),
- income (income is positively associated with work to family interference, probably because of the strong positive association between income and job type),
- employees who supervise the work of others report higher work to family interference,
- employees who work shifts report higher work to family interference,
- union members report lower work to family interference (probably because such employees are less likely to hold management positions), and
- employees who live in Western Canada report higher work to family interference, while employees who live in Quebec report lower interference.

None of the predictors of family to work interference is unique to this form of work–life conflict

The main predictors of family to work interference are non-work demands and organizational culture. Non-work demands also predict caregiver strain while organizational culture is linked with role overload and work to family interference. Accordingly, we conclude that in this study we did not identify any predictors that were unique to this form of work–life conflict.

Caregiver strain is the only form of work–life conflict substantively predicted by family type and adult roles

This study identified several unique predictors of caregiver strain, including family type and responsibility for elder care. With respect to family type, the data indicate that employees in families with sandwich and elder care responsibilities are more likely to report high caregiver strain. It is also interesting to note that the non-work demands that contribute to caregiver strain are somewhat different from those observed with respect to family to work interference. While family to work interference appears to be primarily a function of demands associated with child care, caregiver strain seems to be driven by elder care issues (i.e. for both men and women, caregiver strain is predicted by hours per week in elder care and responsibility for elder care). From these data, we can conclude that caregiver strain is all about having to look after elder dependents.

6.3 Research Question 3

Research question 3 was formulated to examine the role of gender in the prediction of the various forms of work–life conflict. Specifically, it asked:

What impact does gender have on the prediction of the four forms of work–life conflict? Specifically, can we identify a set of factors that: (a) places employees at risk of the various forms of work–life conflict regardless of their gender? (b) is unique to female employees? (c) is unique to male employees?

What conclusions can we draw with respect to gender differences in the prediction of work–life conflict?

A number of key gender differences have already been reported in connection with our discussion of research question 1. These will not be repeated here. The focus in this section will be on summarizing key findings with respect to research question 3. The following key conclusions can be drawn with respect to gender differences in the prediction of work–life conflict:

- Organizational culture is a key predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference for both men and women.
- Job-related travel is associated with increased role overload for women but not men.
- Management positions are associated with higher levels of role overload for men but not women.

- Supportive organizational policies are associated with lower levels of role overload and work to family interference for women but not men.
- Family type and adult roles are predictive of work to family interference and family to work interference for women but not men.
- Age of children in the home is predictive of work to family interference and caregiver strain for women but not men.
- Responsibility for child care is the most important predictor of family to work interference for men. For women, on the other hand, family to work interference is more strongly associated with the amount of time spent providing child and elder care.
- Work demands are associated with caregiver strain for women but not men, suggesting that they change their behaviour at work to cope with elder care responsibilities at home.

Details on these gender differences are provided below.

Organizational culture associated with work–life conflict in both men and women

There is no set of factors that places both male and female employees at risk of all four forms of work–life conflict. If we limit ourselves to an examination of the predictors of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, however, we are able to identify one factor that places both male and female employees at risk of increased work–life conflict—the culture of the organization in which the employee works. The following types of cultures are problematic (i.e. positively associated with role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference) for both men and women:

- a culture of hours where employees believe that if they do not work long hours they will not advance in their organization, and
- a culture of work **or** family where employees perceive that family responsibilities and taking family leave limit advancement.

On the other hand, both men and women who work for an organization whose culture is supportive of work–life balance report lower levels of these forms of work–life conflict (i.e. supportive culture is negatively associated with role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference).

Job-related travel contributes to greater role overload for women

Job-related travel appears to be more problematic for women than men. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the following factors are important predictors of role overload in women but not men: hours commuting to work per week, week nights away from home per month on business, and weekend nights away from home on business.

Men in management positions are at risk for higher role overload

The data reviewed in this report suggest that role overload in men is a function of being a manager and engaging in work extension activities (i.e. taking work home to complete in the evening, engaging in SWAH).

Taken together, these two sets of findings suggest that role overload has a different etiology for men than women.

Supportive policies associated with reducing role overload for women

Working for an organization that has supportive policies in place is predictive of reduced role overload for women but not men. It may be that women, more than men, need work–life policies to be in place before they can take positive action with respect to balance (i.e. such policies give their actions legitimacy and give them the “courage” to push back). This interpretation of the data is consistent with the fact that women (but not men) who feel that they cannot say no to overtime work are more likely to report high work to family interference.

Family type has little impact on work–life conflict in men

For the men in the sample, family type has no strong association with either role overload or work to family interference. That is, men in traditional families and single men with dependent care responsibilities report the same levels of both of these forms of work–life conflict as dual-income fathers and men in dual-income families with elderly dependents.

Family type is associated with work–life conflict for women

For the women in the study, on the other hand, family type is strongly associated with role overload and work to family interference. Women in non-traditional families (i.e. those with a stay-at-home spouse) report lower levels of role overload and family to work interference but higher

levels of work to family interference than other women. In other words, the women in this family type manifest work–life conflict patterns that are more similar to those typically reported by men than to dual-income mothers.

For women, it is the amount of time that one spends in family roles, rather than responsibility for the role, that is associated with family to work interference—for men, it is the responsibility that is more problematic

While non-work demands predict family to work interference and caregiver strain for both men and women, the order of importance of the predictors suggests that there is a gender difference with respect to the link between non-work demands and work–life conflict. Pratt’s coefficient indicates that for women it is the amount of time that they have to spend looking after children and elderly dependents that is more problematic. Responsibility for these roles is of secondary importance with respect to the prediction of family to work interference. For men, on the other hand, having primary responsibility for child care appears to cause more of a problem than the amount of time spent in the role. This finding is consistent with the fact that the women in this sample (see Report One) spend more time providing child and elder care than men—time that can be expected to increase the extent of family to work interference for this group of employees.

Age of children in the home is an important predictor of family to work interference and caregiver strain for women but not men

The data indicate that, for the women in the sample, two forms of work–life conflict (family to work interference and caregiver strain) are substantively associated with the age of their children. Caregiver strain is positively associated with children’s age, while family to work interference is negatively associated with children’s age. These relationships were not significant for men. The following picture emerges from these data. As women get older, the amount of care required by their children declines (as does family to work interference) as they too get older. At the same time, the amount of care required by the parents and in-laws of these women increases (as does caregiver strain) as they get older. Women with school-aged children and parents who are younger and still independent report lower levels of both forms of work–life conflict. These findings indicate that employers and policy makers need to consider both child care and elder care roles when looking at work–life conflict for women.

Women with high levels of caregiver strain cope by modifying their work demands

Work demands have a stronger association with caregiver strain for women than men. Examination of the data indicates that caregiver strain is positively associated with time per week performing SWAH and negatively associated with hours per week in work. It would appear from these data that women with this form of work–life conflict try to fit their work demands around their caregiving obligations by leaving the office early (fewer hours in work per week) and taking work home to complete (higher SWAH).

6.4 Recommendations

The data reviewed in this study leave little doubt that there is no “one size fits all solution” to the issue of work–life conflict and that different policies, practices and strategies will be needed to reduce each of the four components of work–life conflict. That being said, the data indicate that there are a number of strategies and approaches that the various stakeholders in this issue can use to reduce work–life conflict. The recommendation section is divided into three parts. Recommendations with respect to work demands and organizational culture are given first as they have the broadest applicability (i.e. work demands and organizational culture are predictive of three out of four forms of work–life conflict, caregiver strain being the exception). This is followed by recommendations that should help employees cope with family to work interference and caregiver strain. Finally, it should be noted that many of the recommendations offered in this report appear in the other reports in the series as the different analyses have painted a very consistent picture about what needs to be done to address the issues associated with work–life conflict.

Recommendations that deal with work demands

To reduce role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, employers need to focus their efforts on making work demands and work expectations realistic. Work demands, rather than demands from outside work, are the key predictors of role overload and work to family interference, the two most common forms of work–life conflict in Canada at this time (58% of the employees in this sample report high levels of role overload while one in four reports high work to family interference). While employers often point with pride to the many “programs” available in their organization to help employees meet family obligations, these programs or options do not diminish the fact that most people simply have more work to do than can be accomplished by one

person in a standard work week. Therefore, employers and governments need to recognize that the issue of work–life conflict cannot be addressed without addressing the issue of workloads. While a full discussion of workload issues can be found in Report One in this series, it is worthwhile to note the following:

“Comparisons done using the 1991 and 2001 samples suggest that time in work has increased over the decade. Whereas one in ten respondents in 1991 worked 50 or more hours per week, one in four does so now; during this same time period the proportion of employees working between 35 and 39 hours per week declined from 48% of the sample to 27%. This increase in time in work was observed for all job groups and all sectors.” (Higgins and Duxbury, 2002, p. 17)

Further research is needed to determine why work demands have increased over the decade. Competing explanations drawn from the data include:

- organizational anorexia (downsizing—especially of the middle manager cadre—has meant that there are not enough employees to do the work and managers to strategize and plan);
- corporate culture (if you do not work long hours and take work home, you will not advance in your career, not keep your job during downsizing);
- increased use of technology (data collected elsewhere in the survey provide partial support for this supposition);
- global competition (work hours have been extended to allow work across time zones, increased competition and a desire to keep costs down has limited the number of employees it is deemed feasible to hire);
- the speed of change has increased to the point that many organizations have lost their ability to plan and prioritize—workloads increase when organizations practise crisis management (partial support for this hypothesis comes from data collected elsewhere in the survey); and
- employees are worried about the consequences of “not being seen to be a contributor”
 - non-professionals may fear that they will lose their jobs if they do not work overtime,
 - professionals may worry that their career will stagnate if they do not work overtime.

As one respondent noted at the end of the survey:

“Changing expectations have driven us to a fast-paced and hectic lifestyle. We have less people to do the same jobs but jobs have also changed due to technology. We are constantly revving the engine and if not enough oil gets on the pistons, the engine blows up. Business and industry and government need to recognize this and find ways to assist.”

Employers can also help employees deal with heavy work demands by introducing initiatives which increase an employee’s sense of control. The research in this area (see, for example, work by Karasek, 1979) is quite clear—employees can cope with greater demands if they have a greater sense of control. The literature suggests a number of mechanisms which should be investigated, including increased autonomy and empowerment at the individual employee level, the increased use of self-directed work teams, increased employee participation in decision making, increased communication and information sharing, time management training, training on how to plan and prioritize, etc.

The recommendations listed below are, we feel, critical with respect to addressing the issue of demand and control:

1. Employers need to identify ways of reducing employee workloads. This is especially true for not-for-profit sector employers. Special attention needs to be given to reducing the workloads associated with being in management.
2. Employers need to examine workloads within their organizations. If they find that certain employees are consistently spending long hours at work (50 + hours per week), they need to determine why this is occurring (e.g. ambitious staff, unbalanced and unrealistic work expectations, poor planning, too many priorities, lack of tools and/or training to do the job efficiently, poor management, organizational culture focused on hours not output). Once they have determined the causal factors, they need to determine how workloads can be made more reasonable.
3. Employers need to recognize that unrealistic work demands are not sustainable over time and come at a cost to the organization which is often not recognized or tracked (see Reports Two and Three for a summary of these costs). Accordingly, we recommend that the employer start recording the costs of understaffing and overwork (i.e. greater absenteeism, higher prescription drug costs, greater

employee assistance program use, increased turnover and hiring costs), so they can make informed decisions with respect to this issue.

4. Employers need to identify ways to reduce the amount of time employees (especially women) spend in job-related travel (e.g. increase their use of virtual teams and teleconferencing technology). In particular, they need to reduce their expectations that employees will travel on their personal time and spend weekends away from home to reduce the organization’s travel costs.
5. Employers need to analyze workloads and hire more people in those areas where the organization is overly reliant on unpaid overtime.
6. Employers need to track the amount of time employees spend working paid and unpaid overtime and capture the number of hours it actually takes to get various jobs done. They should also collect data which reflect the total costs of delivering high quality work in various areas on time (i.e. paid and unpaid overtime, subsequent turnover, employee assistance program use, absenteeism). Such data should be longitudinal in nature as many of the consequences of poor people management do not appear until 6 to 12 months after the event. This type of data should improve planning and priority setting, as well as allow senior executives to make better strategic, long-term decisions.
7. Employers have to develop an etiquette around the use of office technologies such as e-mail, laptops and cell phones. They need, for example, to set limits on the use of technology to support after-hours work and make expectations regarding response times realistic. The following comments from survey participants speak to this:

“The amount of work, regardless of organization, has increased dramatically in the last decade—particularly with the increase in technology. We have the same bodies as workers of a generation ago—but today we can have someone in our office, an incoming phone call, voice mails and e-mails all at once. Technology has added the expectation of immediate response—and solution—to the workplace.”

“Electronic tools have increased the expectations of availability—anytime anywhere, immediate answers are expected. After hours, during business

travel, Sunday and Friday nights—you are now expected to use this time to return voice mail and e-mails.”

8. Employers need to provide employees with more flexibility around when and where they work. The criteria under which these flexible arrangements can be used should be mutually agreed upon and transparent. There should also be mutual accountability around their use (i.e. employees need to meet job demands, but organizations should be flexible with respect to how work is arranged). The process for changing hours of work or the location of work should, wherever possible, be flexible. The increased use of flexible work arrangements would have the added benefit of reducing the amount of time spent commuting to and from work—an important predictor of role overload for women.
9. It is very difficult (if not impossible) to implement flexible work arrangements in organizations where the focus is on hours rather than output and presence rather than performance. This means that organizations that want to increase work–life balance need to introduce new performance measures that focus on objectives, results and output (i.e. move away from a focus on hours to a focus on output). To do this, they need to reward output, not hours, and reward what is done, not where it is done. They also need to publicly reward people who have successfully combined work and non-work domains and not promote those who work long hours and expect others to do the same.
10. Employers need to give employees the right to refuse overtime work. Saying no to overtime work should not be a career-limiting move. Some organizations may want to give management limited discretion to override the employee’s right to refuse overtime (i.e. because of an emergency situation, due to operational requirements), but this should be the exception not the rule.
11. Employers should implement time-off arrangements in lieu of overtime pay.
12. Employers should provide a limited number of days of paid leave per year for child care, elder care or personal problems.
13. Employers should provide appropriate support for their employees who work rotating shifts. What is an appropriate support should be determined by consulting with employees who work rotating shifts. Policies that have been found to be effective in this

regard include limits to split shifts, advanced notice of shift changes, and permitting shift trades (i.e. allowing employees to change shift times with one another).

14. Employers should implement “cafeteria” benefits packages which allow employees to select those benefits which are most appropriate to their personal situation on a yearly basis.
15. Employees need to say no to overtime hours if work expectations are unreasonable.
16. Employees need to try to limit the amount of work taken home to be completed in the evenings. Employees who do bring work home should make every effort to separate time in work from family time (i.e. do work after the children go to bed, have a home office).
17. Employees need to try to limit the amount of time spent in job-related travel.

Recommendations that deal with organizational culture

To reduce role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference, employers need to deal with their organization’s culture. Work–life policies are a necessary first step, but they are not sufficient in that they will not be implemented or used in a culture that is non-supportive of work–life issues. The findings from this study identified three different organizational cultures which are associated with increased work–life conflict: a culture of hours (if you do not work long hours you will not get ahead and it is unacceptable to say no to more work), a culture of work **or** family (family leave and family responsibilities limit career advancement) and a non-supportive culture (environment is non-supportive of balance). The importance of addressing the issue of organizational culture cannot be overemphasized. Culture was the single strongest predictor of role overload, work to family interference and family to work interference for both men and women. A policy approach on its own will not fix what is wrong in many organizations. To address the issue of work–life conflict, employers need to create supportive work cultures. This means changing reward structures and accountability and measurement systems. Again, the need for such a focus can be seen in the following comment by a study participant:

“I think that we won’t have achieved the objective until it becomes socially unacceptable to write e-mails on evenings/ weekends, brag about long hours and

schedule meetings outside 'core' hours. Although there is much talk about balance, long hours are still rewarded and equated to dedication to the job. Senior managers who talk the most about the need for balance are the worst offenders."

While the recommendations that precede this one will all act to make the work environment more supportive, we would recommend the following specific steps be taken by organizations that wish to focus their efforts on cultural change:

18. Work with employees to identify the types of support they would like (i.e. diagnose the situation) and which types could be accommodated within the organization. Not all supportive policies are feasible and practical in every context.
19. Develop and implement appropriate supportive policies. The development phase should include an analysis of the potential problems associated with the implementation of each policy and suggestions on how these problems could be addressed.
20. Communicate to employees the various policies that are available. Indicate how these policies can be accessed and any restrictions to their use. Repeat these communications on a regular basis (e.g. every couple of months). Publish these data on the company's Intranet.
21. Encourage employees to use the policies by having senior management model appropriate behaviours, conducting information sessions on the policies and how they can be used (e.g. through lunch and learns), communicating how these policies are being used successfully in this organization and others (e.g. communicate best practices), etc. Employees must be made to feel that their career will not be jeopardized if they take advantage of supportive policies.
22. Measure the use of the different supportive policies and reward those sections of the organization that demonstrate best practices in these areas. Investigate those areas where use is low.
23. Change accountability frameworks and reward structures. Stop rewarding long hours and unpaid overtime work and instead focus on rewarding accurate work plans and sound human resource management.

The following comments from survey participants reflect this issue:

"I believe that existing work/balance policies are adequate, but can be improved upon. I also think that management wants to address problems but is trapped in a culture that measures performance and individual contribution by the old standard of time and ability, rather than by quality."

"Although my employer has invested a lot of effort in studying the issue of work/family balance and in promoting it, the 'work culture' speaks to a different situation. Until the management cadre start to 'walk the talk,' the current situation and its implied expectations will continue (employees are considered 'serious' and 'good managers' based upon the number of hours they are at the office).

"Meetings with senior management are often scheduled after the end of a typical day. There is still a tendency to look down on those employees who choose to respect the normal (paid) work day, and leave to take care of family/home responsibilities."

24. Employees need to take advantage of the supportive policies and flexible work arrangements available within their organization.
25. Employees and managers alike need to model the type of behaviour that is associated with organizational support of work-life balance, as actions speak louder than words in this arena (i.e. do not call meetings late in the day or early in the morning, do not expect employees to travel on personal time or save money for the organization by travelling for business on the weekend).
26. Culture change is considered to be transformational in nature. Organizations need to offer training to senior managers on the critical success factors necessary for transformational change, provide training to managers on how to manage a change of this nature, and ensure that several people on the organization's senior leadership team have the necessary competencies to lead and manage this type of change.

Recommendations that deal with family to work interference and caregiver strain

Unique predictors of family to work interference and caregiver strain include non-work demands and responsibilities associated with child care and elder care. To reduce these forms of work–life conflict, a partnership among governments, employees, unions and employers is required. We would recommend the following actions to reduce these forms of work–life conflict:

27. Governments need to take the lead with respect to the issue of child care. In particular, they need to determine how to best help employed Canadians deal with child care issues (i.e. develop appropriate policies for parents of children of various ages, identify and implement relevant supports).
28. Governments need to take the lead with respect to the issue of elder care. In particular, they need to determine how to best help employed Canadians deal with elder care issues (i.e. develop appropriate policies, identify and implement relevant supports).
29. Employers should offer child and elder care referral services.
30. Employers should extend their employee assistance program to cover the families of their employees (e.g. offer an employee family assistance program instead).
31. Employees need to educate themselves on how they can best deal with the issues of elder care. Things such as financial planning courses and nurturing an awareness of what types of community resources are available for those with elder care issues are likely to help employees increase the amount of control they have over these issues.
32. Employees with caregiving responsibilities should self-identify so that their employer can try to respond. This is particularly true with respect to issues surrounding elder care where the employer does not know that the employee is facing challenges outside work. It is difficult for an employer to assist if he or she does not know there is a problem.

Finally, the findings outlined in this study are somewhat disturbing in terms of what they say about Canadian values. Why is caring for our seniors and our children causing so much strain? Why are Canadian men and women foregoing having families or reducing the number of children they have? Has there been a change in values in Canada? Do Canadian organizations with a culture of work **or** family and a culture of hours reflect what is important to Canadians? Do such cultures give us a competitive advantage globally **or** are we hurting our chances of future success by focusing on short-term gains? Are we asking too much of families? Are we asking too much of employees? The data outlined in this study suggest that Canadians need to take a step back and reassess these issues. Canadian employees and employers “survived” the 1990s. Our ability to thrive in this millennium may well depend on how we move forward with respect to the issues outlined in this report.

References

- Barnett, R. (1998). Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 124*, 125–82.
- Barnett, R., & Baruch, B. (1987). Social roles, gender, and psychological distress. In R. Barnett, L. Biener, & G. Baruch (Eds.), *Gender and Stress* (pp. 122–143). New York: Free Press.
- Barnett, R., Gareis, K., & Brennan, B. (1999). Fit as a mediator of the relationship between work hours and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 307–17.
- Bohen, H., & Viveros-Long. (1981) *Balancing Jobs and Family Life*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Buffardi, L., Smith, J., O'Brien, A., & Erdwins, C. (1999). The impact of independent-care responsibilities and gender on work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 356–67.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Flesh, H. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Clark, S. (2001). Work-life cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 58*, 348–65.

- Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 389–411.
- Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (1998). *Work–Life Balance in Saskatchewan: Realities and Challenges*. Regina: Government of Saskatchewan.
- Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2001). *Work-Life Balance in the New Millennium: Where Are We? Where Do We Need to Go?* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Network Discussion Paper No. W/12. <http://www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=77>
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Johnson, K. (1999). *An Examination of the Implications and Costs of Work–Life Conflict in Canada*. Ottawa: Health Canada.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15, 449–66.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., Lee, C., & Mills, S. (1991). *Balancing Work and Family: A Study of the Canadian Public Sector*. Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare Canada (NHRDP).
- Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationships between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178–99.
- Frankel, M. (1998). Creating the family friendly workplace: Barriers and solutions. In S. Klarreich (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Health Psychology: Programs to Make the Workplace Healthier* (pp. 79–100). Psychological Press: Madison, WI: Psychological Press.
- Friedman, D. (1990). Work and family: The new strategic plan. *Human Resource Planning*, 13, 78–89.
- Frone, M. (2002). Work–life balance. In J. Quick, & L. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143–62). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1992a). Antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict: Testing a model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65–78.
- Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1992b). Prevalence of work–family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 13, 723–29.
- Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1997a). Relation of work–life conflict to health outcomes: A four year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 325–35.
- Frone, M., Yardley, J., & Markel, K. (1997b). Developing and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 50, 145–67.
- Grandey, A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work–family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 54, 360–70.
- Greenhaus, J., & Beutell N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76–88.
- Grzywacz, J., & Marks, N. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 111–26.
- Guerts, S., & Demerouti, E. (2003). Work/Non-work interface: A review of theories and findings. In M. Schabracq, J. Winnubst, & C. Copper (Eds.), *The Handbook of Work and Health Psychology* (pp. 279–312). Chichester, England: John Wiley and Sons.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Kelpa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560–68.
- Haas, L. (1995). Structural dimensions of the work–family interface. In G. Bowen, & J. Pittman (Eds.), *The Work and Family Interface, Families in Focus Series* (pp. 113–21). NCFR.
- Hammer, L., Colton, C., Caubert, S., & Brockwood, K. (2002). The unbalanced life: Work and family conflict. In J. Thomas, & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of Mental Health* (pp. 83–102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Higgins, C., & Duxbury, L. (2002). *The 2001 National Work-Life Conflict Study: Report One*. Ottawa: Health Canada. <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/pphb-dgspsp/publicat/work-travail/index.html>

- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Lee, C. (1992). *Balancing Work and Family: A Study of the Canadian Private Sector*. London, ON: National Centre for Research, Management and Development.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Lee, C. (1994). Impact of life-cycle stage and gender on the ability to balance work and family responsibilities. *Family Relations, 43*, 144–50.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research and Policy*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental drain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29*, 285–308.
- Keith, P., & Schafer, R. (1991). *Relationships and Well-being over the Life Stages*. New York: Praeger.
- Kelloway, E.K., Bottlieb, B., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 337–46.
- Kinnunen, U., & Maunao, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict among employed men and women in Finland. *Human Relations, 51*, 157–77.
- Kossek, E., & Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work–family policy and productivity gap: A literature review. *Community, Work and Family, 2*, 7–32.
- Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. (1999). The work–family research agenda in changing contexts. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 382–93.
- Lewis, S., & Dyer, J. (2002). Toward a culture for work–life integration. In C. Cooper, & R. Burke (Eds.), *The New World of Work* (pp. 302–16). London: Blackwell.
- MacBride-King, J., & Bachman, K. (1999). *Is Work-Life Balance Still an Issue for Canadians and Their Employers? You Bet It Is*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
- MacBride-King, & Paris, H. (1989). Balancing work and family responsibilities. *Canadian Business Review, Autumn, 17–21*.
- Milkie, M., & Peltola, P. (1999). Playing all the roles: Gender and the work–family balancing act. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 476–90.
- Neal, M., Chapman, N., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Emlen, A. (1993). *Balancing Work and Caregiving for Children, Adults and Elders*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Netemeyer, R., Boles, J., & McNurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 400–10.
- O’Driscoll, M., Ilgen, D., & Hildreth, K. (1992). Time devoted to job and off-job activities interrole conflict and affective experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 272–79.
- Raabe, R. (1990). The organizational effects of workplace family policies: Past weaknesses and recent progress towards improved research. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 477–91.
- Robinson, B. (1983). Validation of a caregiver strain index. *Journal of Gerontology, 38*, 344–48 (553).
- Scharlach, A., & Boyd, S. (1989). Caregiving and employment: Results of an employee survey. *The Gerontologist, 29*, 382–87.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership (1st edition)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shaffer, M., & Harrison, D. (1998). Expatriates’ psychological withdrawal from international assignment: Work, non-work and family influences. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 87–118.
- Starrels, M. (1992). The evolution of workplace family policy research. *Journal of Family Issues, 13*, 259–78.
- Thomas, D.R., Hughes, E., & Zumbo, B.D. (1998). On variable importance in linear regression. *Social Indicators Research, 45*, 253–75.
- Thompson, C., Beauvais, L., & Lyness, K. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 54*, 392–415.
- Van Der Hulst, M., & Geurts, S. (2001). Associations between overtime and psychological health in high and low reward jobs. *Work and Stress, 15*(3), 227–40.

Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work-role characteristics, family structure demands, and work/family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 749–61.

Wallace, J. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 50, 227–49.

Westman, M., & Piotrkowski, C. (1999). Introduction to the special issue: Work–family research in occupational psychology. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 301–06.

Appendix A:

Reports Coming from the 2001 National Work-Life Conflict Study

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2001). *Work–Life Balance in the New Millennium: Where Are We? Where Do We Need To Go?* Canadian Policy Research Network Discussion Paper No. W/12. Ottawa: CPRN. <http://www.cprn.org/en/doc.cfm?doc=77>

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2003). *Where to Work in Canada? An Examination of Regional Differences in Work–Life Practices*. Vancouver: B.C. Council for the Family. <http://www.worklifeforum.com/pages/3/index.html>

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2003). *Work–Life Conflict in Canada in the New Millennium: A Status Report (Report Two)*. Ottawa: Health Canada. <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/work-travail/report2/index.html>

Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Coghill, D. (2003). *Voices of Canadians: Seeking Work–Life Balance*. Human Resources Development Canada, Cat. No. RH54-12/2003, ISBN: 0-662-67059-0. <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/asp/gateway.asp?hr=/en/lp/spila/wlb/vcswlb/04presentation.shtml&hs=wnc>

Higgins, C., & Duxbury, L. (2002). *The 2001 National Work–Life Conflict Study: Report One*. Ottawa: Health Canada. <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/work-travail/report1/index.html>

Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. (2004). *Exploring the Link Between Work–Life Conflict and Demands on Canada’s Health Care System (Report Three)*. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada. <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/work-travail/report3/index.html>

Appendix B

Statistical Analysis

Both MANCOVA and regression techniques were used for statistical analysis to determine the predictors of who is at risk for work–life conflict.

1. MANCOVA

There are several techniques that can be used to assess differences in means between various groups. For example, analysis of variance (ANOVA) could be used to look for differences in means between three groups (managers, professionals, clerical workers) on job satisfaction. The grouping (i.e. managers, professionals, clerical) is referred to as an independent variable (with three levels) while the measure of interest, job satisfaction, is referred to as the dependent variable. A statistical technique referred to as ANCOVA (analysis of co-variance) is used when the researcher thinks that differences in job satisfaction among these three groups could be influenced by other factors (referred to as co-variates) such as age. By introducing the “co-variate” age into the analysis of variance, the researcher is able to determine the effect of job type on job satisfaction while controlling for the effect of age.

MANOVA is an extension of ANOVA when the researcher has more than one dependent variable. For example, if the analyst wanted to determine differences among the three job types in the above example on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, he or she would use MANOVA. In this case, we would still have one independent variable with three levels (managers, professionals, clerical) but two dependent variables (job satisfaction, commitment). The choice of using MANOVA as opposed to separate ANOVAs is made based on the grounds that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are likely highly related and should be analyzed jointly. By analyzing them jointly, the researcher is not as likely to make a mistake in his or her statistical conclusions. MANOVA can be extended to MANCOVA (multiple analysis of co-variance) with the addition of co-variates.

Interpreting a MANCOVA is a three-step process. The first step is to assess the overall test of significance (referred to as the omnibus test). To understand this, one needs to understand null hypotheses in statistics. A null hypothesis for a test of means basically says there are no differences in means across the various groups. Thus, in our example above, the null hypotheses would be (1) managers, professionals and clerical workers have equal job satisfaction, and (2) managers, professionals and clericals have equal organizational commitment. If any pair of means was unequal (e.g. managers have higher job satisfaction than clerical workers), the null hypothesis would be rejected and the analyst could move to step two. To determine if the null hypothesis of equal means was rejected, one looks at the Wilks' lambda (a multivariate version of the F test) and its associated significant level. If the significance level is less than 0.05 (a common standard), the researcher knows that at least one pair of means is unequal.

In step two, we determine for which dependent variables there are differences. MANOVA does this by running separate ANOVAs for each dependent variable. In our example, the technique would run an ANOVA for job satisfaction and an ANOVA for organizational commitment. The analyst would look at the significance level for each separate ANOVA to determine where significant differences lie. Often, researchers make what is called a Bonferroni adjustment in determining whether the results are significant. It is a simple procedure where 0.05 (the common rejection level) is divided by the number of dependent variables (in our case, two) to get a more conservative rejection level (in our case, we would reject the null if the significance level was below 0.025). The adjustment is made to control what researchers call type 1 error. Basically, it is a more conservative approach to hypothesis testing.

In step three, the analyst can determine exactly which pairs of means are different. For example, the analyst might find no significant differences between managers, professionals and clerical workers on job satisfaction, but

that professional workers had higher commitment than clerical workers. We use a technique developed by Bonferroni to determine which pairs of means are unequal.

In our analyses for this report, we had four dependent variables (overload, work-to-family interference, family-to-work interference, caregiver strain). We used MANCOVA for the following analyses:

- assessment of community variables,
- lifecycle stage (i.e. adult roles, parental status) by gender analysis,
- family type by gender analysis, and
- assessment of sector of employment.

In all cases, the co-variate that we controlled for was job type.

2. Regression

Regression is a technique where one group of variables (called independent variables) is used to predict a dependent variable. For example, one could use knowledge of a person's family situation (e.g. number of children), income and hours per week spent working to predict role overload.

There are three steps in a regression analysis. The first step involves an assessment of the overall regression model. In our example, the researcher would want to know to what extent number of children, income and hours per week working (the independent variables) predicted overload (the dependent variable). To determine this, one looks at the F-test which essentially tests whether the predictive power of the model is null. If we reject this null (i.e. p-value less than 0.05), then we say we have a significant regression. To determine the strength of a regression we look at a statistic called R^2 (R-squared). R^2 , which ranges from 0 to 1, is the percent of variance in the dependent that is explained by the independent variables. The closer R^2 is to 1, the stronger the regression. Determining a threshold value for R^2 depends on what previous researchers have been able to explain. For example, if previous researchers have been able to explain 15% of the variance of overload, then 15% is a minimum standard for researchers to achieve with their regression model. When the regression is significant and we are happy with the level of R^2 , we say we have a substantive regression.

Step one only tells us if the overall model is significant. In step two, we can look at each independent variable separately and determine if it is contributing to the

regression. To do this, we look at t-tests associated with each variable. If the significance of the t-test is less than 0.05, we say the variable is a significant contributor to the regression equation. Normally, when a variable is not significant we drop it from the analysis and re-run the regression.

In step three, we determine the importance of each independent variable. To do this, we use a technique described by Thomas et al. (1998). This technique involves multiplying each standardized regression coefficient by its correlation with the dependent variable. Mathematically, if you multiply each standardized coefficient by its correlation with the dependent variable and sum these products, the sum is equal to the R^2 of the regression. Subsequently, if you divide each product by the overall R^2 , your products will now sum to 1 (these products are called Pratt's measure or Pratt's coefficient). To determine importance, you simply rank order Pratt's measure for each variable: the higher the rank, the more important the variable. As a baseline for importance, Pratt's measure should be greater than 1 divided by the number of variables. Thus, if you have five variables, Pratt's measure must exceed 0.2 before being considered important.

One final point needs to be made about regression equations. In a regression, each coefficient measures the contribution of that variable controlling for all other variables in the model. Thus, if the researcher wants to include controls in a regression, he or she simply adds them as independent variables.

In our analyses, we did a series of regressions using overload, work-to-family interference, family-to-work interference and caregiver strain as dependent variables. Regression models were run for the following independent variable models:

- socio-economic status
- characteristics of work
- work demands
- non-work demands
- organizational culture

Job type was included in all of the above regression equations as a control variable. Consistent with Report One in this series, job type was conceptualized in this analysis to include the following three groups:

- professionals: defined as employees who held either managerial and/or professional positions,

- non-professionals: defined as employees who worked in clerical, retail, administrative and production positions, and
- technicians: defined as employees who indicated they worked in technical jobs.

The technique used to control for job type in the regression analysis is summarized in the section 2.1 below.

2.1 Controlling for Job Type

In regression analysis, the analyst will often want to examine the effect of a qualitative variable such as gender. To do this, the analyst will create a variable called gender and assign a value of 0 when the response is from a male and a value of 1 when the response is from a female. The numbers 0 and 1 are really quite meaningless as one could have coded males as 1 and females as 0. Qualitative variables such as gender are known as dummy variables. By looking at the regression coefficient associated with gender, the analyst can determine if gender has an impact on the variable you are trying to predict.

Dummy variables can be extended from two groups (i.e. male, female) to three groups (managers, clerical, technical) as follows. For a qualitative variable with three

levels, we need two dummy variables to uniquely identify each group.³³ We could call these JOB TYPE 1 and JOB TYPE 2 and code them as shown below.

	JOB TYPE 1	JOB TYPE 2
Managers	0	0
Clerical	1	0
Technical	0	1

By coding the variable this way, we can measure the impact of job type on the dependent variable of interest (e.g. role overload). If job type 1 and/or job type 2 are significant, then job type is a predictor of role overload. The above can be extended to qualitative variables with four or more levels. You simply need one less dummy variable than the number of groups you want to examine.

³³ Since assigning the numbers 1, 2, 3 would imply that the numbers have meaning (in reality any group could be coded as 1), we have to code job type using a dummy variable.

Appendix C

Summary of MANCOVAs

1. Impact of Lifecycle Stage: Adult Roles

Table C1: Sample Size for Lifecycle Stage (Adult Role) Analysis

Family Type	% of Male Sample	% of Female Sample
Single: No dependents	11	15
Dual income: No dependents	13	9
Dual income: Children	37	27
Dual income: Sandwich	18	25
Dual income: Elder care	20	24

N for women = 5,649; N for men = 4,541

Table C2: Statistics for Adult Roles Analysis: Men

Dependent Variable	Adult Stage	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.407	0.052	3.305	3.510
	2	3.390	0.080	3.234	3.547
	3	3.520	0.031	3.459	3.580
	4	3.580	0.039	3.503	3.658
	5	3.673	0.028	3.619	3.728
Work to family interference	1	2.817	0.062	2.695	2.938
	2	2.884	0.095	2.699	3.070
	3	2.993	0.037	2.921	3.065
	4	3.050	0.047	2.958	3.142
	5	3.131	0.033	3.066	3.196
Family to work interference	1	2.026	0.083	1.863	2.188
	2	2.247	0.054	2.140	2.353
	3	2.351	0.032	2.288	2.414
	4	2.363	0.041	2.182	2.343
	5	2.523	0.029	2.466	2.579
Caregiver strain	1	1.834	0.053	1.730	1.938
	2	1.476	0.081	1.318	1.635
	3	1.323	0.031	1.262	1.385
	4	2.122	0.040	2.043	2.200
	5	1.964	0.028	1.908	2.019

Key: 1 = Single: No dependents
 2 = Dual income: No dependents
 3 = Dual income: Children
 4 = Dual-income: Sandwich
 5 = Dual-income: Elder care

Wilks' lambda 0.851, $F = 26.19$, $\alpha < 0.0001$

Table C3: Statistics for Adult Roles Analysis: Women

Dependent Variable	Adult Stage	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.606	0.035	3.537	3.675
	2	3.585	0.054	3.480	3.691
	3	3.828	0.034	3.761	3.895
	4	3.773	0.028	3.718	3.827
	5	3.931	0.023	3.885	3.977
Work to family interference	1	2.831	0.042	2.749	2.914
	2	2.783	0.064	2.657	2.910
	3	2.945	0.041	2.865	3.024
	4	2.922	0.033	2.857	2.987
	5	3.009	0.028	2.954	3.064
Family to work interference	1	2.211	0.038	2.136	2.287
	2	2.035	0.058	1.920	2.149
	3	2.448	0.037	2.375	2.521
	4	2.277	0.030	2.118	2.236
	5	2.562	0.025	2.512	2.612
Caregiver strain	1	1.303	0.041	1.222	1.385
	2	1.684	0.063	1.560	1.808
	3	1.455	0.040	1.376	1.533
	4	2.329	0.033	2.265	2.393
	5	2.305	0.028	2.201	2.409

Key: 1 = Single: No dependents
 2 = Dual income: No dependents
 3 = Dual income: Children
 4 = Dual-income: Sandwich
 5 = Dual-income: Elder care

Wilks' lambda 0.838, $F = 40.22$, $\alpha < 0.0001$

Table C4: Relationship Between Adult Roles and Work–Life Conflict: Men

Lifecycle Stage	Role Overload	W to F	F to W	Lifecycle Stage	Caregiver Strain
Dual: Elder care	3.67	3.13	2.52	Dual: Sandwich	2.12
Dual: Sandwich	3.58	3.05	2.36	Dual: Elder care	1.96
Dual: Children	3.52	3.00	2.35	Single: No dependents	1.83
Dual: No dependents	3.39	2.89	2.25	Dual: No dependents	1.48
Single: No children	3.41	2.82	2.03	Dual: Children	1.32
Total sample: Men	3.51	2.98	2.28	Total sample: Men	1.73

Key: *W to F = Work to family interference*
F to W = Family to work interference

Table C5: Relationship Between Adult Roles and Work–Life Conflict: Women

Lifecycle Stage	Role Overload	W to F	F to W	Lifecycle Stage	Caregiver Strain
Dual: Elder care	3.93	3.01	2.56	Dual: Sandwich	2.33
Dual: Children	3.83	2.95	2.45	Dual: Elder care	2.31
Dual: Sandwich	3.77	2.92	2.28	Dual: No dependents	1.69
Single: No dependents	3.61	2.83	2.21	Dual: Children	1.46
Dual: No dependents	3.58	2.78	2.04	Single: No dependents	1.3
Total sample: Women	3.75	2.9	2.29	Total sample: Women	1.99

Key: *W to F = Work to family interference*
F to W = Family to work interference

2. Impact of Lifecycle Stage: Age of Children at Home

Table C6: Sample Size for Lifecycle Stage (Age of Children in Home) Analysis

Age of Children at Home	% of Male Sample	% of Female Sample
All preschoolers (under 5)	27	24
All school-aged children (5 to 12)	38	41
All teenagers (between 12 and 20)	35	35

N for women = 3,118; N for men = 2,815

Table C7: Statistics for Age of Children in Home Analysis: Women

Dependent Variable	Adult Stage	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.950	.050	3.853	4.048
	2	3.934	.038	3.859	4.009
	3	3.888	.042	3.806	3.969
Work to family interference	1	3.015	.060	2.898	3.131
	2	3.077	.046	2.987	3.167
	3	3.017	.050	2.920	3.115
Family to work interference	1	2.902	.054	2.796	3.007
	2	2.806	.041	2.725	2.888
	3	2.523	.045	2.435	2.612
Caregiver strain	1	1.763	.061	1.643	1.882
	2	1.904	.047	1.812	1.996
	3	2.041	.051	1.941	2.141

1 = All children under 5 years

2 = Children 5 to 12 years

3 = Children between 12 and 20 years

Wilks' lambda 0.945, F = 7.91, $\alpha < 0.0001$

Note: Age of children in the home not associated with work-life conflict for men (Wilks' lambda 0.994, F = 0.66, $\alpha = 0.72$)

Table C8: Relationship Between Age of Children at Home and Work–Life Conflict: Women

Age of Children at Home	F to W	Caregiver Strain
All preschoolers (under 5)	2.9	1.76
All school-aged children (5 to 12)	2.81	1.9
All teenagers (between 12 and 20)	2.52	2.04
Total sample: Women	2.74	1.9

Key: *F to W = Family to work interference*

3. Impact of Family Type

Table C9: Sample Size for Family Type Analysis

Family Type	% of Male Sample	% of Female Sample
Single: No dependents	9	15
Single: Dependents	10	20
Dual income: No dependents	14	6
Dual income: Children	24	24
Dual income: Elder care	16	22
Dual income: Sandwich	15	12
Single breadwinners: Children	12	1

N for men = 5,767; N for women = 7,050

Table C10: Statistics for Family Type Analysis: Men

Dependent Variable	Family Type	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.300	0.078	3.147	3.453
	2	3.540	0.050	3.442	3.639
	3	3.379	0.082	3.219	3.540
	4	3.514	0.033	3.448	3.579
	5	3.590	0.041	3.509	3.671
	6	3.664	0.030	3.606	3.723
	7	3.560	0.048	3.466	3.653
Work to family interference	1	2.717	0.092	2.537	2.897
	2	3.003	0.059	2.888	3.119
	3	2.867	0.096	2.678	3.057
	4	2.984	0.039	2.907	3.061
	5	3.055	0.048	2.960	3.150
	6	3.112	0.035	3.043	3.180
	7	3.088	0.056	2.978	3.197
Family to work interference	1	2.041	0.080	1.884	2.199
	2	2.427	0.051	2.327	2.528
	3	2.025	0.084	1.860	2.191
	4	2.355	0.034	2.287	2.422
	5	2.245	0.042	2.163	2.328
	6	2.541	0.031	2.481	2.601
	7	2.314	0.049	2.218	2.410
Caregiver strain	1	1.569	0.079	1.414	1.724
	2	1.919	0.051	1.820	2.019
	3	1.469	0.083	1.306	1.631
	4	1.333	0.034	1.267	1.399
	5	2.096	0.042	2.014	2.178
	6	1.952	0.030	1.893	2.011
	7	1.726	0.048	1.631	1.820

1 = Single: No dependents
 2 = Single: Dependents
 3 = Dual: No dependents
 4 = Dual: Children
 5 = Dual: Elder
 6 = Dual: Sandwich
 7 = Traditional

Wilks' lambda 0.876, $F = 15.51$, $\alpha < 0.0001$

Table C11: Statistics for Family Type Analysis: Women

Dependent Variable	Family Type	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.476	0.059	3.359	3.592
	2	3.782	0.028	3.726	3.838
	3	3.600	0.054	3.493	3.707
	4	3.819	0.035	3.751	3.887
	5	3.770	0.028	3.715	3.824
	6	3.936	0.023	3.890	3.982
	7	3.696	0.112	3.477	3.916
Work to family interference	1	2.777	0.071	2.637	2.916
	2	2.908	0.034	2.841	2.974
	3	2.786	0.065	2.658	2.913
	4	2.932	0.041	2.851	3.013
	5	2.916	0.033	2.851	2.982
	6	3.010	0.028	2.955	3.065
	7	3.117	0.134	2.794	3.320
Family to work interference	1	2.031	0.066	1.904	2.160
	2	2.464	0.031	2.403	2.526
	3	2.029	0.060	1.911	2.147
	4	2.452	0.038	2.377	2.527
	5	2.176	0.031	2.116	2.236
	6	2.564	0.026	2.513	2.615
	7	2.300	0.124	2.058	2.542
Caregiver strain	1	1.066	0.071	1.926	2.206
	2	2.336	0.034	2.269	2.402
	3	1.678	0.065	1.550	1.806
	4	1.447	0.041	1.366	1.529
	5	2.324	0.033	2.259	2.390
	6	2.160	0.028	2.105	2.215
	7	2.054	0.134	1.791	2.317

1 = Single: No dependents
 2 = Single: Dependents
 3 = Dual: No dependents
 4 = Dual: Children
 5 = Dual: Elder
 6 = Dual: Sandwich
 7 = Non-traditional

Wilks' lambda 0.854, $F = 27.230$, $\alpha < 0.0001$

Table C12a: Relationship Between Family Type, Role Overload and Role Interference: Men

Family Type	Role Overload	W to F	Family Type	F to W
Dual: Sandwich	3.66	3.11	Dual: Sandwich	2.54
Dual: Elder care	3.59	3.06	Single: Dependents	2.43
Traditional	3.56	3.09	Dual: Children	2.36
Single: Dependents	3.54	3.00	Traditional	2.31
Dual: Children	3.51	2.98	Dual: Elder care	2.25
Dual: No dependents	3.38	2.87	Dual: No dependents	2.03
Single: No dependents	3.3	2.72	Single: No dependents	2.04
Total sample: Men	3.51	2.98	Total sample: Men	2.28

Key: *W to F* = Work to family interference
F to W = Family to work interference

Table C12b: Relationship Between Family Type and Caregiver Strain: Men

Family Type	Caregiver Strain
Dual: Elder care	2.1
Dual: Sandwich	1.95
Single: Dependents	1.92
Traditional	1.73
Single: No dependents	1.57
Dual: No dependents	1.47
Dual: Children	1.33
Total sample: Men	1.73

Table C13a: Relationship Between Family Type, Role Overload and Work to Family Interference: Women

Family Type	Role Overload	Family Type	W to F
Dual: Sandwich	3.94	Non-traditional	3.12
Dual: Children	3.82	Dual: Sandwich	3.01
Single: Dependents	3.78	Dual: Children	2.93
Dual: Elder care	3.77	Single: Dependents	2.91
Non-traditional	3.7	Dual: Elder care	2.92
Dual: No dependents	3.6	Dual: No dependents	2.79
Single: No dependents	3.48	Single: No dependents	2.78
Total sample: Women	3.73	Total sample: Women	2.91

Key: W to F = Work to family interference

Table C13b: Relationship Between Family Type, Family to Work Interference and Caregiver Strain: Women

Family Type	F to W	Family Type	Caregiver Strain
Dual: Sandwich	2.56	Single: Dependents	2.34
Dual: Children	2.45	Dual: Elder care	2.32
Single: Dependents	2.46	Dual: Sandwich	2.16
Non-traditional	2.3	Non-traditional	2.05
Dual: Elder care	2.18	Dual: No dependents	1.68
Dual: No dependents	2.03	Dual: Children	1.45
Single: No dependents	2.03	Single: No dependents	1.07
Total sample: Women	2.29	Total sample: Women	2.01

Key: F to W = Family to work interference

4. Impact of Community

Table C14: Statistics for Geographic Area Analysis

Dependent Variable	Geographic Area	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.805	0.108	3.594	4.017
	2	3.595	0.099	3.401	3.789
	3	3.755	0.053	3.651	3.858
	4	3.762	0.078	3.574	3.878
	5	3.833	0.103	3.631	4.034
Work to family interference	1	3.199	0.126	2.952	3.446
	2	2.663	0.116	2.436	2.890
	3	2.958	0.062	2.837	3.079
	4	3.289	0.091	3.111	3.466
	5	3.255	0.120	3.020	3.490
Family to work interference	1	2.267	0.116	2.040	2.494
	2	2.257	0.106	2.048	2.465
	3	2.464	0.057	2.353	2.575
	4	2.513	0.083	2.350	2.677
	5	2.479	0.110	2.263	2.696
Caregiver strain	1	2.069	0.124	1.825	2.312
	2	1.856	0.114	1.633	2.080
	3	1.881	0.061	1.762	2.000
	4	1.970	0.089	1.795	2.145
	5	1.812	0.118	1.580	2.043

N = 16,747

Key: 1 = Atlantic Provinces
 2 = Quebec
 3 = Ontario
 4 = Prairies
 5 = British Columbia

Note: Information on sample size, etc., can be found in Duxbury and Higgins. (2003). *Where to Work in Canada? An Examination of Regional Differences in Work–Life Practices* (see Appendix A).

Key Statistics from This Analysis

1. Three-Way Interaction Term

- While the region of the country X rural/urban X population size of the community was significant, the follow-up tests determined that none of the measures of work–life conflict was significantly associated with this interaction term.

2. Two-Way Interaction Terms

- Population of the community X rural/urban status: Wilks' lambda 0.997, $F = 1.06$, $\alpha = 0.39$
- Region of the country X population of the community: Wilks' lambda 0.997, $F = 1.03$, $\alpha = 0.42$
- Region of the country X rural/urban status: Wilks' lambda 0.996, $F = 1.83$, $\alpha = 0.02$

3. Main Effects

- Rural/urban area: Wilks' lambda 0.999, $F = 1.28$, $\alpha = 0.28$
- Population of the community: Wilks' lambda 0.997, $F = 1.06$, $\alpha = 0.39$
- Region of the country: Wilks' lambda 0.994, $F = 2.58$, $\alpha = 0.002$

4. Control Variables

- Both of the control variables included in this analysis (i.e. job type and gender) were significantly associated with work–life conflict at a significance level of 0.0001.

Table C15: Statistics for Region of the Country by Urban/Rural Analysis

Dependent Variable	Geographic Area	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1 Rural	3.912	0.210	3.500	4.324
	1 Urban	3.699	0.048	3.605	3.792
	2 Rural	3.706	0.197	3.319	4.093
	2 Urban	3.502	0.077	3.351	3.654
	3 Rural	3.776	0.032	3.569	3.963
	3 Urban	3.743	0.032	3.681	3.806
	4 Rural	3.833	0.164	3.512	4.154
	4 Urban	3.637	0.040	3.559	3.715
	5 Rural	3.782	0.164	3.343	4.221
	5 Urban	3.858	0.106	3.650	4.066
Work to family interference	1 Rural	3.340	0.245	2.859	3.821
	1 Urban	3.057	0.056	2.948	3.167
	2 Rural	2.675	0.230	2.224	3.127
	2 Urban	2.653	0.090	2.475	2.830
	3 Rural	2.938	0.117	2.708	3.169
	3 Urban	2.978	0.037	2.905	3.050
	4 Rural	3.628	0.191	3.253	4.002
	4 Urban	3.006	0.047	2.915	3.098
	5 Rural	3.389	0.261	2.877	3.902
	5 Urban	3.188	0.124	2.945	3.431
Family to work interference	1 Rural	2.188	0.226	1.754	2.630
	1 Urban	2.347	0.051	2.246	2.448
	2 Rural	2.283	0.212	1.868	2.699
	2 Urban	2.234	0.083	2.071	2.397
	3 Rural	2.516	0.108	2.304	2.728
	3 Urban	2.411	0.034	2.344	2.478
	4 Rural	2.704	0.176	2.359	3.049
	4 Urban	2.354	0.043	2.270	2.438
	5 Rural	2.073	0.240	1.601	2.544
	5 Urban	2.683	0.114	2.459	2.906
Caregiver strain	1 Rural	2.230	0.242	1.756	2.704
	1 Urban	1.907	0.055	1.799	2.015
	2 Rural	1.863	0.227	1.418	2.308
	2 Urban	1.851	0.089	1.677	2.026
	3 Rural	1.777	0.116	1.550	2.004
	3 Urban	1.985	0.036	1.914	2.057
	4 Rural	2.085	0.188	1.715	2.454
	4 Urban	1.874	0.046	1.784	1.064
	5 Rural	1.472	0.257	0.967	1.977
	5 Urban	1.982	0.122	1.743	2.221

Key as shown with Table C14

5. Impact of Sector of Employment

Table C16: Sample Size for Analysis of Sector of Employment

Sector of Employment	% of Male Sample	% of Female Sample
Public	56	47
Private	16	18
Not for profit	28	35

N for women = 9,271; N for men = 7,541

Table C17: Statistics for Analysis of Sector of Employment

Dependent Variable	Sector of employment	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Levels	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Role overload	1	3.675	0.013	3.649	3.701
	2	3.594	0.023	3.548	3.640
	3	3.755	0.017	3.721	3.789
Work to family interference	1	2.894	0.016	2.863	2.925
	2	2.922	0.028	2.867	2.976
	3	3.132	0.021	3.091	3.172
Family to work interference	1	2.445	0.014	2.416	2.473
	2	2.360	0.025	2.310	2.410
	3	2.295	0.019	2.258	2.332
Caregiver strain	1	1.930	0.015	1.900	1.961
	2	1.870	0.027	1.816	1.923
	3	1.881	0.020	1.842	1.921

Key: 1 = Public
2 = Private
3 = Not for profit

Key Statistics from This Analysis

1. Interaction Term

- Gender by sector of employment: Wilks' lambda 0.999, $F = 0.63$, $\alpha = 0.75$

2. Main Effects

- Gender: Wilks' lambda 0.94, $F = 122.53$, $\alpha < 0.0001$
- Sector of employment: Wilks' lambda 0.95, $F = 25.99$, $\alpha < 0.0001$

3. Control Variables

- Job type was significantly associated with work-life conflict at a significance level of 0.0001.

Table C18: Relationship Between Sector of Employment and Work-Life Conflict

Sector	Role Overload	Sector of Employment	W to F	Sector of Employment	F to W
Not for profit	3.76	Not for profit	3.13	Public	2.45
Public	3.68	Private	2.92	Private	2.36
Private	3.59	Public	2.89	Not for profit	2.3
Total sample	3.67	Total sample	2.99	Total sample	2.37

Key: *W to F = Work to family interference*
F to W = Family to work interference

Appendix D

Impact of Characteristics of Work on Work–Life Conflict

Table D1: Regression Results: Role Overload

Regression: $R^2 = 0.013$ $F = 37.37$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Supervise the work of others	0.091	12.47	<0.0001
Years with the organization	0.022	5.4	0.002
Union member	0.033	12.2	<0.0001
Contract (1) or permanent (2)	-0.049	1.62	<0.0001

Table D2: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference

Regression: $R^2 = 0.046$ $F = 12.80$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Work arrangement (1 = regular, 2 = flextime)	0.029	4.12	0.003		
Work shifts (1 = no, 2 = yes)	0.106	14.97	<0.0001	0.194	2
Supervise the work of others (1 = no, 2 = yes)	0.151	21.27	<0.0001	0.555	1
Years with the organization	0.031	4.49	<0.0001		
Union member (1 = no, 2 = yes)	-0.044	-6.28	<0.0001	0.083	3
Employment status (1 = full time, 2 = part time)	-0.054	-7.28	<0.0001		
Contract (1) or permanent (2)	-0.041	-5.83	<0.0001		

Table D3: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference

Regression: $R^2 = 0.004$ $F = 2.20$ $\alpha = 0.008$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Work arrangement (1 = regular, 2 = flextime)	0.032	4.43	<0.0001
Work shifts (1 = no, 2 = yes)	-0.017	-2.43	0.02
Union member (1 = no, 2 = yes)	0.018	2.44	0.01
Employment status (1 = full time, 2 = part time)	0.036	4.79	<0.0001
Contract (1) or permanent (2)	-0.036	-4.96	<0.0001

Table D4: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain

Regression: $R^2 = 0.006$ $F = 5.54$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Time with organization	0.042	3.28	0.001
Union member	0.049	3.71	<0.0001

Appendix E

Impact of Socio-economic Status on Work-Life Conflict

Table E1: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.016$ $F = 30.45$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Education	0.036	3.26	0.001
Income	0.075	5.19	0.001
Family income	0.007	0.54	0.59
Job type 1	-0.035	-3.04	0.002
Job type 2	-0.041	-3.55	0.001

Table E2: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women

Regression: $R^2 = 0.022$ $F = 55.59$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Income	0.108	9.39	<0.0001
Job type 1	-0.025	-2.72	0.007
Job type 2	-0.057	-5.19	<0.0001

Table E3: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.045$ $F = 88.73$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Education	-0.036	-2.71	0.007		
Income	0.209	14.56	<0.0001	0.93	1
Family income	-0.032	-2.32	0.02		
Job type 1	-0.053	-4.74	<0.0001		
Job type 2	-0.05	-4.23	<0.0001		

Table E4: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.077$ $F = 209.62$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Education	-0.002	-0.25	0.81		
Income	0.224	20.05	<0.0001	0.76	1
Family income	-0.023	-2.27	0.02		
Job type 1	-0.044	-4.84	<0.0001		
Job type 2	-0.111	-10.4	<0.0001	0.27	2

Table E5: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.008$ $F = 14.39$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Education	0.078	6.74	<0.0001
Income	-0.05	-3.43	0.001

Table E6: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – Women

Regression: $R^2 = 0.007$ $F = 17.19$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Education	0.078	3.71	<0.0001
Family income	0.054	5.03	<0.0001

Table E7: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.005$ $F = 3.22$ $\alpha = 0.002$

None of the socio-economic indicators was a significant predictor of caregiver strain for men.

Table E8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – Women

Regression: $R^2 = 0.012$ $F = 10.54$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Family income	-0.107	-5.62	<0.0001
Job type 1	-0.049	-2.96	0.003

Appendix F

Impact of Work and Non-Work Demands on Work–Life Conflict

1. Work Demands

Table F1: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.134$ $F = 35.24$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week commuting	0.052	3.02	<0.0001		
Total hours in work per week	0.097	5.16	0.003	0.12	2
Hours per week in SWAH	0.061	3.42	<0.0001	0.1	4
Hours work paid overtime per month	0.096	5.4	0.001		
Hours work unpaid overtime per month	0.237	12.2	<0.0001	0.55	1
Week nights per month away from home on work	0.031	1.62	0.11		
Weekend nights per month away from home on work	0.006	0.29	0.77		
Hours per month spent driving to client sites	0.039	2.22	0.03		
Supervise the work of others	0.092	4.89	<0.0001	0.11	3
More than one job for pay	0.082	4.16	<0.0001		
Job type 1	0.003	0.18	0.86		
Job type 2	0.022	1.2	0.23		
Hours per week spent in educational activities	-0.01	-0.61	0.54		

Key: SWAH = *Supplemental work at home*

Table F2: Regression Results: Role Overload – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.085$ $F = 17.41$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week commuting	0.126	6.36	<0.0001	0.16	2
Total hours in work per week	0.061	2.96	<0.0001	0.1	4
Hours per week in SWAH	0.036	1.72	0.003		
Hours work paid overtime per month	0.048	2.4	0.09		
Hours work unpaid overtime per month	0.177	8.16	<0.0001	0.49	1
Week nights per month away from home on work	0.098	4.04	<0.0001	0.11	3
Weekend nights per month away from home on work	0.028	1.07	0.29	0.15	2
Hours per month spent driving to client sites	0.002	0.11	0.91		
Supervise the work of others	-0.003	-0.13	0.9		
More than one job for pay	0.02	0.85	0.4		
Job type 1	-0.031	-1.54	0.13		
Job type 2	-0.036	-1.75	0.08		
Hours per week spent in educational activities	-0.041	-2.11	0.04		

Key: SWAH = *Supplemental work at home*

Table F3: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.206$ $F = 58.85$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week commuting	0.036	2.17	0.03		
Total hours in work per week	0.129	7.14	<0.0001	0.15	3
Hours per week in SWAH	0.102	5.96	<0.0001	0.1	4
Hours work paid overtime per month	0.105	6.21	<0.0001		
Hours work unpaid overtime per month	0.237	12.73	<0.0001	0.39	1
Week nights per month away from home on work	0.096	5.16	<0.0001	0.1	5
Weekend nights per month away from home on work	0.114	5.59	<0.0001	0.15	2
Hours per month spent driving to client sites	0.023	1.34	0.18		
Supervise the work of others	0.079	4.35	<0.0001		
More than one job for pay	0.028	1.5	0.134		
Job type 1	0.039	2.17	0.03		
Job type 2	0.031	1.8	0.07		
Hours per week spent in educational activities	0.005	0.34	0.75		

Key: SWAH = *Supplemental work at home*

Table F4: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.196$ $F = 45.41$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week commuting	0.104	5.58	<0.0001		
Total hours in work per week	0.067	3.47	<0.0001	0.1	5
Hours per week in SWAH	0.07	3.62	0.001	0.1	4
Hours work paid overtime per month	0.097	5.11	<0.0001		
Hours work unpaid overtime per month	0.21	10.32	<0.0001	0.34	1
Week nights per month away from home on work	0.159	7.00	<0.0001	0.18	3
Weekend nights per month away from home on work	0.134	5.35	<0.0001	0.21	2
Hours per month spent driving to client sites	-0.011	-0.56	0.58		
Supervise the work of others	0.042	2.12	0.03		
More than one job for pay	-0.016	-0.73	0.47		
Job type 1	-0.031	-1.61	0.11		
Job type 2	-0.034	-1.74	0.08		
Hours per week spent in educational activities	-0.038	-2.04	0.04		

Key: SWAH = Supplemental work at home

Table F5: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.01$ $F = 2.20$ $\alpha = 0.008$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Total hours in work per week	-0.041	-2.15	0.03
More than one job for pay	0.087	4.11	<0.0001

Table F6: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.013$ $F = 2.53$ $\alpha = 0.002$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Weekend nights per month away from home on work	-0.041	-2.2	0.03

Table F7: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.03$ $F = 2.57$ $\alpha = 0.002$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Total hours in work per week	-0.075	-2.13	0.03
Hours work unpaid overtime per month	0.106	2.93	0.003
Job type 1	0.079	2.25	0.03
Job type 2	0.102	3.02	0.003

Table F8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.042$ $F = 2.53$ $\alpha = 0.002$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Total hours in work per week	-0.080	-2.26	0.03	0.238	2
Hours per week in SWAH	0.151	3.93	<0.0001	0.501	1
Hours work paid overtime per month	0.098	2.66	0.008	0.093	3

2. Non-Work Demands

Table F9: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.038$ $F = 6.36$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Hours per week in home chores	0.61	2.14	0.03
Hours per week in leisure	-0.168	-6.14	<0.0001
Hours per week in volunteer activities	0.091	3.34	0.001

Table F10: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women

Regression: $R^2 = 0.041$ $F = 7.51$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Hours per week in home chores	0.61	2.44	0.01
Hours per week in leisure	-0.174	-6.45	<0.0001

Table F11: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.038$ $F = 6.48$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Hours per week in leisure	-0.135	-4.93	<0.0001
Hours per week in volunteer activities	0.059	2.16	0.03
Responsibility for child care (high score = partner does)	0.094	3.35	0.001

Table F12: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – Women

Regression: $R^2 = 0.027$ $F = 4.86$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α
Hours per week in leisure	-0.140	-5.21	<0.0001

Table F13: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.064$ $F = 11.65$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week in home chores	0.042	1.45	0.137		
Hours per week in child care	0.069	2.54	0.01	0.232	2
Hours per week in elder care	0.111	4.04	<0.0001	0.179	4
Hours per week in leisure	-0.121	-4.49	<0.0001	0.23	3
Hours per week in volunteer activities	0.008	0.37	0.76		
Responsibility for child care	-0.139	-5.00	<0.0001	0.25	1
Responsibility for elder care	-0.025	-0.87	0.38		

Table F14: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.078$ $F = 14.05$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week in home chores	0.035	1.31	0.19		
Hours per week in child care	0.169	6.29	<0.0001	0.5	1
Hours per week in elder care	0.108	4.06	<0.0001	0.13	3
Hours per week in leisure	-0.097	-3.11	<0.0001	0.19	2
Hours per week in volunteer activities	0.002	0.07	0.95		
Responsibility for child care	-0.059	-2.11	0.03	0.1	4
Responsibility for elder care	-0.073	-2.63	0.009		

Table F15: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.156$ $F = 26.06$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week in home chores	-0.028	-0.98	0.33		
Hours per week in child care	-0.024	-0.084	0.41		
Hours per week in elder care	0.354	12.62	<0.0001	0.85	1
Hours per week in leisure	-0.123	-9.9	<0.0001		
Hours per week in volunteer activities	0.016	0.57	0.57		
Responsibility for child care	-0.016	-0.58	0.57		
Responsibility for elder care	-0.086	-3.01	0.003	0.1	2

Table F16: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.127$ $F = 22.14$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Hours per week in home chores	-0.006	-0.2	0.84		
Hours per week in child care	-0.089	-3.16	0.002	0.1	3
Hours per week in elder care	0.31	11.14	<0.0001	0.796	1
Hours per week in leisure	-0.059	-2.14	0.03		
Hours per week in volunteer activities	-0.002	-0.8	0.42		
Responsibility for child care	0.038	1.34	0.18		
Responsibility for elder care	-0.118	-4.14	<0.0001	0.14	2

Appendix G

Impact of Characteristics of Work Culture on Work–Life Conflict

Table GI: Regression Results: Role Overload – Men

Regression: $R^2 = 0.198$ $F = 146.39$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	0.03	2.66	0.008		
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	-0.115	-9.34	<0.0001	0.26	1
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.025	-1.5	0.13		
Managers supportive of balance	-0.008	-0.06	0.55		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.002	-0.21	0.83		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.157	13.01	<0.0001	0.24	2
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	-0.019	-1.44	0.15		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.026	2.00	0.05		
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.084	6.4	<0.0001	0.13	4
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	0.037	2.54	0.01		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	0.117	9.38	<0.0001	0.18	3
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	-0.056	-4.68	<0.0001		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.009	0.71	0.5		

Table G2: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.349$ $F = 320.01$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	0.846	8.41	<0.0001		
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	-0.186	-12.44	<0.0001	0.27	1
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.072	-4.46	<0.0001	0.1	5
Managers supportive of balance	-0.14	-1.11	0.27		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.14	-1.77	0.05		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.19	17.53	<0.0001	0.22	2
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	-0.073	-6.02	<0.0001		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.054	4.63	<0.0001	0.12	4
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.107	9.06	<0.0001		
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	0.072	6.62	<0.0001		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	0.116	10.29	<0.0001	0.13	3
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	-0.05	-4.64	<0.0001		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.013	1.18	0.24		

Table G3: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.078$ $F = 50.38$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	-0.019	-1.56	0.11		
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	0.054	3.01	0.003		
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.022	-1.21	0.23		
Managers supportive of balance	-0.019	-1.28	0.22		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.016	4.39	0.2		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.057	4.39	<0.0001	0.12	3
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	-0.005	-0.38	0.71		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.083	5.98	<0.0001	0.22	2
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.198	14.04	<0.0001	0.65	1
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	0.024	1.81	0.07		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	-0.004	-2.72	0.79		
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	0.019	-1.51	0.13		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.013	2.36	0.02		

Table G4: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – MenRegression: $R^2 = 0.028$ $F = 5.52$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.084	3.81	0.001		

This is the only item that had a significant β co-efficient.**Table G5: Regression Results: Role Overload – Women**Regression: $R^2 = 0.171$ $F = 161.51$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	0.033	3.38	0.001		
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	-0.132	-8.83	<0.0001	0.26	1
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.046	-3.03	0.003	0.1	5
Managers supportive of balance	-0.005	-0.39	0.69		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.029	-2.83	0.005		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.103	9.56	<0.0001	0.16	3
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	-0.021	-1.74	0.08		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.041	3.43	0.001		
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.075	6.12	<0.0001	0.12	4
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	-0.003	-0.23	0.82		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	0.109	10.45	<0.0001	0.17	2
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	-0.036	-3.44	0.001		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.026	2.38	0.02		

Table G6: Regression Results: Work to Family Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.330$ $F = 388.16$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	0.105	12.2	<0.0001	0.1	5
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	-0.174	-13.01	<0.0001	0.23	1
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.059	-4.08	<0.0001		
Managers supportive of balance	-0.025	-2.2	0.06		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.047	-5.12	<0.0001		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.189	19.57	<0.0001	0.23	2
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	-0.083	-7.86	<0.0001		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.045	4.19	<0.0001	0.12	4
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.084	7.77	<0.0001	0.1	3
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	0.038	3.89	<0.0001		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	0.085	9.05	<0.0001		
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	-0.038	-4.13	<0.0001		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.023	2.34	0.09		

Table G7: Regression Results: Family to Work Interference – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.089$ $F = 76.76$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Able to refuse overtime	-0.019	-1.86	0.06		
Organization promotes environment that supports balance	-0.021	1.35	0.17		
Organization's policies are supportive of employee	-0.052	-3.26	0.001	0.1	4
Managers supportive of balance	0.023	1.69	0.09		
Co-workers supportive of balance	-0.036	-3.35	0.001		
If unable to work long hours would limit career adv.	0.073	6.5	<0.0001	0.16	2
Manager gives flexibility to arrange schedule	0.029	2.28	0.02		
Leave of absence for family reasons would limit adv.	0.059	4.65	<0.0001	0.15	3
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.208	16.44	<0.0001	0.66	1
There are open and respectful discussions on balance	-0.01	-8.62	0.39		
It is not acceptable to say no to more work	-0.034	-3.07	0.002		
Feel comfortable using the supports that are available	0.008	-0.77	0.42		
Organization does not support the use of policies	0.028	2.42	0.02		

Table G8: Regression Results: Caregiver Strain – WomenRegression: $R^2 = 0.022$ $F = 5.97$ $\alpha < 0.0001$

Predictor (Item)	Standardized β	t	α	Pratt	Rank
Family responsibilities make it difficult to advance	0.076	3.93	0.001		

This is the only item that had a significant β co-efficient.