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ABSTRACT

Managing paid work alongside other parts of life has been the focus of research since the 1960s. The terminology has evolved and reflected the changing social, economic and workplace developments and issues that have occurred over the decades, with the work-life balance discourse beginning in the 1990s. Despite the exponential growth in work-life balance research and practice in recent years, the concept remains underdeveloped. The field is hindered by a lack of solid theoretical models and the absence of a psychometrically sound measure of work-life balance. In addition, very few studies have explored the factors that relate to the achievement of successful work-life balance.

This research addresses the limitations identified above and is guided by a relevant framework that incorporates two complementary lines of scholarship – demands-and-resources theory and work-family interface theory. An integrated conceptualisation and theoretical model of work-life balance is proposed to answer the research questions: How do personal and environmental characteristics contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance and to its consequences? and What are the strategies used by individuals who perceive themselves as having successful work-life balance? Consideration is given to the various aspects of work-life balance: personal and environmental contributing factors (demands and resources), work-family interface indicators (conflict and facilitation), the measurement of perceived work-life balance and its relationship with a range of consequences for individuals and organisations (wellbeing, mental health, satisfaction and performance).
The legal profession consists of a body of men and women who find achieving a satisfactory relationship between their work and personal lives to be very challenging because of the demands of their occupation. Research conducted in Australia in 2007 found that lawyers experience the highest incidence of depressive symptoms and as a result the issue of work-life balance, health and wellbeing is on the legal profession’s business agenda. The Work-life Balance Survey was developed for this study and, through collaboration with the Queensland Law Society, the survey was made available online to law society members practising in the state of Queensland, Australia. A total of 326 respondents participated in the study. The data from the survey were analysed using qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The current research makes a useful contribution to the work-life field. This study is one of the few to integrate multiple levels of analysis (personal and contextual variables); to use a validated measure of work-life balance; to distinguish perceived work-life balance from the concepts of conflict and facilitation and to explore the factors that contribute to successfully achieving the perception of work-life balance. In addition, this research adds to the limited body of Australian work-life literature.

The results shed light on a range of personal, interpersonal and organisational characteristics that hinder or enable perceived work-life balance, recognising that achieving work-life balance is a case of joint and several stakeholder responsibility. The perception of work-life balance was found to be a significant predictor of a range of important outcomes, including life, job and career satisfaction, the intention to remain in
the legal profession, general wellbeing, mental health and self-rated performance. While several gender differences were found, both men and women were seen to be active agents in the creation of successful work-life balance and an opportunity was provided to gain valuable insight into the differences between individuals reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance, compared to those reporting lower levels. This thesis discusses the implications of these findings and suggests avenues for further research to inform individuals and organisations whose aim it is to successfully meet the challenge of balancing the domains of work and home.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Research

The concept of work-life balance has generated much interest in the academic, applied and popular literature (Bailyn 1993; Drago 2007; Gregory & Milner 2009; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007; Halpern & Murphy 2005; Lewis & Cooper 2005; Lewis, Gambles & Rapoport 2007). Reviews of the work-life field and the work-family research agenda indicate how research has evolved against a backdrop of ongoing social and workplace change (Abbott & De Cieri 2008; Cooper & Jackson 1997; Drago 2007; Harrington 2007; Lewis & Cooper 1999). Global, national and local changes continue to affect both work and personal life and their interaction. For example, there are more women in the paid workforce (Bardoel, De Cieri & Santos 2008; Strachan 2010). Also, technology has led to the blurring of the work-life boundaries enabling employees to work at any time and anywhere, thus contributing to the issue of excessive work hours (Blinn-Pike 2009; Fenner & Renn 2010). Further, organisations are outsourcing tasks and adopting the approach of ‘doing more with less’ and, together with an increase in part-time, casual and non-permanent work, this has led to job insecurity and increasing workload expectations of employees (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008; Blyton, Blunsdon, Reed & Dastmalchian 2006; Harrington 2007; Lewis & Cooper 1999; Lewis & Cooper 2005; Lewis et al. 2007; Perry-Jenkins, Repetti & Crouter 2000).

The afore-mentioned factors potentially impact upon all employees regardless of their marital or family status. However, the growing diversity of family structures represented
in the workforce – dual-earner couples, single parents, blended families and employees with responsibility for child-care and elder-care as well as ‘the sandwiched-generation’ (those with responsibility for both older and younger dependants) – has heightened the relevance of balancing work and family roles for a substantial segment of employed men and women (Duxbury, Lyons & Higgins 2007; Halpern 2005; Neal & Hammer 2007). The work-family interface has thus become an area of immense importance, personally, professionally and socially as we seek better ways to manage the demands of our work and personal lives (Bardoel et al. 2006; Heraty, Morley & Cleveland 2008; Pocock 2003).

While much of the research has taken place in Western societies, as other societies experience socio-demographic changes, the field is becoming increasingly multi- and cross-cultural (e.g., Hill, Yang, Hawkins & Ferris 2004b; Joplin, Shaffer, Francesco & Lau 2003a; Lirio, Lituchy, Monserrat, Olivas-Lujan, Duffy, Fox, Gregory, Punnett & Santos 2007; Lu, Cooper, Kao, Chang, Allen, Lapierre, O’Driscoll, Poelmans, Sanchez & Spector 2010; Mortazavi, Pedhiwala, Shafiro & Hammer 2009). A number of studies now involve participants from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds, for example: Albanian (Karatepe & Bakteshi 2008); Chinese (Lu, Siu, Spector & Shi 2009); Dutch (van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009); Finnish (Kinnunen & Mauno 1998); German (Beham & Drobnič 2010; Weigl, Hornung, Parker, Petru, Glaser & Angerer 2010); Greek (Nikandrou, Panayotopoulos & Aspospori 2008); Hispanic (Taylor, Delcampo & Blancero 2009); Iranian (Karimi 2009; Karimi & Nouri 2009); Irish (Montgomery, Panagopoulos, Peeters & Schaufeli 2009); Latino (Grzywacz, Arcury, Marin, Carrillo, Burke, Coates & Quandt 2007); Norwegian (Innstrand, Langballe, Espnes, Aasland &
Falkum 2010), Swiss (Wiese, Seiger, Schmid & Freund 2010) and Taiwanese (Wu, Chang & Zhuang 2010).

In Australia, a variety of stakeholders, including politicians, unions, academics, business consultants and leaders and the media have taken an interest in work-family and work-life issues (Baird & Williamson 2010; Bardoel et al. 2008; Waterhouse & Colley 2010). According to Colley (2010) “work-life balance is one of the leading contemporary issues in the Australian employment environment, driven by both employee demands and employer desire to attract employees in a tight labour market” (Colley 2010, p. 214).

Nevertheless, despite an increase in stakeholder interest and the international growth in research and practice over the past five decades, a number of theoretical and methodological limitations have led to significant gaps in our knowledge and, as a result, the work-life balance concept still remains under-developed (Carlson, Grzywacz & Zivnuska 2009; Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood & Lambert 2007; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley 2005; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Heraty et al. 2008; Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002; Voydanoff 2005b).

Work-life research spans the boundaries of numerous disciplines such as: sociology; psychology; industrial and organisational behaviour; career development and vocational behaviour; occupational health; personnel and human resource development; management; labour economics; industrial relations; demography; gender, marriage and family studies (Drago & Kashian 2003). Given the breadth of the research, it is not surprising that the field is hindered by the following: the lack of consensus over
terminology and an agreed definition of work-life balance (Guest 2002; Kalliath & Brough 2008a, 2008b; Lewis, Rapoport & Gamble 2003; Reiter 2007; Zedeck 1992); the lack of solid theoretical models; and the absence of a psychometrically sound measure of work-life balance (Barnett 1998; Carlson et al. 2009; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007). In addition, despite this breadth, very few studies have explored the factors that relate to the achievement of successful work-life balance (Haddock, Ziemba, Zimmerman & Current 2001; Haddock, Zimmerman, Ziemba & Lyness 2006; Milkie & Peltola 1999; Valcour 2007; Wiersma 1994).

This situation has led to calls for increased methodological sophistication, a move toward providing more precise conceptual definitions and constructs and the development of new, more inclusive theoretical models that reflect the changing landscape of the workplace, individuals and families in the 21st century (Barnett & Hyde 2001; Heraty et al. 2008; Kalliath & Brough 2008a, 2008b; Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002).

According to Way (1991, p. 1), “research and development efforts in work-family relationships will be most effective if they are based upon carefully considered and well formulated theoretical and conceptual frameworks”. The intention of the current research is to contribute to the understanding of the work-life balance construct by unifying established, yet fragmented, research under a single theoretical and empirical framework. As suggested by Guest (2001), for research on work-life balance to be of value we need to incorporate an analysis of causes and consequences. The focus of this thesis is, therefore, on understanding how personal and contextual factors act as either enablers or barriers and thus contribute to an individual's perception of work-life balance, together
with the resultant impact upon their job, career and life satisfaction, wellbeing and work performance.

1.2 Research Questions and Objectives

The principal research question (RQ) in this study is:

**RQ1** How do personal and contextual factors contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance and to its consequences?

A second research question in this study is:

**RQ2** What are the strategies used by individuals who perceive themselves as having successful work-life balance?

The current research is underpinned by four central research objectives (RO):

**RO1:** To identify the key personal and contextual enablers (resources) and barriers (demands) that contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance, specifically:

- **RO1a:** Environmental demands (work and non-work);
- **RO1b:** Environmental resources (work and non-work);
- **RO1c:** Personal demands and resources (such as personality traits, coping style and strategies).
RO2: To develop an integrated conceptual framework and theoretical model of work-life balance based on the outcomes of Research Objective 1 above, to guide empirical analysis.

RO3: To analyse the relationships among perceived work-life balance, its antecedents, indicators and consequences.

RO4: To explore the factors that differentiate individuals reporting perceptions of higher levels of work-life balance from those who report perceptions of lower levels of work-life balance.

The propositions formulated to describe the assumed relationships between the latent constructs at the conceptual level (Bacharach 1989) and designed to investigate the research questions are outlined in Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis.

1.3 Justification for the Research

In 1993, renowned pioneer researcher, Lotte Bailyn, acknowledged that while there is no blue-print for work-life balance, it is important to assist employers and employees jointly in finding ways to accommodate the needs and personal concerns of individuals, in a manner consistent with their particular circumstances. More than a decade later, contemporary Australian researchers De Cieri, Holmes, Abbott and Pettit (2005, p. 92) concur with Bailyn (1993), stating that in order to attract, motivate and retain highly-valued employees “there is a need for organizations in the current business environment to adopt HR strategies and policies that accommodate the work/life needs of a diverse
workforce” (De Cieri et al. 2005). However, in Australia there is limited work-life research available to inform policy and practice (Pocock, Skinner & Williams 2008).

In particular, the issues of work-life balance are salient for the legal profession in Australia. The legal profession consists of a body of working men and women who, because of the demands of their occupation, find achieving a satisfactory relationship between their work and personal lives to be very challenging which has consequences for their health and wellbeing (Wallace 2005; 2002; 1999). The literature on the legal profession strongly indicates that work demands are major sources of stress for members of the legal profession which often lead to work interfering with their non-work life (Abramson & Franklin 1986; Brainbridge 1989; Brockman 1992; Dart 1988; Kaye 1988; Wallace 2005, 1999).

The Annual Professions Study is the largest independent research project in Australia, made possible through collaboration between a range of industry groups associations, professional service firms and a research consultancy (Beaton Consulting 2007). The 2007 study examined issues of health and wellbeing for people in the professional and business community. The survey found that professionals and students experience more depressive symptoms than the general population. When comparisons between the professions were made, lawyers were found to experience the highest incidence of depressive symptoms, followed by attorneys. It was also found that respondents from law firms were the most likely to use alcohol or other drugs as coping strategies (Beaton Consulting 2007). As a result, the issue of work-life balance, coping strategies and health and wellbeing is on the Australian legal profession’s business agenda. An examination of
the legal profession will provide the opportunity to tap into the positive as well as the negative aspects of managing the work-life interface.

While this research is concerned with the legal profession for the reasons cited above, in broad terms the reasons for undertaking this research are to make contributions to knowledge, theory and practice in the area of work-life balance and to provide insights into successfully managing the work and personal life interface in a way that will prove of value to individuals and organisations alike. To that end, this thesis proposes an integrated conceptualisation of work-life balance together with a theoretical model based on a carefully considered framework that incorporates two complementary lines of scholarship: demands-and-resources theory and work-family interface theory.

Furthermore, a range of limitations identified in the current research theory and methodology will be explored providing insights into the specific knowledge gaps identified below.

1.3.1 Research focus

First, the main limitation of previous research lies in the fact that the challenges associated with managing work and family roles have been studied under the rubric of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985; Lapierre & Allen 2006). The ‘conflict perspective’ has dominated the research on work-family dynamics for the past thirty years (Ford, Heinen & Langkamer 2007; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Greenhaus & Powell 2006).
While much is known about the challenges and the effects of lack of work-life balance, too little is known about how to improve it (Bailyn 1993; Baltes & Heydens-Gahir 2003; Kossek & Lambert 2005; Jones, Burke & Westman 2006). The previous focus on work-family conflict and its negative consequences has left a gap in our knowledge with regard to how we might successfully manage our multiple roles and responsibilities (Eby et al. 2005; Greenhaus & Powell 2006).

More recent research has begun to investigate the positive effects of combining work and non-work roles as discussed in Chapter 2. However, as noted by Moen, Kelly and Huang (2008, p. 415), work-family scholars still have “no single overriding theory of actual conditions predicting positive or negative work-family spillover and conflict”. For this reason, the current research has included both sides of the equation with a view to gaining a better understanding of the antecedents and indicators of work-life balance.

In addition, this study is based upon the assumption that solving the problem, that is, the difficulty of successfully balancing work and home life, is best accomplished by learning about those circumstances in which the problem is less present, rather than by continuing to explore the problem itself (Gottman 1999; Haddock et al. 2001; Wallerstein & Blakeslee 1995). Thus, the current study moves the research focus away from conflict to learning more about the effective strategies used to improve the perception of work-life balance. The intention is for these insights to be of benefit to individuals and to the broader professional and business community.
1.3.2 Analytical approach

Second, this study addresses the criticism that previous research has usually taken place at only one level of analysis, either at the individual, inter-personal, organisational or societal level (Eby et al. 2005; Zedeck 1993; Zedeck & Mosier 1990). Eby et al. (2005) urged researchers to pay greater attention to the role of individual differences in understanding how people experience work and home domains. Similarly, Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) noted the disproportional emphasis on environmental and situational characteristics and the relative neglect of individual differences and psychological characteristics as contributing factors. They suggested the need to incorporate relevant environmental and individual variables within a single study, in order to broaden our understanding of the complex work-life phenomenon.

The current research has taken up this call by considering individual (e.g., personality traits, coping style and strategies); inter-personal (e.g., spouse/partner support) and organisational (e.g., work-life balance benefits) characteristics as antecedents that potentially impact upon an individual’s capacity to achieve work-life balance. These characteristics may be categorised as either demands or resources. Demands are defined as structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations and norms to which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or mental effort (Voydanoff 2004). Resources are defined as structural or psychological assets that may be used to help performance, reduce demands or generate additional resources (Voydanoff 2004). For example, a person with a heavy workload and family
commitments (demands) on the one hand, may also have a high level of support from his or her manager and spouse (resources) on the other hand.

The benefit of analysing individual, inter-personal and organisational antecedent characteristics together in the current study is the opportunity to investigate their relative importance which has been lacking in previous research.

1.3.3 Theoretical approach

Third, in this study, Guest’s (2002) approach has been adopted, where ‘work’ is defined as paid employment and ‘life’ includes everything else outside of work (that is, non-work), incorporating personal, home, and family related issues. However, rather than conceptualising work and life as two separate spheres that have to be juggled, the current research joins the shift towards viewing work and personal life as interactive and overlapping (Lewis et al. 2003; Moen & Yu 2000). The relationship is seen as bi-directional – work affects our life outside of work and our personal life affects our working life (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne & Grzywacz 2006; Clark 2001; Frone 2003; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson & Kacmar 2007). This perspective theorises that work, family and individual characteristics interact in ways that may be facilitative and conflictual (Frone 2003; Hill 2005).

Work-family conflict is typically defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which the demands of work and family roles are incompatible in some respect so that meeting the
demands in one domain makes it difficult to meet the demands in the other domain. Frone (2003) suggested that a comprehensive understanding of the work-family interface should include both components of ‘facilitation’ and ‘conflict’. He defined facilitation as “the extent to which participation at work (home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills and opportunities gained or developed at home (work)” (p. 145). For example, an individual who has a heavy workload (demands) may find that these demands make it more difficult to spend time with the family, creating work-family conflict. However, if that individual has a supportive manager or control over when work is done, such resources would lead to work-family facilitation. That is, the greater of any single resource an individual has, the greater the potential for facilitation; likewise the greater the overall accumulation of resources, the greater the potential for facilitation (Wayne et al. 2007). Similarly, the greater of any single demand an individual has, the greater the potential for conflict; likewise the greater the overall accumulation of demands, the greater the potential for conflict.

Accordingly, the current research integrates demands-and-resources theory with work-family interface theory, specifically the concepts of conflict and facilitation (Voydanoff 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005e; 2004; 2002). Thus, in this study the presence of personal and environmental demands and resources and their relationships with the concepts of conflict and facilitation will be examined to better understand the bi-directional, negative and positive connections between work and family.
1.4 Integrated Theoretical and Empirical Framework

In summary, in order to begin to address the conceptual confusion that exists in the work-life literature and to contribute to the nomological network of science (Cronbach & Meehl 1955), the current research proposes a broad, unifying theoretical framework, an empirical framework to measure the various constructs and an investigation into the linkages among and between these two frameworks.

The integrated model proposed here begins with considering primary antecedents in the personal and environmental domains (demands and resources) as having direct effects mapping onto measures of conflict and facilitation. Demands have been thought to cause conflict and resources to result in facilitation (O’Driscoll, Brough & Kalliath 2006). It is further suggested that the resultant unique combinations of conflict and facilitation may be pivotal to understanding perceptions of work-life balance. Concurring with Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) is the approach that work-life balance is considered to be a direct formative latent construct, according to the criteria set out by Edwards and Bagozzi (2000). Specifically, conflict and facilitation are orthogonal constructs that precede and contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance; measures of work-life balance are distinct from measures of conflict and facilitation, and changes in conflict and facilitation indicators will likely result in changes in work-life balance perceptions (Edwards & Bagozzi 2000). Lower levels of conflict and higher levels of facilitation are likely to be associated with perceptions of work-life balance (Frone 2002).
Of note is the approach taken in this study that work-life balance is not an end in itself, but a global perception (Reiter 2007). Perceived work-life balance reflects the positive integration of the life domains whereby individuals are able to perform activities in both the work and home domains effectively. This perspective focuses on what balance means for the individual which is relative to each person's personal and environmental characteristics (Reiter 2007). The benefit of this approach lies in the potential to assess the presence or absence of characteristics that act as barriers to or enablers of work-life balance and the opportunity for intervention at different levels.

A range of outcomes and consequences of work-life balance have been considered by researchers, such as work performance, satisfaction and general health and well-being (Valcour 2007). Perceptions of balance are likely to be associated with positive reports of work performance, satisfaction, general health and wellbeing.

Thus, the proposed conceptualisation parallels and expands on previous handling of the work-life balance concept because it takes into account the following: the antecedents of work-life balance (personal and environmental demands and resources); aspects of the work-family interface (reflected in the degree of conflict and facilitation present); the individual’s perception of work-life balance (through a validated work-life balance measure) and finally, the individual and organisational consequences of balance. The main difference between this conceptualisation and others lies in its integrated approach.
1.5 Research Contributions

In summary, this study makes a number of contributions to the work-life field, as outlined in the points to follow:

- The current study recognises the complex interplay that occurs between the characteristics of individuals, organisations and the external environment and provides a unique insight into the relative importance of these factors.

- Most studies in the literature have not used a ‘true’ measure of work-life balance, using the presence or absence of conflict as a ‘proxy’ measure (Hill 2005), or single-item measures which may not capture the complexity of the work-life domains (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007). The current research has included a validated measure of life balance (Joplin, Shaffer, Lau & Francesco 2003b), as an appropriate ‘true’ measure. In addition, this study is one of the few to empirically differentiate the concepts of work-life balance, conflict and facilitation with a view to gaining a better understanding of the relationships among them (Frone 2003; Grzywacz & Bass 2003; Keene & Quadagno 2004; Rotondo & Kincaid 2008).

- As mentioned previously, few studies have sought to model successful work-life balance (Clark 2001; Marks & MacDermid 1996). In the present study, the use of a validated measure provides the opportunity to quantitatively analyse the factors that are associated with work-life balance and to differentiate individuals who
report higher levels of perceived work-life balance from those reporting lower levels.

- Another layer of insight has been provided by the qualitative analysis of participants’ feedback with regard to the strategies that have assisted them to successfully balance their work and home lives. In the past, investigators have undertaken research into coping with the hope that the concept might help explain why some individuals fare better than others do when encountering conflict and stress in their lives (Folkman & Moskowitz 2004). While there is a large body of research on coping in the stress literature (Edwards, Caplan & Harrison 1998; French, Caplan & Harrison 1982; Thompson, Poelmans, Allen & Andreassi 2007), research that examines coping in the context of work and family is “limited and fragmented” (Thompson et al. 2007, p. 74).

In line with researchers’ preoccupation with work-family conflict, a sub-set of the stress-and-coping literature has focused specifically on the strategies used by individuals in response to experiencing conflict in order to facilitate their management of work and family roles (Haar 2006; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Neal & Hammer 2007). Research has shown that even if conflict is a likely consequence of engaging in work and family roles, it is how people cope with conflict that determines their personal outcomes (Beutell & Greenhaus 1982; Hertz 1999). Nevertheless, Eby et al.’s (2005) comprehensive review found that less than one percent of research actually examined coping as a predictor of work-
family conflict. The present study takes a more direct approach focusing on the
discovery of specific strategies that have been found to lead to successful work-
life balance, rather than assuming that strategies aimed at reducing conflict are the
same as those that improve work-life balance.

- With the inclusion of personality trait measures, the current study adds to the
  empirical research which supports the link between dispositional variables and the
  work-family interface and the influence of personality on how individuals
  perceive and respond to situations (Andreassi & Thompson 2007; Beauregard
  2006; Boyar & Mosley 2007: Bruck & Allen 2003; Carlson 1999; Friede & Ryan
  2005; McNall & Michel 2010; Rotondo & Kincaid 2008; Sumer & Knight 2001;
  Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson 2004).

- The majority of work-life balance research has been undertaken in other parts of
  the world, which raises questions about the generalisability of the results to an
  Australian context. The Australian Personal Wellbeing Index (AWI)
  (International Wellbeing Group 2006) was used in the present survey to gauge
  participants' perceptions about how satisfied they were with their life in general
  and with different areas of their lives. The use of the AWI as a dependent
  variable measure is considered important from an Australian research perspective
  because it provides the opportunity to undertake meaningful comparisons between
  respondents in the current study and the national average (according to the
published 2009 results), and to examine the relationship between perceived work-life balance and life satisfaction and personal wellbeing.

- In addition, the current study contributes to the growing body of Australian research on work-life balance with the inclusion of insights from the legal profession. Bardoel et al.’s (2008) review of work-life research in Australia and New Zealand shows lawyers to be missing from the list of those occupations/industries studied by work-life researchers between 2004 and 2007. The most studied occupation/industry was the construction industry followed by academe, emergency workers, psychologists, banking, medical students, nurses and public organisations (Bardoel et al. 2008). To date, work-life research involving the legal profession has mostly been informed by the work of Canadian, Jean Wallace, whose extensive Juggling It All Survey (Wallace 2002) collected information on the work and family experiences and attitudes of practising lawyers in the Province of Alberta (Wallace 2005, 2002, 1999; Wallace & Young 2010, 2008). The current research provides the opportunity to gain insight into the work-life experiences and attitudes of lawyers practising in another part of the world.

- Criticisms of work-life research include the lack of sophistication of techniques used by researchers to collect and analyse data (Barnett 1998; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999). Some researchers have argued that there is an overemphasis on quantitative methodologies, creating the need for more qualitative studies. Others have suggested the need for a greater use of causal modeling techniques
and techniques to examine moderators and mediators (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007). The current study responds to the abovementioned criticisms with the use of qualitative and quantitative methodologies, including structural equation modelling techniques which allow for the examination and simultaneous testing of relationships amongst the variables in this study (Byrne 2001).

1.6 Methodology

Work-life research has been criticised for the failure to develop new conceptual models and for continuing to test previously established relationships among variables (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007). In answer to this criticism, the present research integrates theory building and theory testing. Theory building includes a thorough and comprehensive desk study. Theory testing involves quantitative analysis of survey data for empirical model verification and qualitative analysis to explore the area of work-life balance management strategies. The quantitative analytical approach taken in this research is classified as a priori, that is, variables were identified and relationships proposed and tested, potentially leading to the development of new theory. The qualitative analytical approach supports the important role of exploratory research in knowledge creation (Bardoel et al. 2008). Table 1.1 gives an outline of the two-stage research design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Theory Building</th>
<th>Phase 1: Desk Study</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1a: Literature review on work-life balance including antecedents and consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1b: Literature review on conflict and facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1c: Literature review on demands and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1d: Literature review on coping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1e: Literature review on personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1f: Research model building and proposition development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: Theory Testing</th>
<th>Phase 1: Field Research</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1a: Questionnaire design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1b: Instrument evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1c: Sample design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1d: Survey administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 2: Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2a: Data preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2b: Profile of respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2c: Preliminary quantitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2d: Structural equation modelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2e: Qualitative analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2f: Results and conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the researcher for this thesis.

The critical realism paradigm has been chosen to guide this research as it best fits the understandings which have informed the research questions, taking scholarly reference into account (Krauss 2005). Realism assumes that reality exists but it can only be understood imperfectly and probabilistically, that is, the researchers are limited by their cognitive capabilities and the complexity of social phenomena (Guba & Lincoln 1994). Methodologically, the focus of critical realism is on explaining phenomena using both quantitative and qualitative methods which are seen as complementary and appropriate for researching the underlying mechanisms that drive actions and events (Cavana,
The research has been designed as a cross-sectional study because of the time and financial resource constraints on the researcher. However, this also conforms to the majority of previous research into work-life balance (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007).

Data collection was conducted via an online questionnaire developed for this research. Data analysis was undertaken in six stages. The first stage involved the generation of a range of descriptive statistics based on the demographic data and personal information captured in the questionnaire. The second stage involved testing of the data for normality. The third stage of data analysis involved exploratory factor analysis following the generation of initial scales. Relationships among the variables were then examined using bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses. The fifth stage involved the identification and testing of the model. Finally, qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis to identify meaningful themes and patterns of living and behaviour, specifically work-life balance management strategies used by study respondents (Van Manen 1990).

In sum, the methodology adopted is appropriate for the nature of this research because it uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches in a two-stage research design to address the research questions.
1.7 Delimitations of Scope

There are six delimitations of scope that have been identified in this study. The first delimitation relates to the nature of the occupation chosen. The legal profession is particularly demanding and difficulties encountered in attempting to balance work and personal life are a source of stress and dissatisfaction, often resulting in lawyers leaving the practice of law (Brockman 1994; Forstenlechner & Lettice 2008; Wallace 2005). This study is limited to Australian lawyers who belong to one professional body, namely, the Queensland Law Society. Findings of this research may well be applicable to other ‘white-collar’ professions where the ability to achieve successful work-life balance is an issue, but the generalisability of results to industries and occupations that are structured differently such as the construction industry where shift-work is prevalent (see Lingard, Townsend, Bradley & Brown 2008) or to employees with different socio-economic backgrounds is uncertain.

The cultural context of the current study is of concern in the second delimitation. The measures identified and verified in this research are specific to Australian participants and thus results may not be generalised cross-culturally. As a result of cultural factors, we cannot assume that two people from different backgrounds, who have the same score on work-life balance or work-family conflict, for example, actually experience the same level of work-life balance or work-family conflict without replicating the study in those environments (see Poelmans in Kalliath & Brough 2008b).

The third delimitation concerns the time and resources available to undertake the research. Researchers have called for more longitudinal studies and daily diary studies
(see Butler, Grzywacz, Bass & Linney 2005; Frone, Russell & Cooper 1992a; Grzywacz, Almeida & McDonald 2002; Jones & Fletcher 1996; Montgomery et al. 2009; Sanz-Vergel, Demerouti, Moreno-Jiménez & Mayo 2010), nevertheless the majority of studies of work and family issues have used predominately between-subject cross-sectional designs (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007). While recognising this delimitation, a cross-sectional design was chosen for the current study as time and resources were not available to permit a longitudinal or daily diary study design.

The fourth delimitation relates to the selection of variables for the study. The variables which appeared to provide the most effective antecedents and outcomes for testing the proposed model of work-life balance have been selected, guided by a comprehensive literature review. The delimitation of antecedent variables centred on demographic characteristics and variables considered to be barriers to or enablers of work-life balance within a demands-and-resources conceptual framework (Voydanoff 2005b, 2002). The delimitation of outcome variables relates to the choice of variables that reflect organisational outcomes (such as performance) and individual outcomes (such as satisfaction and wellbeing). The outcome variables chosen for this study are however well considered in the work-life field (Adams, King & King 1996; Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton 2000; Eby et al. 2005; Voydanoff 2005b, 2004).

The fifth delimitation relates to the position taken in this research with regard to the term ‘work-life’. An appreciation of the complexities involved in defining and measuring the broad concept of work-life balance is put forward in Section 2.4 of Chapter 2. However, it is incumbent upon researchers to take a stance and in this study the choice was made to adopt Guest's (2002) approach where ‘work’ is defined as paid employment and ‘life’
includes everything else outside of work (i.e., non-work), incorporating personal, home, and family related issues. While it is accepted that this approach does not allow for a finer-grained analysis of the dimensions of ‘life’, it is in keeping with the approach taken that work-life balance is an individual’s global perception of how well the domains of work and non-work are successfully or unsuccessfully integrated and that this perception is relative to the personal and environmental characteristics present for that particular individual.

The final delimitation of the current research occurs as a result of sample size. The work-life balance questionnaire designed for this study included questions relating to the size of the organisation in which participants worked (micro, small, medium, large and home-based); the area of law in which they practiced (e.g., criminal, general practice); their employment position (e.g., partner, solo practitioner) and employment status (permanent/casual/self-employed). While previous research has investigated the advantages and disadvantages of home-based business ownership and self-employment in relation to work-life balance (see Felstead, Jewson, Phizacklea & Walters 2002; Prottas & Thompson 2006; Walker, Wang & Redmond 2008), unfortunately the size of the sample of the present research did not allow for differentiation and analyses of these variables as contributing factors (see Tables 5.9 to 5.12 in Chapter 5). However, while the influence of the area of law in which participants worked was not ascertainable through quantitative analysis as there were not enough respondents in each category to provide meaningful data, qualitative data did provide some insights indicating that certain areas of law were less demanding to work in than others, allowing for a greater opportunity to balance work and home life.
1.8 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis comprises seven chapters. This first chapter provides an introduction to the thesis and includes an overview of the research, the research questions and research objectives, the justification for the research, methodology used and delimitations of scope. The second and third chapters provide a review of the literature on the constructs to be examined in this study as well as a review of the approaches used to explain these constructs. Chapter 3 also contains a model of work-life balance which will be investigated in this study, in accordance with the stated propositions. The fourth chapter identifies and justifies the methodological elements in the study, which includes a discussion about the research design, the data collection method and the development of the questionnaire.

The fifth chapter presents the preliminary analysis of data collected from the online survey which includes an examination of the response rate and the respondent profile, together with results of exploratory factor analyses. Chapter 6 contains an examination of the relevant relationships among all the variables identified in the study and tests the conceptual model. In addition, Chapter 6 examines both the qualitative and quantitative data with regard to coping style and work-life balance management strategies. The thesis concludes with an examination of the findings drawn from the analyses. The final chapter also includes a discussion of the implications of this study from theoretical, practical and methodological perspectives.
1.9 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a background to and a justification for this study of work-life balance and has introduced the key concepts to be examined. The research questions have been defined and specific research objectives identified for investigation. The methodology and delimitations were discussed. Lastly, the structure of the thesis has been outlined. In the following chapters these matters are discussed in greater detail.
CHAPTER 2
THE CONCEPT OF WORK-LIFE BALANCE

2.1 Introduction

The purposes of Chapters 2 and 3 are to review the work-life balance literature, to propose an integrated theoretical model of work-life balance and to identify variables that will provide a basis for testing the efficacy of the model. Chapter 2 is concerned principally with reviewing the concepts of work-life balance and the work-family interface scholarship. Chapter 3 provides a review of the literature with regard to the antecedents and outcomes studied in the work-life field, with a particular focus on the demands-and-resources theoretical framework and its integration with the work-family interface scholarship. Turning to Chapter 2, first the sources of the literature review are outlined (Section 2.2). Second, a brief history of work-life balance research is provided by way of contextual background (Section 2.3). Third, issues surrounding the definition and measurement of work-life balance and related terms are discussed (Section 2.4). Next, the approaches that have been taken to study work-life balance and the work-family interface are explored (Section 2.5). Lastly, the constructs to be examined in this study are identified and initial propositions are put forward (Section 2.6).

2.2 Sources of Literature Review

As observed by Watts (2009, p. 38), the literature on the topic of work-life balance “is very broad and characterises work-life balance as multifaceted, operating on a number of
different levels, incorporating qualitative and quantitative aspects”. While scholars have been urged to be well-versed in the current theoretical developments to assist with identifying gaps in knowledge and theory building (Bardoel et al. 2008), as can be seen from examples of reviews mentioned below, capturing and summarising the breadth of work-life research is indeed challenging.

The need for consolidation across the interdisciplinary field of work-family research has been identified by Drago and Kashian (2003) who noted that “no one journal is devoted exclusively to issues of work and family” (Drago & Kashian 2003, p. 489). The authors ‘mapped the terrain’ of work-family journals, concluding that the field is reasonably bounded by a set of 23 core journals. Casper et al.’s (2007) review of research methods in industrial-organisational psychology and organisational behavior (IO/OB) work-family research, between 1980 and 2003, resulted in 210 journal articles from 15 key journals. Bianchi and Milkie’s (2010) review of work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century resulted in a pool of over 800 articles sourced from seminal works including 16 journal publications and specific articles that won or were among the top 20 finalists for the Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work-Family Research between 2001 and 2008. In their review of Australian and New Zealand work-life research conducted between 2004 and 2007, Bardoel et al. (2008) generated 86 articles published in 46 academic journals covering a range of disciplines.

For this thesis, empirical and theoretical articles including key reviews and meta-analyses, were sourced from peer-reviewed journals incorporating those with relevant special editions dedicated to the work-life field. Book reviews were scanned to locate
seminal works and additional relevant articles were also located through broad searches of databases such as Business Source Premier, Sage Premier, PsychINFO, ProQuest Central, Wiley-Blackwell, APA PsycArticles, ScienceDirect Freedom Collection and ABI/INFORM Global. The visibility of research on work and family issues has been expanded through online networks (Bianchi & Milkie 2010) and as a result, overseas and Australian online networks were also sourced for the current research.

2.3 Brief History of Work-Life Balance Research

According to Lewis and Cooper (2005), the debate about how to succeed in our occupational and personal lives has grown out of a long tradition of research and discussion. A number of catalysts can be identified that have moved the research forward over the past five decades (Bianchi & Milkie 2010; Harrington 2007; Lewis & Cooper 1999; Strachan 2010). The major catalyst for research has been the increased number of women in the labour force which began in the 1960s (Barnett 1999), leading scholars such as Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) to examine issues concerning women’s careers, the relationship of work and family, dual-career couples and the equity of gender roles. In the 1950s and 1960s, Australian men were regarded as ‘the wage earners’ and women ‘the homemakers’ (Strachan 2010). Most women worked until they married and following the birth of children, focused on the care of their family and home (Strachan 2010).

The 1970s saw more women occupying dual roles and the challenging of the ‘male model of work’ which assumed continuous employment from the end of education to retirement
and separation of work and family roles (Pleck 1977). In Australia, by 1970 the female labour force participation rate was thirty-nine percent and this increased presence brought about changes in social attitudes towards women’s paid work (Strachan 2010). Widely considered as one of the most influential publications in the evolution of the work-life field is Kanter’s (1977) full-scale review of work and family interactions, entitled *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. Kanter (1977) used the term ‘the myth of separate worlds’ to shift the focus from the separation to the interdependence of the work and family domains.

Nevertheless, most research on work and family in the 1970s addressed the emerging issues as individual rather than organisational problems (Lewis & Cooper 1999). Schein (1978) was one of the first to link family issues to career dynamics with a model of career, family and self. Pleck (1977) began to conduct research on men and their roles in parenting and was one of the first researchers to conceptualise the link between family and work as being different for men and women – a theme that continues to be discussed in the literature today (O’Driscoll et al. 2006).

The 1980s ‘enterprise culture’ saw a decade of corporate mergers and acquisitions, strategic alliances and joint ventures resulting in a culture of increased competitiveness in the workplace and negative consequences for employees (Lewis & Cooper 1999). Research interest moved to stress, conflict and burnout for those with dual responsibilities in the work and family domains, particularly employed women and dual-earner couples (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). Galinsky and Hughes (1987) undertook one of the first studies of work-family issues in a corporation and their results showed that
work characteristics were related to employees’ ability to balance their work and home lives and to their marital relationship, recognising that what happens in the workplace impacts on families. Bailyn’s (1993) well-known book, *Breaking the Mold*, summarises her work from the 1980s where she first began to link corporate changes with changes in family patterns, suggesting that the structure and culture of corporate life should be changed to integrate employees’ other obligations and interests. In Australia, from the mid 1980s the complexity of achieving equality for women at work was recognised through equal opportunity legislation, work and family policies and equal pay inquiries (Strachan 2010).

The calls for workplaces to change began in the 1980s and intensified in the 1990s due to predicted labour shortages and the more rapidly increasing participation of women with young children in the workplace (Dex & Bond 2005; Grady & McCarthy 2008). There was an emphasis on flexibility and employers were urged to develop policies to support employees with family commitments (Lewis & Cooper 1999). Much of the literature at this time was concerned with the nature and extent of strategies adopted by workplaces to respond to work-family issues and the impact on productivity and other organisational outcomes (Hogg & Harker 1992; Kossek & Ozeki 1999). Research began to explore the nature of work-family linkages. Greenhaus and Parasuraman’s (1999) work exploring the antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict and stress recognised the many variables impacting on individual wellbeing. This research trend continues as the nature of the links between work and family domains are further explored (Lewis & Cooper 1999).
The most profound changes in the nature of work have taken place since the mid-1990s (Lingard, Francis & Turner 2010). In contrast to the 1950s, men are no longer the ‘breadwinners’ and it is now the norm for women in Australia to combine both paid work and family care across the life course (Colley 2010; Strachan 2010). In 2006-2007, the female labour force participation rate reached fifty-eight percent (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2008a).

Initiatives that contribute to work-life balance have gained increasing support from policy-makers, employers, employees and employee groups both internationally and nationally (Burgess & Waterhouse 2010; Gregory & Milner 2009). In 2008, the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], an international organisation helping governments tackle the economic, social and governance challenges of a globalised economy (OECD 2008) made the claim that failing to address problems of imbalance between work and other life aspects results in detrimental social and economic consequences. In Australia, the *Fair Work Act 2009* has, at least initially, been acknowledged for dealing with the pressures on working families and assisting with work-life balance, bringing the country into line with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* provisions for the right to employment, pay and rest and leisure through reasonable limits on working hours (Morsink 1999; Waterhouse & Colley 2010).

With regard to research, Bianchi and Milkie’s (2010) comprehensive review cited earlier, outlines the expansion of scope and coverage of scholarship on work and family topics during the 2000-2010 decade. The researchers suggest that this expansion can be
attributed to the increase in diversity of families and workplaces, methodological innovations and the growth of scholarly networks (Bianchi & Milkie 2010).

In summary, over the past fifty years, the different perspectives from which work-life issues have been studied have certainly enriched the field and provided valuable insights into some facets of the relationship between work and life outside of work (Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002). The literature is, however, complex on several accounts. Firstly, theory is uncertain and underdeveloped. Secondly, there are many concepts which are often loosely defined and many of the relationships between them are not well understood. Thirdly, empirical efforts are variable and the implications, particularly for organisations, are often unclear (Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002; Voydanoff 2005d).

Recently, Burgess and Waterhouse (2010, p. 132) commented with regard to the situation in Australia as follows: “Much remains to be done in terms of research and practice. First there is a need for high-level, multi-disciplinary approaches to encompass the intersection of work-life balance in different disciplines. Secondly, and at the other end of the spectrum, is a continued need for investigation of individual cases and experiences.”

To summarise, in light of the abovementioned criticisms the current research aims to develop a better understanding of relationships among a range of established concepts in the work-life field through the development of an integrated conceptual model of work-life balance which is based upon a carefully considered and well formulated theoretical and conceptual framework (Way 1991). Further, testing the model empirically will provide evidence for the relevance and utility of these concepts which have been studied
for the most part in a fragmented fashion. The results will have theoretical implications for researchers in the work-life field and practical implications for organisations and individuals as both personal and contextual characteristics have been taken into account.

2.4 Understanding the Term ‘Work-Life Balance’

2.4.1 Defining work-life balance

The need for an overarching, consistent and agreed-upon definition is fundamental to advancing measures and programs in work-life balance (Reiter 2007). Nevertheless, despite widespread academic and applied interest, the construct is inconsistently defined, creating confusion in the literature (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007; Voydanoff 2005b). In Kalliath and Brough’s (2008a) review of the meaning of the balance construct, they concluded that the elusiveness of a formal definition of work-life balance, together with the lack of a direct well developed measure of the construct, constrains our ability to investigate the phenomenon fully. A number of researchers concur with this conclusion, such as Lewis et al. (2003) who have gone so far as to claim that the limitations of the language and terminology used to frame the issues in the literature is one of the sticking points holding back better ways to integrate paid work with the rest of life.

Definitions are many and varied with almost every relevant published journal article containing a different meaning of what work-life balance represents (Reiter 2007). In addition, sometimes the term is used as a noun (when one is encouraged to achieve balance), other times it is used as a verb (to balance work and family demands), or as an adjective (as in a balanced life) (Greenhaus, Collins & Shaw 2003). Over time, ways of
conceptualising the issues have shifted from ‘work-family’ and ‘family-friendly’ to ‘work-life’ and ‘work-life balance’. Table 2.1 below provides examples of the variety of definitions used in the literature since the work-life balance discourse began in the 1990s and reflects both the overlap and the inconsistencies among them (Greenhaus et al. 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life integration or balance is defined as a process for reconciliation of work, family and individual self demands and time.”</td>
<td>Grady &amp; McCarthy (2008, p. 601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life balance is the individual perception that work and non-work activities are compatible and promote growth in accordance with an individual’s current life priorities.”</td>
<td>Kalliath &amp; Brough (2008a, p. 326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life balance is defined as ‘balances work priorities with personal life so that neither is neglected’.”</td>
<td>Lyness &amp; Judiesch (2008, p. 793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life balance is defined here as an individual’s ability to meet both their work and family commitments, as well as other non-work responsibilities and activities.”</td>
<td>Parkes &amp; Langford (2008, p. 267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains.”</td>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Carlson (2007, p. 458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work–life balance is about people having a measure of control over when, where and how they work.”</td>
<td>Fleetwood (2007, p. 351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life balance means that individuals have ‘successfully’ segmented or integrated ‘life’ and work so as to achieve a satisfying quality of life, overall satisfaction and less strain or stress around juggling conflicting role demands. Put differently, work-life balance denotes fulfillment of multiple roles while maintaining a positive quality of life.”</td>
<td>Blyton et al. (2006, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1: Examples of Definitions Used in the Work-Life Field (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A global assessment that work resources meet family demands, and family resources meet work demands such that participation is effective in both domains.”</td>
<td>Voydanoff (2005b, p. 825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Low levels of inter-role conflict and high levels of inter-role facilitation represent work–family balance.”</td>
<td>Frone (2003, p. 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work–family balance: the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work role and family role.”</td>
<td>Greenhaus et al. (2003, p. 513)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work-life balance is being aware of different demands on time and energy; having the ability to make choices in the allocation of time and energy; knowing what values to apply to choices; making choices.”</td>
<td>Clutterbuck (2003, p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The relationship between the institutional and cultural times and spaces of work and non-work in societies where income is predominantly generated and distributed through labour markets.”</td>
<td>Felstead et al. (2002, p. 56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict.”</td>
<td>Clark (2001, p. 751)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Living a balanced life is ‘achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains, and to do so requires personal resources such as energy, time, and commitment to be well distributed across domains’.”</td>
<td>Kirchmeyer (2000, p. 81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A perceptual phenomenon characterized by a sense of having achieved a satisfactory resolution of the multiple demands of work and family domains.”</td>
<td>Higgins, Duxbury &amp; Johnson (2000, p. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Role balance is ‘the tendency to become fully engaged in the performance of every role in one’s total role system, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care. Put differently, it is the practice of that evenhanded alertness known sometimes as mindfulness’.”</td>
<td>Marks &amp; MacDermid (1996, p. 421)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance refers to “a satisfying, healthy, and productive life that includes work, play, and love…”</td>
<td>Kofodimos (1993, p. xiii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the researcher for this thesis.
However, the term ‘work-life balance’ continues to be problematic (Lewis et al. 2003; Gregory & Milner 2009). In the literature, there is the implication that work is not part of life or that work and the rest of life are mutually exclusive (Halpern & Cheung 2008; Lewis et al. 2003; Ransome 2007). The use of the word ‘balance’ has itself caused problems, since balance suggests an equal investment in both the work and non-work spheres and the notion that when something is given to work (e.g., time and energy), it is seen as taking away from the home and vice versa (Barnett 1998; Halpern & Murphy 2005). Halpern and Murphy (2005, p. 3) concluded that work and family are not a “zero-sum game” and suggested that “It is time to change the metaphor”. To this end, more current thinking frames the issues in terms of “work-personal life integration” as a “working terminology to capture the synergies and connections between the different parts of life and the ways in which they feed into each other” (Lewis et al. 2003, p. 829). Others have suggested using the words ‘harmony’ and ‘harmonisation’ instead of ‘balance’ to indicate the aim of relating work and personal life domains in positive or harmonious ways (Hill, Allen, Jacob, Bair, Bikhazi, Van Lageveld, Martinengo, Parker & Walker 2007; Lewis & Cooper 2005; Poelmans & Caligiuri 2008). Nevertheless, these terms have not been widely adopted and it appears that the ‘work-life balance’ term continues to be most recognised and utilised across the board.

In her commentary on defining work-life balance, Reiter (2007) raised the subject of ethical ideologies, noting that different definitions of work-life balance each have a value perspective that determines what factors will be seen as relevant to achieving balance. Reiter (2007) adapted Forsyth’s (1980) taxonomy of ethical ideologies, categorising the
ethical positions of individuals into four classifications: situationists, absolutists, subjectivists and exceptionists. Definitions framed from a situationalist position focus on a ‘fitting’ definition of balance for a person depending on his or her personal context. Subjectivists are concerned with their desires and if they are happy with their work-life balance, nothing else matters. Absolutists are more prescriptive, accepting that there is a ‘right’ formula for balance. Exceptionists seek the greater good for all. Table 2.2 below outlines Reiter’s (2007) adaptation relating to the definition of work-life balance.

**Table 2.2: Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies Applied to Work-Life Balance Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Relativism</th>
<th>Low Relativism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Idealism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situationists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates individualistic analysis of each act in each situation; relativistic. Example: Different people will balance their home and work lives in different ways depending on what they value and their personal circumstances. There are however guideposts or illuminators to help you achieve balance in a way that is positive for you and your stakeholders.</td>
<td>Assumes that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules. Example: You will achieve balance by investing equal time and equal involvement, and experiencing equal satisfaction in work and family and balance will lead to high quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Idealism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subjectivists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals based on personal values rather than universal moral principles; relativistic. Example: As long as I am happy, nothing else matters.</td>
<td>Moral absolutes guide judgments but pragmatically open to exceptions to these standards; utilitarian. Example: Less work; more play.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Reiter 2007, p. 278.

Reiter (2007) argues that definitions of work-life balance reflecting a situationalist perspective are the most valuable to academics and practitioners because they will
involve making optimum choices for individuals. This perspective offers an opportunity to explore which factors contribute to the attainment of work-life balance because the focus is on the individual relative to his or her circumstances. Situationists would argue that ‘balance’ is not an end in itself, but a perception – “it is a state that gives rise to satisfactions that are of value to the individual and his or her stakeholders” (Reiter 2007, p. 277).

Broadly speaking, the approach taken in the present study falls within the situationalist perspective because it recognises the contribution of and complex interplay between the characteristics of the environment and the individual and evaluates the perception of balance within the context for that individual. This approach also addresses the criticism that research has usually taken place at one level of analysis, either at the individual, family, organisational or societal level (Guest 2001; Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002).

If empirical research on balance is to contribute to understanding work–family dynamics, further development of the construct by way of conceptualisation is essential, particularly given that the way in which work-life balance is conceptualised will determine the manner in which it is measured (Greenhaus et al. 2003; Reiter 2007). The approaches to the measurement of work-life balance taken by researchers in the work-life field are discussed in the following section.
2.4.2 Measuring work-life balance

Developing and validating a measure of work-life balance is a critical element for advancing research in this arena (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007; Carlson et al.2009). The problem is that few attempts have been made to measure work-life balance directly or to discover the main predictors. In addition, where measures have been developed issues arise with regard to their validity and the apparent lack of consensus among the approaches taken by researchers, as reviewed below (Dex & Bond 2005; Kalliath & Brough 2008).

A number of studies of work-life and work-family balance have used a single-item measure. While these measures provide useful global assessments, the primary concern is whether a single item captures the complexity of the work-life domains (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007). Examples include Milkie and Peltola (1999, p. 481) and Keene and Quadagno (2004, p. 4) who asked participants about their perceptions of success: “How successful do you feel in balancing your paid work and family life?” On the other hand, White’s (1999, p. 167) measure is related to perceptions of satisfaction: “Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the balance between your job or main activity and family and home life?” Whereas, Saltzstein, Ting and Saltzstein (2001, p. 467) gauged agreement or otherwise from respondents to the statement “I am satisfied with the balance I have achieved between my work and life”.

Further, in their cross-cultural study, Hill et al. (2004b, p. 1306) asked respondents “How easy or difficult is it for you to manage the demands of your work and family life?” in
order to measure the concept of work-life balance. With a similar focus on ‘managing demands’, Casey and Grzywacz’s (2008, p. 38) longitudinal assessment of the effects of flexibility on worker health and wellbeing used data from health risk appraisals of pharmaceutical company employees, which included responses to the statement: “I feel positively about my ability to manage the demands of my work, personal, and family life”.

Another example comes from researchers Marks and MacDermid (1996, p. 422) who operationalised their theory and construct of role balance by drawing on enjoyment as the focal point of balance, using a single-item measure, scored on a 5-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”: “Nowadays, I seem to enjoy every part of my life equally well.” In their second study, Marks and MacDermid (1996) developed a more complex 8-item scale of role balance designed to measure equal satisfaction or enjoyment across roles, equal importance or caring about roles and equal attention or time across roles. However, the authors acknowledged difficulty in interpreting the meaning of low scores, encouraging researchers to obtain direct measures of positive balance, negative balance and ‘imbalance’ (Marks & MacDermid 1996).

In addition to the concern about the ability of a single-item measure to fully encapsulate the concept of work-life balance, the above measures assume the meaning of ‘balance’ to be self-evident and therefore results are based on participants’ subjective interpretation of what ‘balance’ means (Valcour 2007). Thus, there is a need for researchers to demonstrate whether these measures are valid, that is, they are actually measuring the
theoretical construct they set out to measure – in this case the perception of work-life balance (Clark-Carter 2004; Kalliath & Brough 2008; Reiter 2007).

A set of criteria for evaluating the measurement efficacy of a construct has been established in the literature and researchers of a well-developed measure of work-life balance should outline empirical information on these criteria to demonstrate construct validity (Kalliath & Brough 2008). Criteria include content, convergent and divergent validity (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994). Content validity refers to the degree to which a measure’s items are a proper sample of the theoretical content domain of the construct being measured (Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner & Lankau 1993). Convergent and divergent validity demonstrate that a scale captures a construct that is distinct from what is assessed by other measures (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994).

Examples of studies of work-life balance which do not appear to outline information on such criteria include that of Brett and Stroh (2003), Dex and Bond (2005) and Hill, Märtinson, Ferris and Baker (2004a). Hill et al. (2004a, p. 126) measured work-life balance by the mean of an eight-question scale designed to assess “the ability to simultaneously manage the demands of work and personal/family life”. However, this scale contained questions with differing response categories and included a mixture of items relating to perceptions of success at achieving balance and others assessing variables considered as antecedents of work-life balance, such as flexibility (Casey & Grzywacz 2008; Russell, O’Connell & McGinnity 2009). In this study, a report on the validity of Hill et al.’s (2004a) scale would have been informative for future research.
With regard to Dex and Bond’s (2005) study, the researchers used Daniels and McCarraher’s (2000) work-life balance checklist instrument which consisted of ten statements about work-life balance. Owing to problems with the instrument, two measures had to be constructed to take account of the variation in employees’ family responsibilities (Dex & Bond 2005). The results suggest that further psychometric development is required before this particular measure of work-life balance is satisfactory for research purposes.

Of note, all the items in the abovementioned checklist were worded in a negative manner, for example “I worry about the effect of work stress on my health” (Dex & Bond 2005, p. 630). A negative approach to measuring work-life balance can be found in other research. For example, Brett and Stroh’s (2003) study used a balance scale consisting of five items measured on a 5-point Likert scale. All items were negatively worded, such as “feeling tension about balancing all your responsibilities” (Brett & Stroh 2003, p. 70).

A negative stance towards work-life balance automatically assumes that there is imbalance with some scholars suggesting that it is “easier to define balance by its absence” (Guest 2002, p. 264). An example of this approach can be found in Gudmunson, Danes, Werbel and Lay’s (2009) study of spousal support and work-family balance in relation to launching a family business. The researchers adapted Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connolly’s (1983) measure with the rationale that “work-family balance indicates individuals lack the time and personal energy necessary to maintain satisfactory engagement in the non-business demands of life to which they feel committed” (Gudmunson et al. 2009, p. 1108). Similarly, Tausig and Fenwick’s (2008) research
which examined the possibility that alternate work schedules affect perceived work-life ‘imbalance’ used two items: one measuring perceived success balancing work and personal or family life; the other measuring how much conflict respondents faced in balancing work and family life.

Along the same lines, on occasions in the literature researchers set out with introductory discussions about balance, yet go on in their studies to measure other ‘negative’ constructs such as work-family conflict, negative spillover or interference. For example, Higgins et al.’s (2000) study aimed to examine whether part-time work helped women to balance work and family, yet concluded that part-time work was associated with lower work-to-family interference. This one-sided approach does little to improve our understanding of the factors that contribute to the achievement of successful work-life balance, although it is congruent with researchers’ focus on work-family conflict (Ford et al. 2007; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Lapierre & Allen 2006).

A few studies have, however, provided comprehensive theoretical and empirical information with regard to their particular measure of work-life or work-family balance. Examples include research authored by Carlson et al. (2009), Greenhaus et al. (2003), Hayman (2005), Joplin et al. (2003b), Parkes and Langford (2008), Pocock et al. (2008), Pocock, Skinner & Ichii (2009), Skinner and Pocock (2010) and Valcour (2007).
In the case of Carlson et al.’s (2009) study, the researchers achieve the important goal of designing a scale which represents a definition within a relevant conceptual framework – in this instance, role theory. Carlson et al. (2009) adopted Grzywacz and Carlson’s (2007, p. 458) definition of work-family balance as the “accomplishment of role related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains”. Three different approaches, including confirmatory factor analysis, were used to establish divergent validity between balance, conflict and enrichment and the results showed that balance, defined in this way, was associated with job satisfaction, organisational commitment, family satisfaction, family performance and family functioning.

A new measure to capture employee perceptions of work-life balance was psychometrically assessed by Hayman (2005). Exploratory factor analysis revealed three dimensions referred to as work interference with personal life; personal life interference with work and work/personal life enhancement. However, it should be noted that the results of this study were based on a small sample of 61 human resource administrators which calls into question the generalisability of the findings to other populations (Clark-Carter 2004).

By contrast, in a large study of 16,000 Australian employees Parkes and Langford (2008) used the ‘Voice Climate Survey’ which measures thirty-one different aspects of organisational climate and employee outcomes including a four-item measure of work-life balance. The researchers reported that the survey “shows strong factor structure and
internal reliability” (Parkes & Langford 2008, p. 272) and that the work-life balance scale showed good divergent validity. They concluded that work-life balance is important for engaging and retaining employees and explored how individual and organisational variables were related to work-life balance.

Another recently established measure includes the Australian Work and Life Index (AWALI) (Pocock et al. 2008; Pocock et al. 2009; Skinner & Pocock 2010) which contains questions that directly assess perceptions of work-life interaction, specifically work-life interference. To date, three surveys have been conducted (in 2007, 2008 and 2009), providing important information on issues that impact upon Australian workers. The researchers reported the 2009 survey of 2,691 workers as “a robust, national, stratified random sample of the Australian workforce” (Pocock et al. 2009, p. 9).

Three components of balance were conceptualised and assessed by Greenhaus et al. (2003, p. 510), that is “time balance (equal time devoted to work and family); involvement balance (equal involvement in work and family) and satisfaction balance (equal satisfaction with work and family)”. Greenhaus et al. (2003, p. 513) considered work-life balance a reflection of an individual’s orientation across different life roles, defining work-family balance as “the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work role and family role”. Using hierarchical quadratic regression analyses the researchers distinguished relations of positive balance and negative balance with quality of life.
Also with a focus on satisfaction, Valcour (2007, p. 1517) based her measure of work-family balance on existing work-family literature to “capture multiple facets that add up to an overall assessment of satisfaction with work-family balance”, reporting excellent internal reliability and establishing validity through confirmatory factor analysis.

Of note is Lyness and Judiesch’s (2008) study of nearly ten thousand managers in 33 countries. This research focused on the relationship between perceived work-life balance and career advancement potential, using The Center for Creative Leadership’s (2004) ‘Balance Between Personal Life and Work’ four-item scale. With the use of peer, supervisor and self-ratings, the authors break new ground by answering calls in the literature for the use of multi-source data in work-life research (Casper et al. 2007). The authors found in general that managers who were rated higher in work-life balance were rated higher in career advancement potential than were managers who were rated lower in work-life balance.

Finally, in this review of the measurement of work-life balance, the measure used in the current research is the comprehensive, multi-item scale developed by Joplin et al. (2003b). Joplin et al. (2003b) used qualitative and quantitative methodologies to develop and establish the psychometric properties of the measure using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Convergent and divergent validity were established through the use of pre-validated measures of well-known constructs such as work-family conflict and life satisfaction. The researchers drew on perspectives from many different life situations and diverse work-family structures, using data from three international locations to ensure generalisability of the measure (Joplin et al. 2003b).
The measure includes three sub-scales measuring the following perceptions: i) equilibrium – focus on maintaining priorities (e.g., “I feel fulfilled in all aspects of my life”); ii) control – focus on organising and scheduling life activities (e.g., “I manage all aspects of my life effectively”) and iii) synchrony – focus on multi-tasking and the ability to conduct multiple roles in a complementary fashion (e.g., “my personal life and my work life are complementary”) (Joplin et al. 2003b, p. 24).

This particular measure was chosen because it was identified by Voydanoff (2005) as compatible with and relevant to the demands-and-resources conceptual framework adopted in the present study. According to Voydanoff (2005, p. 834) the measure assesses “individual abilities to perform activities in both the work and family domains effectively”. The current research extends the work of Joplin et al. (2003b) by taking up their call to develop a conceptual model of the antecedents of work-life balance, to test the scale with non-student participants and to further validate the measure with samples from other countries, with a view to adding to its global predictive potential.

Joplin et al. (2003b, p. 4) are of the opinion that “in order to achieve balance a positive integration of the life domains must occur”. In line with this opinion and consistent with the measure adopted, the current study takes the approach that perceived work-life balance reflects the positive integration of the life domains whereby individuals are able to perform activities in both the work and home domains effectively.

In summary, Section 2.4 has highlighted the difficulties associated with understanding the term ‘work-life balance’. First, no consistent, agreed-upon definition has emerged from the literature to date (Reiter 2007). Second, the development of a valid and reliable
measure of work-life balance is also lacking as measures range from single-item measures focusing on perceptions of success (Milkie & Peltola 1999; Keene & Quadango 2004) and satisfaction (Saltzstein et al. 2001) for example, through to scales designed to measure dimensions or components of work-life balance (Greenhaus et al. 2003; Hayman 2004; Joplin et al. 2003b). In light of these difficulties, this Section has also specified the situationalist stance taken in the current research that perceived work-life balance is not an end in itself, but a global perception (Reiter 2007), reflecting the positive integration of the life domains (Joplin et al. 2003b). This perspective focuses on what balance means for the individual which is relative to each person's personal and environmental (demand and resource) characteristics. Thus, the reasons for choosing Joplin et al.’s (2003b) measure of life balance include the fact that it has demonstrated psychometric properties, together with its compatibility with the demands-and-resources conceptual framework adopted in the current research (Voydanoff 2005).

2.5 Approaches to the Study of the Work-Family Interface

The current research is concerned with the work-family interface scholarship. As noted by Frone, Yardley and Markel (1997b, p. 145), “Understanding the work-family interface is a pivotal concern of both work and family researchers”. The term ‘work-family interface’ covers a broad variety of concepts that have been used to describe the intersection of the work and non-work (personal life) domains (Westman & Piotrkowski 1999).
A review of the approaches to the study of the work-family interface is presented in the following sections, incorporating an overview of important conceptual frameworks in the work-life field including role theory, boundary theory, spillover theory, ecological systems theory and theories of ‘fit’. Definitions, models, measures and examples of relevant supporting empirical evidence are included in this overview.

2.5.1 Role theory

The most dominant theoretical perspective used to explain the linkages between work and family has been role theory (Hanson, Hammer & Colton 2006). Within role theory, two predominant hypotheses describe the relationships between work and family – the scarcity hypothesis and the expansion hypothesis (Barnett & Hyde 2001; Goode 1950; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Marks & MacDermid 1996).

2.5.1.1 The scarcity hypothesis

The scarcity hypothesis suggests that a person has a limited amount of time and energy to engage in roles and that strain is normal or inevitable given the over-demanding nature of engaging in multiple roles (Goode 1960; Hanson et al. 2006; Marks & MacDermid 1996). A great deal of research on the work-family interface is grounded in role strain and stress paradigms which underscore the deleterious health effects of pressures and overloads as well as gaps between resources and demands (Moen et al. 2008).

Conflict. The ‘conflict’ perspective has been the major focus of research on work-family dynamics for a number of decades (Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Kossek & Ozeki
Conflict is the most widely discussed concept within the work-family interface literature (Curbow, McDonnell, Spratt, Griffin & Agnew 2003; Tetrick & Buffardi 2006). Research has been conducted on the concept of work-family conflict since 1964 (see Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal 1964). Literally hundreds of academic articles have been published on work-family conflict using diverse samples from over a dozen countries (MacDermid 2005). A number of reviews and meta-analyses of work-family conflict have been undertaken during the last two decades in an attempt to make sense of the literature, such as: Allen et al. (2000); Bianchi and Milkie (2010); Byron (2005); Eby et al. (2005); Ford et al. (2007); Kossek and Lambert (2005); Kossek and Ozeki (1998); MacDermid (2005); MacDermid and Harvey (2006); Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005); Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton and Baltes (2009); Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek and Sweet (2006) and Tetrick and Buffardi (2006).

Work-family conflict was initially conceptualised by Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981) and Holahan and Gilbert (1979) as one-dimensional and bidirectional, referring to both the influence of work on family and the influence of family on work that is, work interference with family and family interference with work were not separated (Ford et al. 2007). Kopelman et al.’s (1983) well-known measure of work-family conflict focused specifically on work interfering with family. Later, Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985, p. 77) conceptualisation resulted in the definition of work-family conflict which is the most agreed upon in the literature, as follows: “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect”. In other words, ‘conflict’ occurs when participation in one role is made more difficult by
virtue of participation in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). An example of role conflict might occur when an employee is pressured at work to work overtime while family members urge him or her to come home (Rothbard & Dumas 2006).

The first widely used measures of work-family conflict that separated work-family interference from family-work interference were developed by Frone et al. (1992a) and Gutek, Searle and Klepa (1991). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) further divided work-family conflict into three categories: time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based. Time-based conflict occurs when time spent in one role precludes participation in another role. Strain-based conflict occurs when stressors in one role affect a person’s ability in another role. Behaviour-based conflict stems from situations where behavioural norms in one role are incompatible with the expectations for behaviour in the other role (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985).

The measurement of conflict has been refined by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) based upon Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) conceptualisation of three subtypes of time, strain and behaviour-based conflict for both work-family and family-work conflict. Van Steenbergen, Ellemers and Mooijaart (2007) have recently proposed including a fourth type of conflict – psychological conflict which refers to being mentally distracted by or preoccupied with one role while physically present in another role (Carlson & Frone 2003).
The psychometric properties of Carlson et al.’s (2000) measure have been well tested in published research (e.g., Allen & Armstrong 2006; Daalen, Willemsen & Sanders 2006; Hughes & Parkes 2007; O’Driscol et al. 2003; Shockley & Allen 2007; Spector, Allen, Poelmans et al. 2007; van Steenbergen et al. 2007). Depending upon the research question, the subscales have been used individually (e.g., Bruck, Allen & Spector 2002) or as an overall measure of work-family conflict (e.g., Witt & Carlson 2006). Matthews, Kath and Barnes-Farrell (2010b) recently developed an empirically valid abbreviated version of Carlson et al.’s (2000) measure for use in research situations in which a shorter version would be more suitable, such as longitudinal and diary-type designs.

Frone et al.’s (1992a) model of work-family conflict has dominated the literature since it was published. According to this model, work-family-conflict mediates the effect of work-related stressors and support on family outcomes and the impact of family stressors and support on work outcomes (Ford et al. 2007). The model has been supported empirically by studies such as Aryee, Fields and Luk (1999) and Carlson and Kacmar (2000).

Of interest is Michel et al.’s (2009) recent research where the authors conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of over twenty years of work-family conflict research. Through a series of path analyses Michel et al. (2009) compared and contrasted existing work-family conflict models and a model the researchers developed, in relation to outcomes of satisfaction. The results indicated that direct effects drive models of work-family conflict and indirect effects provide little incremental explanation with regard to satisfaction outcomes (Michel et al. 2009).
Later work has adopted the terminology of ‘work-home’ conflict or interference to include a broader array of individual and life circumstances (Kreiner 2006; Kreiner, Hollensbe & Sheep 2009). Work-home conflict is defined as “a generalized state of tension that results from incompatible expectations and challenges associated with work and home” (Kreiner et al. 2009, p. 705). For example, Beauregard’s (2006) research set out to compare dispositional and situational antecedents of work interference with home (WIH) and home interference with work (HIW) by adapting Carlson et al.’s (2000) measure of work-family conflict, concluding that self-evaluation characteristics play a key role in predicting HIW. In a recent study, the impact of home life on job performance was examined by Demerouti, Bakker and Voydanoff (2010), finding that the home situation influenced work performance both favourably and unfavourably. In contrast with Kreiner et al.’s (2009) definition, in this study the concept of ‘home-work interference’ (HWI) was defined as the negative process whereby “one’s functioning or performance at work is hampered by the intrusion of demands from the home domain” (Demerouti et al. 2010, p. 130) and was measured with three items from the Dutch questionnaire Survey Work-home Interference NijmeGen (SWING) (Geurts, Taris, Kompier, Dikkers, van Hooff & Kinnunen 2005; Wagena & Geurts 2000).

2.5.1.2 The expansion hypothesis

Recent times have seen a paradigm shift in the behavioural sciences from pathology to health. For example, the positive psychology movement led by Seligman (2008) has shifted the emphasis away from what is wrong with people, to what is right; focusing on strengths, not weaknesses (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi 2000). In the area of
organisational behavior, Luthans (2002, p. 59) made a case for positive psychology to be applied to this field, defining positive organisational behavior as “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace”.

A parallel paradigm shift has taken place in the work-life field where the research has been criticised for viewing work and family largely as conflicting role responsibilities (Werbel & Walter 2002). Reviews of the literature have suggested greater recognition of the benefits of multiple roles leading to a call for a more integrated approach that recognises the positive effects of combining work and non-work roles (Barnett 1998; Eby et al. 2005; Frone 2003; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Grzywacz 2000; Hill 2005; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Marks 1977). As a result, in contrast to the scarcity hypothesis, there is now a growing body of research to suggest that work and family can positively influence one another and that participation in multiple roles can be stimulating and enhance the wellbeing of individuals – referred to as the expansion hypothesis (Barnett & Baruch 1985; Barnett & Hyde 2001; Demerouti, Geurts & Kompier 2004; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Marks 1977; Sieber 1974).

Different terms have been used to refer to the process through which one domain positively influences the other (O’Driscoll et al. 2006) including enrichment, compensation, enhancement, facilitation, positive spillover, role balance, synergy, fit and engagement (McNall, Nicklin & Masuda 2010). Table 2.3 provides a list grouping those
studies where the focus has been on the positive side of the work-family interface, illustrating the proliferation of research in this area over the last decade.

### Table 2.3: Studies of the Positive Side of the Work-Family Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) in Alphabetical Order</th>
<th>Concept Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allis &amp; O’Driscoll (2008)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryee, Srinivas &amp; Tan (2005)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmforth &amp; Gardner (2006)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyar &amp; Mosley (2007)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demerouti, Bakker &amp; Voydanoff (2010)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone (2003)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Carlson (2007)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Butler (2005)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecht &amp; McCarthy (2010)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (2005)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Allen, Jacob et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatepe &amp; Bekteshi (2008)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karimi &amp; Nouri (2009)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu, Siu, Spector &amp; Shi (2009)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotondo &amp; Kincaid (2008)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seery, Corrigall &amp; Harpel (2008)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Delcampo &amp; Blancero (2009)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompso &amp; Werner (1997)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Steenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Steenbergen &amp; Ellemers (2009)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voydanoff (2004; 2005a; 2005c)</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) in Alphabetical Order</td>
<td>Concept Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Powell &amp; Greenhaus (2009)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz (2000)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz, Almeida &amp; McDonald (2002)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Marks (2000)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haar &amp; Bardoel (2008)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair &amp; Shafiro (2005)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Hammer &amp; Colton (2006)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell &amp; Greenhaus (2010)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Franks &amp; Townsend (1994)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon &amp; Kiger (2007)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumer &amp; Knight (2001)</td>
<td>Positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baral &amp; Bhargava (2010)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Grzywacz &amp; Zivnuska (2009)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Grzywacz &amp; Kaemar (2010)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Kaemar, Wayne &amp; Grzywacz (2006)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen &amp; Kirchmeyer (1995)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus &amp; Powell (2006)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmeyer (1992)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingard, Francis &amp; Turner (2010)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNall &amp; Michel (2010)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeters, Wattez, Demerouti &amp; de Regt (2009)</td>
<td>Enrichment/engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell &amp; Greenhaus (2006)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne, Randel &amp; Stevens (2006)</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter &amp; Taris (2008)</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarova, Westman &amp; Shaffer (2010)</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3: Studies of the Positive Side of the Work-Family Interface (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) in Alphabetical Order</th>
<th>Concept Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saks (2006)</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti &amp; Schaufeli (2009)</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedje, Wortman, Downey, Emmons, Biernat &amp; Lang (1990)</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett, Gareis &amp; Brennan (1999)</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Martinengo &amp; Hill (2010)</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moen, Kelly &amp; Huang (2008)</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beutell &amp; Wittig-Berman (2008)</td>
<td>Synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady &amp; McCarthy (2008)</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilies, Wilson &amp; Wagner (2009)</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks &amp; MacDermid (1996)</td>
<td>Role balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted by the researcher from Carlson et al. 2006; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; McNall et al. 2010. Note: Authors cited in full for ease of reference.

A closer look at the different terms used by these researchers indicates content overlap, although there are subtle differences (O’Driscoll et al. 2006). Some researchers use the terms interchangeably and others have offered distinctions on the various terms (McNall et al. 2010) as follows:

**Enrichment.** Work-family enrichment has been defined as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (Greenhaus & Powell

The relationship of individual, family and organisational antecedents to work-family and family-work enrichment and whether enrichment predicted important work outcomes including organisational commitment and turnover intentions has been assessed by Wayne et al. (2006). Results of this study indicated that the strength of an individual’s identity and informal or emotional support within a domain were associated with greater enrichment. In addition, work-family enrichment positively predicted organisational commitment and family-work enrichment negatively predicted turnover intentions (Wayne et al. 2006). Furthermore, Gareis et al. (2009) compared three models of how work-family conflict and enrichment might operate to predict measures of wellbeing (mental health, life satisfaction, affect balance, partner relationship quality) and found that work-to-family conflict and family-to-work enrichment appeared salient for wellbeing.

More recently, studies undertaken by Carlson et al. (2009) and Carlson et al. (2010) have established the theoretical and empirical distinctions between work-family balance and the constructs of work-family conflict and enrichment. In addition, Baral and Bhargava (2010) used nine of the eighteen items from Carlson et al.’s (2006) work-family enrichment scale to examine the role of work-family enrichment in the relationships between organisational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. Job
characteristics and supervisor support were found to be positively related to work-to-family enrichment and work-to-family enrichment mediated the relationships between job characteristics and all job outcomes and between supervisor support and affective commitment (Baral & Bhargava 2010).

**Compensation.** The compensation model proposes that what may be lacking in one sphere, in terms of demands or satisfactions, can be made up in the other (Edwards & Rothbard 2000; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Guest 2001; Rothbard & Dumas 2006). Different conceptualisations of compensation have been discussed within work-family research. For some researchers compensation means that a person decreases his/her involvement in a dissatisfying domain while increasing involvement in another, for others compensation occurs if a person responds to dissatisfaction in one domain by pursuing rewards in another domain (Edwards & Rothbard 2000). The review undertaken for the current research indicates that this model is the least reported in the literature. However, evidence for compensation has been found in a number of studies. For example, Evans and Bartoleme (1984) found that managers temporarily sought fulfilment in their family lives when they were disappointed with their experiences at work. In another study, Rothbard (2001) found women were more engaged with their work if they experienced negative affect from family.

A recent study by Wiese et al. (2010) demonstrated that work-family compensation is an important predictor of positive cross-domain functioning, that is work protects from the negative wellbeing effects of family-related problems/failures and family protects from
the negative wellbeing effects of work-related problems/failures. Wiese et al. (2010) included compensation as one of three theoretically derived facets of work-family enhancement (i.e., compensation, transfer of competencies and transfer of mood), illustrating the overlap of terminology in this area of work-life research.

Enhancement. The term work-family enhancement has been used by a number of researchers to refer to the positive influence process (Frone 2003; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Wiese et al. 2010). Sieber’s (1974) theory of role enhancement is at the core of the perspective that work and family can benefit each other. The role enhancement perspective hypothesises that participation in multiple roles (role accumulation) provides access to a range of resources that can be used across various role responsibilities. According to Wayne (2009) enhancement occurs when an individual acquires a benefit from a particular domain, whereas Grzywacz (2002) considers enhancement to be an outcome rather than a process.

The relationship between work-family conflict and enhancement, organisational work-family culture and work outcomes for women over the age of fifty was studied by Gordon et al. (2007). The results of their survey indicated that older women scored higher on enhancement than on conflict, suggesting that older women have developed strategies or altered their responsibilities in ways that enhance their family lives and vice versa (Gordon et al. 2007). Similar to other studies, Gordon et al. (2007) found that work-to-family conflict was experienced more often than family-to-work conflict and
family-to-work enhancement was experienced more often than work-to-family enhancement (Greenhaus & Powell 2006).

Further evidence for role enhancement is provided by Ruderman et al. (2002) who gathered qualitative and quantitative data to examine the relationships between multiple life roles, psychological wellbeing and managerial skills in two studies of managerial women. Qualitative results showed that women report a number of benefits that are both enriching and enhancing as a result of the roles they play, including psychological benefits, emotional advice and support, practice at multitasking, opportunities to enrich their interpersonal skills and leadership practice that enhances effectiveness in their role as manager. Quantitative results showed the positive relationship between multiple role commitment and life satisfaction, self-esteem and self-acceptance, interpersonal and managerial skills.

**Role balance.** Role balance is considered a general orientation across roles where a person is fully engaged in the performance of every role in their role system (Marks & MacDermid 1996). Two studies were undertaken by Marks and MacDermid (1996) on role balance, role ease and role strain (overload). Their hypotheses were confirmed in the finding that respondents who maintained more balance across their entire systems of roles and activities scored lower on measures of role strain and depression and higher on measures of self-esteem, role ease and other measures of wellbeing.
**Synergy.** In line with the expansion-enhancement hypothesis, the synergy approach argues the beneficial effects of participating in multiple roles for individuals and their families. According to Beutell and Wittig-Berman (2008, p. 508) synergy describes “how work and family, together, create beneficial feelings and outcomes greater than the effects either can create independently”. Beutell and Wittig-Berman (2008) were the first to explore generational issues affecting work-family conflict and synergy and found that ‘generation Xers’ (those born between 1965 and 1983) are particularly concerned about work-life balance, growth opportunities and positive work relationships, compared to ‘boomers’ (those born between 1946 and 1964) and ‘matures’ (those born between 1925 and 1945) (Coupland 1991). The study also found that supervisor support and learning opportunities on the job were the strongest predictors of work-family synergy for each generational group. Of particular interest is the finding that work-family synergy increased significantly for each cohort over a five-year period pointing to the possibility that synergy, rather than conflict, may become the expectation for future generations (Beutell & Wittig-Berman 2008).

**Engagement.** Within the positive paradigm, engagement has been established as an emerging concept of work-related wellbeing (Bakker et al. 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker 2004; Weigl et al. 2010). Emerging from research on stress and burnout, engagement has been defined as “a positive affective-cognitive state, characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption” (Weigl et al. 2010, p. 140). According to this approach, engaged employees have high levels of energy, identify strongly with their jobs, are enthusiastic and experience flow-like states at work (Xanthopoulou et al. 2009; Weigl et al. 2010).
For example, Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) conducted a longitudinal study of the relationships between job resources, personal resources and work engagement in an electrical engineering and electronics company in the Netherlands. Through structural equation modelling analyses they found that work engagement is determined by both environmental and individual factors and that various types of resources and wellbeing evolve into a reciprocal cycle that determines employees’ successful adaptation to their work environment.

Taking a different approach, Lazarova et al. (2010) conceptualised the interdependencies of the work and family domains through their examination of expatriates on international assignments. The purpose of their research was to clarify the process by which expatriates perform their roles as employees and as spouses/partners. Lazarova et al. (2010) adopted Kahn’s (1990) definition and model of engagement. According to this approach, engagement refers to “willingly employing and expressing oneself in a particular role and involves the investment of one’s energies in role performance” (Lazarova et al. 2010, p. 104) emphasising a motivational component.

**Facilitation.** A clear shift in focus towards the study of work-family facilitation has occurred in the 2000s, based on the notion that work and family are interdependent and complementary (Hill et al. 2007; Wayne et al. 2007; Werbel & Walker 2002). However, facilitation has been defined in a number of ways. According to Frone (2003, p. 145), work-family facilitation is defined as: “the extent to which participation at work [or home] is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or
developed at home [or work]”. Voydanoff’s (2004, p. 399) definition is similar to Hill et al.’s (2007): “a form of synergy in which resources associated with one role enhance or make easier participation in the other role”.

The Resource-Gain-Development perspective was developed by Wayne et al. (2007) to provide a comprehensive theoretical explanation and model of the antecedents and consequences of facilitation. The authors defined work-family facilitation as: “the extent to which an individual’s engagement in one life domain (i.e., work/family) provides gains (i.e., developmental, affective, capital, or efficiency) which contribute to enhanced functioning of another life domain (i.e., family/work)” (Wayne et al. 2007, p. 64).

However, Grzywacz et al. (2007, p. 559) have encouraged researchers to “use the enrichment concept when theorizing and researching how an individual’s participation in one domain benefits their role-related performance in another, and use facilitation when theorizing and researching system-level issues”. These authors define work-family facilitation as: “the extent to which an individual’s engagement in one social system such as work or family contributes to growth in another social system” (Grzywacz et al. 2007, p. 559).

One of the few studies to focus solely on the construct of facilitation is Hill et al.’s (2007) qualitative exploration of work-family facilitation. Hill et al. (2007) identified workplace flexibility, financial benefits and the ability to keep family commitments as important components of work-to-home facilitation. In addition, supportive family relationships,
psychological benefits of home and psychological aspects of work were most frequently reported as important components of family-to-work facilitation.

In terms of quantitative measurement of facilitation, researchers have used a variety of scales. A number of earlier measures of facilitation appear to be lacking in reliability and validity (Kalliath & Brough 2008). For example, the measure of work-to-family facilitation used by Voydanoff (2004) was the mean of two items with reasonably poor reliability (alpha coefficient of 0.53): “In the past three months, how often have you had more energy to do things with your family or other important people in your life because of your job?” and “How often have you been in a better mood at home because of your job?”. Further, Hill’s (2005) study of employed mothers and fathers used an unidentified two-item scale with a reliability coefficient of 0.55 for work-family facilitation and an unidentified single item measure for family-work facilitation.

On the other hand, van Steenbergen et al. (2007) employed two strategies to develop measures for four different types of facilitation – time-based, energy-based, behavioural and psychological work-family facilitation. First, they examined existing measures and selected items developed by Wagena and Geurts (2000) and Grzywacz and Marks (2000). Second, they used results from a qualitative study to develop items that captured frequently mentioned experiences. From a pool of thirty-eight items, the researchers selected twenty-four items to best represent the different constructs and used confirmatory factor analysis to establish psychometric validity of the work-family
facilitation sub-scales which demonstrated “good reliability coefficients” (van Steenbergen et al. 2007, p. 288).

A solid body of theoretical and empirical research has evolved around the construct of facilitation, in conjunction with the construct of conflict, which will be discussed further in Section 1.5.4 of this chapter.

2.5.1.3 Negative and positive spillover

The spillover model hypothesises a process whereby experiences in one role affect experiences in the other (Rothbard & Dumas 2006). Work-family spillover is defined as: “the effects of work and family on one another that generate similarities between the two domains” (Edwards & Rothbard 2000, p. 180). The spillover of mood, values, skills and behaviours from one role to another have been examined, although the majority of the research has focused on mood spillover (Edwards & Rothbard 2000). For example, Williams and Alliger (1994) found that working parents were more likely to bring work-related emotions home than they were to transfer family-related emotions to the workplace.

While the majority of research on spillover has been about negative spillover, research now cuts across both the scarcity and the expansion hypotheses with the move towards the study of positive spillover (e.g., Haar & Bardoel 2008; Hanson et al. 2006) and the study of positive and negative spillover together (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Kinnunen et al. 2006; Stephens et al. 1997; Stevens et al. 2007).
An example of research into negative spillover is Grotto and Lyness’ (2010) recent examination of job characteristics and organisational supports as antecedents of negative work-to-nonwork spillover. The results showed that job demands (requirements to work at home beyond scheduled hours, job complexity, time and strain) had positive relationships with negative spillover. Job resources (autonomy and skill development) and organisational supports (flexible work arrangements and two work-life culture facets) had negative relationships with negative spillover (Grotto & Lyness 2010). The findings underscore the need for job characteristics and organisational supports to be considered when developing work-life policies intended to reduce employees’ negative work-to-nonwork spillover.

Research into positive spillover was conducted by Hanson et al. (2006, p. 251) who defined work-family positive spillover as: “the transfer of positively valenced affect, skills, behaviours, and values from the originating domain to the receiving domain, thus having beneficial effects on the receiving domain”. The authors recently developed and validated a multidimensional scale to measure three types of work-family positive spillover: behaviour-based instrumental positive spillover, value-based instrumental positive spillover and affective positive spillover. Each of these types of positive spillover occur in two directions – from work to family and from family to work.

By contrast, Curbow et al. (2003) developed and tested a 20-item measure of the work-family interface including the five factors of: general overload, conflict of family to work, spillover of family to work, spillover of work to family and conflict of family to work.
work. Curbow et al. (2003) found high levels of work-family interference and low job resources to be associated with higher levels of symptoms of depression.

An example of research into both positive and negative spillover was undertaken by Grzywacz and Marks (2000) who developed a measure of negative spillover (work to family and family to work) and positive spillover (work to family and family to work), which the researchers found to be distinct work-family experiences. Haar and Bardoel (2008) used Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000) measure of positive spillover and found work-family positive spillover to be negatively associated with psychological distress and turnover intentions, while family-work positive spillover was negatively linked with psychological distress and positively linked with family satisfaction. These results support previous research linking work-family and family-work positive spillover to mental health, such as Grzywacz (2000), Hanson et al. (2006) and Stephens et al. (1997).

Taking a different approach to spillover, Stevens et al. (2007) found gender differences and similarities in the antecedents of family-to-work spillover, an area the authors referred to as the “neglected side of the work-family interface” (p. 242). Family cohesion and emotion-work satisfaction enhanced positive family-to-work spillover for men and women. Relationship satisfaction was important for men whereas satisfaction with housework arrangements was related to women’s positive spillover. For women, the presence of preschool-aged children was associated with increased negative family-to-work spillover.
The concept of ‘crossover effects’ was studied by Hammer et al. (2005, p. 138) who assessed crossover effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on spouses’ depression. Crossover effects involve “the transmission of emotions, affect or stress from one member of a dyad to another” (Hammer et al. 2005, p. 138). Results of this study indicated that positive spillover has a stronger impact on depression than does work-family conflict. In addition, the effects of spouses’ positive spillover were more strongly related to decreased depression than were the effects of an individual’s own positive spillover. Significant longitudinal effects were related to the crossover of positive spillover on decreased spouse depression (Hammer et al. 2005).

2.5.2 Boundary theory

The concept of boundaries has been extensively used in the work-family literature (Bulger, Matthews & Hoffman 2007; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell 2010; Myrie & Daly 2009). Boundaries are considered by social scientists to be conceptual lines of demarcation that separate domains and domain relevant behaviours. These socially-constructed ‘lines’ are thought to govern the manner in which people think and act (Ashforth 2001; Clark 2000; Zerubavel 1991). Researchers agree that we still have much to learn about boundaries, boundary management, the impact of boundary management strategies on worker outcomes and how such practices impact the interface between work and personal life (Bulger et al. 2007; Kreiner et al. 2009; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell 2010).
The use of boundaries between work and personal life as a means to balance work and life outside of work was originally discussed by Hall and Richter (1988). Boundary theory as applied to the work/personal life interface was further developed by Nippert-Eng (1996) who introduced the idea that individuals actively segment or integrate their work and personal life domains along a segmentation-integration continuum (Bulger et al. 2007).

The related concept, work-family border theory, was developed by Clark (2000). The defining idea behind work-family border theory is the notion that individuals actively construct a boundary around each domain that varies in strength (Clark 2000). Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate (2000) have applied boundary theory to work-family research, proposing that people develop distinct boundaries around both their work and personal life domains that vary in strength and which then influence outcomes of the interaction between their work and personal life.

Both boundary and border theory suggest that the strength of the boundary can be characterised by flexibility and permeability (Bulger et al. 2007). Flexibility is the degree to which an individual contracts or expands a domain boundary, physically or temporally, in response to demands from another domain (Bulger et al. 2007; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell 2010). Permeability is the degree to which an individual allows elements from one domain to enter the other domain (Ashforth 2000; Clark 2000; Hall & Richter 1988). In the case of segmentation, there is low flexibility to leave one domain to attend to the other and low permeability of the domain boundaries. Whereas, in the case
of integration there is high flexibility and high permeability of domain boundaries (Bulger et al. 2007).

Recent empirical research to advance boundary theory includes Matthews and Barnes-Farrell’s (2010) development and initial evaluation of a measure of work and family domain boundary flexibility. Building on previous research, an expanded definition of boundary flexibility is proposed that includes two components – flexibility-ability and flexibility-willingness. The authors conceptualise flexibility-ability as “an individual’s perception of personal and situational constraints that affect boundary management”. Flexibility-willingness is conceptualised as “an individual difference variable that captures the motivation to engage in boundary flexing” (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell 2010, p. 330).

Modern technologies such as the Internet and mobile communication devices such as cell/mobile telephones and computer tablets now enable employees to communicate nearly anywhere and anytime (Ilies et al. 2009). In addition, flexible work arrangements under which employees can complete work from home are increasingly prevalent (Hill, Hawkins & Miller 1996). As a result, the boundary between work and home is becoming increasingly blurred (Ilies et al. 2009). Desrochers, Hilton and Larwood (2005, p. 443) created and validated the Work-Family Integration-Blurring Scale to examine work-family role blurring defined as: “the perception of uncertainty or difficulty in distinguishing one’s work role from one’s family roles (e.g., as parent or spouse) that occurs when these roles are seen as highly integrated)”. Based on boundary theory and
work-family border theory (Ashforth et al. 2000; Clark 2000; Kreiner 2002; Nippert-Eng 1996), the measure has been designed to assess the extent to which people firstly, see their work and family roles as integrated when working from home and secondly, feel that there is a blurred boundary between their work and family roles (Desrochers et al. 2005).

From a qualitative data-gathering perspective, Kreiner et al. (2009) investigated how people manage boundaries to negotiate demands between work and home life and discovered four classifications of boundary work tactics that study participants used to help create their ideal level and style of work-home segmentation and integration. The four types of tactics included behavioural, temporal, physical and communicative (Kreiner et al. 2009). In addition, Kreiner et al. (2009) presented a model based on their qualitative data demonstrating how boundary work tactics reduce the negative effects of work-home challenges.

Another qualitative study using boundary and border theories as central theoretical constructs was undertaken by Myrie and Daly (2009). The experiences of thirty self-employed, home-based workers in Canada were explored using grounded theory methodology. The results indicated that both conceptual and physical barriers were used to create and manage the boundaries between home and work and these boundaries were reinforced by rules (Myrie & Daly 2009).

Further studies investigating the concepts of segmentation and integration have been undertaken by Bulger et al. (2007) and Ilies et al. (2009). First, Bulger et al. (2007)
studied the boundary management profiles of over three-hundred employees and using cluster analysis discovered consistent, although complex, clusters of boundary management practices related to varying segmentation and integration of the work and personal life domains. Ilies et al. (2009), on the other hand, undertook a longitudinal, multi-source, multi-method study using a modified version of Desrochers et al.’s (2005) scale described previously, combining boundary theory and spillover theory. The results showed that employees with highly integrated work and family roles exhibited stronger intra-individual effects on positive and negative affect at home.

2.5.3 Theories of ‘fit’

Grzywacz and Bass (2003, p. 248) made the point that “Historically, fit has not been well defined in the theoretical and empirical literature”. Pittman (1994) introduced the term ‘fit’ in a study of military couples where it acted as a mediator between work variables and marital outcomes. Pittman (1994, p. 186) defined work-family fit as “an assessment of the balance between the spheres and may be considered the acceptability of the multidimensional exchange between a family and work organization”.

On the other hand, Barnett et al. (1999, p. 307) conceptualised ‘fit’ as: “the extent to which workers realize the various components of their work-family strategies, that is, their plans for optimizing their own work and nonwork needs as well as those of other members of their work-family social system”. Accordingly, compatibility and low distress are experienced when available workplace options allow employees to use their strategies.
‘Fit’ has also been conceptualised as the absence of work-family conflict (Barnett 1998; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1999; Perry-Jenkins et al. 2000); as the combination of enrichment and conflict (Barnett 1998); and where work-family facilitation eliminates or offsets the negative potential for work-family conflict (Grzywacz & Bass 2003). Voydanoff (2005b) proposed the concept of work-family fit as a linking mechanism between the work and family domains, suggesting that fit exists when resources in one domain (either work or family) are sufficient to meet the needs or demands in the other domain. Whereas, Moen et al. (2008, p. 3) took an ecology of the life course approach, defining ‘fit’ as “employees’ cognitive appraisals (along a range of different dimensions) of having sufficient resources to function effectively in both their work and family roles”.

Alternatively, person-environment (P-E) fit theory provides a potentially useful framework for integrating stress and work-family research (Edwards et al. 1998). Edwards and Rothbard (2005) presented a theoretical model applying person-environment fit to stress and wellbeing associated with work and family. P-E fit theory indicates that stress arises from misfit between the person and the environment (Edwards & Rothbard 2005). Various models consider P-E fit at the individual, group and organisational level. For example, in a recent study, Lingard et al. (2010) drew on P-E fit theory at the individual level, suggesting that perceptions of work-family fit are the linking mechanism between job-related resources and work-family enrichment – positive attitudes towards work are likely when the degree of P-E fit is high.
2.5.4 Ecological systems theory

Ecological systems theory allows for a broad, unifying theoretical perspective in which workplaces and families can be considered (Westman & Piotrkowski 1999). Ecological systems theory encourages “a holistic examination of the lives of workers by acknowledging the influence of multiple ecological systems and the relationships between them” (Pocock et al. 2009). This theory posits that the work and family micro-systems interact and influence one another through permeable boundaries to create the work-family meso-system (Bronfenbrenner 1986). This relationship is seen as bi-directional – work affects family and family affects work (Grzywacz & Marks 2000).

The ecological perspective theorises that work, family and individual characteristics interact in ways that may be facilitative and conflictual (Hill 2005). Frone (2003) suggested that a comprehensive understanding of the work-family interface should include both components of ‘facilitation’ and ‘conflict’. Frone (2003) further suggested a four-fold taxonomy of work-family balance as a potential conceptual lens through which to examine work and family. This taxonomy allows for two directions of influence between work and family (work to family and family to work) as well as two types of effect (conflict and facilitation), resulting in: work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation, as depicted (see Figure 2.1).
Evidence for the discriminant validity of Frone’s (2003) taxonomy has been found by Aryee et al. (2005). In addition, facilitation and conflict have been found to be orthogonal rather than opposite constructs (van Steenbergen et al. 2007; Wayne et al. 2004). That is, whilst they co-exist each dimension has distinct determinants and consequences (Edwards & Rothbard 2000; Grzywacz & Butler 2005; Grzywacz & Marks 2000, Voydanoff 2005a).

2.5.5 Integrating the positive and negative aspects of the work-family interface

A number of studies examining conflict and facilitation together have emerged in the literature over the last decade, along with numerous studies investigating conflict and other ‘positive’ aspects of the work-family interface such as positive spillover,
enrichment and enhancement. Examples of research including both sides of the work-family interface are provided in Table 2.4.

**Table 2.4: Examples of Researchers Investigating Both the Positive and Negative Aspects of the Work-Family Interface**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) in Alphabetical Order</th>
<th>Concepts Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allis &amp; O’Driscoll (2008)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryee, Srinivas &amp; Tan (2005)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmforth &amp; Gardner (2006)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyar &amp; Mosley (2007)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecht &amp; McCarthy (2010)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (2005)</td>
<td>Facilitation and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatepe &amp; Bekteshi (2008)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karimi &amp; Nouri (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu, Siu, Spector &amp; Shi (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotondo &amp; Kincaid (2008)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seery, Corrigall &amp; Harpel (2008)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Delcampo &amp; Blancero (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Steenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Steenbergen &amp; Ellemers (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4: Examples of Researchers Investigating Both the Positive and Negative Aspects of the Work-Family Interface (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) in Alphabetical Order</th>
<th>Concepts Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voydanoff (2005a; 2004)</td>
<td>Conflict and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beutell &amp; Wittig-Berman (2008)</td>
<td>Conflict and synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Grzywacz &amp; Kacmar (2010)</td>
<td>Conflict and enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Grzywacz &amp; Zivnuska (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict and enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNall &amp; Michel (2010)</td>
<td>Conflict and enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell &amp; Greenhaus (2006)</td>
<td>Enrichment and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Whelan-Berry &amp; Hamilton (2007)</td>
<td>Conflict and enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demerouti, Bakker &amp; Voydanoff (2010)</td>
<td>Facilitation and interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens &amp; Franks (1995)</td>
<td>Interference and enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Powell &amp; Greenhaus (2009)</td>
<td>Conflict, positive spillover and boundary management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair &amp; Shafiro (2005)</td>
<td>Conflict and positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzywacz &amp; Marks (2000)</td>
<td>Positive and negative spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts &amp; Pulkkinen (2006)</td>
<td>Negative and positive spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Franks &amp; Atienza (1997)</td>
<td>Positive and negative spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon &amp; Kiger (2007)</td>
<td>Positive and negative spillover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the researcher for this thesis. Note: Authors are cited in full for ease of reference.

However, a closer investigation of the research included in Table 2.4 reveals methodological issues with regard to construct measurement. That is, while labels were given to constructs in these studies, there appears to be no consensus with regard to the way in which they were measured. Such a lack of consensus leads to an array of overlapping constructs and measures.
For example, Allis and O’Driscoll (2008) used Kirchmeyer’s (1992) spillover measure to assess interrole facilitation and interrole conflict. However, Taylor et al. (2009) used the Grzywacz and Bass (2003) measure of conflict and facilitation. By contrast a number of studies included Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000) measure of positive and negative spillover as measures of conflict and facilitation, such as: Karatepe and Bekteshi (2008); Karimi and Nouri (2009); Lu et al. (2009); Rotondo and Kincaid (2008); van Steenbergen and Ellemers (2009). Other studies used Wayne et al.’s (2004) measure of work-family spillover to measure conflict and facilitation (e.g., Balmforth & Gardner 2006; Innstrand et al. 2010).

Further, Butler et al. (2005) derived a measure of work-to-family conflict using items similar to Carlson et al.’s (2000) and a measure of work-to-family facilitation based on Wayne et al.’s (2004) conceptualisation. Boyar and Mosley (2007) took a similar approach to Butler et al. (2005) to derive work-family interference and work-family facilitation scales. Voydanoff (2005a) derived her own measure of family-to-work conflict and facilitation to examine the differential salience of family and community demands and resources. However, the sample used by Voydanoff (2005a), that is participants from the National Survey of Midlife Development in The United States (MIDUS), to examine family-to-work conflict and facilitation is the same sample used by Grzywacz and Butler (2005) to test their theory of work-family facilitation and the same sample used by Grzywacz and Marks (2000) to identify significant correlates of both positive spillover “(i.e., work-family enhancement)” and negative spillover “(i.e., work-family conflict)” between work and family (Grzywacz & Marks 2000, p. 112).
Despite the issues surrounding construct measurement, the abovementioned studies make a significant contribution to the work-life field by addressing different ways in which work and family roles can benefit each other, in addition to the ways in which they hinder one another, leading to a more balanced view of the work-family interface and answering the numerous calls to expand the conflict paradigm (Voydanoff 2004). Nevertheless, it has become increasingly important to differentiate and clearly understand key concepts and as pointed out by Carlson et al. (2009), in future researchers need to “clearly delineate how these concepts differ and consistently specify the most appropriate constructs when designing work-family research” (Carlson et al. 2009, p. 1460).

While the concepts facilitation, enhancement, positive spillover and enrichment all address different aspects of the positive side of combining multiple roles (Carlson et al. 2006): enhancement encompasses the acquisition of resources and experiences that are beneficial for individuals in facing life challenges (Sieber, 1974); positive spillover indicates moods, values, or skills that transfer from one domain to another domain (Edwards & Rothbard 2000; Hanson et al. 2006); and enrichment refers to the individual’s judgment that participation in one role elicits positive consequences (performance and affect) for the other role (Carlson et al. 2006). However, none of these constructs directly refers to the experience that one role makes it easier to fulfil the requirements of the other, which is the essence of facilitation (van Steenbergen et al. 2007) and the focus of the current research. The approach adopted in the current research ensures the inclusion of both positive and negative aspects and is in line with van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007, p. 294) conclusion: “if we want to understand people’s broader attitudes about their work and nonwork lives, we need to examine the positive
experiences associated with the combination of multiple roles (facilitation) as well as the negative ones (conflict).”

After careful consideration, van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) definition and measure of work-family conflict and facilitation were adopted for the current research. Van Steenbergen et al. (2007, p. 280) differentiated the concepts as follows: “facilitation refers to the extent to which participation in one role makes it easier to fulfil the requirements of another role. As such, we regard facilitation as the conceptual counterpart of conflict, which refers to the extent in which participation in one role makes it more difficult to fulfil the requirements of another role.”

With respect to measurement, van Steenbergen et al. (2007) included sub-scales relating to energy (strain)-based, time-based, behavioural and psychological facilitation and conflict in both directions. Van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) measures were validated by a small qualitative pilot study which looked at how employees experienced their work roles as facilitating their home lives and vice-versa. In a second quantitative study the researchers tested whether the different types of facilitation and conflict could be statistically distinguished (van Steenbergen et al. 2007). Factor analysis and correlations indicated that conflict and facilitation should be seen to represent different constructs rather than single ends of a continuum which can be experienced by an individual at the same time and are likely to have different antecedents and consequences (Carlson et al. 2006; Grzywacz & Butler 2005; van Steenbergen et al. 2007; Wayne et al. 2004). In addition, the inclusion of facilitation, together with conflict, significantly increased the prediction of work, nonwork and stress outcomes (van Steenbergen et al. 2007).
The present study extends the work of van Steenbergen et al. (2007) by taking up their call to assess the robustness of their findings in other organisational contexts and to uncover relevant antecedents.

2.6 Perceived Work-Life Balance and the Work-Family Interface

This Chapter so far has highlighted the numerous reasons why studying the topic of work-life balance is challenging: the literature is extremely broad with no one journal dedicated to consolidating the research emanating from this multidisciplinary field (Drago & Kashian 2003); definitions of work-life balance are many and varied resulting in no one consistent and agreed upon definition (Kalliath & Brough 2008a); and ways of conceptualising the issues have shifted from ‘work-family’ and ‘family-friendly’ through to ‘work-life’, ‘work-life balance’, ‘integration’ and ‘synergy’, creating confusion in the literature (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007). In particular, few attempts have been made to measure work-life balance directly and where measures have been developed, there are issues with regard to validity and lack of consensus among approaches taken by researchers (Kalliath & Brough 2008). In addition, the conceptual distinction between constructs such as work-life balance, conflict and facilitation and the utility of these concepts remains under-developed and empirically unsubstantiated (Carlson et al. 2009). The current research aims to improve the theoretical and empirical understanding of work-life balance and after reviewing previous conceptualisations and approaches to understanding the work-family interface and the concept of work-life balance, the following section outlines the approach taken in the present study.
The current research takes the approach that work-life balance is conceptually and empirically distinct from work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, as opposed to the majority of work-life research in the past which has measured components of work-family balance such as conflict and facilitation or enrichment, with researchers suggesting that work-family balance is a result of high levels of work-family facilitation or enrichment and low levels of work-family conflict (Frone 2003; Grzywacz & Bass 2003; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007). In this study, perceived work-life balance reflects the positive integration of the life domains whereby individuals are able to perform activities in both the work and family domains effectively (Joplin et al. 2003b), which is a more global perspective than that of conflict and facilitation (Carlson et al. 2009).

It is further suggested that the resultant unique combinations of conflict and facilitation may be pivotal to understanding perceptions of work-life balance. Concurring with Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) is the approach that work-life balance is considered to be a direct formative latent construct, according to the criteria set out by Edwards and Bagozzi (2000). Specifically, conflict and facilitation are orthogonal constructs that precede and contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance; measures of work-life balance are distinct from measures of conflict and facilitation and changes in conflict and facilitation indicators will likely result in changes in work-life balance perceptions (Edwards & Bagozzi, 2000). Lower levels of conflict and higher levels of facilitation are likely to be associated with perceptions of work-life balance (Frone, 2002).
To this end specific constructs and measures for work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation, family-work facilitation and perceived work-life balance were included in the current research as shown in Figure 2.2 which depicts the first part of the model put forward in the present study.

Based on the points outlined above, the first two propositions are:

**Proposition 1:** *Perceived work-life balance is distinct from work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation.* The first proposition maintains that the constructs of conflict, facilitation and perceived work-life balance are conceptually and empirically distinct. To that end, it is hypothesised that work-family conflict is negatively related to perceived work-life balance; family-work conflict is negatively related to perceived work-life balance; work-family facilitation is positively related to perceived work-life balance; and family-work facilitation is positively related to perceived work-life balance. Finally, when added to measures that assess the experience of conflict, the inclusion of facilitation measures increases the amount of variance explained in perceived work-life balance.

**Proposition 2:** *The constructs of conflict and facilitation serve as indicators of perceived work-life balance.* The second proposition assumes that low levels of conflict and high levels of facilitation are expected to be associated with work-life balance. The current research adopts Grzywacz and Carlson’s (2007) approach that measures of conflict and facilitation are not in themselves measures of work-life balance, rather they are useful for understanding the effects of the demands and resources associated with the work-family
domains, instead serving as indicators of work-life balance (Frone 2003; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007; Voydanoff 2004).

The relationships between resources and facilitation and demands and conflict are described in Chapter 3. Essentially, a demands-and-resources model is useful to illuminate the characteristics of work and home and how they influence the lives of individuals as consideration is given to the degree to which contextual and personal characteristics place demands on an individual and the extent to which they create resources (Pocock et al. 2009). Conceptualising work and home as characterised by demands and resources that combine in complex ways to either facilitate or inhibit work-life balance creates the opportunity to understand the relationship between work and home which is one of the main purposes of the current research.
Figure 2.2: Hypothesised Relationships Between Conflict and Perceived Work-Life Balance and Between Facilitation and Perceived Work-Life Balance

Source: Developed by the author for this research.
2.7 Conclusion

According to Valcour (2007, p. 1513) “work-family balance is a construct whose popular usage has outpaced its theoretical development”. This comment is not surprising given that a review of the literature undertaken for this research revealed that there is no one journal dedicated to the field; nor is there a widely accepted definition of the construct nor operationalisation that meets widely accepted criteria for construct validity. Nevertheless, following a review and critique of the approaches that have previously been taken to study work-life balance and the work-family interface, relationships between perceived work-life balance, conflict and facilitation have been put forward in this chapter, together with the means for operationalising these constructs. Chapter 3 provides a review of the literature with regard to the antecedents and outcomes studied in the work-life field with a particular focus on the demands-and-resources theoretical framework and its integration with the work-family interface theoretical framework. In addition, a conceptual model of work-life balance will be finalised and further propositions will be put forward.
CHAPTER 3
ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature on the antecedents and outcomes studied in the work-life field relevant to the present research. First, the demands-and-resources theoretical framework underpinning the current study is outlined (Section 3.2). Second, environmental and personal antecedents are identified within the demands-and-resources theoretical framework (Section 3.3). Third, the integration of the demands-and-resources scholarship with the work-family interface scholarship is reviewed from both a theoretical and empirical perspective (Section 3.4). Next, outcomes are classified according to previous research and further discussed (Section 3.5). Finally, an integrated conceptualisation and model of work-life balance is proposed and additional propositions to be tested in this study are outlined (Section 3.6).

3.2 Theoretical Framework

The stance taken in the current research concurs with O’Driscoll et al. (2006, p. 137) who suggest that “A first step in the process of achieving balance is to examine stressors (which cause conflict) and resources (which may result in facilitation)”. This approach treats two lines of work-life scholarship as complementary: demands-and-resources theory and work-family interface theory. The work-family interface scholarship was reviewed in Chapter 2 where the concepts of conflict and facilitation were introduced and
distinguished from the concept of perceived work-life balance. This section of Chapter 3 is concerned with reviewing the demands-and-resources scholarship which provides a framework for discussing the antecedent, predictor or independent variables studied in the work-life field. The relationships among these variables and the concepts of conflict and facilitation are also reviewed.

Historically, research into demands and resources can be found in the field of occupational health psychology, dating back to the 1970s (Moen et al. 2008). This research has been guided by theoretical models of work stress which have proven useful as they help to identify particular job characteristics that impact on employee wellbeing (van Vegchel, de Jonge & Landsbergis 2005). In particular, one of the most influential models has been Karasek’s (1979) Job Demand-Control (JDC) model (also called the job strain model) which identified two crucial job aspects in the work situation: job demands and job control. According to the JDC model, work environments with high psychological demands and low job control negatively impact upon employee health and wellbeing (Karasek 1979; Karasek & Theorell 1990). Later a social dimension was added to the model, resulting in the Job Demand-Control-Support (JDCS) model where social support was hypothesised to moderate the impact of high strain on wellbeing (Häusser, Mojzisch, Niesel & Schulz-Hardt 2010; Johnson & Hall 1988; van der Doef & Maes 1999).

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model was developed later by Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner and Schaufeli (2001). The basic assumption in the JD-R model is that the characteristics of work environments may be classified into two categories: job demands
and resources (Bakker & Demerouti 2007; Mauno, Kinnunen & Ruokolainen 2006). In this context, job demands are defined as “physical, psychological, social or organizational features of the job, requiring physical and/or psychological effort and energy from an employee, and are consequently related to physiological and/or psychological costs (i.e., strain)” (Mauno et al. 2006, p. 212). Job resources are defined here as “physical, psychological, social, or organizational features of the job, which, in turn, are functional in (1) achieving work goals, (2) reducing job demands and the physical and/or psychological costs associated with them, and (3) stimulating personal growth and development” (Mauno et al. 2006, p. 212). The main proposition of the JD-R model is that irrespective of the occupation involved, job demands may cause strain or health problems, whereas job resources induce a motivational process (Schaufeli, Bakker & van Rhenen 2009). Accordingly, the risk of employee burnout is highest in working environments where job demands are high and job resources are low (Bakker, van Veldhoven & Xanthopoulou 2010). However, job resources may offset the negative impact of job demands on burnout referred to as the “buffer hypothesis” (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Dollard, Demerouti, Schaufeli, Taris & Schreurs 2007, p. 768).

Recently, the ‘demands-resources’ approach has been adopted by researchers in the work-life field and the rationale used for the present study has been guided by their work, specifically Voydanoff (see 2002; 2004; 2005a; 2005b) and Wayne et al. (see 2007). Importantly, the conceptual frameworks and models of these particular researchers both illustrate the links between demands and resources and the constructs of conflict and facilitation as described below.
Turning first to the work of Voydanoff (2004, p. 398) who defined demands as: “structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations and norms to which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or mental effort”. While resources are defined as: “structural or psychological assets that may be used to help performance, reduce demands or generate additional resources” (Voydanoff, 2004 p. 398-9). According to Voydanoff’s (2005d, p. 584) conceptual model of the work-family interface “demands and resources associated with participating in the work or family domain directly affect role performance and quality in the other domain”. In addition, Voydanoff (2005d) proposed that demands and resources in one domain are related to appraisals of conflict and facilitation across domains. These appraisals are ‘linking mechanisms’ that are thought to mediate relationships between demands and resources and role performance and quality (Voydanoff 2002). Therefore, as cognitive appraisals of the effects of the work (family) domain on the family (work) domain, work-family conflict and facilitation are considered useful for understanding the differential or independent effects of demands and resources (Voydanoff 2005b).

Voydanoff (2004) suggested that work-family demands are associated positively with work-family conflict. Time-based demands are hypothesised to be related to work-family conflict through the process of resource drain where time or involvement used to participate in one domain limits that available for participation in the other domain (Tenbrunsel, Brett, Maoz, Stroh & Reilly 1995). Strain-based demands are hypothesised to be linked to work-family conflict through a psychological process in which the strain associated with participating in one domain is carried over to the other domain, creating strain in the second domain and thus hindering role performance (Rothbard 2001).
Whereas, Voydanoff (2004) suggested that work-family resources are associated positively with work-family facilitation because they are thought to engender processes that improve performance when they are applied across domains. Voydanoff (2004, p. 400) categorised resources into “enabling” and “psychological” resources. Enabling resources from one domain may generate resources in another domain, thus enhancing participation in the second domain and contributing to work-family facilitation by increasing the competence and capacities of individuals to perform in the other domain. For example, interpersonal communication skills developed at work may facilitate constructive communication in the home domain (Voydanoff 2004). Psychological resources associated with feeling esteemed and valued, for example, may be accompanied by benefits such as motivation or a sense of accomplishment. These resources are thought to be related to work-family facilitation through positive transmission processes similar to strain-based demands. In this case, participating in one domain is carried over to the other domain, creating energy in the second domain and thus enhancing role performance (Rothbard 2001).

Finally, ‘boundary-spanning’ demands and resources are posited by Voydanoff (2005a, 2005b, 2005d) as those that originate in either the work or family domain, but serve as demands and resources in both domains. For example, child-care benefits and services are potentially a resource originating in the workplace but these benefits and services may also serve as a family resource (Voydanoff 2005a, 2005b).
Turning next to Wayne et al. (2007) who used Positive Organizational Scholarship (Cameron, Dutton, Quinn & Wrzesniewski 2003), Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner 1986, 1989) and Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll 1989) to develop the Resource-Gain-Development (RGD) perspective to explain the concept of facilitation. The main tenet of the RGD approach is that facilitation occurs because of an individual’s innate drive to maximise their growth, development and potential and to apply this growth to other areas of their life or life systems (Wayne et al. 2007). According to the RGD perspective “the primary driver of facilitation is the acquisition and utilization of individual and environmental resources” (Wayne et al. 2007, p. 73). Examples of individual resources are personal characteristics such as positive affectivity, self-efficacy and work identity. According to Wayne et al. (2007, p. 67) personal characteristics are defined as: “aspects of one’s self that promote positivity and cause the individual to more readily experience emotional states, seek positive developmental experiences and earn status and other assets”. Whereas, environmental resources enable facilitation by promoting positive, dynamic and enriching environments (Wayne et al. 2007). Examples of environmental resources include job characteristics (e.g., autonomy and control), social support, a supportive workplace culture and developmental opportunities (Wayne et al. 2007).

Wayne et al.’s (2007) model recognises that individuals vary in their ability to obtain resources from their environment or effectively use resources as a result of demand characteristics, such as gender and occupational status (Grzywacz 2002). Wayne et al. (2007, p. 68) proposed that demand characteristics influence facilitation by “shaping the type and degree of resources available to individuals”. Demand characteristics are also
hypothesised to “moderate the relationship between environmental resources and facilitation because they allow certain individuals to receive more benefit from available resources” (Wayne et al. 2007, p. 68).

The theoretical perspective taken in the current study is aligned with that of Voydanoff (2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d) and Wayne et al. (2007). Specifically, this research posits that primary antecedents in the personal and environmental domains (demands and resources) are associated with conflict and facilitation. Voydanoff’s (2004) definitions of demands and resources referred to previously have been adopted in the current study. Demands have been thought to cause conflict and resources to result in facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006). Further, as outlined in Chapter 2, the concepts of conflict and facilitation are important for understanding perceptions of work-life balance and its consequences.

The next sections review the antecedents that have been studied in the work-life field together with the empirical evidence supporting the demands-and-resources conceptual framework and the association of demands and resources with the work-family interface, specifically the concepts of conflict and facilitation.

3.3 Empirical Evidence

The literature offers a plethora of work, non-work and demographic and individual independent characteristics that have been investigated in the work-life field (Bardoel et al. 2008; Byron 2005; Eby et al. 2005; O’Driscoll et al. 2006). Consistent with the demands-and-resources perspective taken in the present study and for the purposes of this
review these variables have been classified into environmental and personal demands and resources (Lazarova et al. 2010; Pitt-Catsouphes, Matz-Costa & MacDermid 2007).

3.3.1 Environmental demands as antecedents

Sources of demands emanate from both the work environment (job and organisational characteristics) and the non-work environment (home and family characteristics) (O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Pitt-Catsouphes et al. 2007; Voydanoff 2005e). With respect to the relationship between demands and the work-family interface, Byron’s (2005) meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents supports the notion that work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW) have unique antecedents and that work factors related more strongly to work interfering with family and non-work factors were more strongly related to family interfering with work. Empirical evidence for the relationship between a range of environmental demand characteristics and the work-family interface is provided below.

Perceived work and family demands have consistently been shown to be significant antecedents of work-family conflict and family-work conflict, respectively (Boyar et al. 2007; 2008; Frone et al. 1992; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Lu et al. 2010). In particular, Boyar et al. (2007) articulated a theoretical rationale that captured the importance of perceived work and family demands and their relationships with work interfering with family and family interfering with work. The researchers defined demand as “a global perception of the level and intensity of responsibility within the work (or family) domain” (Boyar et al. 2007, p. 103). This definition is designed to differentiate perceived work demands from work-role overload and variables such as role conflict, role
ambiguity, job insecurity, job pressure, job stress and job involvement which have been used to reflect the demands resulting from paid employment and studied as antecedents of work-family conflict (see Aryee et al. 1999; Boyar, Maertz, Pearson & Keough 2003; Byron 2005; Frone et al. 1997; Grandey & Cropanzano 1999; Kinnunen & Mauno 1998; Major, Klein & Ehrhart 2002; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Parasuraman, Pruohit, Godshalk & Beutell 1996; Parasuraman & Simmers 2001; Prottas & Thompson 2006). Further, Boyar et al. (2007) developed and validated two scales to capture the work and family demand constructs which were found to have significant direct effects on work-family (family-work) interference (Boyar et al. 2007; 2008).

As a factor contributing to work interfering with home life, time spent in paid work has been the centre of much discussion and research in the work-life literature, because time is a ‘fixed’ or finite resource it means there may not be enough to go around (Hochschild 1997; Skinner & Pocock 2010; van Wanrooy & Wilson 2006; Voydanoff 2005e). For example, long working hours may impede an individual’s ability to spend time at home making it difficult to undertake household and family duties and to maintain healthy relationships (Parris, Vickers & Wilkes 2008; Shepanski & Diamond 2007; Tenbrunsel et al. 1995). Research consistently shows a positive relationship between paid work hours and work-family conflict (Aryee 1992; Carlson & Frone 2003; Duxbury, Higgins & Lee 1994; Frone, Russell & Cooper 1997a; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Gutek et al. 1991; Major et al. 2002; O’Driscoll et al. 1992; Parasuraman et al. 1996; Reynolds 2005; Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness 1999; Voydanoff 1988; 2005e) and difficulties in balancing work and home life (Batt & Valcour 2003; Moen & Yu 2000).
In addition, the number of hours devoted to family responsibilities has been found to be related to family-work conflict (Frone et al. 1997a; Greenhaus & Beutell 1985; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Gutek et al. 1991; Netemeyer, Boles & McMurrian 1996; O’Driscoll et al. 1992; Van der Hulst & Geurts 2001). In their cross-national study of long work hours and family life, Wharton and Blair-Loy (2006, p. 432) concluded that “the more obligations and expectations for family involvement in a society, the more conflict its members will experience when work demands are high”.

Job design characteristics such as time pressure and workload pressure have also been associated with work-family conflict (Ilies, Schwind, Wagner, Johnson, DeRue & Ilgen 2007; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Pocock et al. 2007; Pocock et al. 2009; Skinner & Pocock 2010; Spector et al. 2007; Wallace 1999). Time pressure occurs when employees do not believe they have enough time to complete their duties and workload pressure occurs when employees have to maintain an excessive workload over a period of time (Voydanoff 2005e). Time and workload pressures often result in stress and fatigue and hinder effective participation in home life (Boyar et al. 2003; Frone et al. 1992; Grzywacz & Marks 2000).

Along similar lines, role overload suggests that individuals have too much to accomplish in an inadequate period of time (Aryee, Luk, Leung & Lo 1998; Greenhaus & Beutell 1985; Wallace 1997). Elloy and Smith (2003, p. 57) considered overload to occur “when multiple demands exceed resources, and may be either qualitative or quantitative. Qualitative overload refers to a situation where a task is too difficult to complete, while quantitative overload is experienced when there are too many tasks that need to be done”.
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A number of researchers report work overload to be related to both work-family conflict and family-work conflict (Aryee et al. 1998; Frone et al. 1997; Parasuraman et al. 1996; Wallace 1999), while parental overload has been found to be related to family-work conflict (Aryee et al. 1998) and work-family conflict (Frone et al. 1997).

High involvement and investment in work appears to promote work-family conflict (Byron 2005; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Eby et al. 2005). That is, when a high value is placed upon home life which requires spending time and energy in this domain and these preferences are blocked by involvement in the work domain, work-family conflict is likely to occur (Carlson & Kacmar 2000). Further, research suggests that work-family conflict is likely to occur in situations where employees display greater time commitment to work (Parasuraman & Simmers 2001) and are high in intrinsic motivation and organisational loyalty (Tenbrunsel et al. 1995).

In addition, increased family involvement and responsibilities positively predicts family-work conflict (Anderson, Coffey & Byerly 2002; Boyar et al. 2003; Carlson & Frone 2003; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Eby et al. 2005; Grandey & Cropanzano 1999). Family-work conflict has been found to be higher among those who have disagreements, tension or stress with their family or spouse (Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Williams & Alliger 1994) and those who have children at home (Beatty 1996; Behson 2002; Tausig & Fenwick 2008).

The number and age of children have been considered factors contributing to conflict although the research findings are mixed (O’Dris.coll et al. 2006). While the presence of younger children, particularly those of infant and pre-school age, produce the greatest
found that having pre-school aged children reduced work-family interference. In another study, Kim and Ling’s (2001) results showed that having adolescent children was linked with higher parental levels of work-family conflict. Interestingly, in Wallace and Young’s (2008) later study of parenthood and productivity within the legal profession the researchers concluded that teenage children appeared to advance their mother’s work productivity, changing from “being a ‘demand’ on their working parents’ time and energies to a ‘resource’ instead”, possibly because children of this age require less supervision and can potentially help with the household tasks (Wallace et al. 2008, p. 119).

Studies that have examined elder-care issues have shown that care-giving responsibilities can lead to family-work conflict and responsibilities at work can interfere with care-giving resulting in negative health outcomes, particularly for women (Stephens et al. 1997).

From an Australian perspective, results of the Australia Work and Life Index (AWALI) (Pocock et al. 2009) surveys undertaken from 2007 to 2009 indicated that work life interferes with home life more than the reverse effect, noting that demands created on the personal and home front included “more caring responsibilities, longer commutes, being middle aged (34-55 years), and having higher levels of education” (Pocock et al. 2009, p. 6). On the work front, circumstances that increase demands included “having an unsupportive supervisor or workplace culture; feeling overloaded; working longer hours; having a poor quality job with little control; having little flexibility about when and how
one works; having a poor fit between actual and preferred hours of work; being insecure at work and being a manager or a professional” (Pocock et al. 2009, p. 6).

Taking a demands-and-resources perspective and moving away from the conflict/interference-based focus, a number of the work variables identified in the AWALI surveys have been considered in the work-life field as resources and are discussed in the following section. For example, jobs characterised by high levels of flexibility and control and organisations characterised by management and workplace cultures supportive of work-life balance have been found to reduce conflict and to be positively related to facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006).

3.3.2 Environmental resources as antecedents

As with environmental demands, environmental resources emanate from both the workplace and the home (Bardoel et al. 2008; Eby et al. 2005; O’Driscoll et al. 2006). As a result of the focus on the concept of conflict in the literature, there is a body of research which provides evidence for the link between environmental resources and reduced work-family and family-work conflict (Byron 2005; Galinsky, Bond & Friedman 1996). However, along with the growth of interest in the positive side of the work-family interface has grown the identification of resources positively associated with work-family and family-work facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006). Both bodies of evidence will be included in this review.

With regard to workplace and home characteristics, this section is concerned with those that have been the focus of most attention in the literature: job characteristics (flexibility,
autonomy and control); organisational characteristics (workplace culture, including family-supportive policies and practices, managerial and colleague support) and home characteristics (support from spouse, family and friends).

**Job characteristics.** Thompson and Prottas (2005, p. 102) suggested that “employees who have discretion over the way in which they perform their job are better able to integrate their work and family lives”. Such discretion is influenced by an employee’s ability to decide when, where and how work is done which has been much discussed and studied in the work-life literature under the concepts of control, autonomy and flexibility (Bailyn 1993; Clark 2001; Thompson & Prottas 2005). The literature review undertaken for the current study found a degree of overlap and ambiguity in the way these job characteristics have been conceptualised and operationalised in work-life research. However, the following section is mainly concerned with their role as environmental resources and how they relate to the work-family interface.

In general, autonomy refers to the “latitude of arranging tasks and actions within a given time-frame” (Kattenbach, Demerouti & Nahcreiner 2010), defined by Thompson and Prottas (2005, p. 115) as: “discretion over how the job is to be performed”. Job autonomy has been linked to less family-to-work conflict (Parasuraman et al. 1996) and to work-family facilitation (Voydanoff 2004). Thompson and Prottas’ (2005) conclusions reinforced previous research suggesting that autonomy is related to an employee’s ability to manage the work-family interface (Clark 2001; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Voydanoff 2004). They found that employees with higher levels of job autonomy experienced more positive spillover between job and home and were less likely to experience “either form
of work-family conflict” (Thompson & Prottas 2005, p. 115). This research also investigated the relationship between job autonomy and perceived control, finding that job autonomy was associated with employee perceptions of control, which in turn decreased negative consequences of managing multiple life roles and increased positive attitudes about job, family and life (Thompson & Prottas 2005).

In a more recent study, Innstrand et al. (2010) investigated how work-home conflict and facilitation varied among Norwegians living in different family structures (two-parent families; single parents; childless couples and singles). The researchers found that autonomy was negatively related to work-home conflict and positively related to work-home facilitation as well as home-work facilitation. They concluded that autonomy enhances facilitation and reduces conflict which implies that autonomy promotes balance between work and home life regardless of family structure (Innstrand et al. 2010).

Psychologists consider perceived control to be important for psychological wellbeing and an important motive guiding human behaviour whereas lack of perceived control is a factor in the development of depression (Seligman 1975). Karasek’s (1979) JDC model, referred to previously, underscored the role of job control in the domain of job stress. In the work-life literature control, particularly control over work time, is considered a resource because it is related to the ability to manage multiple role demands and is linked to positive work-family interactions (Hill et al. 2007; Kossek, Lautsch & Eaton 2006; Lingard et al. 2010; Thompson & Prottas 2005; Valcour 2007). According to Beham and Drobnič (2010, p. 674) job control refers to “the degree to which an employee perceives that he/she can control when, where, and how to do his/her job”.
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Research evidence suggests that employees with higher levels of perceived control experience lower levels of work-to-family conflict (Adams & Jex 1999; Butler et al. 2005; Duxbury et al. 1994; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Haddock et al. 2006; Kossek et al. 2006; Thomas & Ganster 1995).

Using objective measures of job characteristics (e.g., autonomy and variety) to test their theory of work-family facilitation Grzywacz and Butler (2005, p. 97) concluded that “resource-rich jobs enable work-to-family facilitation”. In support of this research, Butler et al. (2005) reported skill level and control to be positively related to work-family facilitation. Furthermore, Valcour’s (2007, p. 1512) study of work-based resources found that the work characteristics of job complexity and control were positively associated with satisfaction with work-family balance and suggested that more research attention be paid to resources which may be “useful to the successful integration of work and family demands”.

In particular, greater control over work time is a resource which enables individuals to fulfil both work and family demands and lessens the strain they experience (Beham & Drobnič 2010; Thomas & Ganster 1995). A series of studies has investigated ‘work-time control’ where control over work hours has been associated with lower work-family conflict (Jansen, Kant, Nijhuis, Swaen & Kristensen 2004). In particular Hughes and Parkes (2007) concluded that work hours are not necessarily associated with higher work-family interference because of the moderating influence of control over work hours, suggesting that where some flexibility and control over work hours is provided by
employers it may help to reduce the potential negative impact of long work hours on employees.

On the topic of flexibility, the concept of workplace flexibility has been referred to as “the most significant structural response formulated to confront work-family conflict” (Poelmans & Chenoy 2008, p. 134). Hill, Grzywacz, Allen, Blanchard, Matz-Costa, Shulkin and Pitt-Catsoupes (2008) provided a broad conceptual framework to provide researchers with a clearer understanding of what workplace flexibility is, defining the concept as “the ability of workers to make choices influencing when, where, and for how long they engage in work-related tasks” (Hill et al. 2008, p. 149). Flexibility has been cited as benefiting employees by allowing them to meet work-related responsibilities while maintaining a satisfying personal life (Casey & Grzywacz 2008) and to benefit employers through the attraction and retention of high quality employees, enabling a competitive advantage (Carlson et al. 2010; The Law Society of New South Wales 2004).

A cross-cultural model of the work-family interface was tested by Hill et al (2004b) using over twenty-five thousand survey responses from forty-eight countries. The results supported a model showing job flexibility to be related to reduced work-family conflict, reduced family-work conflict and enhanced work-family fit, concluding that the investment in job flexibility initiatives by international organisations is likely to benefit men, women and businesses in diverse cultures. Casey and Grzywacz (2008) came to a similar conclusion, that is, organisations benefit from building a culture of flexibility. The researchers’ longitudinal study over a year showed that increased flexibility was
associated with decreased sickness absence and work-related impairment and improved job commitment (Casey & Grzywacz 2008).

Taking a different stance on flexibility, Grzywacz, Carlson and Shulkin (2008) differentiated between flexibility as a phenomenological experience (perceived flexibility) as opposed to an environmental attribute (formal flexible arrangements). Flexible work arrangements are defined as “alternative work options that allow work to be accomplished outside of the traditional temporal and/or spatial boundaries of a standard work-day” (Shockley & Allen 2007, p. 479). The term ‘schedule flexibility’ has been used to cover options related to flexibility in when work is done, where policies and practices allow employees to modify their work schedules, such as ‘flextime’ or ‘flexitime’ (flexibility in the arrangement of daily work hours) and compressed work weeks (weekly hours worked in fewer than the standard five-day work week, e.g., 4 x 10-hour days) (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright & Neuman 1999; Carlson et al. 2010; Lingard et al. 2008; Pierce & Dunham 1992). Time in lieu of payment (taking time off to make up for extra hours worked), banked hours (extra hours worked above the expected number of hours, for use at another time) and making up time (working extra hours for time taken off at an earlier date and which are now ‘owed’ to the employer) are further practices that provide employees with schedule flexibility (Beauregard & Henry 2009; The Law Society of New South Wales 2004).

Location flexibility, sometimes referred to as ‘flexplace’, provides employees with a choice over where they do their work (e.g., telecommuting or working from home) (Hill et al. 2008). The term ‘telecommuting’ is used interchangeably with ‘telework’ and
‘virtual work’ to describe a variety of arrangements that involve working away from the employer’s main workplace (Garrett & Danziger 2007; Kurland & Bailey 1999; Morganson, Major, Oborn, Verive & Helan 2010). Sites away from the workplace include working from home, from a satellite office, in a telecentre and at another worksite (for example a client’s office) (Morganson et al. 2010).

Telework has been found to be positively associated with autonomy (Gajendran & Harrison 2007) and flexibility (Hill, Miller, Weiner & Colihan 1998) because it allows workers control over how and when work is performed. A number of studies have shown that telework helps workers to accommodate work-life balance demands by providing flexibility to balance the competing roles of work and family, fulfil household responsibilities and enable time management. For example, Hill et al. (2003) compared traditional office workers, mobile workers and home-based workers and found that home-based workers reported the highest levels of work-life balance and the greatest amount of work/family success. Studies of work-family interference and conflict include that of Golden, Veiga and Simsek (2006) who identified a positive relationship between the amount of time people telework and levels of work interference with family and a negative relationship between time spent teleworking and family interference with work. Similarly, Lapierre and Allen (2006) found telework was negatively related to family interference with work and Gajendran and Harrison’s (2007) meta-analytic review found a negative relationship between telework and work-family conflict.
On the other hand, virtual workers are removed from the central office location and other researchers have argued that telework reduces task interdependence and increases social isolation (Feldman & Gainey 1997) and can be a source of work-life imbalance because teleworkers can work longer hours and may experience increased stress and overload (Hill et al. 1998; Russell, O’Connell & McGinnity 2009).

A recent study by Morganson et al. (2010) compared workers employed by a single organisation, but with four primary work locations (viz., employer’s main office, a satellite office, a client site and the employee’s home) to examine differences in work-life balance support, job satisfaction and inclusion. Work-life balance support was defined as “individuals’ perceptions of the organization’s willingness to and interest in supporting family and personal life needs” (Morganson et al. 2010, p. 581). Work-life balance support is reported to be negatively related to work interfering with family and positively related to job and family satisfaction (Ford et al. 2007; Michel & Hargis 2008). The results of Morganson et al.’s (2010) study showed home-based workers more likely to report higher work-life balance support than satellite and client-based workers. Contrary to expectations, home-based and office-based workers reported the same levels of work-life balance support which they attributed to the possibility that home-based work has benefits and drawbacks, which may counteract one another (Morganson et al. 2010).

Part-time work or reduced-hours employment (working part days for five or less days per week, or working full days but fewer than five days per week) and varied annual leave time are two options that provide employees with flexibility in how long they engage in work (Baltes et al. 1999; Hill et al. 2008). Further reduced hours employment includes
job-sharing (where two employees share one full-time job with its pro-rata salary) and part-year work (working reduced hours on an annual basis e.g., working full-time during the school year and taking time off during school holidays) Other forms of flexible leave options include time off during the workday to address personal and family issues, time off for personal illness, family leave or paid time off to care for children or other dependants and parental leave (paid or unpaid planned time off for mothers and fathers for the birth or adoption of a child or care of a foster child) (Beauregard & Henry 2009; The Law Society of New South Wales 2004).

A number of researchers have compared the efficacy of flexible working arrangements. For example, using a sample of employed women Shockley and Allen (2007) found that flexible work arrangements related more highly to work interference with family, than to family interference with work and that flextime had a stronger relationship with work-family interference than did flexplace. In addition, the relationship was stronger for participants with greater family responsibility (Shockley & Allen 2007).

Data from the first wave of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) project was analysed by Hosking and Western (2008) who focused on three types of non-standard employment: part-time hours, casual and fixed-term contracts and non-standard scheduling practices. In this study, mothers who worked full-time, rather than part-time reported experiencing significantly greater work-family conflict (Hosking & Western 2008).
In another Australian study, Lingard et al. (2008) collected data from four case studies undertaken in the Australian construction industry. Two construction projects implemented a compressed work week and the others two sites introduced reduced hours schedules (one was optional). The mixed results clearly showed that future attempts to improve work-life balance need to take into account the industry’s labour markets, particularly whether employees are on wages or on a salary. While the compressed work week was favourably received where it was introduced, waged workers were concerned about the impact on their pay. Similarly, waged workers did not favour reduced hours schedules, providing evidence for the existence of two distinct labour markets operating in the Australian construction industry (Lingard et al. 2008).

The relationship between four flexible working arrangements (flexitime, part-time hours, working from home and job sharing) and work pressure and work-life conflict was investigated by Russell et al. (2009) using a sample of over five thousand Irish workers. The results showed that while part-time work and flexitime reduced work pressure and work-life conflict, working from home was associated with greater levels of work pressure and work-life conflict (Russell et al. 2009). Previous research has also shown that working from home increases the permeability of work and personal life domains, contributing to work-life imbalance (Hartig, Kylin & Johansson 2007; Marsh & Musson 2008).

Lastly, Carlson et al. (2010) examined the relationship of schedule flexibility with performance and satisfaction in the work and family domains and whether work-to-family conflict and work-to-family enrichment acted as mediating mechanisms. The
researchers found that women benefited more from flexible working arrangements than men, together with evidence for work-to-family conflict and enrichment as mediating mechanisms in the relationship of schedule flexibility with job satisfaction and family performance (Carlson et al. 2010).

**Organisational characteristics.** While job characteristics as discussed above are important antecedent variables in the work-life field, equally or more important to individuals is how supportive the work environment is towards work-life balance, including supportive co-workers, supervisors and workplace culture (Beauregard & Henry 2009; Behson 2005; Berg, Kalleberg & Appelbaum 2003; Clark 2001; Premeaux, Adkins & Mossholder 2007; Thompson et al. 2007; Wayne et al. 2007).

Emphasising the importance of organisational culture, Galinsky and Stein (1990) noted a number of years ago that the most progressive organisations go beyond instituting programs, instead they change the culture of the organisation to become more ‘family-friendly’. According to Bailyn (1997) the three characteristics of family-friendly work cultures include temporal flexibility (flexible work schedules), operational flexibility (control over work conditions) and an understanding by organisation leadership that family needs are important.

Overall, organisational support for work-family issues seems to be the key factor in reducing work-family conflict (Allen 2001; Anderson et al. 2002; Gordon et al. 2007; Thomas & Ganster 1995). Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999, p. 394) defined work-family culture as: “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family
lives”. Thompson et al. (1999) developed a measure of work-family culture and examined its relationship to work-family benefit utilisation, organisational attachment and work-family conflict. They identified three dimensions of work-family culture: managerial support for work-family balance, career consequences associated with utilising work-family benefits and organisational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities (Thompson et al. 1999). The study found that perceptions of work-family culture were related to employees’ use of work-family benefits and both work-family benefit availability and a supportive work-family culture were negatively related to work-family conflict (Thompson et al. 1999).

In other studies investigating the relationship between work-family culture and the work-family interface, Hill (2005) found a significant relationship between positive perceptions of the work-family culture and work-family conflict for mothers, but not for fathers. According to Gordon et al.’s (2007) research, work-family culture is negatively associated with work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict and positively associated with work-to-family enhancement. Wayne et al. (2007) concluded that a supportive work-family culture is likely to influence facilitation and relates to performance, satisfaction and well-being in the family domain. Peeters et al. (2009) examined whether work-family interference functioned as a mediating mechanism between work-family culture and well-being, concluding that a supportive work-family culture contributes to work engagement through the perception of less work-family conflict and to less feelings of burnout through work-family enrichment.
Workplaces with a supportive work-family culture are likely to provide work-family benefits to their employees. Work/family benefits have been defined as “any benefit, working condition, or personnel policy that has been shown to empirically decrease job-family conflicts among employed parents” (Glass & Fujimoto 1995, p. 382). Other terms that have been used in the work-life literature include family-friendly policies (FFPs) or work-life benefits and policies (WLBPs) (Baral & Bhargava 2010; Osterman 1995; Scheibl & Dex 1998).

The literature suggests a negative association between WLBPs and work-family conflict (Anderson et al. 2002; Behson 2005; Kossek & Ozeki 1998; Thompson & Prottas 2005). Frye and Breaugh (2004) tested a model of antecedents (the use of family-friendly policies, supervisor support, number of hours worked, having childcare responsibilities) and consequences (job and family satisfaction) of work-family (family-work) conflict. The results supported their predictions: the use of family-friendly policies, hours worked per week and supervisor support were predictive of work-family conflict; childcare responsibility and supervisor support were found to be related to family-work conflict and work-family conflict was related to both job and family satisfaction. By contrast, Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood and Colton’s (2005) finding of a positive relationship between the use of workplace supports (policies, services and benefits) and family-to-work conflict for women was not expected. The researchers suggested that using supports may exacerbate work-family conflict because women may take on even more family care responsibilities rather than increasing their own ability to manage existing work and family demands (Hammer et al. 2005).
Another contrary result was found by Baral and Bhargava (2010) who examined the role of work-family enrichment in the relationships between organisational interventions for work-life balance (job characteristics, work-life benefits and policies, supervisor support and work-family culture) and job outcomes (job satisfaction, affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour). Contrary to past research a positive association between work-family culture and the use of WLBPs and work-to-family enrichment was not found (Gordon et al. 2007; Wayne et al. 2006). However, the significant association between supervisor support and work-to-family enrichment was consistent with earlier research studies (Beutell & Wittig-Berman 2008; Grzywacz & Marks 2000).

Research has also examined the relationship between the availability of work-family policies and family-supportive organisation perceptions (FSOPs) and supervisory support perceptions (SSPS) (Allen 2001; Cook 2009; Haar & Roche 2010). Allen’s (2001) work indicated that FSOP mediated the relationship between family-friendly benefits available and work-family conflict and the relationship between supervisor support and work-family conflict, underscoring “the important role that perceptions of the overall work environment play in determining employee reactions to family-friendly benefit policies” (Allen 2001, p. 414).

**Social support.** According to House (1981, p. 39) “social support involves the exchange of resources between at least two persons, with the aim of helping the person who receives the support. It can involve providing empathy, care, love and trust (emotional support), actual aid in time, money and energy (instrumental support), information
relevant to self-evaluation (appraisal support), and advice, information and suggestions (informational support)”.

Social support may be received from work related sources (e.g., co-workers, peers and supervisors) or non-work related sources (e.g., spouse and kin) (Adams et al. 1996; Byron 2005; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Erdwins, Buffardi, Casper & O’Brien 2001; Gordon & Whelan-Berry 2004; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1994; Nelson & Brice 2008; Thoits 1995). Much attention has been devoted to the examination of the relationship between these sources and work-family and family-work conflict (Adams et al. 1996; Aryee et al. 1998; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Matthews et al. 2010; Md-Sidin, Sambasivan & Ismail 2010; Seiger & Wiese 2009; van Daalen, Willemsen & Sanders 2006), work-family and family-work facilitation (Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Karatepe & Bekteshi 2008; Taylor et al. 2009) and work-family enrichment (Wayne et al. 2006).

Recent meta-analyses have found that work support reduced work-family conflict and family support alleviated family-work conflict (Byron 2005; Ford et al. 2007). A number of studies have shown a significant relationship between employees’ perception of the supportiveness of their supervisor with regard to work and family issues and lower levels of work-family conflict (Allen 2001; Anderson et al. 2002; Barrah, Schultz, Baltes & Stolz 2004; Batt & Valcour 2003; Behson 2005; Frye & Breaugh 2004; Karimi & Nouri 2009; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Voydanoff 2004). In addition, Thompson and Prottas (2005) reported that support from one’s supervisor was positively predictive of work-family facilitation.
Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner and Hanson (2009, p. 837) developed and validated a measure of family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB), which they conceptualised as a “multidimensional superordinate construct with four subordinate dimensions: emotional support, instrumental support, role modeling behaviours, and creative work-family management”. Hammer et al. (2009) found FSSB to be significantly related to work-family conflict, work-family positive spillover, job satisfaction and turnover intentions over and above measures of general supervisor support highlighting the value of managerial engagement in relation to managing the work-family interface.

Other studies have examined social support within the home domain. For example, family support was found to be significantly related to family-work facilitation in Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000) study, while Karatepe and Bektishi (2008) reported that work social support enhanced facilitation between work (family) and family (work) domains. In addition, the researchers found that family social support alleviated conflicts in the work-family interface and increased family-work facilitation (Karatepe & Bektishi 2008). Similarly, Aryee et al. (2005) concluded that family support was significantly related to family-work facilitation. In an earlier study, Aryee et al. (1999) found that social support form one’s spouse buffered the relationship between parental overload and family interfering with work. Low support from spouses regarding their partner’s work has been found to be associated with high levels of work-family conflict (Holohan & Gilbert 1979). Social support available through friendships has also been recognised as a means to alleviate some of the stresses of work demands (Parris et al. 2008).
3.3.3 Personal demands and resources as antecedents

While many researchers suggest that structural factors within the work and non-work domains are of primary importance, recognition of the contribution of personal characteristics and individual differences is taking place (Wayne et al. 2004). Work-life researchers are now recognising the critical role of the individual in managing conflict and enabling facilitation (Hecht & McCarthy 2010; Rotondo & Kincaid 2008). The following section is concerned with the nature of personal demands and resources, specifically dispositional characteristics, the role of coping and demographic variables and how they relate to the work-family interface.

3.3.3.1 Dispositional characteristics

Researchers have suggested that personality traits be given greater consideration in understanding how an individual views and experiences work and family roles (Carlson 1999; Eby et al. 2005; Rotondo & Kincaid 2008; Sumer & Knight 2001; Wayne et al. 2004). Personality may influence the perceptions of work and family role requirements and individuals with different personality types may perceive situations as conflictual or facilitative or may differ in the magnitude of their perceptions (Andreassi & Thompson 2007; Beauregard 2006; Friede & Ryan 2005).

Personality traits. Recently researchers have begun to examine the relationship between personality traits and the work-family interface. For example, Wayne et al. (2004) examined the predictive power of the ‘Big Five’ personality traits (conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness and openness to experience) (McCrae & John 1992) to conflict and facilitation between work and family roles. These five personality
traits capture a broad picture of an individual’s personality and have been shown to influence behaviour patterns and interpretations of objective situations in a variety of life domains (Matthews & Deary 1998).

Conscientiousness is characterised by achievement orientation, dependability, orderliness, efficiency, organisation, planfulness, responsibility, thoroughness and ‘hardworkingness’ (Barrick & Mount 1991; McCrae & John 1992). Wayne et al. (2004) predicted a negative relationship between conscientiousness and conflict as planning, organisation and time management may allow individuals to manage time, thus reducing time pressures and reducing stress and strain. Further, conscientiousness was expected to be positively related to facilitation as conscientious individuals are more likely to thoroughly and correctly perform tasks, resulting in positive mood and enhanced self esteem (Wayne et al. 2004).

Neuroticism refers to anxiety, insecurity, defensiveness, tension and worry (Barrick & Mount 1991; McCrae & John 1992) and, therefore, likely to be positively related to conflict because such characteristics may lead individuals to experience more job and family stress, increasing the degree of conflict experienced. Neuroticism was not predicted to be related to facilitation as it has generally been found to have no relationship with positive events (Wayne et al. 2004).

Active, assertive, energetic, enthusiastic, outgoing and talkative are characteristics associated with extraversion (McCrae & John 1992). Positivity and energy are most likely to be relevant to conflict and facilitation leading Wayne et al. (2004) to predict a
negative relationship between extraversion and conflict and a positive relationship with facilitation.

Agreeableness is described by cooperation, likeability, forgivingness, kindness, sympathy and trust (McCrae & John 1992). These characteristics are likely to lead to less interpersonal conflict and greater support leading to reduced work-family conflict and a positive relationship with facilitation (Wayne et al. 2004).

Intelligence, unconventionality, imagination, curiosity, creativity and originality are used to describe openness to experience (Barrick & Mount 1991; McCrae & John 1992). This trait was predicted to be negatively related to conflict and positively related to facilitation by Wayne et al. (2004) because individuals high on this trait are likely to be creative in developing solutions when conflict arises and more willing to transfer new skills and behaviours learned in one domain to benefit another.

In this study, Wayne et al. (2004, p. 122) found that participants’ levels of conflict and facilitation are “not only a function of work and family circumstances, but also reflect individuals’ contributions”. The traits relevant to conflict were found to be distinct from those relevant to facilitation. Neuroticism was related to both directions of conflict but generally not related to facilitation. Extraversion was related to both directions of facilitation but not to either direction of conflict. Individuals higher in conscientiousness experienced less work-family and family-work conflict. Agreeableness was negatively related to work-family conflict. With regard to facilitation, conscientiousness and agreeableness were positively related to family-work facilitation and openness to experience was positively related to work-family facilitation (Wayne et al. 2004).
In another study of personality and the work-family interface, Carlson (1999) considered the effect of two personality variables (Type A and negative affectivity) on work-family conflict. Type A personalities are typically ambitious, persistent, impatient and involved in their work and more susceptible to work-related strain (Carlson 1999). Negative affectivity is characterised by a tendency to focus on negative aspects of a situation and to experience ongoing feelings of distress and nervousness and was expected to be positively related to work-family conflict (Carlson 1999). The study showed that dispositional variables play a role above and beyond situational variables in determining the level of work-family conflict. In addition, negative affectivity was significantly and positively related to conflict whereas the Type A personality trait only plays a role in behaviour-based conflict – the more Type A an individual was, the less conflict he/she experienced (Carlson 1999).

Three personality characteristics were examined by Aryee et al. (2005) that is proactive personality, neuroticism and optimism, together with their relationship with work-family conflict and facilitation. In the context of work-family balance, proactive personality traits were expected to be negatively related to work-family conflict and positively related to work-family facilitation because proactive individuals are likely to take steps to elicit support and/or engage in role restructuring or negotiation (Aryee et al. 2005). Neuroticism, as a “negative cognitive lens through which life experiences are interpreted” (Aryee et al. 2005, p. 134) was expected to be positively related to work-family conflict and negatively related to work-family facilitation. Finally, optimistic individuals expect positive outcomes and are likely to elicit social support and adopt appropriate coping strategies to deal with stressful life events. As a result, optimism was expected to be
negatively related to work-family conflict and positively related to work-family facilitation (Aryee et al. 2005). The results of this study showed that neuroticism was positively related to work-family conflict and family-work conflict. However, only weak support for the impact of personality variables on facilitation were found (Aryee et al. 2005).

Recent research undertaken by Halbesleben, Harvey and Bolino (2009) proposed that conscientiousness, as a personal resource, would serve to buffer the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviours and work interference with family. Halbesleben et al. (2009) found that overinvestment in work may lead to work interference with family. However, highly conscientious individuals were better able to manage their engagement at work and their family lives (Halbesleben et al. 2009).

**Core self-evaluations.** A body of research exploring the influence of core self-evaluations on the work-family interface is developing in the work-life literature (see Boyar & Mosley 2007; Friede & Ryan 2005; Kacmar, Collins, Harris & Judge 2009; McNall & Michel 2010). Core self-evaluations is a higher order concept representing the fundamental evaluations that people make about their worthiness, competence and capabilities and their functioning in their environment (Judge, Bono, Erez & Locke 2005; Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen 2003). The concept is indicated by four traits: self-esteem (overall value of person), locus of control (degree of control in one’s life), neuroticism (tendency to experience negative or positive affectivity) and generalised self-efficacy (judgment of one’s capabilities across a variety of situations) (Judge, Locke & Durham 1997). According to Judge, Van Vianen and De Pater (2004, p. 326-326) “individuals
with positive core self-evaluations appraise themselves in a consistently positive manner across situations; such individuals see themselves as capable, worthy, and in control of their lives”.

Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) (Hobfoll 2002) has been used to explain the relationship between core self-evaluations and the work-family interface from a demands-and-resources perspective. According to COR theory, individuals strive to obtain, retain and protect resources and individuals with resources are more capable of coping with stressful circumstances (Hobfoll 2002). Hobfoll (2002) identified self-efficacy and self-esteem as key personality-based resources, noting that individuals with high levels of self efficacy “might be more capable of selecting, altering, and implementing their other resources to meet stressful demands” (Hobfoll 2002, p. 308).

Studies have explored how various dimensions of core self-evaluations impact on the work-family interface, lending empirical support to COR theory. Andreassi and Thompson (2007) found that individuals with an internal locus of control were more likely to experience positive spillover and less likely to experience work-family conflict. Beauregard (2006) found that self-esteem was negatively related to work interference with home but was not related to home interference with work. Nikandrou et al.’s (2008) research examined the dynamics of individual and organisational characteristics in work-family conflict and career outcomes. The results confirmed that those with high self-esteem experienced lower work-family conflict, concluding that “an individual’s sense of self-worth provides them with psychological resources that help them cope with work-related issues” (Nikandrou et al. 2008, p. 591).
Unexpectedly, Boyar and Mosley (2007) found that core self-evaluations did not positively predict work-family (family-work) facilitation. However, core self-evaluations were negatively related to work interfering with family and family interfering with work (Boyar & Mosley 2007).

In their study investigating a dispositional model of the work-school interface, McNall and Michel (2010) proposed that core self-evaluations provide key control-related resources which assist individuals to manage work and school roles successfully. The results showed that core self-evaluations were related to work-school conflict and work-school enrichment. Further, work-school conflict was negatively related to school performance, while work-school enrichment was positively related to school and job satisfaction and school performance (McNall & Michel 2010).

3.3.3.2 Coping style and strategies

Investigators have undertaken research into coping with the hope that the concept might help explain why some individuals fare better than others do when encountering conflict and stress in their lives (Folkman & Moskowitz 2004). According to Folkman and Moskowitz (2004) coping is defined as “the thoughts and behaviours used to manage the internal and external demands of situations that are appraised as stressful” (Folkman & Moskowitz 2004, p. 745). There are some researchers who suggest that the coping style or strategy used may be more important to individual wellbeing than the presence of the stressor itself (Boyd, Lewin & Sager 2009; Perrewé & Zellars 1999).
The coping strategies used to manage specific stressors have been categorised by researchers into those that are problem-focused and those that are emotion-focused (Boyd et al. 2009; Friede & Ryan 2005; Lazarus & Folkman 1984). Problem-focused or action-oriented coping is directed at identifying the problem and acting in ways to eliminate or reduce it, whereas emotion-focused coping is directed at altering emotions regarding the stressor to reduce strain (Haar 2006; Lazarus & Folkman 1984). Avoidance coping has also been identified as a coping strategy which involves engaging in activities or mental states that allow one to withdraw from the stressful event (Carver, Scheier & Weintraub 1989; Hecht & McCarthy 2010; Lazarus & Folkman 1984).

Folkman and Moskowitz (2004, p. 747) reviewed the coping research and commented that “coping is a complex, multidimensional process that is sensitive both to the environment, and its demands and resources, and to personality dispositions that influence the appraisal process of stress and resources for coping”. Thus, personality may influence the types of psychological resources and strategies selected to cope with work and home demands (Beauregard 2006; Friede & Ryan 2005).

Significant associations between personality variables and coping responses have been demonstrated empirically in the literature (Kammeyer-Mueller, Judge & Scott 2009; Parkes 1994; Carver et al. 1989). For instance, Kammeyer-Mueller et al. (2009) conducted a meta-analytic review which demonstrated that core-self-evaluations were associated with less avoidance coping, more problem-solving coping and were not strongly related to emotion-focused coping, while individuals with high core self-evaluations engaged in less avoidance coping. However, this research demonstrated that
emotional stability was uniquely related to the stress and coping process, moderating the relationship between stressors and strain (Kammeyer-Mueller et al. 2009).

In line with researchers’ preoccupation with work-family conflict, research on coping with work-family conflict has spanned over thirty years (Thompson et al. 2007). For a comprehensive review of empirical research evidence regarding coping and work-family conflict see Thompson et al. (2007). A sub-set of the literature has focused specifically on the strategies used by individuals in response to conflict in order to manage their work and family roles (Aryee et al. 1999; Baltes & Heydens-Gahir 2003; Haar 2006; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Neal & Hammer 2007; Voydanoff 2005b).

Research has shown that even if conflict is a likely consequence of engaging in work and family roles, it is how people cope with conflict that determines their personal outcomes (Beutell & Greenhaus 1982). For example, Aryee et al. (1999) and Lapierre and Allen (2006) found that individuals who use more problem-focused coping experience less work-family conflict. Rotondo, Carlson and Kincaid (2003) studied the relationships between four styles of work and family coping (direct action, help-seeking, positive thinking and avoidance/resignation) and levels of work-family (family-work) conflict. The findings of this study showed help-seeking and direct action coping used at home to be associated with lower family-work conflict. Avoidance/resignation coping was associated with higher conflict levels of all types. Rotondo et al. (2003, p. 275) concluded that “individuals may have greater control and opportunity for positive change within the family domain compared with the work environment”.
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The moderating effect of employee coping strategies was explored by Haar (2006, p. 146) in a study of New Zealand government workers, where the “downside of coping” was discovered: direct action coping intensified the negative relationships for both work-family conflict and family-work conflict, with employees coping through working harder and suffering intensified burnout as a result. Similarly, resignation coping intensified the family-work conflict and employee burnout relationship. Haar (2006) recommended further analysis of how employees cope with conflict and a more proactive approach to conflict management by managers, warning against assuming that individuals may be able to cope through utilising personal coping strategies.

Another study demonstrating the relationship between coping strategies and the work-family interface is that of Moreno-Jimenéz, Mayo, Sanz-Vergel, Geurts, Rodríguez-Munoz and Garrosa (2009) who linked work-family and family-work conflict with two recovery strategies: psychological detachment from work and verbal expression of emotions. The findings of this research showed that psychological detachment from work moderated the relationship between work-family conflict and psychological strain and between family-work conflict and life satisfaction. Verbal expression of emotions moderated the relationship between both types of conflict and psychological strain (Moreno-Jimenéz et al. 2009).

With regard to the relationship between coping style and strategies and the concept of facilitation, recent research has been undertaken by Rotondo and Kincaid (2008) and by Hecht and McCarthy (2010). In the first study to explore the impact of coping styles on work and family facilitation, Rotondo and Kincaid (2008) examined the relationships
between four general coping styles (direct action, advice seeking, positive thinking and cognitive reappraisal), work and family conflict and work and family facilitation, in a simultaneous equations framework. The findings of their study suggested that the different forms of coping operated differently depending on the domain, with none of the coping styles associated with lower work-family conflict (Rotondo & Kincaid 2008). Positive thinking was associated with higher work-family and family-work facilitation; direct-action was associated with lower family-work conflict and higher family-work facilitation; reappraisal and advice seeking were associated with higher family-work conflict and advice seeking was related to higher work-family facilitation (Rotondo & Kincaid 2008).

Further, Hecht and McCarthy (2010) took the approach that “individual differences in coping styles are related to propensities to experience conflict and facilitation” finding that “individuals have dispositional tendencies to experience interrole conflict and facilitation and that these tendencies may affect the extent to which they experience conflict and facilitation between specific roles in which they are engaged” (Hecht & McCarthy 2010, p. 644). As a result of this work, the researchers recommended that individuals pay attention to the coping styles that they adopt as problem-focused coping was found to play both a facilitative and debilitative role. They also recommended that individuals choose roles that offer positive design characteristics such as autonomy and flexibility, with a view to decreasing the negative effects of having too many role demands (Hecht & McCarthy 2010).
According to Hecht and McCarthy (2010, p. 634), coping is both a “stable individual difference (i.e., dispositional coping) and a dynamic set of situation-specific responses (i.e., situational coping)”. The discussion above has been concerned with dispositional coping. The current research is also concerned with situational coping, specifically how individuals cope with balancing their work and home lives, joining a new body of research which focuses on effective work-life balance management strategies (Aspinwall & Taylor 1997; Baltes & Heydens-Gahir 2003; Jennings & McDougald 2007; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Moen & Yu 2000; Neal & Hammer 2007; Woodward 2007). Researchers have found that employees (and their families) engage in strategies and tactics so that they can be effective and satisfied at home and at work (Haddock et al. 2001; Moen & Wethington 1992; Pitts-Catsoupes et al. 2007). The current study takes a direct approach, focusing on the discovery of specific strategies that have been found to lead to successful work-life balance, rather than assuming that strategies aimed at reducing conflict are the same as those that improve work-life balance.

With regard to dispositional characteristics, coping style and strategies, in line with the above review the current research proposes that dispositional variables impact directly on the work-family interface. Dispositional characteristics are also proposed to be associated with an individual’s coping style and strategies, which in turn are related to managing the work-family interface – in this case exerting an indirect influence (Voydanoff 2005a). In addition, as situation-specific responses, work-life balance management strategies are proposed to be associated with an individual’s perception of work-life balance (Neal & Hammer 2007).
3.3.3.3 Demographic characteristics

Associations between demographic characteristics and work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation are complex and mixed (Hammer, Colton, Caubet & Brockwood 2002). While the linkage between gender and the work-family interface is the demographic characteristic that has been most frequently studied in the literature (Bardoel et al. 2008; Byron 2005; Eby et al. 2005; Karimi 2009; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Powell & Greenhaus 2010; Rothbard & Dumas 2006), a range of other characteristics have been explored, such as family characteristics including marital status and family composition, including the presence, number and age of children at home as previously discussed (Bellavia & Frone 2005), socioeconomic or social status (Emslie & Hunt 2009; Wayne et al. 2007), culture (Mortazavi et al. 2009), age and life stage (Emslie & Hunt 2009).

In particular, the empirical research on gender has presented contradictory findings (Bardoel et al. 2008; Byron 2005). The historical conceptualisation of work-family balance is that it is an issue for women with families engaged in paid employment (Barnett 1999). Based on the ‘gender role hypothesis’, it is expected that men will experience higher levels of work-to-family conflict while women will experience higher levels of family-to-work conflict (Pleck 1977). However, some studies have found no gender differences (Barnett & Hyde 2001; Duxbury & Higgins 1991; Eagle, Miles & Icenogle 1997); higher work-family conflict for women (Gutek et al. 1991; Wharton & Blair-Loy 2006); higher work-family conflict for men (Parasuraman & Simmers 2001; Wallace 1999) and stronger family-work interference for women (Aryee et al. 1999).
Other studies suggest women experience similar levels of work-family (family-work) conflict or interference compared with men (Gutek et al. 1991; Karimi 2009).

While the studies above consider the direct relationship between antecedent variables and the work-family interface, in some cases personal characteristics have been considered as moderators (Bardoel et al. 2008; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Wayne et al. 2007). For example, social class may moderate the relationship between demands and resources and conflict and facilitation (Emslie & Hunt 2009; Wayne et al. 2007). Wayne et al. (2007, p. 72) posited that personal demand characteristics “can influence the availability of resources in the work environment thereby indirectly influencing work-family facilitation or they can moderate the relations of work resources to work-family facilitation”. In support of this theory, Emslie and Hunt (2009) found that middle-class, independent women in their study had the freedom to reduce their working hours in order to enhance their work-life balance whereas this option was not open to other individuals who had limited resources. Of note, Emslie and Hunt’s (2009) qualitative research suggests a direct link between demographic characteristics and the perception of work-life balance which contrasts with the plethora of quantitative research focusing on these characteristics as predictors of conflict and facilitation, using these constructs as ‘proxy’ measures of work-life balance.

Given the contradictory nature of the findings described above, an exploratory approach has been taken to discover and report on the relationship of demographic characteristics with the work-family interface and with perceived work-life balance in the current study.
3.4 Integration of the Demands-and-Resources Scholarship with the Work-Family Interface Scholarship

Following the review of the work-family interface scholarship (specifically conflict and facilitation) in Chapter 2 and the review of the antecedents (specifically demands and resources) studied in the work-life literature, this section reviews the empirical support for the approach taken in the current research, that is, the integration of the demands-and-resources scholarship with the work-family interface scholarship. The research reviewed in this section specifically takes into account the simultaneous relationships among environmental and personal demands and resources and the constructs of work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation.

As noted in Chapter 2, Frone’s (2003) fourfold taxonomy of work-family conflict and facilitation has been adopted in the current study. Data collected from a sample of employed parents in China by Lu et al. (2009) provided evidence for Frone’s (2003) taxonomy. The researchers found that child care responsibilities, working hours, monthly salary and organisational family-friendly policy were positively related to conflict, whereas new parental experience, spouse support, family-friendly supervisors and co-workers were positively related to facilitation (Lu et al. 2009).

In a study of Iranian male employees, Karimi and Nouri (2009) examined the effects of work demands-resources on work-to-family conflict and work-to-family facilitation. Work demands included job demands and working hours and work resources included social support at work and autonomy. The results showed a negative relationship between social support at work and work-to-family conflict and a positive relationship between autonomy at work and work-to-family facilitation (Karimi & Nouri 2009).
addition, greater work demands were associated with greater work-to-family conflict and lower work-to-family facilitation. However, working hours were found to be related to work-to-family facilitation which the researchers suggested was a cultural effect – in Iran working longer hours is likely to be associated with greater comfort and pleasure because of difficult economic conditions and the “importance of (financial) social status” (Karimi & Nouri 2009, p. 200).

A high level of social support at work; decision latitude and a low level of job demands were associated with a low level of experience of work-family conflict and a high level of work-family facilitation in Grzywacz and Marks’ (2000) study. However, Grzywacz and Butler (2005) used objective and subjective measures of job characteristics and an individual resource characteristic to test their theory of work-to-family facilitation and to distinguish work-to-family facilitation from work-to-family conflict. The researchers found support for the distinction between work-family conflict and facilitation as a result of significant differences in the strength of associations with job characteristics. In addition, participants who reported having jobs with more resources (autonomy and variety) and whose jobs required greater complexity and social skill had a higher level of work-to-family facilitation (Grzywacz & Butler 2005).

Employed parents in non-professional occupations used personal digital assistants in Butler et al.’s (2005) study to keep a daily diary about their job characteristics and work-family experiences. Significant daily variations in work-to-family conflict and facilitation were found which were predictable from daily job characteristics: higher levels of conflict were associated with greater job demands and control at work; demands
were negatively related to work-to-family facilitation and control and skill level were found to be positively related to work-to-family facilitation (Butler et al. 2005). The finding that work-to-family conflict was stronger when control was high is not in keeping with Karasek’s (1979) JDC model as described previously, nor findings in work-life research (Duxbury et al. 1994; Hughes & Parkes 2007; Tausig & Fenwick 2001).

Voydanoff (2004) examined the effects of work demands and resources on work-to-family conflict and facilitation, basing her analysis on nearly two thousand employed adults. Demands included paid work-hours, extra work without notice, job insecurity and time pressure. Resources included autonomy, learning opportunities, respect, meaningful work, parental leave, time off for family, supportive work-family culture, and supervisor work-family support (Voydanoff 2004). The results showed that demands (work hours and extra work without notice, job insecurity and time pressure) were positively associated with work-to-family conflict but not strongly related to work-to-family facilitation. On the other hand, resources (autonomy, learning opportunities, respect and meaningful work) were positively related to work-to-family facilitation (Voydanoff 2004). In addition, parental leave and time off for family, supportive work-family culture and supervisor work-family support were negatively associated with conflict and positively related to work-to-family facilitation (Voydanoff 2004).

The relationships between personal benefit activities, facilitation, conflict and wellbeing were investigated by Allis and O’Driscoll (2008). Personal benefit activities are those undertaken by a person for his/her own benefit and include “leisure (e.g., physical activities, sport and hobbies), personal development (e.g., private study, new challenges),
spiritual involvement (e.g., religious activities, meditation), and voluntary work” (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008, p. 274). The results showed that involvement in personal benefit activities can have positive outcomes for individuals, resulting in facilitation of work outcomes and positive wellbeing (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008).

A demands-resources approach was adopted by Grotto and Lyness (2010) when examining job demands (requirements to work at home beyond scheduled hours, job complexity, time and strain); job resources (autonomy and skill development) and organisational supports (flexible work arrangements and two facets of work-life culture) as antecedents of negative spillover. Job demands were found to have positive relationships with negative spillover and job resources and organisational supports were found to have negative relationships with negative spillover. The researchers concluded that job characteristics (demands and resources) were more important than organisational supports in explaining negative spillover (Grotto & Lyness 2010).

In a departure from the antecedents usually studied in the work-life field, Seery et al. (2010) adopted the demands-resources model to explore how self-focused and other-focused job-related emotional labour were associated with bidirectional measures of work-family conflict and facilitation. Emotional labour has been defined as: “work that requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others” (Hochschild 1983, p. 7). The results of Seery et al.’s (2010, p. 474) study suggested that “individuals’ subjective interpretations of situations are more important in understanding how objective conditions shape their lives”. As a result, Seery et al. (2010) recommended that in future researchers should
take into account the possibility that people may experience demands and resources in different ways, rather than pre-determining whether a particular aspect of work constitutes a demand or a resource.

A number of studies taking an integrated approach have investigated both the direct effects of demands and resources on outcome variables and the indirect (mediated) effects through work-family conflict and facilitation (Voydanoff 2002). A mediator effect is obtained when a third variable “represents the generative mechanism through which the focal independent variable is able to influence the dependent variable of interest” (Baron & Kenny 1986, p. 1173). A mediator effect is distinct from a moderator effect which is obtained when the relationship between the independent and dependent variables varies for different levels of a third variable (the ‘moderator’ variable) such as gender, race or class (Baron & Kenny 1986; Barnett 1998; O’Driscoll et al. 2006).

In a study examining the relationship between home life and job performance of a sample of male employees, Demerouti et al. (2010) hypothesised that home resources (home autonomy, social support and developmental possibilities) would have a direct positive effect on job performance and an indirect relationship through home-work facilitation. Home demands (emotional demands, mental demands and time requirements) were predicted to negatively affect job performance through home-work interference (Demerouti et al. 2010). The results supported direct effects between demands and resources and home-work interference and home-work facilitation, respectively. In addition, the positive influence of home life on job performance was found to be stronger than the negative influence (Demerouti et al. 2010).
Researchers have begun to examine the relative contribution of environmental and personal antecedents, focusing on the role of dispositional characteristics – an approach which has been incorporated into the current study. For example, Beauregard (2006) examined four dispositional, self-evaluation traits (adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, generalised self-efficacy and general self-esteem) together with three situational factors (organisational time demands, potential negative career consequences and managerial support) in predicting work interference with home and home interference with work. With regard to situational factors, organisational time demands were positively associated with work interference with home and managerial support had a negative relationship with work interference with home (Beauregard 2006). In addition, negative relationships were found between adaptive perfectionism on home interference with work and of self-esteem on work interference with home, while positive relationships were found between maladaptive perfectionism and both work interference with home and home interference with work (Beauregard 2006). This study emphasises the role of dispositional factors as antecedent variables and the need for their inclusion in research together with situational factors.

The relationship of individual and organisational characteristics with work-family conflict and career outcomes was also examined by Nikandrou et al. (2008) in a study of Greek female managers. Individual characteristics included self-esteem, career management and multiple life role commitment, while organisational characteristics included career encouragement and organisational culture (Nikandrou et al. 2008). The results showed that both individual and organisational characteristics were significant in determining work-family conflict and highlighted the fact that work-family conflict can
be considered as an outcome and as a mediator in the relationship between individual and organisational characteristics and career outcomes (Nikandrou et al. 2008).

It should be noted that none of the studies described above included environmental (work and non-work) demands and resources as well as personal demands and resources as antecedents, together with the relationship of these antecedents with both work-family and family-work conflict as well as work-family and family-work facilitation in the same model. The model put forward in the current study integrates all of these relationships and the ‘front-end’ is closely aligned with Hill’s (2005) research.

Hill (2005) integrated ecological systems, family stress, family resilience and sex role theories to develop a conceptual model which was partly based on Voydanoff’s (2002) theoretical framework. Hill (2005) investigated the relationships among work, family and individual stressors (job hours, job pressure, child care hours, household chore hours, children under the age of six years of age); work, family and individual resources and supports (flexible work policies, supportive organisational culture, supervisor support for job and family, work group support, work-at-home, free hours, marital status, stay-at-home spouse); work-family conflict and facilitation and work, family and individual outcomes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, family satisfaction, marital satisfaction and life satisfaction).

The results of Hill’s (2005) research reflect the multiple potential relationships between independent variables in the work and home environments and work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation: job hours and job pressure were found to be positively
related to work-family conflict but unexpectedly child care hours were positively related
to work-family facilitation. Flexible benefits, supervisor and work-group support were
positively related to work-family facilitation and a supportive organisational culture was
negatively related to work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Work-at-home was
found to be positively related to work-family and family-work facilitation and free hours
were positively related to work-family facilitation and negatively related to work-family
and family-work conflict. Finally, having a stay-at-home spouse was positively related to
family-work facilitation (Hill 2005).

In addition, Hill (2005) found gender effects in this study: working men reported longer
weekly work hours on the job, fewer weekly hours in child care and household chores, a
less supportive organisational culture but more family and individual resources and
support and less work-family conflict than working mothers. The report of Hill’s (2005,
p. 812) research concluded that “more work must be done to identify what are stressors,
and what are resources and support, for each gender”.

As outlined above, the demands-and-resources scholarship has provided a framework for
understanding environmental and personal antecedent variables. The integration of the
demands-and-resources scholarship with the work-family interface scholarship expanded
the framework to encompass the relationships among environmental and personal
demands and resources and the concepts of work-family (family-work) conflict and
facilitation.

Based on the theoretical and empirical evidence outlined above, the following
propositions are put forward in the current research and are depicted in Figure 3.1:
**Proposition 3:** Demands are positively related to work-family conflict and to family-work conflict. The third proposition maintains that environmental and personal demand characteristics are positively related to work-family and family-work conflict.

**Proposition 4:** Resources are positively related to work-family facilitation and to family-work facilitation. The fourth proposition maintains that environmental and personal resource characteristics are positively related to work-family and family-work facilitation.

**Proposition 5:** Dispositional variables are indirectly related to conflict and facilitation. The fifth proposition maintains that dispositional characteristics have indirect relationships with work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation mediated by their relationship with coping style and strategies.
Figure 3.1: Environmental and Personal Demand and Resource Characteristics as Predictors of Conflict and Facilitation

Source: Developed by the author for this research.
3.5 Consequences of Perceived Work-Life Balance

As part of her conceptual framework, Voydanoff (2005b) proposed that work-family balance is positively associated with work and family role performance (behaviours such as work duties, household chores and dependent care) and role quality (positive affect such as job satisfaction, marital happiness and satisfaction with parent-child relationship). Voydanoff (2005b, p. 832) suggested that “A global assessment of balance between the work and family domains is posited to improve performance and quality in both domains”. Unfortunately, as discussed previously, few studies have empirically assessed work-life balance directly, resulting in a dearth of research on the individual, family and organisational outcomes of work-life balance (Carlson et al. 2009). Conversely, the consequences of forms of work-life imbalance, in particular work-family conflict, have been extensively documented (Allen et al. 2000; Eby et al. 2005; Guest 2001; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Tetrick & Buffardi 2006). A number of empirical studies have been conducted examining the consequences of facilitation between work and family roles; others have examined the consequences of both conflict and facilitation together (O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Wayne et al. 2004).

The following section provides an overview of the research on the outcome variables studied in the work-life field and draws on the literature to develop a foundation for the propositions tested in this study in relation to the consequences of perceived work-life balance.
Conflict. Frone et al.’s (1992a) paper which introduced and tested their work-family conflict model is considered one of the most influential in the area of work and family research (Michel et al. 2009). The model distinguished between work interfering with family and family interfering with work and tested the unique antecedents and outcomes of both forms of work-family conflict and a reciprocal relationship between them (Frone et al. 1992a). Since that time, the construct of conflict has been associated with a broad range of undesirable outcomes such as stress, turnover, absenteeism, burnout and dissatisfaction with job, family and life (Allen et al. 2000; Demerouti, Bakker & Bulters 2004; Edwards & Rothbard 2000; Frone 2003; Grant-Vallone & Donaldson 2001; Greenhaus et al. 2001; Karimi 2009; Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham 1999; Kelly, Kossek, Hammer, Durham, Bray, Chermack, Murphy & Kaskubar 2008; Kinnunen, Geurts & Mauno 2004; Kinnunen et al. (2010); Kinnunen & Mauno 1998; Kossek & Ozeki 1998; Kreiner 2006; Lu et al. 2010; Noor 2002; O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002; Rice, Frone & McFarlin 1992; Rode, Rehg, Near & Underhill 2007; Yvas, Babakus & Karatepe 2008).

Several meta-analyses of work-family and family-work conflict have been undertaken during the past two decades: Allen et al. (2000); Ford et al. (2007); Kossek and Ozeki (1998; 1999); Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) and Michel et al. (2009). Allen et al. (2000) examined the relationships between work-family conflict and three categories of outcomes: stress related outcomes (e.g., emotional exhaustion, depression, somatic complaints), work outcomes (e.g., job performance, work satisfaction) and non-work outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction) as summarised in Table 3.2 below.
Allen et al.’s (2000) categorisation provides a viable means for examining the consequences of work-family conflict and it has been adopted in this section to guide the review. With regard to work-related outcomes, job satisfaction has had the most attention in the work-life literature (Allen et al. 2000). Most studies have found work-family conflict to be positively related to lower job satisfaction (Adams & Jex 1999; Adams, King & King 1996; Allen 2001; Aryee, Luk & Stone 1998; Batt & Valcour 2003; Bedeian, Burke & Moffett 1988; Bruck et al. 2002; Drory & Shamir 1988; Kopelman, Prottas, Thompson & Jahn 2006; Kossek & Ozeki 1998; Moen & Sweet 2002; O’Driscoll, Ilgen & Hildreth 1992; Shamir 1983) and to reduced career satisfaction (Martins, Eddleston & Veiga 2002; Parasuraman & Simmers 2001).

In addition, a body of research has found that less organisational commitment is reported by employees with higher work-family conflict (Berg et al. 2003; Casper, Martin, Buffardi & Erdwins 2002; Mesmer-Maguns & Viswesvaran 2005; Netemeyer et al. 1996; Siegel, Post, Brockner, Fishman & Garden 2005). Reduced commitment is also seen in studies of turnover intentions where employees with higher work-family conflict are more likely to report their intention to leave the organisation (Balmforth & Gardner 2006; Boyar et al. 2003; Grandey & Cropanzano 1999; Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Collins 2001; Haar 2004; Netemeyer et al. 1996).

Further, work-family conflict has been found to affect performance on the job as many studies show that employees with more work-family conflict also have higher levels of self-reported absenteeism (Boyar, Maertz. & Pearson 2005; Hammer, Bauer & Grandey 2003; Thomas & Ganster 1995); and lower levels of self-reported job performance
Table 3.1: Summary of Outcome Variables Related to Work-Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-family conflict</th>
<th>Work-related outcomes</th>
<th>Nonwork-related outcomes</th>
<th>Stress-related outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>General psychological strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>Marital satisfaction</td>
<td>Somatic/physical symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention to turnover</td>
<td>Family satisfaction</td>
<td>Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>Family performance</td>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Leisure satisfaction</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work-related stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career success</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family-related stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Allen et al. 2000.

Turning to nonwork-related outcomes, research has found work-family conflict to be positively related to lower family satisfaction (Bedeian et al. 1988), and also to reduced life satisfaction (Allen et al. 2000; Rice et al. 1992) and negatively related to marriage
satisfaction (Wu et al. 2010). In terms of stress-related outcomes the association between work-family conflict and psychological distress has been widely explored and suggests that increased conflict is associated with increased psychological distress (Major et al. 2002; Stephens, Townsend, Martire & Druley 2001). Relationships between work-family conflict and depression have also been demonstrated (Allen et al. 2000; Frone, Russell & Barnes 1996; MacEwen & Barling 1994; Noor 2002). In addition, associations have been found between work-family conflict and burnout (Bacharach, Bamberger & Conley 1991; Barnett et al. 1999; Burke & Mikkelsen 2006; Chaoping, Kan & Zhengxue 2003); and greater stress (Beena & Poduval 1992; Hammer, Saksvik, Nytro, Torvant & Bayazit 2004; Kelloway et al. 1999; Netemeyer, Brashear-Alejandro & Boles 2004). Frone (2000) found both family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict positively related to anxiety, mood and substance abuse disorders.

Studies have also examined the link between work-family conflict and adverse physical health including hypertension (Frone et al. 1997a) and stress-strain symptomology such as weight gain or loss, headaches, drowsiness, fatigue, nervous tension, anxiety, emotional exhaustion and insomnia (Allen et al. 2000; Hall, Dollard, Tuckey, Winefield & Thompson 2010; Lee 1997); as well as increased cholesterol levels and somatic complaints (Thomas & Ganster 1995).

**Facilitation.** From a theoretical standpoint, Voydanoff (2002, 2005b) and Wayne et al. (2007) have put forward comprehensive theoretical frameworks and models which take into account the consequences of the linkages between the work-family interface. Wayne et al. (2007) provided a theoretical explanation and model of work-family facilitation
which proposed enhanced outcomes within the work and family systems as a result of work-to-family facilitation, such as work group cohesion and effectiveness and marital quality and family wellbeing. On the other hand Voydanoff (2002) suggested in her model that the combined effects of both enhancing and conflicting work and family characteristics be considered in relation to aspects of work (e.g., job performance, absenteeism, turnover, involvement and job satisfaction); family (e.g., marital and family involvement and satisfaction, marital conflict and stability, family cohesion and developmental outcomes for children); and individual outcomes (e.g., psychological and physical wellbeing).

From an empirical standpoint, McNall et al. (2010) conducted the first meta-analysis on the positive side of the work-family interface. The researchers used the broad term ‘enrichment’ to cover measures of enrichment, positive spillover, facilitation and enhancement – constructs which were discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.5.1.1). The relationships between work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment and work-related, non work-related and health-related consequences were investigated. The results found that both work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment were positively related to job satisfaction, affective commitment and family satisfaction, but not turnover intentions. Work-to-family enrichment was more strongly related to non work-related variables and both variables were positively related to physical and mental health (McNall et al. 2010).

As noted above, a number of researchers have included measures of both conflict and facilitation together with outcomes in their studies, such as those summarised in Table
3.2 below. The results of these studies illustrate the contribution of facilitation to a variety of outcomes, over and above the contribution of conflict, lending further support to the need for work-life research to include both positive and negative sides of the equation (Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Hill 2005; Wayne et al. 2004).

**Table 3.2: Examples of Studies Including Measures of Conflict, Facilitation and Outcome Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Outcome variable(s) studied together with measures of conflict and facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tompson &amp; Werner (1997)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship, in-role behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2: Examples of Studies Including Measures of Conflict, Facilitation and Outcome Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Outcome variable(s) studied together with measures of conflict and facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>van Steenbergen &amp; Ellemers (2009)</td>
<td>Objective health and performance indicators – health (cholesterol level, body mass index, physical stamina); performance (absenteeism, job performance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the researcher for this thesis. Note: Authors cited in full for ease of reference.

Hill’s (2005) study of working mothers and fathers tested his conceptual model of conflict and facilitation and found that work-to-family facilitation was positively related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction and negatively related to individual stress. In addition, family-to-work facilitation was found to be positively related to marital satisfaction, family satisfaction and life satisfaction and negatively related to organisational commitment. Gender differences were found with regard to conflict as working fathers reported less work-family conflict, less individual stress and greater family satisfaction, marital satisfaction and life satisfaction than working mothers (Hill 2005).
Grzywacz and Bass (2003, p. 248) stated that “work-family conflict and facilitation must be considered separately, and that adult mental health is optimized when family to work facilitation is high and family to work and work to family conflict is low”. The researchers found that family to work facilitation was a protective factor that offsets and buffers the negative effects of work-family conflict on mental health (Grzywacz & Bass 2003).

Concurring with Grzywacz and Bass (2003), van Steenbergen et al. (2007, p. 290) concluded that “conflict and facilitation should be seen to represent different constructs rather than single ends of a continuum”. The researchers found that the inclusion of facilitation together with conflict significantly increased the prediction of job performance, affective commitment, work satisfaction, home performance, home commitment, home satisfaction, global life satisfaction, emotional exhaustion and depression.

Innovative research has been conducted by van Steenbergen and Ellemers (2009) who extended the findings of previous research by relating experiences in the work-family interface to objective health and performance indicators. The researchers undertook two studies within a multinational financial services organisation. The results of the first study showed that conflict experiences related to objective indicators of poor health (cholesterol level, body mass index and physical stamina), whereas facilitation experiences indicated better health (van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009). The second study longitudinally examined the relationship between facilitation experiences and objective physical health, sickness absence and objective job performance over time. The
results showed that facilitation measured at Time 1 reliably predicted better physical health (cholesterol level and body mass index), lower absenteeism and increased job performance one year later (van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009).

An exploratory study which aimed to examine whether work-family facilitation, family-work facilitation, work-family conflict and family-work conflict were associated with job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour and intention to leave was conducted by Balmforth and Gardner (2006). In line with previous research, work-family facilitation and work-family conflict were found to be separate constructs (Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Wayne et al. 2004). Work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation were significantly related to job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment and work-family facilitation was related to organisational citizenship behaviour. In addition, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation were negatively related to turnover intention and family-work conflict was positively related to turnover intention (Balmforth & Gardner 2006).

Further support for the association between conflict and facilitation and job satisfaction has been reported by Aryee et al. (2005) who found work-family facilitation to be related to job satisfaction and to organisational commitment. Boyar and Mosley’s (2007) study showed work-family facilitation was significantly related to job satisfaction and family-work facilitation positively predicted family satisfaction. Wayne et al. (2004) found that work-family facilitation positively predicted job satisfaction and job effort, while family-work facilitation was positively related to job effort, family satisfaction and family effort.
In a study of frontline employees in the hotel industry Karatepe and Bekteshi (2008) found that work-family facilitation was significantly and positively related to life satisfaction, while family-work conflict reduced life satisfaction. In addition, work-family and family-work facilitation were associated with higher performance in the workplace.

The relationship between psychological involvement with facilitation; time demands with conflict and the subsequent relationships between facilitation and conflict with positive wellbeing were investigated by Allis and O’Driscoll (2008). The main contribution of their research was the finding that “involvement in personal benefit activities can have positive outcomes for individuals, resulting in facilitation of work outcomes and positive well-being” (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008, p. 273).

In a departure from the more common outcomes included, Taylor et al. (2009) studied the relationship between work-family conflict/facilitation and the perception of psychological contract fairness by a sample of business professionals. A psychological contract relates to the beliefs of the individual worker with regard to the employment arrangements and mutual obligations between employee and employer (Taylor et al. 2009). The results revealed that individuals who experience low work-to-family conflict and high facilitation are more likely to report their perception of the psychological contract to be fair.

Work-life balance. As noted previously, a comparatively small number of studies have investigated the outcomes associated with measures of work-family and work-life balance and the results are mixed. According to Greenhaus et al. (2003, p. 514) “work-
family balance is generally thought to promote well-being”. The researchers examined the relation of work-family balance and quality of life among professionals employed in public accounting. Using three components of work-family balance (time balance; involvement balance; satisfaction balance) Greenhaus et al. (2003, p. 510) found that “individuals who invested substantial time in their combined work and family roles, those who spent more time on family than work experienced a higher quality of life than balanced individuals who, in turn, experienced a higher quality of life than those who spent more time on work than family”.

Bradley, Bailey, Lingard and Brown (2006) used Greenhaus et al.’s (2006) measure to investigate the factors influencing work-life balance and wellbeing of project team members working in the construction industry. The results of this study indicated that management’s attendance to work-life balance improves employee satisfaction and creates a more productive workforce (Bradley et al. 2006).

Testing a theoretical framework using a sample of government employees Saltzstein et al. (2001) found a strong positive relationship between satisfaction with work-family balance and job satisfaction.

A longitudinal study of the health and wellbeing effects of workplace flexibility conducted by Casey and Grzywacz (2008) found that greater work-family balance was associated with reductions in work-related impairment and increased job commitment. In addition, work-family balance was found to partially mediate the effects of flexibility on impairment and job commitment but not sickness absence (Casey & Grzywacz 2008).
In contrast to the above studies, Parkes and Langford (2008) assessed whether employees were satisfied with their ability to balance work and other life commitments, testing the hypothesis that work-life balance is important for engaging and retaining employees in the context of other aspects of organisational climate. Results found a small positive correlation between work-life balance and employee engagement and each of its components (job satisfaction, organisational commitment and intention to stay) (Parkes & Langford 2008). However, of the twenty-eight organisational climate factors work-life balance was least related to employee engagement and intention to stay with an organisation, whereas aspects of the organisation such as effective change management and belief in the mission and values of the organisation were strongly correlated with engagement (Parkes & Langford 2008).

3.6 Consequences and the Current Research

The approach to work-life balance taken in the current research concurs with the conceptualisation of Voydanoff (2005a; 2005b) and Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) and the empiricism of Carlson et al. (2009). The current research is closely aligned with the approach taken by Carlson et al. (2009) who used a measure of work-family balance which they found to be empirically distinct from work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. These researchers examined the relationship between work-family balance and six outcomes: job satisfaction, organisational commitment, turnover intentions, family satisfaction, family performance and family functioning (Carlson et al. 2009). The results of their study showed that work-family balance explained additional variance
in all of the outcome measures, except for turnover intentions, beyond that explained by conflict and enrichment (Carlson et al. 2009).

Outcome measures are suggested in the model put forward in the current research. However, rather than using measures of conflict as a ‘proxy’ for work-life balance, as is often the case, it is intended that by including a ‘real’ measure of work-life balance the outcomes will be associated with an actual appraisal of work-life balance rather than the presence or absence of conflict. Consistent with variables studied in the work-life literature (Allen et al. 2000; Bardoel et al. 2008; Eby et al. 2005), the work outcomes chosen for the current research included occupational satisfaction (job satisfaction, career satisfaction and intention to leave the legal profession) and self-rated performance. The non-work outcomes chosen included life satisfaction, personal wellbeing and mental health.

Based on the theoretical and empirical evidence outlined above, the following proposition is put forward in the current research and is depicted in Figure 3.2:

**Proposition 6:** Independent of conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance is positively related to desirable work and non-work outcomes and negatively related to undesirable work and non-work outcomes. The sixth proposition maintains that perceived work-life balance is positively related to life, job and career satisfaction, personal wellbeing, psychological health and self-rated work performance and negatively related to the intention to leave the legal profession and psychological ill-health.
Further, work-life balance should mediate the relationship between measures of conflict and facilitation and outcome measures. This is in keeping with the present study’s rationale that conflict, facilitation and work-life balance represent different constructs – work-life balance is considered a global measure of an individual’s experiences, whereas conflict and facilitation are considered as reflections of the work-family interface and as such are indirect indicators of work-life balance. In short, it is proposed that work-life balance should be directly associated with work and non-work outcomes and conflict and facilitation should be indirectly associated with work and non-work outcomes (Carlson et al. 2009; Greenhaus et al. 2003; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007).

Based on the rationale outlined above, the following proposition is put forward in the current research and is depicted in Figure 3.2:

**Proposition 7:** Perceived work-life balance is directly related to work and non-work outcomes, whereas conflict and facilitation are indirectly related to work and non-work outcomes. The seventh proposition maintains that perceived work-life balance mediates the relationship between conflict and facilitation and work and non-work outcomes.
Figure 3.2: Proposed relationships among work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance and outcome variables

Source: Developed by the author for this research.
3.7 Proposed Model

Rotondo and Kincaid (2008, p. 485) stated that “The challenge remaining for researchers is to identify the unique antecedents, moderators, and outcomes that influence conflict and facilitation while incorporating directionality by modelling the relationships in a simultaneous framework. Through these efforts, we can establish a better understanding of work and family balance”. Thus, the approach taken in this study to linking the components of the model described above begins with considering primary antecedents in the personal and environmental domains (demands and resources) as having direct effects mapping onto measures of conflict and facilitation. Demands have been thought to cause conflict and resources to result in facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006). It is further suggested that the resultant unique combinations of conflict and facilitation may be pivotal to understanding perceptions of work-life balance and its consequences. Specifically, conflict and facilitation precede and contribute to an individual’s appraisal of work-life balance; measures of work-life balance are distinct from measures of conflict and facilitation and changes in conflict and facilitation indicators will likely result in changes in work-life balance perceptions (Edwards & Bagozzi 2000). Outcomes and consequences of work-life balance are then considered, such as work performance, satisfaction and general health and wellbeing. Perceptions of balance are likely to be associated with positive reports of work performance, satisfaction, general health and wellbeing.
The proposed conceptualisation parallels and expands on previous research because it takes into account the following: the antecedents of work-life balance (personal and environmental demands and resources); aspects of the work-family interface (reflected in the degree of conflict and facilitation present); the individual’s perception of work-life balance (through a validated work-life balance measure) and finally, the personal and organisational consequences of balance (e.g., general health, wellbeing, satisfaction and performance). This conceptualisation of work-life balance is depicted as a model in Figure 3.3. While still bound by the limitations of the language and terminology used to frame the issues, as previously mentioned, the main difference between the proposed conceptualisation and others is in its integrated approach.

Based on the rationale outlined above, the following proposition is put forward in the current research and is depicted in Figure 3.3:

**Proposition 8:** Personal and environmental demands and resources are associated with work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, which are in turn related to the perception of work-life balance and perceived work-life balance is a predictor of a range of personal and organisational outcomes.
Figure 3.3: Proposed relationships among antecedents, work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance and outcome variables.
3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the literature on the antecedents and outcomes studied in the work-life field. The demands-and-resources scholarship provided a framework for understanding environmental and personal antecedent variables. The integration of the demands-and-resources scholarship with the work-family interface scholarship expanded the framework to encompass the relationships between environmental and personal demands and resources and the concepts of work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, bearing in mind that the theoretical and empirical distinctions between conflict, facilitation and work-life balance were put forward in Chapter 2. An overview of the outcome or dependent variables studied in the work-life field was also provided in this chapter. Finally, an integrated conceptualisation and model was proposed which takes into account perceived work-life balance, together with hypothesised antecedent, indicator and outcome variables. A methodology now needs to be determined to collect and analyse data to test the new model of work-life balance.
CHAPTER 4  
METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter identifies and justifies the methodological aspects of the study. First, the paradigm adopted and the methodology used for the research are discussed and justified (Sections 4.2 and 4.3). Then, the research design is described (Section 4.4). Next, the data collection method is identified and the justification for its adoption is provided (Section 4.5) and sampling issues are examined (Section 4.6). Fourth, data collection for the current research is outlined (Section 4.7) followed by an outline of the development of the online questionnaire used in the study and the identification of appropriate measures (Section 4.8). Lastly, the administration of the questionnaire and the ethical considerations are discussed (Sections 4.9 and 4.10).

4.2 Justification for the Paradigm and Methodology

The concept of paradigm was first proposed by Kuhn (1962) and is now accepted as providing a framework of guidelines and principles to assist researchers with the way research is conducted (Guba & Lincoln 1994; Hussey & Hussey 1997: Ticehurst & Veal 2000). Three inter-related levels are used to explain paradigms, namely, ontology, epistemology and methodology (Guba & Lincoln 1994). Ontology reflects basic beliefs about the world and is concerned with the assumptions that are made about the nature of reality. Epistemology refers to how knowledge about the world becomes known to a
researcher. Methodology is concerned with the most appropriate ways that are suitable for researchers to investigate different phenomena (Easterby-Smith et al. 2002; Guba & Lincoln 1994; Hussey & Hussey 1997).

Prior to deciding upon the paradigm adopted, researchers need to take into consideration the topic of their research and the outcomes sought (Cavana et al. 2001). Five alternative paradigms have been identified to guide this decision: positivism (also known as functionalism), realism (also known as post-positivism), critical theory, constructivism and interpretivism (Burrell & Morgan 1998; Guba & Lincoln 1994).

The current study is most closely aligned with the critical realism paradigm (Krauss 2005). Realism assumes that reality exists but it can only be understood imperfectly and probabilistically, that is, the researchers are limited by their cognitive capabilities and the complexity of social phenomena (Guba & Lincoln 1994). With regard to ontology, an individual’s perception of work-life balance is seen as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon which realistically can be understood only imperfectly and probabilistically through the ‘eyes’ of the study respondents. In terms of epistemology, the researcher is expected to be as objective as possible and findings should probably be ‘true’ taking scholarly reference into account. Regarding epistemology, taking into account the extensive research literature, the researcher has assumed an independent stance and every effort has been taken to ensure the findings are as ‘true’ as possible (i.e., they are valid, reliable and likely to be replicated in the general population). Methodologically, the focus is on explaining phenomena using both quantitative and qualitative methods which
are seen as complementary and are discussed in the next section (Cavana et al. 2001; Easterby-Smith et al. 2002; Guba & Lincoln 1994).

4.3 Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

As stated previously, the critical realism paradigm uses both quantitative and qualitative methods, usually referred to as mixed-method research methodology (Kiessling & Harvey 2005; Krauss 2005). In short, quantitative methods involve numerical measurement while qualitative methods involve verbal description (Clark-Carter 2004). Quantitative techniques use predetermined categories that can be treated as ordinal, interval or ratio data and analysed statistically (Patton 1997). On the other hand, qualitative research techniques focus on discovering “people’s experiences and the meanings they place on events, processes and the environment of their normal social setting” (Kiessling & Harvey 2005, p. 30) with a view to gaining an insight into what ‘real life’ is like (Miles & Huberman 1994).

The majority of the data collected in the current study fits within the quantitative method as respondents’ answers to questions in the online questionnaire were measured numerically. However, there are still gaps in our knowledge with regard to men’s and women’s perceptions of work-life balance and the factors that contribute to successful balance (Milkie & Peltola 1999; Parasuraman & Greenhaus 2002; Valcour 2007; Wiersma 1994). In order to contribute to reducing gaps in the literature, an open-ended question was used to supplement the quantitative questions relating to work-life balance strategies with the specific aim of gaining verbal descriptions from respondents regarding
the strategies they have used that have been successful in helping them to integrate their work and home life. The findings of both approaches are covered in Chapter 6.

The advantage of taking a mixed methods approach to the study of work-life balance strategies means that a ‘story’ can be developed from both the closed and open-ended questions which captures more of the ‘fabric’ of the work-life balance phenomenon (Kiessling & Harvey 2005). As noted by Bardoel et al. (2008, p. 330), “The value in using qualitative, and exploratory, methods lies not only in their ‘additionality’ (in exploring specific questions) but also in their complementarity”.

4.4 Research Design

A research design is the master plan used for transforming a conceptual problem into a practical project – it specifies the methods and procedures for accurate data collection and analysis, in order to meet the aims of the research (Zikmund 2000). Three types of research have been identified, namely exploratory, descriptive and causal (Emory & Cooper 1991; Zikmund 2000).

**Exploratory research.** The objective of exploratory research is to understand a research problem and its background information. Exploratory research is usually unstructured and flexible in nature and often used to define a research problem or develop operational definitions, clarify concepts and to develop propositions (Cooper & Schindler 2001; Zikmund 2000). In the current study, exploratory research was conducted in the initial stage of the research as evidenced by the comprehensive literature review presented in Chapters 2 and 3.
**Descriptive research.** The objective of descriptive research is to describe and measure phenomena of interest and to gain a deeper understanding of the research topic. Descriptive research is usually based on some previous understanding of the nature of the research problem and seeks to determine the answers to who, what, when, where and how, but not the cause (Cavana et al. 2001; Zikmund 2000). In the current study, descriptive research was conducted in the second stage of the research, based on the previously conducted exploratory research and resulting in the design, administration and analysis of the structured online survey (see Table 1.2).

**Causal research.** The objective of causal research is to explain cause and effect relationships between variables and to establish the sequence of events. Causal research usually recognises the presence or absence of alternative explanations (Zikmund 2000). The intention of the current study is not to explain cause and effect, but rather to answer important questions about the extent to which the data provide support for the hypothesised theoretical model and as a result would not be considered causal research.

The majority of research undertaken in the work-life field has been of a cross-sectional nature, a trend which has been criticised in the literature because results may lack representativeness (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007). A recent review of work-life research conducted in Australia and New Zealand between 2004 and 2007 revealed that research designs were almost exclusively cross-sectional, with only six out of sixty-three empirical studies including longitudinal data (Bardoel et al. 2008). While longitudinal studies have the potential to provide a better understanding of the dynamics of a problem because they look at the same people or situation on multiple occasions, they are also
time-consuming and expensive (Cavana et al. 2001). On the other hand, cross-sectional studies obtain data once over a short period of time, normally from different organisations or groups of people and have the advantage of being inexpensive and useful where time constraints exist (Cavana et al. 2001). Time and resource constraints were a facet of the current research, thus a cross-sectional study design was selected.

The key issues related to the research design are addressed as follows: identification of types of data to be collected; identification of sources of data; sampling issues; the data collection method; approaches to data measurement; strategies for data processing and issues associated with data analysis.

4.5 Data

4.5.1 Types of data

The review of previous research discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 has informed the development of the research questions and the subsequent identification of data required to achieve the research aims of the present study. The adoption of a realism paradigm and a mixed-methods research methodology requires that the data be numerical in nature or capable of conversion to a numerical form (for quantitative analysis) and verbal description (for qualitative analysis).

4.5.2 Sources of data

A target population is “the collection of elements or objects that possess the information sought by the researcher and about which inferences are to be made” (Malhotra 1999, p.
As noted in Chapter 1, the issue of work-life balance, coping strategies and health and wellbeing is on the Australian legal profession’s business agenda for the reasons cited. The population for this study, therefore, comprises men and women in the legal profession who are also members of the Queensland Law Society in the State of Queensland, Australia. According to the Queensland Law Society’s 2007/08 Annual Report, there were 7,527 members. Given that the current study’s aim was to determine how various factors in an individual’s work and non-work life act as enablers versus barriers and how they collectively contribute to the perception of work-life balance and its consequences, the underlying inference made in the current study is that participants experience both the positive and negative sides of the work-life balance equation.

4.6 Sampling Issues

In order to be able to generalise the findings of the current research, a suitable sub-set of the population of interest was selected (Cavana et al. 2001). The process of sampling has been adopted for the present study because the entire population of the legal profession is too large to be investigated and the researcher was constrained by limitations of time and cost (Cavana et al. 2001; Zikmund 2000).

4.6.1 Size of sample

Determining the size of the sample involved consideration of different factors, including resource constraints and the statistical method for data analysis. For this research a sample size of at least two hundred would be considered adequate for the proposed data analysis technique of structural equation modelling (Kline 2005).
4.6.2 Sampling frame

A sampling frame is a list of population elements from which the study sample is drawn (Cavana et al. 2001; Malhotra 1999). The sampling frame for the present study was specified as the membership database of the Queensland Law Society in the State of Queensland, Australia. The researcher did not have direct access to the database of Society members and was dependent upon Society management for the dissemination of information to members about the research. This is acknowledged as a limitation of the proposed sampling frame. In addition, it was not possible to identify the number of potential respondents because there was no way of knowing how many Society members would access the information provided to them via email and the Society’s monthly publication (provided in hard copy and online, as described in this Chapter). This is also accepted as a limitation of the sampling frame.

4.6.3 Representativeness of the sample

It is rare for a sample to be totally representative of the population from which it is drawn (Sekaran 2000). Given that the current study’s sampling frame has been drawn from one State in Australia, the results may not be representative of legal professionals working in other parts of Australia or indeed other parts of the world. However, a number of well established, validated and reliable measures have been used in the current study, such as the Australian Personal Wellbeing Index (AWI) (International Wellbeing Group 2006) and the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) (Goldberg 1991).
To ensure that the sample for the present study is as representative as possible, the findings may be contrasted with the robust results of the validated measures used in the current research. In addition, the findings of this research may be contrasted with the results of Wallace’s (2002) research into work-life balance among lawyers practising in Alberta, Canada as a number of Wallace’s (2002) measures were adapted for the current study.

4.6.4 Sampling approaches

After selecting the sampling frame, a sampling method has to be chosen to obtain an acceptable representation of the target population. This involves a decision about whether probability or non-probability sampling is appropriate (Cooper & Schindler 2001). With probability sampling each population element has a known chance of being selected for the study (Cooper & Schindler 2001; Zikmund 2000). On the other hand, with non-probability sampling population elements do not have an equal chance of being included in the sample (Cavana et al. 2001).

In the current research, taking into account the inherent difficulties of gaining access to the legal profession, two non-probability sampling techniques were used – convenience sampling and snowball sampling. Convenience sampling was used because the population of legal professionals was readily available to the researcher as a result of contacts with the Queensland Law Society. The advantages of this technique are that it is cost efficient and relatively easy to perform and enables efficient data collection. However, the disadvantages include low reliability and lack of generalisability (Cavana et al. 2001; Cooper & Schindler 2001; Zikmund 2000). Snowball sampling was used to
increase the response rate and involved requesting respondents (via the weekly Society email update) who had accessed the online questionnaire to refer the study to other legal professionals in their network, who may not have received the invitation to participate or the newsletter article about the survey. This sampling technique was considered appropriate because the researcher did not have direct access to potential respondents. However, the disadvantages of snowball sampling include the potential for systemic bias and lack of generalisability (Cavana et al. 2001; Cooper & Schindler 2001; Zikmund 2000).

4.7 Data Collection

Data can be collected in a variety of ways: personal or face-to-face interviews; telephone interviews; personally administered questionnaires; mail questionnaires; electronic questionnaires; and observational studies (Cavana et al. 2001; Emory & Cooper 1991). Each method has advantages and disadvantages and the choice of an appropriate method is dependent upon the research objectives and constraints (Cavana et al. 2001). Given that at least 200 participants were required for the current research, face-to-face and telephone interviews and observational studies would likely be excessively time-consuming and expensive. In addition, taking into account the time constraints of members of the legal profession these data collecting methods were deemed to be unsuitable. It was determined that an electronic survey or questionnaire administered via the Internet, would be the most effective and efficient method of data collection for the present study. A strong preference for surveys is a feature of previous work-life research (Bardoel et al. 2008).
4.7.1 Justification for using electronic questionnaire

An electronic survey administered via the Internet was chosen because it has several advantages. The use of email has grown rapidly in the last two decades and is now considered an essential and ubiquitous method of communication in the business world. In addition, the Internet is increasingly looked at as a means of surveying the public (Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine 2004). It is inexpensive, relatively easy to use and a questionnaire can be transmitted and received almost instantaneously to a geographically dispersed sample (Kittleson 1997). Respondents are also free to think about the questions and to anonymously complete the questionnaire at their own convenience (Cavana et al. 2001; Cooper & Schindler 2001; Sax, Gilmartin & Bryant 2003).

The disadvantages of electronic surveys include the fact that they do not provide ready access to the researcher for queries on questions and also responses may be frivolous or missing (Cavana et al. 2001; Cooper & Schindler 2001; Ticehurst & Veal 2000). Some studies suggest that response rates for electronic surveys may not match those of other survey methods (Cook, Heath & Thompson 2000; Couper 2000; Kittleson 1997). Kaplowitz et al. (2004) note that the successful design methods used for mail surveys are the result of many years of research and study, but that these approaches may not translate to response rate benefits for electronic surveys. In the present study, it was anticipated that a low response rate would occur as a result of lack of control over the dissemination of information about the research to potential study participants, together with the fact that members of the legal profession are no doubt inundated with incoming electronic and paper-based information and are ‘time-poor’.
The problem of a low response rate was addressed in the current study by offering participants the opportunity to claim a ‘professional development point’ (ten percent towards their annual requirement) and written feedback in the form of a ‘Work-life Balance Individualised Report’. In addition, an appropriate number of four follow-up reminders (Kittleson 1997) were sent during the duration of the study. However, the disadvantage of non-response bias is an issue with surveys of any kind because the respondents who do participate in the research may differ in a significant way to the other members of the sampling frame who do not respond to the questionnaire (Bordens & Abbot 2005). It is accepted by the researcher that non-response bias can hinder the generalisation of the study’s findings (Bordens & Abbot 2005).

Research has revealed concerns about Internet security on the part of survey participants (Kaplowitz et al. 2004; Sills & Song 2002). Concerns about Internet security and the sending and receipt of electronic ‘junk mail’ or ‘spam’ (Sills & Song 2002) were eliminated in the current study because members of the Queensland Law Society were invited to participate in the online survey through the Law Society's weekly emailed newsletter, *QLS Update*. The research was also supported and promoted by the Chief Executive Officer at the time, who endorsed two articles regarding the research which appeared in the QLS magazine, *Proctor*, in October and November 2008 (see Appendix B).

A further issue of concern for researchers is that of survey breakoff, where respondents start a questionnaire but fail to complete it. This behaviour occurs at high rates in
electronic surveys (Peytchev 2009). It is accepted by the researcher that questionnaire design characteristics may contribute to survey breakoff in the current research.

4.7.2 Questionnaire design

Questionnaire design is an important facet of research as it contributes to the relevance and accuracy of the data gathered (Zikmund 2000). The present study involved the development of items, determination of scales of measurement and decisions about the length and layout of the questionnaire, which included pretesting and revising. These aspects are now described.

4.7.2.1 Development of items

The review of previous work-life research has enabled the identification of a range of instruments, scales and items that were employed in the current study. In some cases, an existing scale was used in full; in others, selected items from an existing scale were used on their own or in combination with other scales; or new items were developed by the researcher. The use of a scale was determined by the construct to be measured and how it was to be operationalised. Operationalisation is the process of applying specific attributes or properties to a construct so that it can be measured (Emory & Cooper 1991; Sekaran 1992). The actual scales and items used are outlined in Section 4.8 below.

4.7.2.2 Measurement scales

The Likert scale (Likert 1932) has been used predominantly in the present study as it represents the most common scale used in attitudinal research and provides an interval
level of measurement appropriate for statistical tests (Bordens & Abbott 2005; Cavana et al. 2001; Zikmund 2000). A Likert scale is usually a five-point or seven-point scale with negative anchors on one side of a neutral mid-point, and positive anchors on the other side (Cavana et al. 2001). A five-point scale was adopted for this study and the anchors used were: ‘strongly disagree, tend to disagree, neutral, tend to agree and strongly agree’. In other cases, where established scales were used, the applicable measurement scale was adopted.

4.7.2.3 Length and layout

The Opinio survey system was used to create, publish, analyse and maintain the online survey used in the current study (see www.objectplanet.com/Opinio). The University of the Sunshine Coast is licensed to use the Opinio software and the researcher was granted access to the programme and the 108-page user’s manual. Assistance and support relating to all aspects of Opinio were provided by the University’s Strategic Information Analyst.

The Opinio survey system allows the user a great deal of control and choice over the look and feel of the questionnaire and decisions had to be made with regard to such elements as colour (background and text), headers and footers, screen layout, screen breaks, check boxes and rating scale design. A template with a light blue background and black text was adopted to ensure a professional appearance and screen ‘pages’ were kept as short as possible.
4.7.2.4 Pre-testing and revising

A draft of the questionnaire was pre-tested and revised before being used in the field. The purpose of pre-testing was to check for flaws in questionnaire design and to cover aspects such as length, timing, clarity and layout of questions (Emory & Cooper 1991). The pre-test was conducted with a sub-sample of legal professionals (7 participants), professional colleagues with research experience (4 participants) and experts familiar with the research methodology used in the study (6 participants) (Emory & Cooper 1991). The pre-test sample consisted of seven males and ten females. Feedback from the pre-test was collated. In general, the feedback was positive but the consensus was that the questionnaire was too long. Nevertheless, some pre-test participants did complete the questionnaire in the allocated 20-25 minutes.

Technical feedback from the University’s Strategic Information Analyst was provided and used to improve flow and ‘user-friendliness’. After much deliberation about reducing the length of the questionnaire, the only change made was to remove the last three items in each of the work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation scales. These items had been added to original measures by van Steenbergen et al. (2007) to measure psychological ‘spillover’ and it was decided to retain the original measures. In general, the feedback from this process helped to improve the content, structure and appearance of the questionnaire.
4.8 Description of Questionnaire

The present Work-Life Balance Survey was developed for this research (see Appendix A). The first part of the questionnaire contains an invitation to participate in the online survey and a brief introduction outlining the principal investigators, the study’s primary objectives and the survey completion time. The second part contains information about the project relating to confidentiality, voluntary participation and appropriate contact details (as required by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Sunshine Coast). The third part contains items designed to gather demographic data specifically age, marital status, work status of partner (where applicable) and the presence of dependants (children, parents or others) living at home. The fourth part contains information related to the nature of respondents’ employment, specifically employment status, position at work, size of legal practice or organisation, area of law practised, and number of years spent as a practicing lawyer.

The fifth part of the questionnaire contains information related to a range of environmental variables identified in chapters two and three that may act as environmental demands and resources – the degree of flexibility and control/autonomy at work, workplace benefits and culture, allocation of time, perception of degree of work and home demands and the availability of support at work and outside of work. The sixth part contains information related to dispositional characteristics identified in Chapters 2 and 3 as important variables for consideration, specifically core self-evaluations, personality factors, coping style and work-life balance management strategies. The
seventh part contains items related to the constructs of work-family and family-work conflict; work-family and family-work facilitation as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3.

The eighth part of the questionnaire contains items measuring the perception of work-life balance. The ninth part contains the dependent variable measures, specifically occupational satisfaction (job and career satisfaction and intention to leave the legal profession), self-rated work performance, life satisfaction, personal wellbeing and psychological health. The tenth part contains information for the respondent with regard to the availability of individualised feedback on their survey results and space for them to leave their email address should they wish to receive the report containing this feedback. The final part contains contact details of one of the researchers for the purposes of discussing any issues relating to the study and an invitation to the respondent to provide any additional comments that they would like to make.

4.8.1 Research project invitation and information pages

In accordance with national standards, the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Sunshine Coast requires that appropriate information be provided to potential participants in research projects conducted by members of the University. The present questionnaire included a ‘splash page’ which appeared once potential respondents clicked on the link to the online survey. The ‘splash page’ served as an introduction and included a brief outline of the aims of the research so that a decision could be made by participants as to whether or not they wished to proceed with completing the questionnaire. On clicking the ‘Continue’ button at the bottom of the ‘splash page’
further information regarding confidentiality, voluntary participation and contact details of the researchers and the Human Research Ethics Committee appeared as part of the instructions to potential respondents (see Appendix A). Participants not wishing to continue on to complete the questionnaire, simply clicked out of the window on their computer at which point in time the link to the survey was terminated and no further contact ensued.

4.8.2 Respondent, household and employment demographics

The demographic variables have been chosen as a result of the detailed examination in Chapters 2 and 3 and were adapted from the Australian Work and Life Index (AWALI) (Pocock et al. 2007) and Wallace’s (2002) work-life research involving lawyers practising in Canada. The variables and applicable questions are presented in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Q2. Are you male or female?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>Q3. What year were you born?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Q4. What is your current marital status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status of spouse (if applicable)</td>
<td>Q5. If married/de facto, does your spouse/partner work outside the home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependants</td>
<td>Q6. Do you have dependants living with you at home (i.e., children, parents or others)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of dependants</td>
<td>Q7. If yes, please indicate each category of dependants living with you at home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1: Demographic Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td>Q8.  Do you currently work full-time or part-time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Q9.  Do you work on a permanent, casual or self-employed basis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work position</td>
<td>Q10. Please indicate your present position at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of legal practice</td>
<td>Q11. Please indicate the size of the legal practice or organisation in which you work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of legal practice</td>
<td>Q12. Please indicate the area of law in which you work, such as General Practice, Family Law, Business and Commercial law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of legal practice</td>
<td>Q13. How many years have you been working as a practising lawyer?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3 Environmental resource and demand characteristics

4.8.3.1 Job characteristics – workplace flexibility

Two questions were included in the present study to measure the degree of flexibility in selecting the location of where work is done and the degree of flexibility in scheduling when work is done, as shown in Table 4.2. Hill et al.’s (2004) original scale included a third item relating to the acceptability of telecommuting in one's work group. The third item was omitted from the current scale to avoid duplication, because the availability of telecommuting (a flexible work arrangement option) was included as part of a set of questions relating to work-life balance benefits provided in the workplace.
Table 4.2: Workplace Flexibility Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15. How much flexibility do you have in scheduling when you do your work (e.g., the hours, time of day)?</td>
<td>Hill et al. (2004)</td>
<td>The word ‘when’ changed from upper to lower case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.2 Job characteristics – work control/autonomy

The three-item scale contained in the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) and adapted by Wilson, Dejoy, Vandenberg, Richardson and McGrath (2004) were included in the present study to measure the degree of control or autonomy over how work is carried out and these items are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Work Control/Autonomy Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16.1 You decide on your own how to go about doing your work.</td>
<td>Wilson, Dejoy, Vandenberg, Richardson &amp; McGrath (2004)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16.2 Your job gives you a chance to use your personal initiative or judgment in carrying out your work.</td>
<td>Wilson et al. (2004)</td>
<td>'The work’ changed to 'your work' for consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16.3 Your job gives you considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how you do your work.</td>
<td>Wilson et al. (2004)</td>
<td>'The work’ changed to ‘your work’ for consistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.3 Organisational characteristics – work-life balance benefits

The list of ten organisational family-responsive policies used by O’Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath, Allen, Cooper and Sanchez (2003) was adopted for the current
research. The items used in this study to assess the availability and usage of these work-life balance benefits are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Work-life Balance Benefits Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17.1 Flexitime (choice in starting and ending work times).</td>
<td>O’Driscoll, Poelmans, Spector, Kalliath, Allen, Cooper &amp; Sanchez (2003) – the only modification to the list was the insertion of definitions in brackets to clarify items 17.1, 17.2 and 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.2 Compressed work week (e.g., 4 x 10 hour days).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.3 Telecommuting (working from home at least 1 day a week).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.4. Part-time work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.5 Job share arrangements.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.6 On-site child care centre.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.7 Subsidised local child care.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.8 Child-care information/referral services.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.9 Paid maternity/paternity leave.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17.10 Elder care leave.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.4 Organisational characteristics – perceptions of a supportive work-family culture

The measure of work-family culture developed by Thompson et al. (1999) was adapted for the current research. The items used in this study to assess respondents’ perceptions regarding the extent to which their workplace was supportive of the integration of their work and non-work lives are shown in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5: Perceptions of a Supportive Work-Family Climate Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18.1. In this workplace, employees can easily balance their work and non-work lives.</td>
<td>Thompson, Beauvais &amp; Lyness (1999)</td>
<td>‘Workplace’ used instead of ‘organization’. ‘Family’ changed to ‘non-work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.2. In the event of a conflict it is understood when employees have to put their family first.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Managers understand’ changed to ‘it is understood’ for generalisability to those respondents who do not have a manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.3. In this workplace, it is generally okay to talk about one’s non-work life at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Workplace’ used instead of ‘organization’. ‘Family’ changed to ‘non-work’ life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.4. In this workplace people are sensitive to employees’ family and personal concerns.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be’ changed to ‘In this workplace people are’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.5. This workplace is quite accommodating of non-work related needs.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘In general, managers in this workplace are’ replaced with ‘This workplace is’. ‘Family-related’ changed to ‘non-work related’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.6. In this workplace it is easy to leave during the working day to take care of personal or family matters.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Changed from ‘it is very hard’ to ‘it is easy’, to avoid reverse-scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.7. In this workplace employees are encouraged to set limits on where work stops and non-work life begins.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘This organisation encourages employees’ changed to ‘In this workplace employees are encouraged’. ‘Home’ changed to ‘non-work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.8. In this workplace there is sympathy towards employees’ childcare responsibilities.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward’ changed to ‘In this workplace there is sympathy towards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.9. In this workplace there is support for employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for non-work related reasons.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘This organisation is supportive of’ changed to ‘In this workplace there is support for’. ‘Family’ replaced with ‘non-work related’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: Perceptions of a Supportive Work-Family Climate Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18.10. In this workplace there is sympathy towards employees' elder-care responsibilities.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward’ changed to ‘In this workplace there is sympathy towards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18.11. In this workplace employees are encouraged to strike a balance between their work and non-work lives.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Workplace’ used instead of ‘organization’. ‘Family’ replaced with ‘non-work’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.5 Organisational characteristics – perceptions of an unsupportive work-family culture

The measure of work-family culture developed by Thompson et al. (1999) was adapted for the current research. The items used in this study to assess respondents’ perceptions regarding the extent to which their workplace was unsupportive of the integration of their work and non-work lives are shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Perceptions of an Unsupportive Work-Family Culture Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19.1 In this workplace employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends.</td>
<td>Thompson et al. (1999)</td>
<td>‘In this workplace’ added at beginning of statement for consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19.2 In this workplace employees are regularly expected to put their job before their family or personal life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘In this workplace’ added at beginning of statement for consistency. ‘Families’ replaced with ‘family or personal life’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6: Perceptions of an Unsupportive Work-Family Culture Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19.3 To get ahead in this workplace employees are expected to work more</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>‘Workplace’ used instead of ‘organization’. ‘48 hours’ used instead of ‘50 hours’. ‘whether at the workplace or at home’ removed from end of statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 48 hours a week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19.4 To be viewed favourably in this workplace, employees must constantly put their jobs ahead of their family or personal life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The phrase ‘by top management’ replaced with ‘in this workplace’; ‘in this organisation’ deleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.6 Environmental demands – allocation of time to work and to domestic duties

Based on the detailed examination of variables outlined in chapters two and three, the items used in this study to assess the allocation of time to work and domestic duties are shown in Table 4.7.

4.8.3.7 Environmental resources – allocation of time to non-work related activities

The items used in this study to assess the allocation of time to non-work related activities are based on Allis and O’Driscoll’s (2008) personal benefit activities which relate to “activities an individual undertakes to take care of themselves” (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008, p. 275). The items are shown in Table 4.8.
### Table 4.7: Allocation of Time to Work and Domestic Duties Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20.1 Working at the office/home office.</td>
<td>Item developed by researcher for current research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.2 Working out of normal (9-5) working hours (i.e., in the evening or at the weekend).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.3 Attending work-related activities after hours (e.g., functions, professional development).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.4 Commuting to and from work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.5 Taking care of children.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.6 Taking care of other dependants, such as elderly parents who may or may not live with you.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.7 Doing domestic duties (e.g., cooking, cleaning, shopping, gardening).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.8: Allocation of Time to Non-Work Related Activities Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20.8 Taking care of yourself - “self-care / me time” (e.g., rest and relaxation).</td>
<td>Item developed by researcher for current research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.9 Taking part in leisure activities (e.g., sports, hobbies, socialising).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.10 Taking time out with your partner/spouse (if applicable).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.11 Taking time out with your children (if applicable).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20.12 Taking part in community activities (e.g., helping at school/charity work).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.3.8 Work hours preference

One question adopted from the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (Alexander & Baxter 2005) was included in the present study. The item used in this study to assess participant’s work hours preference is shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Work Hours Preference Item in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Would you prefer to work more, fewer or the same number of hours, compared to those you currently work?</td>
<td>Alexander &amp; Baxter (2005)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.9 Environmental demands - perceived home demands

The items used in this study to measure respondents’ perceived demands on their time, energy and attention emanating from home life are shown in Table 4.10. Boyar, Carr, Mosley and Carson’s (2007) perceived family demand scale was used in the current study, together with an item from the Australian Work and Life Index (Pocock et al. 2007) and items developed for this research to assess time pressure and overload.

Table 4.10: Home Demands Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22.2 I feel like I have a lot of home demands.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The phrase ‘home demands’ used instead of ‘family demand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10: Home Demands Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22.3 I have to work hard on family-related demands.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The word ‘demands’ used instead of ‘activities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.4 I have a lot of responsibility in my home life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The phrase ‘home life’ used instead of ‘family’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.5 I have to work very quickly to get everything done in my home life.</td>
<td>Wallace (2002)</td>
<td>Developed by the researcher from Wallace (2002) to mirror perceived work demands scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.6 I do not have enough time to get everything done at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.7 I often feel rushed at home.</td>
<td>Australian Work and Life Index, Pocock, Williams &amp; Skinner (2007)</td>
<td>Adapted from item assessing time pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.8 I often have obligations at home that compete with one another.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Developed by researcher for current research to assess overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22.9 I often over-extend myself at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.10 Environmental demands – perceived work demands

The items used in this study to measure workload and the demands on time, energy and attention emanating from work are shown in Table 4.11. Boyar et al.’s (2007) perceived work demand scale was used in the current study, together with items from Wallace’s (2004) research, the Australian Work and Life Index (Pocock et al. 2007) and items devised to assess overload.
Table 4.11: Work Demands Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q23.2 I feel like I have a lot of work demands.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The word ‘demands’ used instead of ‘demand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.3 I feel like I have a lot to do at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.4 I have a lot of responsibility at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed by the researcher to mirror the family demand scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.5 My work requires a lot from me.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.6 My workload is too heavy in my job.</td>
<td>Wallace (2002)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.7 I have to work very quickly to get everything done in my job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.8 I do not have enough time to get everything done in my job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.9 I often feel rushed in my job.</td>
<td>Australian Work and Life Index, Pocock, Williams &amp; Skinner (2007)</td>
<td>Adapted from item assessing time pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.10 There are too many demands on my time at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed by researcher for current research to assess overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.11 I often have obligations that compete with one another at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23.12 I often over-extend myself at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.3.11 Environmental resources – support from colleagues

Wallace’s (2002) scale was adopted for the current research. The items used in this study to measure the support provided by work colleagues are shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Colleague Support Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24.1 Listen to your work related problems.</td>
<td>Wallace (2002)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.2 Empathise with your stresses.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.3 Offer support and encouragement.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.4 Show concern.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.5 Offer suggestions or solutions.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.6 Share ideas or advice.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.7 Share relevant difficulties they have experienced in their job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24.8 Help you figure out how to solve a work-related problem.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.12 Environmental resources – support from managers/supervisors

The items used in this study to measure House’s (1981) four categories of social support, that is informational, emotional, appraisal and instrumental support, provided by managers/supervisors are shown in Table 4.13.
Table 4.13: Manager/Supervisor Support Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q25.1 Helpful information or advice.</td>
<td>Adapted from House (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25.2 Sympathetic understanding and concern.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25.3 Clear and helpful feedback.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25.4 Practical assistance.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.13 Environmental resources – support from family

The items used to measure informational, emotional, appraisal and instrumental social support (House 1981) provided to respondents by family members are shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Family Support Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q26.1 Helpful information or advice.</td>
<td>Adapted from House (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26.2 Sympathetic understanding and concern.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26.3 Clear and helpful feedback.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26.4 Practical assistance.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.14 Environmental resources – support from friends

The items adapted from House (1981) used in this study to measure the social support provided to study participants by friends are shown in Table 4.15.
Table 4.15: Friend Support Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1 Helpful information or advice.</td>
<td>Adapted from House (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2 Sympathetic understanding and concern.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.3 Clear and helpful feedback.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.4 Practical assistance.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.3.15 Environmental resources – spouse/partner support

The items used in this study to measure the support provided by spouses/partners are shown in Table 4.16. The measure developed by Houston and Waumsley (2003) was used for the current research.

Table 4.16: Spouse/Partner Support Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q28.1 My spouse/partner plays an important role in my success at work and home.</td>
<td>Houston &amp; Waumsley (2003)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28.2 My spouse/partner provides me with practical support.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The phrase ‘which helps me at work’ removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28.3 My spouse/partner provides me with emotional support.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The phrase ‘which helps me at work’ removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.4 Personal resources

4.8.4.1 Dispositional characteristics – core self-evaluations

The items used in this study to measure dispositional characteristics known as core self-evaluations are shown in Table 4.17. The measure developed and validated by Judge, Erez, Bono and Thoresen (2003) was used for the current research.

Table 4.17: Core Self-Evaluation Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q29.1 I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.</td>
<td>Judge, Erez, Bono &amp; Thoresen (2003) unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.2 Sometimes I feel depressed. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.3 When I try, I generally succeed.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.4 Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.5 I complete tasks successfully.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.6 Sometimes I do not feel in control of my life. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.7 Overall, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.8 I am filled with doubts about my competence. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.9 I determine what will happen in my life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.10 I do not feel in control of my success in my career. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29.11 I am capable of coping with most of my problems.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.12 There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[R] denotes items that are reverse-scored.
4.8.4.2 Dispositional characteristics – personality traits

The items used in this study to measure dispositional characteristics known as personality traits are shown in Table 4.18. The Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John & Srivastava 1999) assesses five broad dimensions of personality (extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness and emotional stability) was used for the current research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q30.2. Tends to find fault with others. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.3. Does a thorough job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.4. Is depressed, blue.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.5. Is original, comes up with new ideas.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.6. Is reserved. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.7. Is helpful and unselfish with others.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.8. Can be somewhat careless. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.9. Is relaxed, handles stress well. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.10. Is curious about many different things.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.11. Is full of energy.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.12. Starts quarrels with others. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.13. Is a reliable worker.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.14. Can be tense.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.17. Has a forgiving nature.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.18. Tends to be disorganised. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.19. Worries a lot.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18: Personality Trait Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q30.20. Has an active imagination.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.21. Tends to be quiet. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.22. Is generally trusting.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.23. Tends to be lazy. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.25. Is inventive.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.26. Has an assertive personality.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.27. Can be cold and aloof. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.28. Perseveres until the task is finished.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.29. Can be moody.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.30. Values artistic, aesthetic experience.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.32. Is considerate and kind to everyone.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.33. Does things efficiently.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.34. Remains calm in tense situations. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.35. Prefers work that is routine. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.36. Is outgoing, sociable.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.37. Is sometimes rude to others. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.38. Makes plans and follows through with them.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.39. Gets nervous easily.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.41. Has few artistic interests. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.42. Likes to co-operate with others.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.43. Is easily distracted. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30.44. Is sophisticated in art, music or literature.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[R] denotes items that are reverse-scored.
### 4.8.4.3 Dispositional characteristics – coping style and strategies

The items used in this study to measure dispositional characteristics relating to the style and strategies used to cope with stress are shown in Table 4.19. Carver’s (1997) ‘Brief COPE’ measure was used for the current research to assess respondents’ effective and ineffective coping style and strategies.

**Table 4.19: Coping Style and Strategy Items in Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q31.1 I concentrate my efforts on doing something about the situation I am in.</td>
<td>Carver (1997) – all items were modified by changing the first word in each statement from “I’ve been” to “I” and amending the tense of the following verb accordingly – the purpose of the change was to phrase the statements to reflect a pattern of usual responses to stressful situations, rather than to describe response to a recent event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.2 I try to come up with a strategy about what to do.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.3 I try to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.4 I accept the reality of the fact that it has happened.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.5 I make jokes about it.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.6 I try to find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.7 I get emotional support from others.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.8 I try to get advice or help from other people about what to do.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.9 I turn to work or other activities to take my mind off things.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.10 I say to myself “this isn't real”.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.11 I say things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.12 I use alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.13 I give up trying to deal with it.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.14 I criticise myself.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.15 I learn to live with it.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.16 I take action to try to make the situation better.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.17 I think hard about what steps to take.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.18 I look for something good in what is happening.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.19 I make fun of the situation.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.20 I pray or meditate.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.21 I get comfort and understanding from someone.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.22 I get help and advice from people.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.23 I do something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping or shopping.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.24 I refuse to believe that it has happened.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.25 I express my negative feelings.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.26 I use alcohol or other drugs to help me get through it.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.27 I give up attempting to cope.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31.28 I blame myself for things that happened.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.4.4 Dispositional characteristics – work-life balance strategies

Table 4.20 shows the items used in this study to measure dispositional characteristics relating to the strategies respondents identified that they use to integrate work and home life. Neal and Hammer’s (2007) measure of coping strategies for managing work and family was adapted for the current research. The present approach concurs with the aforementioned researchers, that is, coping strategies are conceptualised as resources used to help alleviate the demands of working and caring for children and ageing parents.

4.8.4.5 Dispositional characteristics – additional work-life balance management strategies

The item used in this study to explore any additional strategies that respondents used to successfully integrate work and home life is shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4.20: Work-life Balance Strategy Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q32.1 Time management (e.g., reduce hours spent on certain tasks and demands and prioritise other activities).</td>
<td>Adapted for this study by the researcher using the results of Neal &amp; Hammer’s (2007) research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.2 Set limits (e.g., avoid taking on new tasks; cease doing things that are not necessary; limit personal and family commitments).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.3 Plan and organise (e.g., implement systems, use diaries).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.4 Change attitudes (e.g., lower expectations of what is achievable).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.5 Manage stress through health behaviours (e.g., exercise, nutrition, taking holidays and leisure time).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.21: Work-life Balance Strategies Item in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q32.6 Increase flexibility (e.g., change work schedule).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.7 Increase involvement from spouse/partner (if applicable).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.8 Change lifestyle (e.g., downshift, reduce mortgage).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.9 Engage in personal or professional development activities (e.g., coaching, mentoring, training programs).</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.10 Increase support from family members, friends, work colleagues.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.11 Utilise technology.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32.12 Utilise hired help.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Please describe any other strategies you have used that have been successful in helping you to integrate your work and home life.</td>
<td>Developed by the researcher for the current study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.5 Conflict

With regard to the construct of conflict, the current research adopted the approach and measure validated by van Steenbergen, Ellemers and Mooijaart (2007) which is based on the measures developed and validated by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) and Carlson and Frone (2003).

4.8.5.1 Work-family conflict

The items used in this study to measure work-family conflict are shown in Table 4.22. The measure adopted is that of van Steenbergen et al. (2007). However, the three items designed to measure psychological work-family conflict were dropped after pre-test
feedback indicated that the online survey was too long, leaving the measure similar to that of Carlson et al. (2000) upon which the measure was based.

### Table 4.22: Work-Family Conflict Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34.1 My work keeps me from activities at home more than I would like.</td>
<td>van Steenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007) – unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.2 The time I must devote on my job keeps me from participating in responsibilities and activities at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.3 I have to miss activities at home due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.4 When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in activities/responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.5 I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.6 Because of all the pressures at work, sometimes when I get home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.7 The problem-solving behaviours I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.8 Behaviour that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34.9 The behaviours that make me effective at work do not help me to function better at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.8.5.2 Family-work conflict

The items used in this study to measure family-work conflict are shown in Table 4.23. The measure adopted is that of van Steenbergen et al. (2007). However, the three items designed to measure psychological family-work conflict were dropped after pre-test
feedback indicated that the survey was too long, leaving the measure similar to that of Carlson et al. (2000) upon which the measure was based.

Table 4.23: Work-Family Conflict Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q35.1 The time I spend on responsibilities at home often interferes with my work responsibilities.</td>
<td>van Stenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007) unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.2 The time I spend on activities in my home life often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that would be helpful to my career.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.3 I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.4 Because of stress at home, I am often preoccupied with home-related matters at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.5 Because I am often stressed from responsibilities at home, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.6 Tension and anxiety from my home life often weakens my ability to do my job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.7 The problem-solving behaviours that work for me at home do not seem to be as useful at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.8 Behaviour that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35.9 The behaviours that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.6 Facilitation

With regard to the construct of facilitation, the current research has adopted the approach and measure validated by van Steenbergen et al. (2007) which is based on the measures developed by Wagena and Geurts (2000) and Grzywacz and Marks (2000).
4.8.6.1 Work-family facilitation

The items used in this study to measure work-family facilitation are shown in Table 4.24. The measure adopted is that of van Steenbergen et al. (2007). However, the three items designed to measure psychological work-family facilitation were dropped after pre-test feedback indicated that the online survey was too long.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q36.1 Because I work, I enjoy my time at home more.</td>
<td>van Steenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007) unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.2 The amount of time I spend on my work stimulates me to undertake enjoyable activities in the time I spend on my home life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.3 Because I work, I am better able to limit the responsibilities I take on at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.4 When I get home from work I often feel energised, making me feel more like participating in activities/responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.5 When I get home from work I often feel emotionally recharged, enabling me to make a better contribution at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.6 When I get home from work I am often in a good mood which has a positive effect on the atmosphere at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.7 Because of the way I perform my job, I also use my time at home more effectively.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.8 Because of the things I learn at work I also function better in social contacts at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36.9 The skills I use at work help me to better handle matters at home.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.6.2 Family-work facilitation

The items used in this study to measure family-work facilitation are shown in Table 4.25. The measure adopted is that of van Steenbergen et al. (2007). However, the three items designed to measure psychological family-work facilitation were dropped after pre-test feedback indicated that the online survey was too long.

Table 4.25: Family-Work Facilitation Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37.1 Because of the time I spend on my home life, I enjoy my work more.</td>
<td>van Steenbergen, Ellemers &amp; Mooijaart (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.2 The amount of time I spend on my home life stimulates me to use my time at work effectively.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.3 Because of my home life, I am better able to limit the responsibilities I take on at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.4 Because I relax and regain my energy at home, I can better focus on performing my work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.5 Because I relax and regain my energy at home, I can better concentrate on my work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.6 After undertaking activities at home, I often arrive at work in a good mood, which has a positive effect on the atmosphere at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.7 Because I have to plan my time at home, I also use my time at work effectively.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.8 Because of the things I learn at home I also function better in social contacts at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37.9 The skills I use at home help me to better handle matters at work.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.7  Perceived work-life balance

The items used in this study to measure the perception of work-life balance are shown in Table 4.26. The measure of work-life balance used in the current research is the comprehensive, multi-item scale developed by Joplin et al. (2003b) as discussed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q38.1 I feel fulfilled in all aspects of my life.</td>
<td>Joplin, Shaffer, Lau &amp; Francesco (2003)</td>
<td>Unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.2 I have established priorities for my work and personal life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.3 I focus my energy on those aspects of my life that are important to me.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.4 I do what is important to me to keep balance in my life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.5 I have achieved a sense of inner harmony.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.6 I can schedule my activities so they do not interfere with each other.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.7 I manage all aspects of my life effectively.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.8 My life is organised to the extent I think it should be.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.9 I can integrate the various areas of my life so none of them suffer.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The term ‘integrate’ was used instead of ‘juggle’ as a preferred connotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.10 I am satisfied with the way I apportion my time to different aspects of my life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Unmodified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.26: Work-Life Balance Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q38.11 I can move easily from family to work obligations without experiencing negative feelings.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.12 My personal life and my work life are complementary.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.13 I feel that I can successfully balance the different aspects of my life.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>This original item of Joplin et al.’s (2003) was adopted to replace “I can’t balance my life because I spend too much time working” – this item is out of kilter with the rest of the items which are in a positive direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.14 There is a good “fit” between my home, social and work activities.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38.15 I have the resources to juggle the multiple demands multiple demands of work, family and personal activities.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>“I am able to” was replaced by “I have the resources to” in keeping with the current study’s demands-and-resources conceptual framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.8 Occupational satisfaction

The items used in this study to assess occupational satisfaction are shown in Table 4.27. Specifically, the aspects of occupational satisfaction of interest in this research include job and career satisfaction and respondents’ intention to leave the legal profession. The items chosen were adapted from the measures used by Wallace (2002) in her study of Canadian lawyers.
### Table 4.27: Occupational Satisfaction Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q39.1 I would like to leave the legal profession.</td>
<td>Adapted from Wallace (2002)</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.2 I would like to continue working in the legal profession. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.3 I definitely dislike my job. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.4 I am happy with the way things are going in my legal career.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.5 I would like to work in an occupation other than the legal profession.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.6 I am dissatisfied with the progress I have made towards meeting my overall career goals practicing law. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The words ‘not satisfied’ changed to ‘dissatisfied’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.7 I plan to continue practicing law as long as possible. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.8 Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.9 I am dissatisfied with my overall achievements as a lawyer. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Developed by researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.10 I am satisfied with the success I have achieved so far in my legal career.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The word ‘legal’ replaced the word ‘law’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.11 Generally, my job is boring. [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39.12 I find real enjoyment in my job.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[R] denotes items that are reverse-scored.

#### 4.8.9 Self-rated work performance

Two questions were devised for the study to gauge participants’ perception of their performance over the previous six months and during the week prior to completing the survey. Table 4.28 outlines these three questions.
Table 4.28: Self-rated Work Performance Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q41 On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is the worst job performance anyone could have at your job and 10 is the performance of a top lawyer, how would you rate your usual job performance over the past six months?</td>
<td>Developed by researcher for current research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Using the same 0 to 10 scale, how would you rate your overall performance on the days you worked during the past week?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.10 Life satisfaction and subjective wellbeing

The Australian Personal Wellbeing Index (AWI) (International Wellbeing Group 2006) was used in the current research to gauge participants’ perceptions about how satisfied they were with their life in general and with different areas of their lives – their health, personal relationships, personal safety, standard of living, what they are achieving in life, community connection, future and financial security and spirituality or religion. The items used in this study to measure life satisfaction and subjective wellbeing are shown in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29: Life Satisfaction and Subjective Wellbeing Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q43.1 Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?</td>
<td>Australian Personal Wellbeing Index (AWI) ((International Wellbeing Group 2006) unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.2 How satisfied are you with your standard of living?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.29: Life Satisfaction and Subjective Wellbeing Items in Questionnaire (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q43.3 How satisfied are you with your health?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.4 How satisfied are you with what you are currently achieving in life?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.5 How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.6 How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.7 How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.8 How satisfied are you with your future security?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.9 How satisfied are you with your religion or spirituality?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43.10 How satisfied are you with your financial security?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.11 Mental health

The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) is an extensively researched and well-validated instrument for the assessment of mental health (Campbell, Walker & Farrell, 2003). There are a range of versions based on the number of items used and the shorter, twelve-item GHQ-12 (Goldberg 1991) has been used for the current research, as shown in Table 4.30.
Table 4.30: Mental Health Items in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q44.1 Been unable to concentrate on whatever you are doing?</td>
<td>Goldberg (1991) - GHQ-12 unmodified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.2 Lost much sleep over worry?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.3 Felt that you are playing a useful part in things? [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.4 Felt capable of making decisions about things? [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.5 Felt constantly under strain?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.6 Felt you could not overcome your difficulties?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.7 Been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities? [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.8 Been able to face up to your problems? [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.9 Been feeling unhappy and depressed?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.10 Been losing confidence in yourself?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.11 Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person?</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44.12 Been feeling reasonably happy, all things considered? [R]</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[R] denotes items that are reverse-scored.

4.8.12 Individualised feedback

The invitation in the questionnaire for respondents to request individualised feedback in the form of a confidential report is shown in Table 4.31.
Table 4.31: Individualised Feedback Report Item in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q45. Individualised feedback on your survey results is available. We will send you a tailored letter with a summary of your results on key areas from the survey, if requested. If you would like individual feedback sent to you, please provide your name and e-mail address in the box below. Your contact details will be kept confidential and will be stored in secure locked premises located at the University of the Sunshine Coast. Your identity will remain confidential and will not be given to any other person. These details cannot be matched to your survey responses.</td>
<td>Developed by the researcher for the current study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.13 Further comments

The opportunity for respondents to discuss issues relating to the questionnaire or to provide further comments is shown in Table 4.32.

Table 4.32: Further Comments Item in Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Should you wish to discuss any issues relating to this questionnaire in confidence, please contact Barbara Haddon (Project Investigator and Registered Psychologist) by e-mail at <a href="mailto:bhaddon@usc.edu.au">bhaddon@usc.edu.au</a> or on telephone (07) 5459 4573 (during business hours). If you have any further comments that you would like to make, please add them in the box below. Once again, we thank you for your contribution to our research – it is very much appreciated.</td>
<td>Developed by the researcher for the current study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 Administration of Questionnaire

The work-life balance questionnaire was available for Queensland Law Society members to access online from 8 October to 22 December 2008 via an Internet URL. The Internet link was provided in the weekly emailed newsletter *QLS Update*, the Society’s monthly magazine *Proctor* and a sequence of four follow-up reminders undertaken throughout October, November and December 2008. See Appendix B for copies of the initial invitation, *Proctor* articles and e-newsletter follow-ups.

Participants received feedback in the form of an individualised report and were entitled to a full professional development point for taking part in the research if they requested and actioned this feedback (see Appendix C for a copy of the report). One hundred and forty two participants requested and were provided with feedback via email or post. The aim of the report was to provide individuals with an overall appraisal of their current work-life balance status. Details of the measures used in the report are provided in Chapter 5.

In addition to providing Queensland Law Society members with an opportunity for personal and professional development, preliminary and final reports were compiled and provided to the QLS and a presentation of the survey results was delivered by the researcher. The insights gained from this research will contribute to the Queensland Law Society’s planning of the ongoing program of support and professional development activities offered to its members.
4.10 Ethical Considerations

Ethics approval for the current research was granted on 22 April 2008 by the University of the Sunshine Coast Human Ethics Committee (HREC approval number S/08/146). In addition to this approval, a number of ethical considerations need to be taken into account during the research process, including the obligations of the researcher and the rights of respondents (Zikmund 2000). A number of strategies were adopted to address the relevant ethical considerations, as follows. Firstly, respondents were advised of the purpose of the research at the time of invitation to participate and were reminded that their participation was voluntary, confidential and that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any time (Ruane 2005). Secondly, the privacy of respondents was protected during both the quantitative and qualitative analysis stages through the aggregation of data to a level where it is not possible for anyone to identify a particular individual (Cavana et al. 2001; Ruane 2005). All electronic copies of completed questionnaires have been stored in a database with limited, password-protected access. In addition, the feedback provided to participants, in the form of an electronic report, was identified only by their Christian names and has since been deleted from file.

Thirdly, research participants have the right to be protected from harm (Cavana et al. 2001; Ruane 2005). The current research design did not place participants in any physical or psychological jeopardy. Nevertheless, contact details of the researcher and the principal supervisor (both of whom are Registered Psychologists) together with those of the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee, were provided at the outset. In addition, contact details for counselling services were provided at the end of the
individualised report to assist participants who may have reported symptoms of mental ill-health.

Researchers are obliged to avoid conflicts of interest that may arise from any study and to report their findings honestly and truthfully (Ruane 2005). To that end, the researcher has neither a conflict of interest nor vested interest in the findings.

4.11 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the options for a research paradigm to guide the study. The realism paradigm has been chosen as the best fit to inform the research questions. The major method categories were reviewed and a mixed methods methodology chosen. The range of research designs available has been considered, with the study identified as both exploratory and descriptive, and with a cross-sectional approach being selected. The types and sources of data have been determined and sampling issues have been addressed. Next, data collection procedures have been discussed and an online questionnaire justified as the mechanism for collecting data for this research. The items comprising the questionnaire have been sourced from existing scales and modified where necessary, or elsewhere developed by the researcher. Lastly, ethical considerations have been identified and addressed. The preparation of the data is reported next in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
DATA PREPARATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the data collected from the survey. First, preparation of the data file is undertaken (Section 5.2). Second, cleaning, screening and transformation of the data is conducted and decisions taken on missing data (Section 5.3). Third, the response rate of the survey is discussed (Section 5.4). Fourth, the demographic and personal characteristics of respondents to the study are analysed and a profile of respondents developed (Section 5.5). Fifth, results of exploratory factor analysis for relevant scales and results for scales not subjected to exploratory factor analysis are presented (Section 5.6).

5.2 Preparation of Data File

A data preparation procedure should precede any actual data analysis to ensure the results of the research conducted can be meaningfully interpreted from data of a reasonable quality (Sekaran 1992). The first step to be undertaken is that of converting the raw source material to a useable data file (Coakes & Steed 2003). A distinct advantage of using the Opinio software system for creating the online survey in the current study, was the fact that the data were able to be saved as a ‘hash delimited’ (# delimited) file and opened in the software program used for the statistical analysis – Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 17.0) and the software program used for the
preparation of individualised feedback to respondents – Microsoft Excel. A ‘# delimited file’ was used instead of the more common ‘comma delimited’ (, delimited) format because the data in the current data set contained commas as part of the responses to open-ended questions. As the data in the file were obtained directly from respondents, the step of having to manually enter the data into spreadsheets and programs was thereby avoided, saving time and reducing data entry errors to nil.

Once the data were imported into SPSS all variables were named and labelled and missing values, variable type, column format and measurement level codes were assigned (Coakes & Steed 2003). Coding is the assigning of numbers to answers so that the responses can be grouped for analysis (Cooper & Schindler 2001). In the current study, some questions yield a number as an answer (e.g., number of years spent as a practising lawyer). The coding for all Likert scale items were pre-coded in the standard pattern: Strongly Disagree = 1; Tend to Disagree = 2; Neutral = 3; Tend to Agree = 4; Strongly Agree = 5 (Ticehurst & Veal 2000).

Categorical data such as marital status were re-coded into numeric data. The responses to open-ended questions, such as the area of law within which respondents worked, were post-coded into categories represented by a numeric code. In this particular case, The Queensland Law Society was consulted to ensure the categories were accurate. In some cases, such as the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg 1991) and the scale used to assess the availability and usage of work-life balance benefits (O’Driscoll et al. 2003), coding had been determined by the previous researcher(s) and implemented accordingly. Reverse-coded items within scales were re-coded at this stage. In all cases codes were
noted and allocated by the researcher and a coding manual was kept as a complete and accurate record of same.

Editing involves the checking of questionnaires for completeness and consistency and the making of corrections where possible (Cavana et al. 2001). As a result of the online survey format used in the current study, all questionnaires were originally in electronic form. A hard copy of each respondent’s questionnaire was printed for editing and checking purposes. As many of the respondents were anonymous it was not possible to verify their intentions and data editing was kept to a minimum for this reason, focusing instead on the validity of the data. However, it was identified in Respondent #20923’s case that from Question 31 onwards all answers in the ‘Neutral’ option were selected. The decision was made to recode these answers to ‘missing’ as a more accurate reflection of the respondent’s pattern of responses.

5.3 Cleaning, Screening and Transformation of Data

The next step in the analytic process was to explore the characteristics of the data (Coakes & Steed 2003). The cleaning and screening of data involves procedures relating to missing data and outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). In some circumstances, distributions of variables may deviate from normal and may need to be transformed before further analysis. In addition, there are instances where data values need to be modified, such as the case of collapsing continuous variables into categorical variables, or obtaining composite scores for items on a scale (Coakes & Steed 2003).
**Missing Data.** Missing data can be attributed either to researcher’s mistakes in data entry or to respondents’ errors in completing the questionnaire (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black 1995). In this study, mistakes in data entry were not a concern because this step was not required. Missing data from respondent item non-response was checked for all measurement variables using descriptive (Frequency) statistics in SPSS. The issue of survey breakoff has been discussed in Chapter 4. Survey breakoff is where survey respondents start a survey but fail to complete it and this behaviour pattern has been found to be as high as 50% in electronic surveys (Peytchev 2009). Survey breakoff was found to be an issue for the current research with 28% of the sample failing to complete all sections (33% for female; 22% for male). Breakoff was likely to be the result of survey length and occurred at different parts of the survey. There were also a number of sections in the survey that were repetitive, particularly the questions relating to conflict and facilitation, which may have become tedious for respondents. In addition, of the 342 participants who proceeded to the first page of the questionnaire, 16 decided not to go any further and their empty records were removed from the data set. It is accepted by the researcher that these design characteristics are limitations of the current research.

Nevertheless, the full data set of 326 participants has been reported on at the outset of the study and the data analysed for a range of informative variables. In particular, these include questions relating to the availability and usage of work-life balance benefits, information about respondents’ use of time and qualitative data provided by respondents who answered the open-ended question relating to effective work-life balance strategies. This data set was also used for a range of bivariate and multivariate analyses, using pairwise deletion to maximise the sample size without impacting upon the inferential...
statistics (George & Mallery 2006). Pairwise deletion means that if for any data analysis calculation a necessary data point is missing for a subject, the calculation will be conducted without the influence of that subject (George & Mallery 2006).

With regard to exploratory factor analysis, Costello and Osborne (2005) note that strict rules for sample size have mostly disappeared as adequate sample size is partly determined by the nature of the data – the stronger the data, the smaller the sample size can be (Costello & Osborne 2005; Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum & Strahan 1999; MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang & Hong 1999). In the current research, the researcher has endeavoured to follow ‘best practices’ to ensure the use of ‘strong data’ (Costello & Osborne 2005) and these practices will be outlined later in this chapter.

The reduced data set of 232 participants who completed all sections of the questionnaire was used for structural equation modelling to test the hypothesised conceptual model of work-life balance. This data set was found to have minimal, random non-response missing data. The sample size of 232 was considered acceptable for this research as it would be considered a ‘medium’ sized sample for structural equation modelling (Arbuckle & Wothke 2006; Kline 2005; Ullman 1996).

**Outliers.** Once missing data had been addressed, outliers were scrutinised. Outliers are values that appear at the extreme of the data set (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). Outliers may be either genuine values or errors resulting from data entry (Wild & Seber 2000). As previously noted, because the data were not entered manually, data entry errors were not possible in the current study. All univariate outliers were identified by running the minimum and maximum values report attached to the Frequencies function in SPSS. All
multivariate outliers were detected by observing Mahalanobis distance values using Amos (Analysis of Moments Structure). Both univariate and multivariate outliers detected may be retained in or removed from further analysis according to the type of information they provide to the research (Hair et al. 1995). In this research, all potential outliers were scrutinised but none was found to be abnormal or inconsistent. Hence, all of the statistically identified possible outliers were retained in the analysis, because they might represent a segment of the target population and deletion of them could impact upon the generalisability of the results.

**Transformation.** As with the analysis of outliers, distribution of the data needs to be examined as the assumption of normality is a prerequisite for many inferential statistical techniques (Hair et al. 1995). Normally distributed data is symmetric about the mean (George & Mallery 2006). Nevertheless, variables rarely conform to a classic normal distribution and are more often skewed, with varying degrees of kurtosis (Coakes & Steed 2003). Skewness measures to what extent a distribution of values deviates from symmetry around the mean and kurtosis is a measure of how peaked or flat the distribution is (George & Mallery 2006). Skewness and kurtosis values between ±1.0 are considered excellent for most psychometric purposes, but a value of ±2.0 is acceptable, depending on the application (George & Mallery 2006). When skewness and kurtosis are extreme, transformation is an option depending upon the severity of the departure from normality (Coakes & Steed 2003). Square root transformations were used for moderately skewed data and logarithm (log) transformations were used for substantially skewed data (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). Each instance needs to be considered on its merits as transformation can make variables harder to interpret (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001).
There are a number of different ways to explore and test normality and the current study used the descriptive (Explore) statistics in SPSS to produce histograms, normal probability plots and values (Coakes & Steed 2003). A summary of values is provided in Appendix 5.1. As few extreme cases of skewness and kurtosis were found in the current analysis, transformations were rarely required. Where necessary, analyses involving the skewed variables were performed prior to and after appropriate transformations (Hair et al. 1998) to reveal no significant means differences. Therefore, results were reported from analyses using the untransformed data in order to preserve comparability when interpreting the data (Hair et al. 1998). Moderate deviations from normality, as observed in this research, are not considered to be an impediment to structural equation modelling depending upon the estimation method chosen (Storms 1995). Maximum likelihood estimation was used in this research due to its robustness against moderate violations of the normality assumptions (Arbuckle & Wothke 2006; Byrne 2001).

Following exploratory factor analysis, transformations were used to collapse the continuous variable of work-life balance into a categorical variable to allow comparison of participants reporting higher levels of work-life balance with those reporting lower levels; and to obtain summated scores for items on scales to be used in further bivariate and multivariate analyses (Coakes & Steed 2003).

A final process was followed to verify the accuracy of the imported data set and to ensure that coding of variables was correct. A printed copy of every fifteenth questionnaire was thoroughly checked manually against the data in the data set. No errors were found during this process.
5.4 Response Rate

A potential problem in research is the issue of non-response (Ghauri & Gronhaug 2005) particularly with email surveys (Grava-Gubins & Scott 2008; Kaplowitz et al. 2004; Kittleson 1997). Non-response in the current study could have occurred for a range of reasons: potential participants may not have read the Queensland Law Society emails and articles promoting the study; or may have read about the study but may not have had enough time to complete the online questionnaire. The issue of time constraints for participants and whether the information provided was read or not were factors out of the researcher’s control. However, the researcher and collaborating staff at the Queensland Law Society made every effort to maximise the response rate by providing advance notification via email and published articles, multiple email follow-up and personalisation (offering confidential, individualised feedback and credit towards ongoing professional development) (Dillman 2000; Kittleson 1996).

It could be argued that responses to the online survey are biased owing to self-selection. Self-selection bias occurs where respondents feel strongly, in either a positive or negative way, about the focus of the research and this influences them to respond to the survey (Zikmund 2000). Certainly, potential participants may not have had an interest in the subject of work-life balance which would have deterred their participation. Alternatively, those Queensland Law Society members who were interested in the topic and were keen to receive feedback and continuing professional development credit would have been more likely to participate. The researcher accepts these factors as limitations of the current research.
The response rate is usually calculated by dividing the number of returned questionnaires by the number of questionnaires sent out and is usually reported as a percentage (Zikmund 2000). For the current research, it should be noted that while the target audience consisted of a potential 6,534 practising Queensland Law Society members (i.e., out of the total of 7,527 practising and non-practising members according to the 2007/08 Annual Report), it was not possible to determine a percentage response rate because it was impossible to ascertain how many of those members received the invitation to participate in the online survey. While it is conceded that the response rate was most likely quite low, the number of respondents who did participate in the current research was deemed adequate for statistical analysis purposes and every effort has been made by the researcher to make informed choices, from the options available for data analysis, to ensure that conclusions drawn from this research are most likely to generalise beyond the current sample (Costello & Osborne 2005).

5.5 Profile of Respondents: Personal, Household and Employment Demographics

A profile of respondents is constructed to determine their demographic characteristics and to determine the extent of representativeness of the sample when compared to the population. The higher the extent of representativeness the more generalisable the findings to the population (Ghauri & Gronhaug 2005). This study identified a range of demographic variables relevant to the subjects who completed the survey. The QLS Annual Report 2007/2008 provided minimal information on some of these variables – age and gender. Hence, it is only possible to undertake a direct comparison, on the basis
of these variables, of those who responded to the survey and those who did not respond. These demographic variables were analysed by using the Frequencies function in SPSS.

5.5.1 Gender

Each respondent was requested to provide information on gender. Numbers and percentages for the gender of respondents are reported in Table 5.1. According to the 2007/2008 Annual Report of the Queensland Law Society, membership consisted of 41% females and 59% males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender pattern of respondents is not representative of the population. However, the over-representation of women in the current sample is congruent with the historical conceptualisation that work-life balance is more an issue for women with families engaged in paid employment than it is for men (Barnett 1999). In addition, a substantial amount of literature demonstrates the difficulties female lawyers face balancing the demands of practising law and balancing work and family (Brockman, 1992; Chambers 1989; Epstein 1981; Rhode 1988; Seron & Ferris 1995; Stanford Law Project 1988).

On the other hand, it is important to note that although much research has found gender differences in work-family relationships, some researchers have not found these
differences (Anderson et al. 2002; Frone et al. 1992a; Frone et al. 1992b; Jones et al. 2006).

In the current research, there are sufficient cases of both men and women to conduct meaningful analyses and to draw generalisable conclusions and these results are reported accordingly.

5.5.2 Age

Respondents provided their age at the time of the survey. The range and the measures of central tendency are reported in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of respondents</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td>62 yrs</td>
<td>37 yrs</td>
<td>34 yrs</td>
<td>26 yrs</td>
<td>10.03 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational tenure</td>
<td>0 yrs</td>
<td>39 yrs</td>
<td>9.4 yrs</td>
<td>6 yrs</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>8.6 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work control/autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of supportive work-family culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of unsupportive work-family culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multi-modal</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived home demands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Multi-modal</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Measures of Central Tendency and Range for Study Measures
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived work demands</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit availability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit usage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/supervisor support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/partner support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core self-evaluations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and instrumental support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active coping and planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-blame</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural disengagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family conflict</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-work conflict</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family facilitation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Measures of Central Tendency and Range for Study Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-work facilitation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived work-life balance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective wellbeing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to leave the legal profession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive mental health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative mental health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated performance during previous week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rated performance during previous six months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 compares the numbers of legal professionals in the age ranges for the survey sample with that reported in the 2007/2008 Queensland Law Society Annual Report figures. It should be noted that the latter figures include 996 non-practising lawyers with a maximum age of over 85 years, which may partly account for the difference between the two samples in the over 55 age category. However, it is difficult to draw a completely accurate comparison of the two groups. The Annual Report specified that 52% of Queensland Law Society members were under the age of 39. All things being equal, it is likely that the age pattern of respondents in the current study could be
considered a reasonably representative sample, given the mean, median and mode
statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25–34</th>
<th>35–44</th>
<th>45–54</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop’n</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 Marital status

Data with respect to the marital status of respondents and the nature of the current
employment of their partner (where applicable) were reported. Numbers and percentages
are reported in Tables 5.4 and 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single/never married</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/de facto</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5: Nature of Current Employment of Spouse/Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Employment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewers and commentators of the work-life field, such as Casper et al. (2007) and Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002), have noted the overemphasis on intact nuclear and dual-income families and the lack of diversity in terms of demographic characteristics and family configurations in work-life research. While a large proportion of the current study sample reported having partners who were employed, the current research includes a varied range of characteristics, including participants without partners and participants whose partners (where applicable) were not employed. In addition, family configurations in the current study were not restricted to nuclear families, as outlined below.

### 5.5.4 Dependants

Each respondent was requested to provide information on whether they had dependants living with them at home, that is, children, parents or others. Numbers and proportions are reported in Tables 5.6 and 5.7. As can be seen, the current sample is split between respondents who reported having dependants at home and those who did not. Dependants (where applicable) ranged in age, with the majority under the age of twelve years. However, only a very small percentage of participants reported the presence of
dependants other than children and as a result, the current sample cannot be considered representative of ‘the sandwiched-generation’ (those with responsibility for child-care and elder-care) (Neal & Hammer 2007).

Table 5.6: Dependants Living At Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Dependents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Category of Dependents Living at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Dependents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 0-4 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 5-12 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 13-17 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 18 years and over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other dependants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.5 Nature of current employment

Respondents provided information on the nature of their current employment. Numbers and proportions are reported in Tables 5.8 and 5.9. The majority of participants were employed on a permanent, full-time basis.
Table 5.8: Nature of Current Employment of Respondents – Work Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9: Nature of Current Employment of Respondents – Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.6 Employment position

Respondents provided information with regard to the position they held at work. Numbers and proportions are reported in Tables 5.10. A little over half the participants in the current research were associates or employees of law firms, with the balance of respondents indicating a variety of positions ranging from partners and solo practitioners through to government and in-house company employees.
### Table 5.10: Employment Position of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate or employee of a legal firm</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner of a law firm</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo practitioner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house company employee</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated legal practitioner director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.5.7 Size of legal practice or organisation

Respondents provided information with regard to the size of the legal practice or organisation in which they were employed. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001) categories were used for the current research. Numbers and proportions are reported in Tables 5.11. Approximately one third of the participants in the current research were employed in small businesses and one third in medium-sized businesses, with the remaining third of participants split between micro/home-based and large-sized businesses.
### Table 5.11: Size of Legal Practice or Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Organisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-based business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro business 1-4 employees</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business 5-19 employees</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium business 20-199 employees</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large business 200+ employees</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td>326</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.5.8 Area of law

Data on the area of law in which participants practised was gathered in the current research. Responses were categorised into broad segments, in line with those used by the Queensland Law Society. For example, commercial/property law included sub-categories such as franchising, conveyancing, body corporate and succession law. Where respondents listed more than one area of law, the first area was coded, using the rationale that this would likely be the area where the largest percentage of work was done. The ‘miscellaneous’ category included single responses such as maritime, marine and aviation law. Numbers and proportions are reported in Table 5.12. Approximately, one third of the sample reported working within the area of commercial/property law, with the balance spread out across a range of different areas.
### Table 5.12: Area of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Law</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (Adjusted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/property</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33.4 (34.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.6 (16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.7 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal injury</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/construction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.5.9 Occupational tenure

Respondents were requested to indicate the length of time that they had spent in the legal profession. The measures of central tendency and range are reported in Table 5.2. The results indicate a reasonable spread of occupational tenure across the sample.

#### 5.6 Exploratory Approach

A progressive approach to data analysis was used for this study (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). The first step involved an exploratory approach where the aim was to explore the variables and relationships among variables, particularly those which had not been tested in previous studies. The following bivariate and multivariate techniques were used in the
exploratory stage: exploratory factor analysis, bivariate correlation and multiple linear regression. While these techniques do not consider measurement error (Ullman 1996), they contribute to a useful heuristic strategy for model specification prior to step two – confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling (Gerbing & Hamilton 1996). The results of the exploratory factor analyses are outlined below. Results of the bivariate, multivariate and confirmatory factor analyses are reported in Chapter 6.

5.6.1 Exploratory factor analysis principles

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is “a widely utilised and broadly applied statistical technique in the social sciences” (Costello & Osborne 2005, p. 1). The main purpose of EFA is to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller set of interpretable, underlying factors that summarise the essential information contained in the variables (Coakes & Steed 2003). Despite the popularity of EFA, its appropriate use remains a concern because a series of decisions are required to be made which have implications for the validity of the results obtained (Coakes & Steed 2003). The three key decisions are the choice of factor extraction method, the number of factors to retain and the rotation method to employ. Sample size also needs to be taken into consideration (Costello & Osborne 2005). Best practices in EFA were used in the current research to obtain optimal results, that is, those most likely to “generalise to other samples and that reflect the nature of the population” (Costello & Osborne 2005, p. 7), as outlined below.

**Factor extraction.** Principal components analysis (PCA) is the default method of extraction in many statistical software packages. However, it is simply a data reduction method and should not be considered a true method of factor analysis (Costello &
Osborne 2005; Gorsuch 1997). In PCA, the correlation matrix that is analysed assumes that each of the measured variables is perfectly reliable; hence the estimated factor loadings are based on the total item variance which includes both common and unique sources of variance (Gorsuch 1997). Because PCA does not explicitly take into account measurement error and specific variance, it can produce inflated values of variance accounted for by the components, potentially resulting in inappropriate substantive conclusions (Gorsuch 1997). In contrast, during factor analysis the shared variance of a variable is partitioned from its unique variance and error variance which means that the factor loadings obtained in EFA are derived from only the common or shared variance between the items (Costello & Osborne 2005). Fabrigar et al. (1999) summarise the different goals of EFA and PCA as follows: “whereas the goal of common factor analysis is to explain correlations among measured variables, the goal of PCA is to account for variance in the measured variables” (p. 275).

Researchers can choose from several factor analysis extraction methods. Two of the more well-known are maximum likelihood (ML) estimation and principal axis factoring (PAF) (Fabrigar et al. 1999). ML estimation is considered the best choice when data are relatively normally distributed, whereas PAF does not make distributional assumptions (Fabrigar et al. 1999). Studies suggest that either of these techniques recover the population parameter estimates well, although ML estimation is gaining in popularity because it is more embedded in statistical theory (Fabrigar et al. 1999; Gorsuch 1997). ML estimation and PAF were chosen for the current exploratory factor analyses, rather than PCA, depending upon the distribution of the data.
Number of factors to retain. Widely-used criteria for determining the number of factors to retain in an EFA include the eigenvalue-one rule (Kaiser 1960) and the scree plot (Velicer & Jackson 1990). The default in most statistical software packages is to retain all factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Eigenvalues are a measure of the total variance explained by each extracted factor (Kaiser 1960). The scree plot is a two-dimensional graphical representation of descending eigenvalues against equally-spaced factor numbers. The graph is examined visually to determine the ‘elbow’ in the graph which is the point where the difference in the descending eigenvalues is small – the number of factors above the ‘elbow’ are retained (Velicer & Jackson 1990). Both these approaches are subjective in interpretation and have been criticised for over-estimating the number of factors to retain (Costello & Osborne 2005).

An alternative approach to determining the optimal number of factors to retain in an EFA is to manually specify the number of expected factors based on the *a priori* factor structure (Costello & Osborne 2005). In this way, theoretical considerations determine the factors to retain (Fabrigar et al. 1999). Examination of the item loading tables after rotation (see below) is also important to determine a ‘clean’ factor structure. A ‘clean’ factor structure which has the best fit to the data is one where item loadings are above 0.32, communalities are uniformly high (0.40 to 0.70), there are no or few item crossloadings, several variables load strongly on each factor (0.50 or better) and there are no factors with fewer than three items (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001; Velicer & Fava 1998). Decisions to drop problematic items need to be carefully considered by the researcher to ensure that the integrity of the data is not compromised (Costello & Osborne 2005). The
alternative approach described above was used in the current research, together with an examination of the eigenvalues and scree plots.

**Rotation.** After deciding on the extraction method and the number of factors to retain, the third key decision in an EFA is specifying the rotation method to use on the initial estimates of the factor loadings. The goal of rotation is to achieve simple structure that maximises high loadings and minimises low loadings on particular factors (Costello & Osborne 2005). The decision about rotation is empirically and theoretically driven and determined on the basis of whether the researcher has reasons to assume that the factors obtained may or may not be correlated. Rotation may be orthogonal if factors are uncorrelated with one another, or oblique if factors are correlated (Coakes & Steed 2003). Oblique rotation (Direct Oblimin in SPSS) was used in the current research because some correlation among factors was anticipated. The pattern matrices were examined for factor/item loadings and the results are reported later in this chapter (Costello & Osborne 2005; Hair et al. 1998).

**Sample size.** A minimum of five subjects per variable is required for factor analysis. The rule-of-thumb used by many researchers for determining *a priori* sample size is a subject to item ratio of 10:1. A sample of 200 or more participants is preferable – the current study thus meets the criteria for sample size to enable effective EFA (Coakes & Steed 2003).

Additional statistical tests were employed in the current research to determine the factorability of the data and the reliability of the scales derived from the results of exploratory factor analysis. The Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to measure
whether the distribution of values of the data was adequate for conducting factor analysis. If the measure is greater than 0.6 then factorability is assumed (George & Mallery 2006). Bartlett’s test of sphericity is a measure of multivariate normality – factorability of the data is assumed if it is large and significant (Coakes & Steed 2003; George & Mallery 2006). The percent of variance explained by each factor was also observed (George & Mallery 2006).

Reliability is an important procedure in scale construction and definition and is complementary to factor analysis (Coakes & Steed 2003). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of internal consistency is the measure used to ensure that items comprising a factor produce a reliable scale, that is, they are all measuring substantially the same thing (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). The closer the alpha coefficient is to 1.00, the greater the internal consistency of items (George & Mallery 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). Acceptable alpha values are deemed to be those above 0.7; values between 0.6 and 0.7 are considered questionable; between 0.5 and 0.6, poor; and less than 0.5, unacceptable (George & Mallery 2006). Cronbach alpha coefficients for all scales were calculated using the Reliability Analysis procedure in SPSS and are reported in the Appendix 5.2, together with applicable KMO and variance results.

5.6.2 Exploratory factor analysis results

The results of the exploratory factor analyses conducted in the current study are presented in this section and in Appendix D.
5.6.2.1 Job characteristics – control/autonomy

In the current study, work control/autonomy was measured with a three-item scale. The results of exploratory factor analysis reveal a reliable, unidimensional factor as shown in Appendix 5.3.1, in support of Wilson et al.’s (2004) measure. The summated scale was mildly, negatively skewed and no transformation was performed. The findings suggest a group of individuals who have a great deal of control and autonomy with regard to how they go about doing their work, as indicated by the measures in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.2 Organisational characteristics – perceptions of a supportive work-family culture

The results of exploratory factor analysis support Thompson et al.’s (1999) measure. A reliable, unidimensional factor for supportive work-family culture perceptions is shown in Appendix 5.3.2. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting the perception of a supportive work-family culture. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.3 Organisational characteristics – perceptions of an unsupportive work-family culture

The results of exploratory factor analysis support Thompson et al.’s (1999) measure. A reliable, unidimensional factor for respondents’ perceptions of an unsupportive work-family culture in their workplace is shown in Appendix 5.3.3. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting the perception of an unsupportive work-family culture. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2. The
histogram of frequencies for the data showed multi-modes across the distribution, reflecting a broad range of responses for this particular question.

### 5.6.2.4 Environmental demands - perceived home demands

The results of exploratory factor analysis by and large support Boyar et al.’s (2007) scale. Four crossloading items were removed from the scale used in the questionnaire to produce a reliable, unidimensional scale as shown in Appendix 5.3.4. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of perceived home demands. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2. Once again multimodality was a feature of this distribution.

### 5.6.2.5 Environmental demands - perceived work demands

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived work demands, as shown in Appendix 5.3.5. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of perceived work demands. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2. Unlike the results for perceived home demands, where results are varied, the findings indicate the tendency for respondents to perceive their work demands to be reasonably high.

### 5.6.2.6 Environmental resources – support from colleagues

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived colleague support, as shown in Appendix 5.3.6. A summated score was
calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of support from colleagues. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.7 Environmental resources – manager/supervisor support

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived support from respondents’ manager/supervisor, as shown in Appendix 5.3.7. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of managerial/supervisor support. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.8 Environmental resources – family support

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived family support, as shown in Appendix 5.3.8. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of family support. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.9 Environmental resources – friend support

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived support from friends, as shown in Appendix 5.3.9. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of support from friends. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.
5.6.2.10  **Environmental resources – spouse/partner support**

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a reliable, unidimensional factor for perceived support from respondents’ spouse or partner, as shown in Appendix 5.3.10. A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of support from respondents’ spouse/partner. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2. As the majority of respondents reported their spouses/partners as being supportive, this variable was found to have a ceiling effect (Clark-Carter 2004).

5.6.2.11  **Dispositional characteristics – core self-evaluations**

The results of exploratory factor analysis did not support Judge et al.’s (2003) measure as a unidimensional, twelve-item scale. The data in the current study supported a four-item scale, once crossloading items and items overlapping with the emotional stability scale used in the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava 1999) were removed (see Appendix 5.3.11). A summated score was calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of core self-evaluations or positive self-regard. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.12  **Dispositional characteristics – personality traits**

The data in the current study supported a five-factor solution, in line with the five factors designated by the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava 1999), that is: extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness to experience and agreeableness. Fifteen of the original forty-four items were removed due to cross or low loadings (see Appendix 5.3.12). Summated scores were calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of the
respective personality traits. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.13    Dispositional characteristics – coping strategies

The current study used Carver's (1997) Brief COPE inventory, a twenty-eight item inventory which aims to measure “fourteen conceptually differentiable coping reactions” (Carver 1997, p. 98) – active coping, planning, positive reframing, acceptance, humor, religion, using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, venting, substance use, behavioral disengagement and self-blame. A number of issues were encountered during exploratory factor analysis, including low loading, single loading items and two-item measures with unacceptable reliability. It should be noted that Carver himself (1997) admitted that the factor structure for the Brief COPE “was not perfect” (Carver 1997, p. 97). In addition, he used Nunnally’s (1978) reliability cut-off of 0.50 as acceptable, which was not deemed acceptable in the current research (George & Mallery 2006). Problems could also have been due to the four-point response scale which may not have provided enough differentiation among respondents’ answers and the fact that two-item scales are not usually considered appropriate for factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001; Velicer & Fava 1998).

It should also be noted that the responses from study participants indicated that they were a group of people more likely to use active coping strategies than to use humour, substances such as alcohol and drugs or to turn to their religion/spirituality as coping strategies, which could account for why the Brief COPE scales did not work particularly well with this sample of respondents.
The most parsimonious result for coping strategies is presented in Appendix 5.3.13. A five-factor structure emerged with two factors representing adaptive coping strategies (active coping and planning; using instrumental and emotional support) and three factors representing maladaptive coping strategies (denial, self-blame and behavioural disengagement). The denial and behavioural disengagement scales exhibited skewness and kurtosis. However, transformation did not make a substantial difference, thus untransformed data was retained for analyses. Summated scores were calculated, with high scores reflecting high levels of the respective coping strategies used by respondents. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.14 Work-family conflict

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a three factor solution for work-family conflict in support of van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) sub-scales of time, strain and behaviour based work-family conflict, as shown in Appendix 5.3.14. A total work-family conflict score was calculated by combining the sub-scales (Witt & Carlson 2006). Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.15 Family-work conflict

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a three-factor solution for family-work conflict in support of van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) sub-scales of time, strain and behaviour based work-family conflict, as shown in Appendix 5.3.15. A total family-work conflict score was calculated by combining the sub-scales (Witt & Carlson 2006). Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.
5.6.2.16  Work-family facilitation

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a three-factor solution for work-family facilitation in support of van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) sub-scales of time, energy and behaviour based work-family facilitation (see Appendix 5.3.16). However, one of the items produced a Heywood case that is a factor loading greater than 1.0 (Costello & Osborne 2005). Maximum likelihood estimation is susceptible to Heywood cases as during iteration a variable with a high communality is given a high weight which increases its communality and so on, which appears to be the case in the current factor analysis. The item was removed and a total work-family facilitation score was calculated by combining the sub-scales. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.17  Family-work facilitation

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a three-factor solution for family-work facilitation in support of van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) sub-scales of time, energy and behaviour based work-family facilitation, as shown in Appendix 5.3.17. Once again, one of the items produced a Heywood case. The item was removed and a total family-work facilitation score was calculated by combining the sub-scales. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.2.18  Perceived work-life balance

The results of exploratory factor analysis yielded a two-factor solution, as shown in Appendix 5.3.18 compared with Joplin et al.’s (2003) three-factor solution. The two sub-scales of synchrony and control formed one factor in the current study. In addition, the
sub-scale of equilibrium was reduced by the two low-loading items relating to feelings of harmony and fulfilment. Two components of perceived work-life balance resulted: a sense of control and synchrony over life's domains; and a sense of planned action (establishing priorities and investing energy). The sub-scales were added together to create an overall perceived work-life balance score. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

**5.6.2.19 Occupational satisfaction**

The results of exploratory factor analysis revealed a three-factor solution reflecting job satisfaction, career satisfaction and the intention to leave the legal profession, as shown in Appendix 5.3.19. Summated scores were calculated and measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

**5.6.2.20 Mental health**

Previous research has failed to find a consistent replicable structure with regard to the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) and various studies have reported either a two-factor or a three-factor solution (Campbell et al. 2003). The results of exploratory factor analysis in the current study yield a positive/negative items two-factor model for the GHQ-12 which is similar to that found by Graetz (1991), as shown in Appendix 5.3.20. Summated scores were calculated and measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.
5.6.3 Results of analysis of additional variables

A number of dependent and independent variables in the current research were not subjected to factor analysis because they were either single-item measures (location and scheduling flexibility; allocation of time to work and domestic duties; self-rated performance), or were scored according to the researcher’s instructions for the particular measure adopted for this study (work-life balance benefit availability and usage; life satisfaction and subjective wellbeing). The measures of central tendency and range are presented in this section and measures of skewness, kurtosis, factorability and reliability are presented in the appendices (see Appendix D).

5.6.3.1 Job characteristics – flexibility

In the current study, work flexibility was measured with two single items relating to the amount of flexibility that respondents had with regard to selecting the location of where they did their work and in scheduling when they did their work. The findings suggest a group of individuals who have very little flexibility with regard to the location of where they do their work and in scheduling when they do their work, as indicated by the measures in Table 5.2.

5.6.3.2 Organisational characteristics – work-life balance benefits

In this study respondents were asked to select one of five responses to indicate the availability and usage of a range of organisational benefits: (a) “not offered and not needed”; (b) “not offered but needed”; (c) “offered but not used”; (d) “offered and used” and (e) “unsure if offered”. The last response option was added to O’Driscoll et al.’s (2003) response categories to assess participants’ degree of awareness of benefits offered
within their organisation. The percentages of responses for each benefit are presented in Table 5.4.1 in Appendix D.

To derive a score for benefit availability, responses (a) and (b) and (e) were coded zero and responses (c) and (d) were coded one. Total benefit availability was then calculated by summing across the ten benefits. To obtain a benefit usage index, responses (a), (b), (c) and (e) were coded zero and response (d) was coded one. Total benefit usage was computed by summing usage scores across the ten benefits.

The results presented in Table 5.4.1 and in Table 5.2 indicate clearly that work-life balance benefits are not being made available to the majority of participants in this study. A number of these benefits would be used by participants if they were offered, in particular flexible working arrangements such as a compressed work week, flexitime and telecommuting, together with a range of child-care benefits such as subsidised and on-site child-care.

5.6.3.3 Environmental demands – allocation of time to work and to domestic duties

The answers to questions regarding the allocation of time to work and domestic duties were recoded to reflect narrower categories. The frequency data are reported in Tables 5.13 to 5.19 below. The results of this study indicate that the majority of participants are working long hours, including time spent at work, time spent on work related activities after hours and time commuting. On the domestic front, it appears that the majority of respondents in this study are spending a lot of time on domestic duties but are not responsible for elder care.
Table 5.13: Frequency Data for Hours Spent At Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25 hours</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 hours</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 + hours</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14: Frequency Data for Hours Spent Working Out of Business Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hour</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 hours</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 + hours</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15: Frequency Data for Hours Spent At Work-Related Activities After Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: Frequency Data for Hours Spent Commuting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.17: Frequency Data for Hours Spent On Domestic Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 hours</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 -10 hours</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 + hours</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18: Frequency Data for Hours Spent On Child-Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + hours</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19: Frequency Data for Hours Spent on Elder Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + hours</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.3.4 *Environmental resources – allocation of time to non-work related activities*

The answers to questions regarding the allocation of time to personal benefit activities were recoded to reflect narrower categories. The frequency data are reported in Tables 5.20 to 5.24 below. The results of this study indicate that the majority of participants do engage in self-care and leisure activities, however, do not spend time on community-related activities.
### Table 5.20: Frequency Data for Hours Spent on Self-Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.21: Frequency Data for Hours Spent on Leisure Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.22: Frequency Data for Hours Spent With Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.23: Frequency Data for Hours Spent With Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 hours</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 + hours</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.24: Frequency Data for Hours Spent on Community Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 hours</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + hours</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.3.5  Work hours preference

Results of the current research are in line with previous Australian research in so far as participants would prefer to work fewer hours (see Alexander & Baxter 2005; Pocock et al. 2008; Skinner & Pocock 2010). However, by way of comparison, the percentage of 60.25% in this study is much higher than the results of the Australian Work and Life Index (AWALI) 2007 reported by Pocock et al. (2008) where 43.5% of all employees expressed wanting to work less. In this study, a small percentage would like to work more hours (1.85%) while a number of participants reported that they did not wish to change the number of hours worked (37.64%).

5.6.3.6  Self-rated work performance

Results indicate that the lawyers who participated in the current study, on average, rate themselves as performing well in the week and previous months prior to participating in the research. Measures of central tendency and range are presented in Table 5.2.

5.6.3.7  Life satisfaction and subjective wellbeing

The Australian Wellbeing Index monitors the subjective wellbeing of the Australian population. The Index is concerned with an overall question gauging satisfaction with life as a whole which is standardised to a 0-100 range. In addition, the Personal Wellbeing Index comprises questions relating to satisfaction with life domains. Each question is answered on a 0 to 10 scale of satisfaction and scores are then combined across domains to yield an overall Index score, also standardised to a 0 to100 range (International Wellbeing Group 2006). Measures of central tendency and range for life satisfaction and personal wellbeing for the participants in the present study are presented.
in Table 5.2. The most recent national average life satisfaction score is reported as 78% and the average personal wellbeing score is reported as 76% (International Wellbeing Group 2006). The results of the current research indicate that, on average, participants in this study are less satisfied with their life in general and with other areas of their life than the average Australian.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter has covered the preliminary analysis of data collected through the administration of the present Work-Life Balance Survey. The data were cleaned and screened, decisions were taken on missing data and the rate of response to the survey was discussed. The demographic and personal characteristics of respondents to the study were analysed and a profile of respondents developed. Lastly, results of exploratory factor analyses for relevant scales were presented to assist with model specification prior to confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling (Gerbing & Hamilton 1996). In addition, the results of analysis of variables not subjected to exploratory factor analysis were reported. Results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses follow in Chapter 6.
6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the data collected from administration of the Work-Life Balance Survey. First, the quantitative analysis and results are presented and discussed. Key relationships between the variables are identified and explored and the proposed model of work-life balance is examined. The relationships between the variables are analysed and the model is tested. Second, the qualitative analysis and results are presented and discussed.

6.2 Results of Quantitative Data Analysis

Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis were concerned with the first two research objectives (RO1 – RO2) of the current research, as specified in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.2). Specifically, previous conceptualisations and approaches to understanding the work-family interface and the concept of work-life balance were reviewed. In addition, the key personal and contextual enablers (resources) and barriers (demands) considered as contributing to an individual’s perception of work-life balance were identified. An integrated conceptual framework and theoretical model of work-life balance was proposed to guide empirical analysis. A methodology to collect and analyse data to test the model of work-life balance was determined in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 covered the preliminary analysis of data collected through the administration of the Work-Life Balance Survey.
This section of Chapter 6 is concerned with research objectives three and four (RO3 – RO4) (see Section 1.2). A progressive two-step approach to quantitative data analysis was used for this study (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). The first step involved an exploratory approach where the aim was to explore the variables and relationships between variables, particularly those which had not been tested in previous studies. The second step involved confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling (Gerbing & Hamilton 1996). With regard to RO3, bivariate correlation, multiple regression and structural equation modelling analyses were conducted to ascertain the relationships between perceived work-life balance, its antecedents, indicators and consequences. With regard to RO4, independent samples t-tests were conducted to explore gender differences and the factors differentiating individuals reporting perceptions of higher levels of work-life balance from those reporting lower levels. The results of data analyses are presented and discussed as follows.

6.2.1 Exploratory analysis

An exploratory stage of analysis was conducted in this research as a precursor to confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling. The approach of progressing from exploratory to confirmatory analysis is appropriate for research such as the current study because it involves both relationships justified by prior theory (such as the relationships between conflict and facilitation) and those which have not been tested in past studies (such as the relationships among conflict, facilitation and perceived work-life balance) (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). The exploratory analysis consists of three parts: exploratory factor analysis, bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses. The results of the exploratory factor analyses were presented in Chapter 5. The results of
bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses are presented and discussed in the next sections.

6.2.1.1 **Bivariate correlation between variables**

Bivariate correlation is the most common measure of linear relationship between two variables (Coakes & Steed 2003). Bivariate correlations were checked and inspected in the current study to help the researcher gain familiarity with the data (Frost & Stablein 1992) and to ensure feasibility of the data for further multivariate analyses and structural equation modelling (Hair et al. 1998; Ullman 1996). The variables were subject to a correlation analysis using the Correlate: Bivariate facility in SPSS Version 17 for Windows. Correlation coefficients range from -1 to +1: the value relates to the strength of the relationship between variables and the sign (+ or -) relates to the direction (Coakes & Steed 2003; George & Mallery 2006). For example, a correlation of +1 designates a perfect, positive correlation indicating that one variable is perfectly predictable from the other (George & Mallery 2006).

Correlational analysis assumes that data is collected from related pairs, that the data is interval or ratio in nature and that the scores for each variable are normally distributed (Coakes & Steed 2003). Linearity and homoscedasticity of variables are also important assumptions for multivariate analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). Linearity assumes that the relationship between two variables is linear and any departure from linearity might impact upon the results (Coakes & Steed 2003). Homoscedasticity assumes that the variability in scores for one variable is roughly the same at all values of the other variable and is desirable for multivariate dependent analysis such as multiple regression.
and structural equation modelling (Hair et al. 1995). Linearity and homoscedasticity were tested in the current research by examining scatterplots of the variables (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001).

Significance or probability is computed to determine the likelihood that a correlation could occur by chance. The significance (or p value) is commonly regarded as indicating the degree of rarity of a result with a significance of less than 0.05 (p < 0.05) meaning that there is less than a 5% chance that the relationship occurred by chance (George & Mallery 2006). The rule-of-thumb is to use a two-tailed significance measure when the direction of the correlation is unknown and a one-tailed measure if there are prior expectations (George & Mallery 2006). Two-tailed measures were employed in the current research.

Key relationships revealed in the correlation analysis, that is, those demonstrating a moderate or better relationship, are discussed in the following section. For the purposes of this study, variables with a correlation between 0.30 and 0.49 demonstrate a moderate relationship while variables with a correlation greater than 0.50 demonstrate a strong relationship (Cohen 1988). In addition, a correlation of over 0.90 is considered evidence of multicollinearity (high correlations among independent variables) or singularity (when perfect correlations among independent variables exist) and was used as a cut-off point (Hair et al. 1998) although no correlations reached this level in the present study.

**Perceived work-life balance together with conflict and facilitation.** The bivariate correlations between perceived work-life balance, work-family and family-work conflict and work-family and family-work facilitation outlined in Table 6.1 show perceived work-
life balance to have a strong negative relationship with work-family conflict \((r = -0.75, p < 0.01)\) and a moderate negative relationship with family-work conflict \((r = -0.34, p < 0.01)\). In relation to facilitation, perceived work-life balance demonstrates strong positive relationships with both work-family \((r = 0.63, p < 0.01)\) and family-work facilitation \((r = 0.61, p < 0.01)\). In addition, work-family and family-work conflict were found to be moderately positively related to one another \((r = 0.37, p < 0.01)\) and work-family and family-work facilitation were found to have a strong positive relationship \((r = 0.62, p < 0.01)\). The results of this study also indicate that work-family conflict is strongly negatively related to both measures of facilitation \((r = -0.60, p < 0.01\) for work-family and \(-0.51, p < 0.01\) for family-work). Of all the relationships in this matrix, the relationship between perceived work-life balance and work-family conflict is shown to be the strongest \((r = -0.75, p < 0.01)\), with family-work conflict demonstrating weaker relationships with the other variables.

Table 6.1: Correlation of Perceived Work-Life Balance, Conflict and Facilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived work-life balance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work-family conflict</td>
<td>-.746**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family-work conflict</td>
<td>-.341**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work-family facilitation</td>
<td>.629**</td>
<td>-.601**</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family-work facilitation</td>
<td>.610**</td>
<td>-.506**</td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level  
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level  
3. Shaded boxes indicate a correlation of 0.3 or more
**Perceived work-life balance together with dependent variables.** In relation to the dependent variables, Table 6.2 below summarises the relationships among perceived work-life balance and the outcome variables included in the current research: life satisfaction, personal wellbeing, job and career satisfaction, intention to leave the legal profession, negative and positive mental health and self-rated job performance. Perceived work-life balance demonstrates strong positive relationships with life satisfaction ($r = 0.56, p < 0.01$) and personal wellbeing ($r = 0.56, p < 0.01$) and moderate positive relationships with job satisfaction ($r = 0.44, p < 0.01$), career satisfaction ($r = 0.38, p < 0.01$) together with negative relationships with the intention to leave the legal profession ($r = -0.36, p < 0.01$), and mental ill-health ($r = -0.46, p < 0.01$).

As would be expected, job satisfaction and career satisfaction are positively related ($r = 0.49, p < 0.01$) and job and career satisfaction and the intention to leave the legal profession are negatively related variables ($r = -0.64, p < 0.01$; $r = -0.45, p < 0.01$, respectively). It should be noted that the weak associations between positive mental health and the other variables are likely to be due to the fact that this measure was not normally distributed, exhibiting extreme positive kurtosis which indicates a narrow range of responses from participants (see Table 5.1 in the appendices) (Coakes & Steed 2003).

**Conflict, facilitation, perceived work-life balance together with outcome variables.** In order to differentiate perceived work-life balance from the constructs of work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation the relationships among conflict and facilitation and the outcome measures used in the present study were also examined. The results of
bivariate correlations are presented in Table 6.3. An analysis of these relationships shows weak associations between the conflict and facilitation measures and positive mental health and self-rated performance. However, work-family conflict is seen to be negatively associated with life satisfaction \( (r = -0.41, p < 0.01) \), job \( (r = -0.35, p < 0.01) \) and career satisfaction \( (r = -0.31, p < 0.01) \) and personal wellbeing \( (r = -0.47, p < 0.01) \), and positively associated with the intention to leave the legal profession \( (r = 0.32, p < 0.01) \) and negative mental health \( (r = 0.47, p < 0.01) \).

The results of the current research suggest that participants do not experience high levels of family-work conflict (see means reported in Chapter 5, Table 5.36). Nevertheless, family-work conflict was found to be negatively related to career satisfaction \( (r = -0.35, p < 0.01) \) suggesting that when home and work life clash, satisfaction with a career in the legal profession is reduced. Furthermore, work-family and family-work facilitation are both positively related to life, job and career satisfaction and personal wellbeing and negatively related to mental ill-health.

It is interesting to note that the results of this research show perceived work-life balance to demonstrate stronger relationships with the outcome variables than work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation. However, with regard to perceived work-life balance and work-family conflict the pattern of relationships among these variables and the outcome variables is almost in the equal and opposite direction. For example perceived work-life balance is positively associated with life satisfaction, whereas work-family conflict is negatively associated with life satisfaction. This is in line with the view that the absence of work-family conflict is the same as work-family balance. However,
Table 6.2: Correlation of Perceived Work-Life Balance and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived work-life balance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Life satisfaction</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal wellbeing</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.686**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Career satisfaction</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intention to leave legal profession</td>
<td>-.358**</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>-.641**</td>
<td>-.449**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative mental health</td>
<td>-.458**</td>
<td>-.444</td>
<td>-.454**</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>-.309**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positive mental health</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-rated performance (during previous week)</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>-.268**</td>
<td>-.244*</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-rated performance (during previous six months)</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.256**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:  
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level  
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level  
3. Shaded boxes indicate a correlation of 0.3 or more
Table 6.3: Correlation of Conflict, Facilitation and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work-family conflict</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family-work conflict</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-family facilitation</td>
<td>-.601**</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family-work facilitation</td>
<td>-.506**</td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>.623**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Life satisfaction</td>
<td>-.413**</td>
<td>-.220**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal wellbeing</td>
<td>-.468**</td>
<td>-.287**</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.686**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.347**</td>
<td>-.260**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Career satisfaction</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>-.354**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intention to leave legal profession</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>-.296**</td>
<td>-.281**</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>-.641**</td>
<td>-.449**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Negative mental health</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>-.415**</td>
<td>-.377**</td>
<td>-.444**</td>
<td>-.454**</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>-.309**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Positive mental health</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-rated performance (during previous week)</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
<td>-.275**</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>-.268**</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-rated performance (during previous six months)</td>
<td>-.156*</td>
<td>-.204**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.256**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:  
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level  
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level  
3. Shaded boxes indicate a correlation of 0.3 or more
the approach taken in this study is that the two measures represent different constructs and should not be used interchangeably.

On the other hand, while perceived work-life balance appears to be more strongly associated with the outcome variables compared with the measures of work-family and family-work facilitation, the pattern of relationships among these variables is in a similar direction. For example, perceived work-life balance is positively related to life satisfaction, as are work-family and family-work facilitation. Once again, the approach taken in this study is that perceived work-life balance is not facilitation and as with conflict, the terms and measures should not be used interchangeably. Nevertheless, at the outset this pattern of results does indeed suggest that both conflict and facilitation are indirect indicators of work-life balance. The above results support the proposition put forward in this thesis which states that the constructs of conflict and facilitation serve as indicators of perceived work-life balance.

**Environmental and personal demands and resources.** In order to simplify the analysis of the relationships among the antecedent or independent variables considered as demands and resources in this study and the constructs of perceived work-life balance, conflict and facilitation, the strongest relationships (those with a correlation of more than 0.30) were extrapolated from the overall correlation matrix and are presented in Table 6.4 below.

While the theory behind this thesis suggests that demands are related to conflict and resources are related to facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006) as outlined in detail in Chapters 2 and 3, perceived work-life balance was included in the table to ascertain
whether demands and resources have direct relationships with perceived work-life balance or whether these relationships are indirect, that is, they are potentially mediated by conflict and facilitation. Such relationships are further examined with multiple regression analysis later in this chapter.

With regard to demands on the home front, as can be seen from the table the perception of having a demanding home life \((r = 0.48, p < 0.01)\) and hours spent in childcare \((r = 0.33, p < 0.01)\) are related to family-work conflict. Perceived work demands are seen to be most strongly positively associated with work-family conflict \((r = 0.51, p < 0.01)\) but this perception is also negatively related to the perception of work-life balance \((r = -0.44, p < 0.01)\) and work-family facilitation \((r = -0.32, p < 0.01)\).

Turning to job and organisational characteristics, a flexible work schedule is associated with both work-family \((r = 0.36, p < 0.01)\) and family work facilitation \((r = 0.32, p < 0.01)\). Work control/autonomy and managerial support are both associated with perceived work-life balance while managerial support is also a factor in work-family facilitation \((r = 0.33, p < 0.01)\). The strongest relationships appear to be as a result of perceiving the workplace as supportive of work-life balance which is positively related to work-life balance \((r = 0.51, p < 0.01)\) and both measures of facilitation and negatively related to work-family conflict \((r = -0.51, p < 0.01)\). Conversely, perceiving the workplace as unsupportive is positively associated with work-family conflict \((r = 0.51, p < 0.01)\) and negatively associated with work-life balance \((r = -0.43, p < 0.01)\) and work-family facilitation \((r = -0.33, p < 0.01)\).
Focusing on dispositional characteristics, core self-evaluations are strongly positively related to perceived work life-balance \( (r = 0.55, p < 0.01) \) and to both measures of facilitation and negatively related to both measures of conflict. Emotional instability appears to be negatively associated with work-family facilitation \( (r = -0.32, p < 0.01) \) and perceived work-life balance \( (r = -0.33, p < 0.01) \) and positively associated with work-family conflict \( (r = 0.31, p < 0.01) \).

**Table 6.4: Correlations – Relationship of Antecedent Variables with Perceived Work-Life Balance, Conflict and Facilitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived work-life balance</th>
<th>Work-family conflict</th>
<th>Family-work conflict</th>
<th>Work-family facilitation</th>
<th>Family-work facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived work demands</td>
<td>-.442**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.321**</td>
<td>-.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent working out of business hours</td>
<td>-.327**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.157*</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived home demands</td>
<td>-.278**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.129*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent in childcare</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work schedule</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work control/autonomy</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.267**</td>
<td>.241**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive work culture</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>-.507**</td>
<td>-.142*</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive work culture</td>
<td>-.433**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial support</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
<td>-.172*</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core self-evaluations</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>-.462**</td>
<td>-.356**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional instability</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>-.320**</td>
<td>-.187**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level
3. Shaded boxes indicate a correlation of 0.3 or more
In addition, with regard to environmental and personal demands and resources the results of the bivariate correlation analyses reveal a number of significant, albeit weak relationships (correlations < 0.30) among variables.

With regard to demographic variables, family-work conflict was found to be positively related to the presence at home of younger children aged between 0 and 4 years ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$) and children aged between 5 and 12 years ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$). Being single was negatively related to family-work conflict ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.01$). Working part-time showed a negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -0.21$, $p < 0.01$) and a positive relationship with family-work facilitation ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$).

With regard to social support, family support was found to be negatively associated with family-work conflict ($r = -0.18$, $p < 0.05$) and positively associated with family-work facilitation ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$). The support of friends is a resource showing a positive relationship with family-work facilitation ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$) and a negative relationship with both work-family conflict ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.05$) and family-work conflict ($r = -0.19$, $p < 0.01$). Support from one’s spouse/partner was positively related to family-work facilitation ($r = 0.17$, $p < 0.05$) and support from colleagues was found to be positively related to work-family ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$) and family-work facilitation ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) and negatively associated with work-family conflict ($r = -0.15$, $p < 0.01$).

Other results of note include the positive relationships between the availability and use of work-life balance benefits and conflict and facilitation. The availability of benefits shows a positive relationship with work-family ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$) and family-work facilitation ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$) and a negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -0.17$, $p <
Similarly, utilising benefits that assist with balancing work and home life was found to be positively associated with work-family facilitation ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$) and family-work facilitation ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$) and negatively associated with work-family conflict ($r = -0.22$, $p < 0.01$).

Time spent on personal benefit activities including self-care and leisure was found to be beneficial. Time spent on self-care activities has positive relationships with work-family ($r = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$) and family work facilitation ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$) and a negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -0.15$, $p < 0.05$). While leisure activities were found to counteract conflict showing a negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -0.14$, $p < 0.05$) and family-work conflict ($r = -0.20$, $p < 0.01$).

As noted previously emotional stability was found to be an important personality variable: in addition conscientiousness was found to have an association with conflict and facilitation: work-family conflict ($r = -0.21$, $p < 0.01$); family-work conflict ($r = -0.23$, $p < 0.01$); work-family facilitation ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$); and family-work facilitation ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$).

The association between dispositional characteristics, coping style and strategies is further examined later in this chapter (see Section 6.3.5). However, with regard to coping style the maladaptive coping strategies of self-blame and behavioural disengagement were found to be positively associated with work-family ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$, respectively); and family-work conflict ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$, respectively); and negatively associated with work-family conflict ($r = -0.20$, $p < 0.05$; $r = -0.13$, $p < 0.05$, respectively); and family-work facilitation ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.05$; $r = -
Conversely, the adaptive strategies of active coping and planning and using instrumental and emotional support were found to be positively associated with work-family facilitation \( (r = 0.20, \ p < 0.01; \ r = 0.16, \ p < 0.05, \ \text{respectively}) \); and family-work facilitation \( (r = 0.33, \ p < 0.01; \ r = 0.27, \ p < 0.01, \ \text{respectively}) \); and negatively associated with work-family conflict \( (r = -0.21, \ p < 0.01; \ r = -0.15, \ p < 0.05, \ \text{respectively}) \); and family-work conflict \( (r = -0.23, \ p < 0.01; \ r = -0.15, \ p < 0.05, \ \text{respectively}) \). These results suggest that a proactive approach is more effective than withdrawal when it comes to managing the work-family interface.

In relation to specific work-life balance management strategies, engaging in healthy lifestyle behaviours (e.g., exercise, good nutrition, taking holidays) appears to be the most effective showing positive associations with work-family facilitation \( (r = 0.31 \ p < 0.01) \); and family-work facilitation \( (r = 0.34 \ p < 0.01) \) and negative associations with work-family conflict \( (r = -0.26 \ p < 0.01) \); and family-work conflict \( (r = -0.15 \ p < 0.05) \). In addition, a number of work-life balance management strategies were found to be positively associated with work-family and family-work facilitation and unrelated to work-family and family-work conflict: time management (e.g., reducing hours spent on certain tasks and demands and prioritising other activities); setting limits (e.g., avoiding taking on new tasks; limit personal and family commitments); planning and organising (e.g., implementing systems, use a diary); change attitudes (e.g., lower expectations of what is achievable); increase flexibility (e.g., change work schedule); increase involvement from spouse/partner; change lifestyle (e.g., downshift, reduce mortgage); engage in personal or professional development activities (e.g., coaching, mentoring,
training programs); increase support from family members, friends, work colleagues; utilise technology and utilise hired help. Table 6.5 below summarises the correlations.

Table 6.5: Correlation of Work-Family and Family-Work Facilitation with Work-Life Balance Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-family facilitation</th>
<th>Family-work facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set limits</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and organise</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change attitude</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage stress through healthy lifestyle behaviours</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase flexibility</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase involvement from partner</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change lifestyle</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and professional development</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase support from others</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise technology</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise hired help</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level  
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level

Perceived work demands, the number of hours spent working outside business hours and a workplace unsupportive of work-life balance were found to be related to work-family conflict. Perceived home demands and hours spent in childcare were found to be related to family-work conflict. In addition, a supportive workplace, schedule flexibility, managerial and colleague support and the availability and use of family-friendly benefits were found to be related to work-family facilitation. It was expected that social support
in the home environment (from spouse/partner, friends and family) would act as environmental resources and would be positively related to family-work facilitation which was supported, albeit weakly.

With regard to personal characteristics the results show that dispositional factors are important resources as core self-evaluations and conscientiousness are positively related to work-family and family-work facilitation and negatively related to work-family and family-work conflict. In addition the tendency to engage in personal benefit activities (self-care and leisure), to use adaptive coping strategies (active coping and planning and using instrumental and emotional support) and to use a range of work-life balance management strategies show positive associations with work-family and family-work facilitation.

On the other hand, personal characteristics can also be linked to conflict as the current study indicates that having young children under the age of twelve years and being married are positively related to family-work conflict. With relation to dispositional characteristics, the personality trait of emotional instability was found to be positively related to work-family and family-work conflict and to be negatively related to work-family and family-work facilitation. In addition, the tendency to use maladaptive coping strategies (self-blame and disengagement) showed positive associations with work-family and family-work conflict.

It should also be noted that the results suggest evidence for what Voydanoff (2005b) refers to as ‘boundary spanning’ variables which are variables that exert an influence in both the work and family domains. As noted above, a number of variables fit this
description. For example, having a flexible work schedule was found to be associated with both work-family and family-work facilitation.

6.2.1.2 Multiple regression

Given the multiplicity of relationships among the variables as evidenced by the bivariate correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis was appropriate in the current study for exploring and making clearer the links between the independent and dependent variables (Hair et al. 1998).

Multiple regression is an extension of bivariate correlation and is used when independent variables are correlated with one another and with the dependent variable, as was the case with the current study (Coakes & Steed 2003). In regression analysis it is important to find variables that significantly influence the dependent variable. The result of regression is an equation that represents the best prediction of a dependent variable from several independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell 2001). The choice of technique used depends upon the goals of the researcher. In the standard or simultaneous model, all independent variables enter the regression equation at once in order to examine the relationship between the whole set of predictors and the dependent variable. In hierarchical multiple regression the order of entry of the independent variables is determined by theoretical knowledge. In stepwise regression, the number of independent variables entered and the order of entry are determined by statistical criteria and can be backward, forward or a combination of both (Coakes & Steed 2003; Hair et al. 1998).
The measure of the strength of relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is designated with a capital R and is usually referred to as multiple R. The number squared (R²) yields a value that represents the proportion of variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables. R square is considered an optimistic estimate for the population value and as a result the adjusted R square is usually reported (George & Mallery 2006). The R square change indicates the amount of additional variance accounted for by the inclusion of another variable. A beta (β) value is calculated to show the strength of association between two variables which will always vary between + 1.0 and – 1.0 in linear relationships (the closer the value to 1.0 the stronger the association) and the F value and tests of significance indicate whether the results are statistically significant or not (George & Mallery 2006). Once again, a p < 0.05 is generally interpreted as indicating a statistically significant result (George & Mallery 2006). The assumptions underpinning the use of regression are assessed through regression analysis and include the detection of outliers, multicollinearity, singularity, together with normality, homoscedasticity and independence of residuals (Coakes & Steed 2003).

The variables in the current study were subject to analysis using the Regression: Linear facility in SPSS Version 17 for Windows. Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to investigate the associations between work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance and the dependent variables. The results are presented in Appendix E.
Perceived work-life balance, conflict and facilitation together with outcome variables. The first set of analyses established the amount of variance accounted for by conflict and facilitation in perceived work-life balance. The control variables of gender, age, marital status and job tenure were included to reduce the influence of demographic characteristics. These variables are commonly controlled for in the work-life field and were entered as the first step in the regression analysis followed by work-family and family-work conflict and work-family and family-work facilitation in the second step with perceived work-life balance as the dependent variable. The results show that work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation together account for 64% of the variance in perceived work-life balance, with work-family conflict exerting the greatest influence and family-work conflict the least influence (see Appendix 6.1).

The amount of variance accounted for by perceived work-life balance in each of the outcome variables included in this study was examined next and the results appear in Appendices 6.2 to 6.5. Perceived work-life balance accounts for significant amounts of variance as follows: life satisfaction (32%), personal wellbeing (33%), job satisfaction (18%), career satisfaction (15%), intention to leave the legal profession (13%), self-rated performance in the week prior to survey participation (7%), self-rated performance in the six months prior to survey participation (5%), negative mental health (20%) and positive mental health (2%).

In order to ascertain the contribution of perceived work-life balance over and above conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance was entered third, following the
control variables and work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation. This process was used for each of the dependent variables (see Appendices 6.6 to 6.10)

The results show that perceived work-life balance adds significant variance above and beyond work-family and family-work conflict and work-family and family-work facilitation when considering outcome variables: life satisfaction (6%), personal wellbeing (4%), job satisfaction (2%), career satisfaction (2%). However, perceived work-life balance did not add significant variance to the outcome variables: intention to leave the legal profession, positive mental health, negative mental health, self-rated performance during previous week and self-rated performance during previous six months.

An explanation for the above pattern of results can be gained through an examination of the pattern of direct and indirect relationships among the variables to ascertain whether perceived work-life balance acts a mediating variable. According to Baron and Kenny (1986) mediation is indicated when certain conditions are met. Firstly, there is a significant relationship between the independent and mediator variables (Step 1); second there is a significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Step 2); next the mediator is significantly related to the dependent variable (Step 3); and the relationship of the independent variable is less at Step 3 than at Step 2. Full mediation occurs when the independent variable has no significant relationship with the dependent variable when the independent and mediator are entered into the equation simultaneously at Step 3. Partial mediation is indicated when the independent-dependent association is
reduced in magnitude, but remains significant when the independent and mediator are entered simultaneously.

It would appear from the regression tables that perceived work-life balance partially mediates the relationship between conflict and facilitation and the outcome variables in some cases. That is, work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation, while having a relationship with perceived work-life balance, also have a relationship with a number of the outcome variables, as indicated in the bivariate correlation analyses discussed previously.

Perceived work-life balance mediated the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation and life, job and career satisfaction and personal wellbeing except for the cases where partial mediation occurred: between work-family facilitation and life satisfaction; family-work conflict and personal wellbeing; job and career satisfaction and work-family facilitation and job satisfaction.

**Environmental and personal demands and resources together with conflict and facilitation.** Regression analyses were conducted in the current research to investigate the associations between environmental demands and resource characteristics and work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation. The presence of dependants and whether work status was part-time of full-time were included in addition to the control variables of gender, age, marital status and job tenure following previous results which indicated their potential influence as independent variables. In addition, at this point the dispositional trait of core self-evaluations was not entered into the analyses as it was
found to be correlated with work-family and family-work conflict and work-family and family-work facilitation.

In order to ascertain the relationships among the dependent variables and work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. The control variables were entered as the first step in the regression analysis followed by the dependant variables in Step 2. This process was used for each of work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation and the results for each equation including only those results which were statistically significant are presented in Appendices 6.11 to 6.18.

With regard to work-family conflict, the antecedent variables exhibiting the strongest positive association include work demands, the perception of a negative work-life balance culture, number of hours spent outside of business hours and number of hours spent in work-related social activities, together with the dispositional trait of emotional instability, accounting for 42% of the variance in work-family conflict (see Appendix 6.11).

Turning to family-work conflict, home demands, number of hours spent in childcare and the dispositional trait of emotional instability were significant predictors, accounting for 24% of the variance in family-work conflict (see Appendix 6.13).

The perception of a positive work-life balance culture, schedule flexibility, managerial support and the dispositional trait of conscientiousness were found to be significant predictors of work-family facilitation, accounting for 34% of the variance (see Appendix 6.15).
With regard to family-work facilitation hours spent in self-care, managing stress through healthy lifestyle behaviours, increasing involvement from spouse/partner, planning and organising and the personality trait of conscientiousness were significant predictors, accounting for 26% of the variance (see Appendix 6.17).

Collectively, the results outlined above indicate that environmental and personal resources are predictors of facilitation and environmental and personal demands are predictors of conflict. In addition, there is evidence to suggest that dispositional variables should be taken into account as contributing factors. The results of the regression analyses corroborate the results of the bivariate correlation analyses as would be expected.

**Environmental and personal demands and resources, conflict and facilitation together with perceived work-life balance.** In order to ascertain the relationships among the dependent variables, work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation and perceived work-life balance further hierarchical regression analyses were conducted including the variables of work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation in the third step, using perceived-work life balance as the dependent variable.

Work-family conflict contributed a further 21% to the variance in perceived work-life balance over and above the dependent variables and fully mediated the relationship between work demands, negative work-life balance culture and hours spent working out of normal business hours and perceived work-life balance. Partial mediation occurred for emotional instability and hours spent in work-related social activities was found to be insignificant (see Appendix 6.12).
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Family-work conflict only contributed a further 3% to the variance in perceived work-life balance over and above the dependent variables and partially mediated the relationship between home demands and emotional instability and perceived work-life balance, with hours spent in childcare found to be insignificant (see Appendix 6.14).

Turning to work-family facilitation, this variable contributed a further 12% to the variance accounted for in perceived work-life balance fully mediating the relationship between managerial support and conscientiousness and partially mediating the relationship between the perception of a supportive work-life balance culture and perceived work-life balance. Schedule flexibility was found to be insignificant in this equation (see Appendix 6.16).

With regard to family-work facilitation a further 20% of the variance in perceived work-life balance was accounted for over and above the dependent variables. Full mediation was found for managing stress through healthy lifestyle behaviours and conscientiousness and partial mediation was found for hours spent in self-care. Planning and organising and increasing help from spouse/partner were found to be insignificant (see Appendix 6.18).

6.2.2 Confirmatory analysis

The relationships among the variables were explored in the previous section by examining the results of the bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses. However, these multivariate techniques do not consider measurement error which is why they were applied in this research as precursors to more comprehensive confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling (Ullman 1996). In structural equation
modelling (SEM) a theoretical model comprising hypothesised causal relations among the latent variables is specified a priori and SEM techniques are used to evaluate the goodness-of-fit of the hypothesised model to the sample data in order to provide support for the theoretical model (Cunningham 2008). SEM has the advantage of modelling relationships between variables after accounting for measurement error and provides tests that answer important questions about the extent to which sample data provide support for hypothesised theoretical models. SEM is well-known for its capacity to deal with complicated research problems (Hair et al. 1998). In addition, SEM is a good match with the realism paradigm which has been adopted in the current research. Realism maintains that ‘unobservable constructs’ can be captured with multiple measures and SEM permits theory testing of those ‘unobservable constructs’ (Hair et al. 1998).

A number of stages are involved in the SEM process: model conceptualisation; model specification; model estimation; model evaluation and model interpretation (Cunningham 2008). These are outlined below.

**Model conceptualisation.** In this study, the theory-based model of perceived work-life balance was developed through a comprehensive literature review as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3.

**Model specification.** Application of SEM in data analysis begins with specification of models to be estimated which involves translating conceptual models into diagrams that represent relationships between variables (Cunningham 2008). The Analysis of Moment Structures (Amos 17) computer software package was used to perform SEM in this research (Arbuckle & Wothke 2006). In each model reported, consistent with
convention, measured (observed) variables are represented by rectangles while latent variables are represented by ellipses (Byrne 2001) and connecting lines indicate a hypothesised effect in the direction of the arrow.

Specifying the measurement model involves assigning indicator variables to each of the constructs and thus is a confirmatory process of factor analysis (Hair et al. 1998). Multiple indicators were used to tap facets of conflict, facilitation and perceived work-life balance for example. In some cases a single indicator was used to capture variables that could be measured directly, such as schedule flexibility. A further consideration of model specification is setting a scale for latent variables because they have no defined scale of measurement (Cunningham 2008). In this research, an initial regression weight of ‘1’ was assigned to one of the indicator variables for latent constructs and all error terms. This imposed initial path coefficient provides a unity scale to each latent construct and standardised subsequent parameter estimates (MacCallum 1995).

**Model estimation.** The sample size of 232 was considered acceptable for model estimation in this research (Arbuckle & Wothke 1999; Kline 1998). Maximum Likelihood Estimation is the most often used method of estimation in structural equation modelling (Anderson & Gerbing 1988) and was used to estimate the parameters in the structural models for the current study. The covariance matrix was used for data input in this research as it is preferable for theory testing, as opposed to a correlation matrix which is more suitable for detecting the relationship between constructs (Hair et al. 1998).
**Model evaluation.** The *Amos* software produces three models for each model specified (Cunningham 2008). The model specified by the researcher is labelled as the Default Model. The second model produced is the Saturated Model in which all possible parameters are estimated. The third model, the Independence Model, hypothesises that all variables are uncorrelated. The Saturated Model and the Independence Model provide baselines for comparison with the specified model. For the purposes of this chapter the Default Model is reported as the specifics of the other two models have been considered of little importance (Cunningham 2008).

The assessment of goodness-of-fit is one of the primary goals in the application of SEM techniques. Usually model evaluation is assessed by the chi-square ($\chi^2$) test and its accompanying significance test. If the associated $p$ value is not significant, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between the sample variance/covariance matrix and the model-implied variance/covariance matrix and the data is considered to fit the model well (Cunningham 2008). In addition to the chi-square test, a number of other measures have been proposed to determine whether the data supports a hypothesised model in SEM which has led to considerable debate (see special issue of Personality and Individual Differences (2007), Volume 42, dedicated to a discussion of SEM). The other measures are called practical fit indices and can be divided into absolute fit indices and incremental fit indices (Hu & Bentler 1998). Absolute fit indices evaluate the degree to which the specified model reproduces the sample data and incremental fit indices measure the proportionate amount of improvement in fit when a target model is compared with a null model in which all the observed variables are uncorrelated (Hu & Bentler 1998).
Barrett (2007, p. 815) argued that the chi-square exact fit is “the only substantive test of fit for SEM”. In response, others have stated that “reliance on the $\chi^2$ alone is not the best approach”, suggesting that ‘Fit indices from different families provide different kinds of information, and these different kinds of information can be useful in determining model fit” (Miles & Shevlin 2007, p. 874). To that end, in the current study five model fit indices were reported: chi-square statistic ($\chi^2$), chi-square per digress of freedom (CMIN/DF), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), Tucker Lewis index (TLI), comparative fit index (CFI). Table 6.6 summarises these indices with their cut-off values used in this research.

Though often cited, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI) and adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) were not included in the current research as both indices have been found to be inconsistently sensitive to model misspecification and are strongly influenced by sample size (Cunningham 2008).

The two step approach first assesses the quality of the measurement items before proceeding to the second step where the structural models are evaluated. The single step approach evaluates both measurement and structural models simultaneously if the models possess both a strong theoretical rationale and highly reliable measures (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). In this research the single step approach was adopted as results of the exploratory phase of the study were considered to have provided the theoretical and empirical foundation required.
### Table 6.6: Summary of Goodness-of-Fit Indices and Their Cut-Off Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness-of-fit indices</th>
<th>Fit criteria used in this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>Tests the null hypothesis that the estimated variance-covariance matrix deviates from the sample variance-covariance matrix only because of sampling error. An insignificant chi-square suggests a satisfactory fit of the model; $p &lt; 0.05$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>Takes into account the relative size of the model. For acceptable model fit the ratio should not be greater than 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>Compares the model with the estimated population covariance matrix, taking into account the error of approximation. Measured on a scale of 0 – 1 with values of less than 0.05 indicating a close fit while values of less than 0.08 indicate a reasonable fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>Based on the chi-square statistic and compares alternate models with a null model. Measured on a scale of 0 – 1 with a value of 0.90 or greater representing an acceptable fit and a value of 0.95 or greater representing a good fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Measures the improvement in going from a target model to an independent model. Measured on a scale of 0 – 1 with 0.90 representing an acceptable fit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: developed for this research based on Arbuckle & Wothke (1999); Byrne (2001); Cunningham (2008); Hair et al. (1998).

The standardised residual covariances and modification indices as identified by Amos were reviewed. Prior to re-specification potential covariances between error measures were considered as well as their likelihood of improving the fit of the model and changes to the model were justified from a theoretical standpoint (Kline 1998).
Model interpretation. The final stage of the SEM process is to interpret the results in light of the propositions and hypotheses tested (Hair et al. 1998).

6.2.2.1 Results of structural equation modelling

The results of structural equation modelling provide preliminary support for the conceptual model put forward in this thesis, taking into account a range of theoretical and empirical issues which are discussed during this section.

Figure 6.1 displays the path diagram including standardised coefficients for the part of the model including the relationships among work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance and life satisfaction as the dependent variable.

As can be seen in this diagram, the results are in line with the exploratory analyses, that is, work-family conflict has the strongest relationship with perceived work-life balance followed by family-work facilitation and work-family facilitation. However, family-work conflict shows the weakest relationship. In addition, 63% of the variance in perceived work-life balance is accounted for by conflict and facilitation. Perceived work-life balance is a predictor of life satisfaction, accounting for 28% of the variance. Table 6.7 below outlines the results of the goodness-of-fit indices for all of the outcome variables included in this study, indicating that the model fits the data in all cases according to the modification indices, exhibiting good fit for life satisfaction, personal wellbeing, job satisfaction, intention to leave the legal profession and positive mental health.
Figure 6.1: Relationships Among Work-Family and Family-Work Conflict and Facilitation and Perceived Work-Life Balance

NOTES:
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level
While the model put forward in this thesis is based on solid theoretical underpinnings, empirically there are issues as prefaced above which become apparent during the SEM stage of analysis. Firstly, the presence of variables that span both the work and home domains and the many direct and indirect relationships among the variables makes the model complicated.

In addition, there is the need to take into account the adequate but small sample size and the required power to detect significant results. Further, issues arise as a result of the overshadowing influence of work-family conflict accounting for a large proportion of variance in perceived work-life balance; the comparatively insignificant impact of family-work conflict and the fact that work-family and family-work facilitation are closely related. Nevertheless, an example of support for the full conceptual model can be seen in Figure 6.2 below.
As shown in the Figure 6.2, perceived work demands are positively related to work-family conflict; perceived home demands are positively related to family-work conflict; resources in the workplace (managerial support) are positively related to work-family facilitation and resources in the home environment (engagement in healthy lifestyle behaviours) are positively related to family-work facilitation. In turn, work-family and family-work conflict are negatively related to perceived work-life balance and work-family and family-work facilitation are positively related to perceived work-life balance. Lastly, perceived work-life balance predicts life satisfaction. According to the goodness-of-fit indices, the model is an acceptable fit with the data: ($\chi^2$ (83) = 169.20, $p = 0.00$; CMIN/DF = 2.04, CFI = 0.761, TLI = 0.936, RMSEA = 0.07). The results of this model lend support to the convergent and divergent validity of the constructs that is the constructs demonstrate that each measure is capturing a phenomenon that is distinct from what is assessed by other measures (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994).

In addition, when the model in Figure 6.2 is compared with that presented in Figure 6.3 below, where the measures of facilitation have been removed, it becomes evident that work-family and family-work facilitation add to the variance in perceived work-life balance and mitigate the negative impact of work-family conflict on perceived work-life balance. The standardised coefficient for work-family conflict reduces from $\beta = -0.72$ ($p < 0.001$) to $\beta = -0.47$ ($p < 0.001$) and the variance in perceived work-life balance increases from 55% to 59% with the inclusion of the facilitation measures. This model is an excellent fit with the data: ($\chi^2$ (46) = 57.6, $p = 0.12$; CMIN/DF = 1.25, CFI = 0.994, TLI = 0.991, RMSEA = 0.03) and adds to the large body of research in the work-life field showing the negative impact of conflicting work and home responsibilities.
Figure 6.2: Test of the Full Conceptual Model

NOTES:
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level
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While these results suggest that the constructs of conflict and facilitation are useful for understanding the work-family interface, the current research suggests that it is a complicated vehicle for understanding work-life balance, indicating that it may be preferable to examine the direct impact of environmental and personal demands and resources on perceived work-life balance, rather than examining the relationships mediated by conflict and facilitation, given the establishment of a valid measure. This conclusion is corroborated by the results of the independent samples t-tests and the qualitative data provided by participants in the next sections which more directly tap into the factors that contribute to the successful integration of life at work and life at home.
Figure 6.3: Testing of Partial Conceptual Model

NOTES:
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level
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6.2.3  Independent samples t-tests

A t-test is used to determine whether the means of two sample distributions differ significantly from one another (George & Mallery 2006). Assumptions underlying t-tests are that the data are interval or ratio in nature, scores are randomly sampled from the population of interest and scores are normally distributed (Coakes & Steed 2003). Independent samples t-tests are appropriate when participants in one condition are different from the participants in the other condition (Coakes & Steed 2003). Two additional assumptions of independent samples t-tests include independence of groups and homogeneity of variance. Independence of groups assumes that participants appear in only one, unrelated group. Homogeneity of variance assumes that the groups come from populations with equal variances (Coakes & Steed 2003). In the current study, the Levene test for equality of variances was used to test for homogeneity of variance. A significant t-test (p < 0.05) indicates homogeneity of variance (Coakes & Steed 2003). In order to determine whether two distributions differ significantly from one another, a two-tailed test of significance was used in the current research as this test measures the difference in sample means, regardless of the direction (positive or negative) (George & Mallery 2006).

In this study, independent samples t-tests were used to explore two important areas: gender differences and differences in levels of perceived work-life balance. Gender differences are considered an important research perspective within the work-family literature, however the findings are mixed and researchers have been encouraged to study them further with a view to extending our understanding (Jones et al. 2006).
The significance of comparing respondents reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance with those reporting lower levels lies in the fact that prior research has not provided the opportunity to study employees’ levels of work-life balance owing to the lack of development and use of conceptually based measures (Carlson et al. 2009; Voydanoff 2005) and the tendency for researchers to use measures of work-family conflict, assuming that the absence of work-family conflict is equivalent to work-life balance (Carlson et al. 2009; Frone 2003).

One of the main aims of the current research is the development of a comprehensive model of work-life balance based on solid theoretical underpinnings. To that end, Joplin et al.’s (2003) validated measure of work-life balance was included as it was considered to be compatible with this theoretical framework (Voydanoff 2005). Such an approach has provided the opportunity to gain valuable insights into this relatively unexplored area of work-life balance research.

The results of the t-tests undertaken with regard to gender differences and differences in participants’ levels of perceived work-life balance are provided in the sections following.

6.2.3.1 Gender differences

The results of this study indicate gender differences in a range of areas and those reaching statistical significance are presented below:

**Respondent, household and employment demographics.** On average, the results indicate that men are older than women in the current research \((t = 5.38, p < 0.001)\). While eighty percent of women and sixty-two percent of men are aged between 25 and 44
years of age, the results show that men are more likely to be married ($t = 2.39, p < 0.01$); and to have dependants ($t = 3.65, p < 0.001$) and children who are aged eighteen years or older ($t = -3.13, p < 0.01$). Men have been practising law longer than the women in the current study ($t = -6.54, p < 0.001$), which is consistent with the reported age difference between men and women. Men are more likely to be self-employed ($t = -2.97, p < 0.01$). Women are more likely than men to work part-time ($t = 4.01, p < 0.001$). These results are in line with Neal’s (2010) research into women solicitors’ experiences of workplace discrimination in the Queensland legal profession. Neal (2010) reported that women solicitors in Queensland are more likely to be younger, have fewer years in the profession and to be less likely to have children than their male counterparts.

**Environmental demands and resources.** A number of variables relating to the resources and demands present in respondents’ work and home environments were investigated in the current study. Variables included job characteristics (flexibility and control/autonomy); organisational characteristics (availability and usage of work-life balance benefits; work-family culture); perceived environmental demands (work and home) and environmental resources (social support, including managerial support and support from colleagues, spouse/partner, family and friends). In addition, the time spent on work and work-related activities was considered a demand characteristic and time spent on activities such as self-care and leisure was considered a resource characteristic.

In summary, the results show that men report having more control and autonomy with regard to how they go about doing their work ($t = -2.19, p < 0.05$) and are more likely to perceive their workplaces as supportive of the integration of their work and non-work
lives \( t = -2.98, p < 0.01 \). According to the results of this study, men are more likely than women to spend time working out of normal working hours \( t = -1.96, p < 0.05 \), yet more likely than women to engage in self-care \( t = -3.67, p < 0.001 \) and leisure activities \( t = -2.72, p < 0.01 \) and to take time out with their spouse/partner and children \( t = -2.28, p < 0.05 \), where applicable. On the other hand, regardless of marital status women report more perceived home demands \( t = 2.16, p < 0.05 \) and spending more time on home duties than men \( t = 2.64, p < 0.01 \). Lastly, in the current study women report having more support from their friends \( t = 2.91, p < 0.01 \), compared to men.

**Dispositional characteristics.** The dispositional characteristics examined in the current study included core self-evaluations or positive self-regard, personality traits, coping style and strategies, including strategies specific to work-life balance management. No gender differences were found for core self-evaluations, whereas differences were found between men and women for personality traits, coping style and strategies. The results show men to be higher on openness to experience \( t = -3.32, p < 0.001 \) and lower on emotional instability than women \( t = 4.21, p < 0.001 \); with no gender differences found for the traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness and extraversion.

In addition, women in the current study report that they are more likely to engage in self-blame \( t = 2.19, p < 0.05 \) and to depend on emotional and instrumental support \( t = 2.92, p > 0.01 \) as ways of coping with stress than men. When it comes to work-life balance management strategies, the results show that men are more likely to utilise technology than women \( t = -2.93, p < 0.01 \). Women are more likely to use planning
and organising (t = 2.44, p < 0.01) and to increase support from other people (t = 3.18, p < 0.01) as strategies to balance their work and non-work lives.

**Gender differences – Non-significant results.** It is important to note that while differences were found between men and women with regard to a variety of environmental demand and resource characteristics, dispositional characteristics and coping style and strategies, no differences were found on measures of perceived work-life balance (t = 0.10, p > 0.05), work-family conflict (t = 0.09, p > 0.05), family-work conflict (t = -0.63, p > 0.05), work-family facilitation (t = 0.33, p > 0.05), family-work facilitation (t = 1.52, p > 0.05), life satisfaction (t = -0.12, p > 0.05), subjective wellbeing (t = 0.45, p > 0.05), job satisfaction (t = -0.86, p > 0.05), career satisfaction (t = -0.22, p > 0.05), intention to leave the legal profession (t = -0.21, p > 0.05), mental ill-health (t = 1.45, p > 0.05), positive mental health (t = -1.50, p > 0.05), self-rated performance in the week prior to study participation (t = 0.09, p > 0.05) and six months prior to participation (t = -1.53, p > 0.05).

**6.2.3.2 Differences in levels of perceived work-life balance**

As noted above, the opportunity to understand more about the relationships between different levels of perceived work-life balance and the antecedents and consequences of work-life balance has been provided by the current research. In order to investigate these relationships a median split (Coakes & Steed 2003) was performed on the work-life balance index data, resulting in two groups of participants with a significant mean difference (p < 0.001): 118 participants reporting lower levels of perceived work-life balance (mean of 30.19); standard deviation of 6.59; and 114 participants reporting
higher levels of perceived work-life balance (mean of 48.14; standard deviation of 5.94). The results of this study indicate differences between the groups in a range of areas as shown in the table contained in Appendix 6.20 and those reaching statistical significance are presented below.

Respondent, household and employment demographics. Results of the current study show that participants who work part-time are more likely to report higher levels of work-life balance than those who work full-time ($t = -1.99, p < 0.05$). No other demographic variables reached statistical significance.

Environmental demands and resources. In terms of job characteristics, higher levels of autonomy and control ($t = -3.87, p < 0.01$) and a high degree of flexibility in scheduling when work is done ($t = -3.05, p < 0.001$) were found to be associated with higher levels of perceived work-life balance. With regard to organisational characteristics, high levels of work demands ($t = 6.96, p < 0.001$) and an unsupportive work-life balance culture ($t = 5.72, p < 0.001$) were found to be associated with lower levels of perceived work-life balance. In addition, long hours spent in the office ($t = 2.54, p < 0.01$), together with extra hours spent working out of normal business hours ($t = 5.26, p < 0.001$) and time spent attending work-related activities after hours ($t = 2.14, p < 0.05$) were all associated with lower levels of work-life balance.

When asked if they would prefer to work more, fewer or the same number of hours, 62% of participants in this study responded that they would prefer to work fewer hours, which is in keeping with previous research (Alexander & Baxter 2005; Skinner & Pocock 2010). The negative impact of long working hours is well documented in the work-life
literature (Duxbury & Higgins 2006; Skinner & Pocock 2010). However, the results of this research are important because they establish, rather than assume, a direct link between working hours and perceived work-life balance. On the other hand, a supportive work-life balance culture \( (t = -7.17, p < 0.001) \), the use of work-life balance benefits \( (t = -1.99, p < 0.05) \) and support from management \( (t = -4.21, p < 0.001) \) and work colleagues \( (t = -2.36, p < 0.05) \) were found to be associated with higher levels of perceived work-life balance.

On the home front, lower levels of work-life balance were found to be associated with higher levels of home demands \( (t = 4.68, p < 0.001) \) and time spent on domestic duties \( (t = 2.29, p < 0.05) \). On the other hand, support from friends \( (t = -3.16, p < 0.01) \) and family \( (t = -2.09, p < 0.05) \) and time spent engaged in self-care \( (t = -3.23, p < 0.001) \) and leisure activities \( (t = -3.23, p < 0.001) \) were found to be associated with higher levels of perceived work-life balance.

**Dispositional characteristics.** As evidenced above in the discussion regarding gender differences, it is important to consider individual differences and psychological characteristics as contributing factors in the work-life field (Wayne et al. 2004). A significant finding from this study is the relationship between core self-evaluations and perceived work-life balance. The results indicate that those with positive core self-evaluations report higher levels of work-life balance \( (t = -8.62, p < 0.001) \). These findings make sense because individuals with a positive self-regard have been found by researchers to see themselves as capable, worthy and in control of their lives (Boyar &
With regard to personality traits, in the current research conscientiousness and emotional instability were found to be important variables. No significant results were found for the personality traits extraversion, openness to experience and agreeableness. Conscientiousness is characterised by achievement orientation, dependability, orderliness, efficiency, organisation, planfulness, responsibility, thoroughness and ‘hardworkingness’ (Barrick & Mount 1991; McCrae & John 1992). Higher levels of perceived work-life balance were associated with higher levels of conscientiousness (t = -2.89, p < 0.001) which makes sense as planning, organisation and time management may allow individuals to manage time, thus reducing time pressures and reducing stress and strain.

On the other hand, lower levels of perceived work-life balance were associated with higher levels of emotional instability or neuroticism (t = 5.29, p < 0.001). Neuroticism refers to anxiety, insecurity, defensiveness, tension and worry (Barrick & Mount 1991; McCrae & John 1992) and as a result such characteristics may lead individuals to experience more job and family stress, increasing the degree of conflict experienced.

The current study asked participants about the ways they usually cope with stress in their life. The survey included measures on a range of coping strategies – specific behavioural and psychological efforts used to master, tolerate or reduce the impact of stressful events (Carver 1997). Behavioural disengagement (t = 3.11, p < 0.01) and self-blame/self-criticism (t = 4.79, p < 0.001) were maladaptive styles of coping most associated with
lower levels of work-life balance. Alternatively, active coping and planning ($t = -2.62$, $p < 0.01$) and seeking emotional and instrumental support ($t = -2.43$, $p < 0.05$) were adaptive styles of coping most associated with higher levels of work-life balance.

With regard specifically to work-life balance management, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they used a range of strategies to integrate their work and home life, based on findings from Neal and Hammer’s (2007) research. Several strategies were found to be significantly associated with higher levels of work-life balance: time management ($t = -2.71$, $p < 0.01$); setting limits ($t = -2.16$, $p < 0.05$); planning and organising ($t = -2.73$, $p < 0.01$); increasing work schedule flexibility ($t = -2.18$, $p < 0.05$); changing attitudes, for example, lowering expectations of what is achievable ($t = -2.71$, $p < 0.01$); managing stress through health behaviours ($t = -3.32$, $p < 0.001$); engaging in personal and professional activities ($t = -2.33$, $p < 0.05$) and increasing support from others ($t = -2.72$, $p < 0.01$). Interestingly, non-significant results were found for: utilising technology; utilising hired help; changing lifestyle, for example, downshifting or mortgage reduction; and increasing support from spouse/partner. The majority of participants indicated that their spouse/partner (where applicable) was already a great support for them, so the last result is not surprising. In addition, the results show that participants in this study are least likely to utilise hired help or to change their lifestyle as work-life balance management strategies.

The work-life balance management strategies outlined in this section will be discussed later in chapter where the quantitative results are supplemented by further qualitative data provided by the participants of the current research.
Conflict and facilitation. The results of the current research indicate clearly that work-life balance is significantly associated with the constructs of conflict and facilitation. In particular, strong support is provided for the view that higher levels of work-life balance are likely to be associated with lower levels of conflict and higher levels of facilitation (Frone 2003).

This study examined work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation. Higher levels of perceived work-life balance were found to be associated with higher levels of work-family facilitation ($t = -8.76$, $p < 0.001$) and family-work facilitation ($t = -8.09$, $p < 0.001$) and lower levels of work-family conflict ($t = 11.86$, $p < 0.001$) and family-work conflict ($t = 5.58$, $p < 0.001$).

Dependent variables – life satisfaction, personal wellbeing, occupational satisfaction, mental health and self-rated performance. The Australian Personal Wellbeing Index (AWI) was used in the present survey to gauge participants’ perceptions about how satisfied they were with their life in general and with different areas of their life – their health, personal relationships, personal safety, standard of living, what they are achieving in life, community connection, future security and spirituality or religion. The AWI measures subjective wellbeing which is a more stable state of being well, feeling satisfied and being contented. It refers to a deep, long-lasting sense of contentment as opposed to a passing moment of happiness (International Wellbeing Group 2006).

Much of the work-life balance research has been undertaken in other parts of the world, which raises the question about the generalisability of findings to an Australian context. The use of the AWI as a benchmark allows comparisons to be made between respondents
in the current study and the national average. In terms of satisfaction with life as a whole, respondents reporting higher levels of work-life balance were on average 72% satisfied with their life, which is close to the national average of 78% (International Wellbeing Group 2006). The average life satisfaction score for participants reporting lower levels of work-life balance was 54%, well below the national average of 78%. In terms of personal wellbeing, respondents reporting higher levels of work-life balance were on average 73% satisfied with the different areas of their lives, which is also close to the national average of 76%. The average index score for participants reporting lower levels of work-life balance was 58%, once again well below the national average of 76%. Overall, the results indicate a strong positive relationship between perceived work-life balance and life satisfaction and wellbeing.

Previous research suggests that job and career satisfaction are comparatively low in the Australian legal profession (Beaton Consulting 2007). In the current study, occupational satisfaction was gauged by investigating participants’ job satisfaction, career satisfaction and their intention to leave the legal profession. The results show that those with higher work-life balance scores are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs ($t = -5.86, p < 0.001$) and with their careers ($t = -5.27, p < 0.001$). Those with lower levels of perceived work-life balance are more likely to be dissatisfied with their job and their career and to express the intention to leave the legal profession ($t = 5.15, p < 0.001$) (see Table 6.13 below).

Lawyers have been found to experience a high incidence of depressive symptoms (Beaton Consulting 2007) indicating that mental health is an important issue in the legal
profession. The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) was used in the current survey to measure participants’ general psychological health at the time of the survey. In general, the results of this study indicate that work-life balance is negatively related to psychological ill-health ($t = 6.40$, $p < 0.001$) and positively related to psychological health ($t = -2.08$, $p < 0.05$) – those with lower levels of work-life balance perceptions are more likely to report symptoms of depression.

The current study also investigated participants’ perceptions of their work performance. While self-rated performance may not accurately reflect actual performance, interestingly the results indicate that perceptions of recent performance are related to perceptions of work-life balance. Participants with higher levels of work-life balance rated their performance in the previous week significantly higher than those with lower levels ($t = -3.07$, $p < 0.01$).

**6.3 Results of Qualitative Data Analysis**

**6.3.1 Introduction**

As discussed previously, much of the work-family literature has portrayed employees as being victims of their work-family conflicts (Allen et al. 2000; Beutell & Greenhaus 1982; Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Frone 2003, 2002; Wallace 1999). However, researchers have begun to focus on understanding the use of effective work-life balance strategies (Aspinwall & Taylor 1997; Baltes & Heydons-Gahir 2003; Jennings & McDougald 2007; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Moen & Yu 2000; Neal & Hammer 2007), discovering that individuals engage in strategies and tactics so that they can be effective and satisfied at
home and at work (Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009; Haddock et al. 2001; Moen & Wethington 1992; Pitts-Catsouphes et al. 2007). Adaptive strategies have been described as “ways that people address everyday challenges, cope with exacting circumstances and generally think about their lives” (Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009, p. 390). Thus, the present study takes a closer look at the synergistic connections between work and home life, moving the research focus away from conflict to learning more about the effective strategies used by individuals to improve their perception of work-life balance.

The following section examines the qualitative data collected from administration of the work-life balance questionnaire. The rationale for using a mixed methods approach in the current study follows that of Hill et al. (2007, p. 508) who stated: “Qualitative research, which is particularly well adapted to reveal perceptions and attributions of meaning to phenomena (Bryman 1988) has the potential to contribute to theoretical understanding of positive interdependencies between work and family in several ways. First qualitative methods facilitate further development and refinement of theoretical frameworks and measures based on concepts emerging from the voices of those experiencing the work-family interface. Second, findings that emerge from qualitative analyses can be compared with quantitative analyses to adjust and deepen what is currently understood about facilitative work-family processes”.

To that end, the aim of this qualitative research is to contribute to our understanding of the positive interdependencies between work and family and to compare the qualitative data with quantitative analyses to further understand more about effective work-life balance management strategies. The following findings are the result of exploratory
research using a discovery-oriented, qualitative methodology (Haddock et al. 2001) to address the second research question posed in this thesis: What are the strategies used by individuals who perceive themselves as having successful work-life balance?

6.3.2 Data analysis

Qualitative data analysis involves a process of data reduction that “seeks to enhance the data’s meaning” (Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009, p. 393). A sub-set of 82 study participants responded to the open-ended question and the remainder left the question blank. All respondents’ answers to the research question were analysed using thematic analysis to identify meaningful themes and patterns of living and behaviour (Van Manen 1990). The raw data was entered into the computer software program NVivo 8 (QSR International 2007). NVivo is a program used for qualitative data analysis which allows for importing and coding large amounts of textual data (Richards 1999). A convergence methodology was used to systematically analyse the raw data and all efforts were made to promote completeness, reduce bias in the data collection and analysis process.

While work-life balance strategies are experienced differently by individuals and are reflective of their particular circumstances (Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009), themes were identified using regularly recurring responses and isolated or uncommon comments were not included in the final analysis. Two rounds of coding were used by the researcher. The first round of coding used ‘free nodes’ which are considered ‘containers for ideas’ and are created to store ideas or text about related concepts (Richards 1999). The content of all responses was coded broadly in the first round. In the second round of coding, ‘tree nodes’ were used to take the broad concepts and break them down into sub-categories or
themes (Beekhuyzen 2007; Braun & Clarke 2006). In the description of findings that follows, quotes have been selected from the data to illustrate the themes and to depict the intended meaning of the study participants (note that identifying information is omitted to preserve the anonymity of respondents).

6.3.3 Results of qualitative data analysis

The following section summarises the key findings from the current study and reflects the attitudes and perceptions of participants with regard to effective work-life balance management strategies. Six main themes were identified – boundary management, leisure, support, flexibility, cognitive strategies and active coping strategies.

6.3.3.1 Boundary management

The main theme identified in this part of the study relates to how participants manage the boundary between home and work, lending support to the theoretical and empirical research discussed in Chapter 2 with regard to boundary theory (Hall & Richter 1988; Nippert-Eng 1996) and border theory (Clark 2000) and the use of integration versus segmentation as strategies for coping with work and family roles (Ashforth et al. 2000; Bulger et al. 2007; Haddock et al. 2006; Haddock et al. 2001; Ilies et al. 2009; Jennings & McDougald 2007; Kreiner 2006; Kreiner et al. 2009; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell 2010; Rothbard, Phillips & Dumas 2005; Woodward 2007). According to Powell and Greenhaus (2006, pp. 656-657) “people who engage in a high degree of role segmentation try to keep their work and family domains as separate as possible; in
contrast, people who engage in a high level of role integration try to blend these two domains and remove boundaries between them”.

Many participants reported making conscious decisions not to take work home or to work over weekends, “so that there is a separation”. Others made sure they focused on work during work hours and did not think about it when they went home – these are examples of segmentation strategies. The following responses from two respondents who work from home reflect the fact that people vary in their preference for segmentation or integration as a work-life balance strategy (Rothbard et al. 2005; Woodward 2007):

“I work completely from home and I have learned to turn off the computer at night and not to check work emails on the weekend. I have also learned that if possible, work should stop by 7.00 pm or I have trouble sleeping.” – Respondent #23, female insurance lawyer.

“I work from home and move from work jobs to home jobs multiple times per day – I hang out the washing at morning tea and often have kids working on the computer in the background while I am answering phone calls or emails.” – Respondent #40, female conveyancer.

It is important for employees to find a ‘fit’ between their preferred boundary management strategy and workplace policies and practices and for employers to understand that employees have preferences, as research evidence suggests that when there is incongruence, employees experience lower positive affect, job satisfaction and commitment (Ilies et al. 2009; Rothbard, Phillips & Dumas 2005) and when there is congruence individuals experience less work-family and family-work conflict (Chen et al. 2009; Powell & Greenhaus 2006).
A number of researchers in the work-life field have expressed concern over the blurring of boundaries between work and home as a result of telecommuting and home-based work (Desrochers et al. 2005; Lewis & Cooper 1999; Myrie & Daly 2009) and technology which provide the means for employees to work anywhere and anytime (Blinn-Pike 2009; Fenner & Renn 2010; Ilies et al. 2009; Kreiner et al. 2009). Despite extensive speculation on the effects of technology on work-life balance there appears to be ambivalence in this regard and a lack of consensus as to whether it is an enabler or a barrier (Fenner & Renn 2010). Nevertheless, the current study lends support to the view that the use of technology increases people’s autonomy and work functioning and enables the successful integration of multiple life roles (Eaton & Bailyn 1999; Jackson 2002):

“Ordering groceries on-line and getting them delivered has significantly reduced the amount of time I spend on the (precious) weekend doing chores and weeknights cooking dinner/making lunches for the next day.” – Respondent #78, female corporate lawyer.

Technology is also being used for relaxation purposes, such as participating in social networking activities:

“I use the internet/Facebook at the end of the day and at home to relax from the office work routine.” – Respondent #51, male lawyer in private practice.

It would appear that how people manage boundaries to negotiate the demands between work and home life is an area of importance that will continue to challenge employers and employees and will no doubt continue to be the subject of further investigation by work-life balance researchers (Kreiner et al. 2009).
6.3.3.2 Leisure

The current study supports a growing body of research in the work-life field indicating that leisure can be an effective coping strategy or resource (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008; Haworth & Lewis 2005; Hecht & Boies 2009; Joudrey & Wallace 2009; Wallace & Young 2010). Time out for rest, relaxation and leisure activities offer opportunities for recovery, rejuvenation and greater resilience in coping with stress (Caldwell 2005; Iwasaki 2006, 2003; Moreno-Jiménez et al. 2009; Sanz-Vergel et al. 2010). Brown, Bradley, Lingard, Townsend and Ling (2010, p. 194) emphasised the importance of recreation time concluding that “personal time’ is a key element in achieving satisfactory work-life balance for employees”.

Leisure is considered by Joudrey and Wallace (2009) as including passive activities (e.g., watching television), active activities (e.g., playing sport, exercising) or taking time out (e.g., holidays, days off). Whereas, Allis and O’Driscoll (2006, p. 274) referred to activities that a person “undertakes for their own personal benefit” as ‘personal benefit activities’ which include leisure (e.g., physical activities, sport and hobbies), personal development (e.g., private study), spiritual involvement (e.g., meditation) and voluntary work.

A large number of study participants reported the importance of the planned participation in leisure activities as a strategy for successful work-life integration:

“I have negotiated so that I am able to take the Christmas school holidays off - this prolonged break last year gave me a great restorative boost to my sanity and has made this year easier to cope with knowing that it will occur again.” – Respondent #66, female body corporate lawyer.
“Playing sport / exercise helps provide a division between work and home.” – Respondent #49, female lawyer in general practice.

“Try to take some time out for myself. I like to have a massage and watch something really dumb on TV when I get home from work.” – Respondent #40, female commercial lawyer.

On the other hand, while not consistent with previous research on volunteering and health (e.g., Thoits & Hewitt 2001) one participant’s comments revealed the extra burden that involvement in a personal benefit activity such as voluntary work can potentially create:

“My work (as in legal work) and home is and could be well balanced. However, the stress on my time is from things external to work which are though indirectly related. I am President of the Local Chamber of Commerce which requires a large time commitment (during working hours and outside working hours). This is with the approval and desire of the firm to increase profile of our business. I am also Chairman of [a major charity] which involves me travelling quite regularly. This improves my skill as a lawyer, director and person, but does not add direct value to the firm and involves me being busy often with these duties.” – Respondent #41, male commercial lawyer.

Nevertheless, the results from the current research support Joudrey and Wallace’s (2009, p. 213) conclusion: “organisations that encourage and support their employees taking vacations, participating in social activities and taking time for leisure may find they have happier employees and a healthier work environment”. In addition, it is important for individuals to ensure that they ‘self-manage’, that is, they plan to take time out for themselves to engage in rejuvenating activities so that they are better able to manage the demands of their work and home lives (Allis & O’Driscoll 2006; Mattingly & Bianchi 2003; Quick et al. 2004).
6.3.3.3 Support

Results of the current study provide strong evidence for the importance of a work environment which is supportive of the need for work-life balance, particularly the impact of having a supportive supervisor and workplace culture. These results reiterate a recurrent theme in the work-life literature (Clark 2001; Frye & Breaugh 2004; Haar & Roche 2008; Wayne et al. 2007):

"Finding a great boss who is very understanding of the need for work/life balance. My previous employer did not understand this, so I made it an unspoken condition for my future place of employment.” – Respondent #31, male lawyer in general practice.

“In my current job I do have much better work-life balance than other jobs I have had. I probably could be earning more elsewhere but I have continued in my current job because it is a family-friendly environment.” – Respondent #9, female family lawyer.

“In my first place of employment as a lawyer, I suffered quite severe depression to the point where I started taking sleeping pills and was constantly on edge, particularly with my wife. The turning point came when I had a panic attack one night and my wife thought that she might need to call the ambulance. The following day, I called the Queensland Law Society free counselling service and spoke to someone. I left my job and found my current job where I have been for one and a half years. The difference between my bosses is unbelievable. This has without a doubt been the biggest factor in my enjoyment of my legal career as a junior solicitor. I am treated with respect and am given a lot of responsibility, but only so much that I can handle without it becoming too burdensome. I know a lot of people who have struggled with their careers as junior lawyers and I believe that the number one factor is the employer, particularly the partner that the person works under.” – Respondent #45, male commercial lawyer.

Research has shown that accessing support from others is an effective coping mechanism (Carlson & Perrewé 1999; Wallace 2004). In particular, employees who report that their spouses provide support experience less difficulty in balancing the work and home
domains (Beutell & Greenhaus 1982; Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009; Halbesleben & Rotondo 2007; Quick et al. 2004).

A number of researchers have noted the importance for individuals to actively understand themselves, their personal needs and to effectively communicate with others about their needs, as communication plays a key role in fostering support (Gudmunson et al. 2009; Haddock et al. 2006; Quick et al. 2004; Wu et al. 2010). The current study provides evidence for this view:

“I communicate with my spouse that I am the primary breadwinner and potential baby-maker, so I need him to contribute e.g., cooking dinners and doing washing, and talk about him staying home with any potential baby. Communication has worked in terms of weekday home chores but not so much on the weekends. Also, communication with my employer that I need help when it gets too much.” – Respondent #79, female commercial property lawyer.

“My wife and I work together (not that getting married was an integration strategy!), but co-ordinating work and home life together assists each of us in managing both spheres of life.” – Respondent #22, male insolvency lawyer.

In summary, the results of past and present qualitative and quantitative research appear to be unequivocal – support (including a supportive workplace and manager/supervisor, support form spouse/partner, colleagues, family and friends) is an enabler of work-life balance for men and women (Brummelhuis & van der Lippe 2010; Burke 2010; Ezzedeen & Ritchey 2009; Grady & McCarthy 2008; Haddock et al. 2006; Halpern & Cheung 2008; Moen & Yu 2000; Parasuraman, Greenhaus & Granrose 1992; van Daalen et al. 2006; Watts 2009).
6.3.3.4 Flexibility

Findings from the current study lend support to the importance of flexibility as a factor in the achievement of work-life balance, which is another common theme in work-life research (Clark 2001; Frye & Breaugh 2004; Grady & McCarthy 2008; Grzywacz et al. 2008; Hill et al. 2003b; Hill, et al. 2008). In particular, respondents reported the perceived value of flexible work arrangements and the negotiation of same, for example:

“I work from home at least one day a week which enables me to care for an infant.” – Respondent #32, female commercial lawyer.

“My hours have been negotiated so that I am able to drop my children to school each morning and collect them each afternoon.” – Respondent #65, female commercial lawyer.

“The main one [strategy] was moving out of private practice, which offered no flexibility whatsoever, into the community sector, which provides me with much more flexibility, albeit at a much reduced salary, but I see that as the price I have had to pay to achieve this goal. I would never have been able to do this in private practice.” – Respondent #61, male lawyer in a community legal centre.

The research evidence with regard to workplace flexibility strongly suggests that both perceived flexibility and formal flexible arrangements (Grzywacz et al. 2008) are enablers of work-life balance, allowing employees to meet work-related responsibilities while maintaining a satisfying personal life (Casey & Grzywacz 2008) and benefiting employers through the attraction and retention of high quality employees (Carlson et al. 2010).
6.3.3.5 Cognitive strategies

A theme identified in the current research supports the conceptual and empirical research found in the coping literature, focusing on cognitive coping strategies (Steptoe 1991; Wiersma 1994). A number of study participants identified positive cognitive restructuring strategies such as acceptance, humour and positive reappraisal (Carver et al. 1989; Folkman & Moskowitz 2004) as contributing to their successful work-life balance, for example:

“My work tends to be either a flood or a drought. Over the years I have learnt to accept that’s the way family law is. When it’s really busy I have to put in long hours. When it’s quiet I try to spend more time with the family.” – Respondent #21, male family lawyer.

“I do not take myself too seriously.” - Respondent #62, male lawyer in general practice.

“Facing the reality that some things just can't be achieved or engaged in helps reduce stress.” – Respondent #70, female litigation and insolvency lawyer.

In particular, the following participants' responses provide insights into how cognitive reappraisal involved a reinterpretation of their situation in line with their values and beliefs (Folkman 1997), leading to actively revising their expectations and scaling back within the work domain (Jennings & McDougald 2007):

“I left the sixty hours/week inner city 'successful' legal life two and a half years ago after my best friend died a horrible death and my twenty year old child was diagnosed with a horrible cancer. I also left all the rhetoric about what you needed to do and be to succeed in law. Guess what, you can be a very competent and successful lawyer and have a good life outside of work.” – Respondent #60, female commercial lawyer.

“Change to a less stressful job. Deliberately avoid working long hours. Accept slightly lower pay as a trade off. Stop the obsession with money and position.” – Respondent #18, male precedents lawyer.
“After several years as a lawyer I made a conscious decision to change roles to achieve better job satisfaction and a better work-life balance. The legal profession, in my view revolves around stress, deadlines, constant client demands, time recording, money money money, and longer than average working hours. It seems that you are simply a conveyor belt for files; a machine whose purpose is to pump out billable hours. There isn't much scope for actual enjoyment of the law and I often went home stressed and dissatisfied. While staying in the profession, I decided to change roles to move away from direct client work and fee earning. This has substantially improved my lifestyle.” – Respondent #5, male company lawyer.

The above comments also emphasise the point that employees now expect employers to be responsive to their need to balance work and life commitments (Kossek, Dass & DeMarr 1994) and organisations that do not meet their employees’ work-life balance needs will find it hard to retain their staff as individuals choose to willingly make tradeoffs and to actively seek and secure employment at workplaces that offer lifestyle-friendly alternatives (De Cieri et al. 2005; Haddock et al. 2006; Pitt-Catsouphes et al. 2007; Thompson & Aspinwall 2008).

While the results also highlight the challenges of achieving work-life balance in the legal profession (Abramson & Franklin 1986; Beaton Consulting 2007; Brainbridge 1989; Brockman 1992; Dart 1988; Forstenlechner & Lettice 2008; Kaye 1988; Wallace 1999) in addition the following comment also highlights the influence and impact of the ‘macro-environment’, that is, society’s expectations (Lewis et al. 2003; Lewis et al. 2007):

“I run a little law firm with a handful of employees, and for the last ten years I’ve been raising three kids on my own. I don’t think it’s possible to have ‘work-life balance’ in the sense that no matter what you’re doing at any one time, there’s at least a hundred things you’re not doing at that moment, that you ought to be. We are under extreme pressure, constantly bombarded with guilt inducing and conflicting messages. If you really want to succeed in business, you’d put in the hours and do what it takes. If you are really serious about networking, you’d
come out to the golf day this weekend. If you really love your children you’d volunteer in tuckshop/scouts/not put them into child care. You should be making home cooked meals with veggies grown in your own garden. And when was the last time you visited your grandma’s nursing home? The implication is of course that if you don’t put in 100% into something, then you aren’t giving it the priority it deserves. But your career deserves 100%. And the kids. And your grandma. And 100% is not enough, everyone now has to put in 110%. 200%. Make it a million percent, it wouldn’t be any more achievable. So what do I do? I do what I can. It’s not balance, but it’s the best I can manage.” Respondent #70, female in IT law.

The views of this respondent would not have been heard had the current research adopted a purely quantitative approach to data collection, emphasising the need for work-life researchers to adopt a mixed methodology if we are to fully understand the issues surrounding work-life balance (Hill et al. 2007; Kiessling & Harvey 2005). Moreover, the points made above go to the heart of calls made by researchers and commentators urging us to address work-life issues at a deeper level, such as Lewis et al. (2003, p. 838) who believe that for work-life integration to be achieved wider social change is essential, strongly suggesting that there is a “need to rethink many of our existing assumptions operating throughout all the levels of society”.

6.3.3.6 Active coping strategies

The current study supports previous research reporting the use of active coping and problem solving strategies to manage the work-life interface (Aryee et al. 1999; Aspinwall & Taylor 1997; Baltes & Heydens-Gahir 2003; Boyd et al. 2009; Carver et al. 1989; Haddock et al. 2001; Lapierre & Allen 2006; Neal & Hammer 2007; Rotondo et al. 2003; Weigl et al. 2010). According to Weigl et al. (2010, p. 143) active coping is a key personal resource and refers to “problem-oriented and persistent behaviour to overcome
or constructively deal with the causes of personally distressing or dissatisfying circumstances”.

Aspinwall and Taylor (1997) considered active coping as a set of skills which may include goal setting, planning and organising. In the current study, fifty percent of participants reported using planning and organising strategies. Other strategies mentioned were time management, prioritising and goal-setting:

“Set time limits to come home early to spend time with the family instead of staying in the office after hours.” – Respondent #41, male criminal and family lawyer.

“I try and organise my day so that I work from 8.00 am to 5.00 pm during the week and so I do not need to work on weekends. I am fortunate that there is not a lot of pressure where I work to bill a certain amount per month. Having said that, I do the best I can and am always improving my work practices to increase my efficiency.” – Respondent #44, male litigation lawyer.

“Sorting out priorities, and reminding myself that I need to look after my marriage as that is the most important thing.” – Respondent #76, female local government lawyer.

“Set quantifiable and realistic goals and consciously and firmly allocate time to specific activities regarding the four sectors of self, family, work and community involvement.” – Respondent #37, male energy and resources lawyer.

“Decide what is important and then revolve around those ‘immovable’ aspects. Once I realised that I cannot please everyone and focused on pleasing/focusing on what is most important, then as long as I was meeting those commitments, I diminished the feeling of failure in respect to 'everything' as was only ‘failing’ at things which I designated as ‘not as important’.” – Respondent #16, female litigation and insolvency lawyer.

The above results indicate that individuals engage in specific behavioural strategies aimed at achieving work-life balance which has important implications for employers. Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) suggested that practitioners responsible for promoting
work-family balance should implement multi-level interventions which involve creating co-ordinated activities at the individual and organisational level that support each other. The example they use focuses on enabling workers to allocate their time effectively, thereby fostering levels of control and work-family balance by implementing flexible work arrangements at the organisational level and introducing time management practices at the individual level. The benefit of this approach lies in its recognition that the responsibility for achieving work-life balance is shared by both the organisation and the individual.

6.3.4 Effective strategies – quantitative results

In addition to asking participants to provide qualitative data with regard to the strategies that have been successful in helping them to integrate their work life and their home life, participants were also asked to indicate the extent to which they used a set of strategies adapted from Neal and Hammer’s research. Neal and Hammer (2007) conceptualised coping strategies as resources used to help individuals alleviate the demands of working and caring for dependants.

In keeping with the demands-and-resources approach taken in this study, the items selected were those found to decrease demands or increase resources in the three domains of behavioural, emotional and cognitive coping as exemplified in Table 6.15 below (Neal & Hammer 2007).

The results are presented in Table 6.16 below. In terms of integrating their work and home life, study participants overall indicated that the strategies they used a great deal
included time management and planning and organising. However, the results show that participants in this study are least likely to utilise hired help, to change their lifestyle or to engage in personal and professional development as work-life balance management strategies. As discussed in Section 6.2.1.2, when examining the differences between those who report higher levels of work-life balance from those with lower levels, several work-life balance management strategies were found to be significantly associated with higher levels of work-life balance: time management; planning and organising; setting limits; increasing work schedule flexibility; increasing support from others; managing stress through health behaviours; engaging in personal and professional activities and changing attitudes (e.g., lowering expectations of what is achievable).

Table 6.8: Work-life Balance Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease demands</th>
<th>Increase resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral</strong></td>
<td>Limit social activities</td>
<td>Use hired help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set limits</td>
<td>Get instrumental support from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change lifestyle</td>
<td>Use technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage stress through health behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional</strong></td>
<td>Lower expectations</td>
<td>Get emotional support from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Find humour in the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td>Prioritising</td>
<td>Planning and organising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted for this research from Neal & Hammer (2007).

Interestingly, with regard to participants’ general coping style, those reporting higher levels of work-life balance were more likely to cope with stressful events by utilising
external sources for emotional and instrumental support and utilising cognitive and behavioural strategies – planning and acting.

Table 6.9: Participants’ Utilisation of Work-Life Balance Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Not at all %</th>
<th>To some extent %</th>
<th>A great deal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management (e.g., reduce hours spent on certain tasks and demands and prioritise other activities)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set limits (e.g., avoid taking on new tasks; cease doing things that are not necessary; limit personal and family commitments)</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and organise (e.g., implement systems, use diary)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>49.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change attitudes (e.g., lower expectations of what is achievable)</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage stress through health behaviours (e.g., exercise, nutrition; take holidays and leisure time)</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>57.49</td>
<td>24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase flexibility (e.g., change work schedule)</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase involvement from spouse/partner (if applicable)</td>
<td>44.49</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change lifestyle (e.g., downshift, reduce mortgage)</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in personal or professional development activities (e.g., coaching, mentoring, training programs)</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase support from family members, friends, work colleagues</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise technology</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td>13.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise hired help</td>
<td>63.56</td>
<td>29.96</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, the results from the current research outlined above suggest an overlap between an individual’s general style of coping with stress (Carver 1997) and the
strategies used to manage the work-home interface, in particular the use of active coping strategies and accessing support (Carver et al. 1989). In addition, the results of the qualitative data analysis suggest that there are strategies specific to the successful management of work-life balance such as managing the boundaries between work and home, accessing flexible working arrangements and exercising healthy lifestyle behaviours including taking time out for personal benefit activities (Allis & O’Driscoll 2008; Grzywacz et al. 2008; Joudrey & Wallace 2009; Powell & Greenhaus 2006). These results lend support to the view of Hecht and McCarthy (2010, p. 634) who suggested that coping is both a “stable individual difference (i.e., dispositional coping) and a dynamic set of situation-specific responses (i.e., situational coping)”.

The qualitative research provided in this study contributes to our understanding of the positive interdependencies between work and family. In addition, integrating the qualitative and quantitative analyses creates a deeper, practical understanding of strategies that contribute to the perception of work-life balance (Hill et al. 2007).

6.3.5 Association between dispositional variables and coping style and strategies

As discussed in Chapter 3 (see Section 3.4), research has found that personality may influence the types of psychological resources and strategies selected to cope with work and home demands (Beauregard 2006; Friede & Ryan 2005).

The results of the current research show that dispositional traits are predictors of coping style which is in turn related to conflict and facilitation. Emotional instability was found to be associated with the maladaptive coping strategy of self-blame which was found to
be most positively associated with work-family conflict. Results of structural equation modelling showed the trait of emotional instability to be related to self-blame ($\beta = 0.30$, $p < 0.001$), which mediated the relationship between emotional instability and work-family conflict, accounting for 8% of the variance in work-family conflict. As previously established, work-family conflict is a predictor of perceived work-life balance which is related to the dependent variables used in this study. The goodness-of-fit indices indicate that the model fits the data well using life satisfaction as the dependent variable: ($\chi^2 (28) = 38.9$, $p = 0.05$; CMIN/DF = 1.39, CFI = 0.987, TLI = 0.979, RMSEA = 0.04).

In addition, the current research shows positive relationships between the personality trait of conscientiousness and the coping styles of active coping and planning and the use of instrumental and emotional support. Coping style was found to mediate the relationship between conscientiousness and family-work facilitation. In addition, family-work facilitation was found to be positively related to perceived work-life balance which is a predictor of the outcome variables included in this study: personal wellbeing, life, career and job satisfaction, mental health and perceived job performance.

Figure 6.4 below depicts the relationships between the variables, including life satisfaction as the outcome variable. The goodness-of-fit indices indicate that the model fits the data well: ($\chi^2 (82) = 103.7$, $p = 0.05$; CMIN/DF = 1.27, CFI = 0.988, TLI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.03).

From the current research it would appear that the personality trait of conscientiousness is a personal resource which is also responsible for gaining other resources, such as support from others. The results also indicate that these resources are related to facilitation in the
home domain which fully mediates the relationship between resources and perceived work-life balance, giving credence to the theoretical model put forward in this thesis. This result is also in line with Rotondo et al. (2003, p. 275) who concluded that “individuals may have greater control and opportunity for positive change within the family domain compared with the work environment”. In addition, the results show that emotional instability is a barrier to perceived work-life balance through its direct association (see Table 6.4) and its indirect association with maladaptive coping strategies.
Figure 6.4: Relationship Between Conscientiousness, Coping and Family-Work Facilitation

NOTES:
1. * Denotes statistical significance at .05 level
2. ** Denotes statistical significance at .01 level
The purpose of this chapter was to examine the data collected from administration of the Work-Life Balance Survey. First, the quantitative analysis and results were presented and discussed. Key relationships between the variables were identified and explored and the proposed model of work-life balance was put to the test. The results provided evidence to suggest that demands were found to be positively related to conflict and resources positively related to facilitation. Conflict and facilitation were found to serve as indicators of perceived work-life balance which was found to be a predictor of a range of personal and organisational outcomes. Second, the qualitative analysis and results were presented and discussed. In summary, the results of the current research provide insights into the personal and contextual factors that contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance and to its consequences and insights into a range of effective work-life balance management strategies.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

7.1 **Introduction**

This chapter draws together the contents of the previous chapters in this thesis. First, the earlier stages of the study are reviewed and the research questions are re-stated (Section 7.2). Second, conclusions on the research propositions based on the analyses contained in the previous chapters are summarised (Section 7.3). Third, the contributions of the current research to the literature are outlined (Section 7.4). Then the implications of the findings from the theoretical, practical and methodological perspectives are discussed (Section 7.5). Following this discussion, the limitations of this study are reviewed (Section 7.6). Last, suggestions with regard to future research directions are proposed (Section 7.7).

7.2 **Review of the Study**

Chapter 1 provided a background to and a justification for this study of work-life balance and introduced the key concepts to be examined. The research questions were defined and specific research objectives identified for investigation. The methodology and specific delimitations were discussed. Lastly, the structure of the thesis was outlined.

The purposes of Chapters 2 and 3 were to comprehensively review the work-life balance literature, to propose an integrated conceptual model of perceived work-life balance and to identify variables that provided a basis for testing the efficacy of the model based on
solid theoretical and empirical foundations. Chapter 2 was concerned principally with reviewing the concepts of work-life balance and the work-family interface scholarship. Firstly, the sources of the literature review were outlined and a brief history of work-life balance research was provided by way of contextual background. Next, issues surrounding the definition and measurement of work-life balance and related terms were discussed and the approaches that have been taken to study work-life balance and the work-family interface were reviewed and critiqued. Lastly, the constructs included in this study were identified and reviewed. Specifically, the relationships among perceived work-life balance, conflict and facilitation were put forward in this chapter together with the means for operationalising these constructs.

Chapter 3 provided a review of the literature with regard to the antecedents and outcomes studied in the work-life field, with a particular focus on the demands-and-resources theoretical framework and its integration with the work-family interface scholarship. The demands-and-resources scholarship provided a framework for understanding environmental and personal antecedent variables. The integration of the demands-and-resources scholarship with the work-family interface scholarship expanded this framework to encompass the relationships between environmental and personal demands and resources and the concepts of conflict and facilitation. An integrated conceptualisation and model was put forward in Chapter 3 which took into account perceived work-life balance together with hypothesised antecedent, indicator and outcome variables.
Chapter 4 identified and justified the methodological elements relevant to this study. The chapter reviewed the options for a research paradigm to guide the study. The critical realism paradigm was chosen as the best fit to inform the research questions. The major method categories were reviewed and a mixed methods methodology chosen. The range of research designs available was considered with the study identified as both exploratory and descriptive and a cross-sectional approach selected. The types and sources of data were determined and sampling issues addressed. Next, data collection procedures were discussed and an online questionnaire justified as the mechanism for collecting data for this research. The items comprising the questionnaire were sourced from existing scales and modified where necessary, or otherwise developed by the researcher. Lastly, ethical considerations were identified and addressed.

Chapter 5 covered the preliminary analysis of data collected through the administration of the Work-Life Balance Survey designed for this study. The data were cleaned and screened, decisions taken on missing data were reported and the rate of response to the survey was discussed. The demographic and personal characteristics of respondents to the study were analysed and a profile of respondents was developed. Lastly, results of exploratory factor analyses for relevant scales were presented to assist with model specification prior to confirmatory theory testing with structural equation modelling. In addition, the results of analysis of variables not subjected to exploratory factor analysis were reported.

Chapter 6 further examined the data collected from administration of the Work-Life Balance Survey. First, the quantitative analysis and results were presented and discussed.
Key relationships among the variables were identified and explored and the proposed model of work-life balance was tested and evaluated. Second, the qualitative analysis and results were presented and discussed. The findings provided support for the propositions put forward in this research and these are discussed in more detail in Section 7.3 below.

7.3 Research Questions and Research Propositions

The two principal research questions (RQ) in this study are:

RQ1 How do personal and contextual factors contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance and to its consequences?

RQ2 What are the strategies used by individuals who perceive themselves as having successful work-life balance?

In order to answer the first research question, following a review of the research literature in Chapters 2 and 3, an integrated conceptual model of perceived work-life balance was devised, tested and evaluated. This model was underpinned by eight principal propositions which are discussed in turn in this section. In addition, the research was informed by investigating how men and women differ in their personal experience of perceived work-life balance and by investigating how participants reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance differ from those reporting lower levels.
The second research question was answered by analysing and reporting on the qualitative responses to this question provided by study participants who undertook the Work-Life Balance Survey, together with their quantitative responses to a specific range of work-life balance management strategy options taken from the work of Neal and Hammer (2007). In addition, the ways in which participants reported that they usually cope with stressful situations and how this coping style might be related to dispositional characteristics was also examined with a view to understanding more about the adaptive and maladaptive processes involved in managing the work-family interface.

7.3.1 Research question one

With regard to the first research question, in order to understand more about the antecedents and outcomes of perceived work-life balance, it was important for this study to establish validation of a sound, multi-item measure of work-life balance and to distinguish work-life balance from more traditional work-family interface constructs. Although there is strong research evidence for the concept of work-family conflict and concepts like work-family facilitation are a welcome addition to the work-life field, the current research takes the approach that work-life balance is distinct from the constructs of work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation and that conflict and facilitation precede and contribute to appraisals of work-family balance (Butler et al. 2005; Carlson et al. 2009; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007).

Based on theoretical analysis and empirical evidence the first two propositions were put forward. Findings of this research support these propositions, demonstrated as follows:
**Proposition 1:** Perceived work-life balance is distinct from work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation.

The first proposition maintains that the constructs of conflict, facilitation and perceived work-life balance are conceptually and empirically distinct. Divergent or discriminant validity of work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation and perceived work-life balance was considered by examining the pattern of associations revealed in the bivariate correlation analysis shown in Table 6.1, the regression analysis shown in Appendix 6.1 and the structural equation model shown in Figure 6.1. These results show that conflict and facilitation are associated with perceived work-life balance in different ways: work-family conflict is strongly negatively related to perceived work-life balance; family-work conflict is moderately negatively related to perceived work-life balance; work-family facilitation is strongly positively related to perceived work-life balance and family-work facilitation is strongly positively related to perceived work-life balance.

In addition, the models depicted in Figures 6.2 and 6.3 show that when added to measures that assess the experience of conflict, the inclusion of facilitation measures increases the amount of variance explained in perceived work-life balance from 55% to 59% and the negative relationship between work-family conflict and perceived work-life balance reduces significantly as indicated by the change in the standardised coefficient for work-family conflict from $\beta = -0.72 \ (p < 0.001)$ to $\beta = -0.47 \ (p < 0.001)$.

Thus, the results strongly show that the five constructs (viz., work-family conflict, family-work conflict, work-family facilitation, family-work facilitation and perceived
work-life balance) appear to exhibit sufficient differences to suggest that they are conceptually distinct.

**Proposition 2:** *The constructs of conflict and facilitation serve as indicators of perceived work-life balance.*

The second proposition assumes that lower levels of conflict and higher levels of facilitation are expected to be associated with work-life balance. The current research adopts the approach that measures of conflict and facilitation are not in themselves measures of work-life balance: rather they are useful for understanding the effects of the demands and resources associated with the work-family domains, instead serving as indicators of work-life balance (Frone 2003; Grzywacz & Carlson 2007; Voydanoff 2004).

The results of comparisons between those participants reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance and those reporting lower levels, clearly show that individuals with higher perceived work-life balance report higher levels of work-family facilitation ($t = -8.76, p < 0.001$) and family-work facilitation ($t = -8.09, p < 0.001$) and lower levels of work-family conflict ($t = 11.06, p < 0.001$) and family-work conflict ($t = 5.58, p < 0.001$). In addition, the models depicted in Figures 6.2 and 6.3 show that the impact of work-family conflict on perceived work-life balance is reduced with the introduction of work-family and family-work facilitation into the model. Therefore, the less work-family conflict experienced and the more work-family and family-work facilitation experienced by an individual, the more likely they are to report higher levels of perceived work-life balance.
Theoretically, the results supporting Propositions One and Two are important because they offer an alternative, but related, perspective to traditional work-family interface measures (Joplin et al. 2003b). In addition, the results provide important insights into the relevance and utility of these measures. While the current research answers scholars' calls for theoretical development of and greater attention to positive aspects of combining work and family roles (Aryee et al. 2005; Barnett 1998; Grzywacz & Marks 2000), a global perception of work-life balance is different in the nomological network of work-life constructs for two main reasons. First, it does not centre on conflict. While work-family and family-work conflict are inversely related to perceived work-life balance, the results do not support the argument that the two constructs represent opposite ends of a continuum (Aryee et al. 2005; Grzywacz & Marks 2000). Thus, the results indicate that researchers should not assume the absence of conflict is equivalent to work-life balance nor should these concepts be used interchangeably, as they have been in the past (Grzywacz & Carlson 2007).

Second, in the current study perceived work-life balance reflects the global sense that there is a positive integration of the life domains whereby individuals are able to perform activities in both the work and home domains effectively, rather than an appraisal of how work-domain factors affect the family role and vice versa, as is the case with conflict and facilitation (Valcour 2007). While the latter approach is useful for illuminating how each role domain influences the other, it can become unwieldy in empirical research (Valcour 2007). Instead, the concept of perceived work-life balance offers utility as a testable construct intervening between antecedents and outcomes of interest in models of work-life balance for future research which may be considered as a more parsimonious
approach. Further, the results of this study show that perceived work-life balance includes a sense of control and synchrony over one’s life domains and a sense of planned action (establishing priorities and investing energy) suggesting a behavioural component to work-life balance. The results of independent samples t-tests reported in Section 6.2.3.2 certainly indicate that individuals reporting higher levels of work-life balance behave in different ways to those reporting lower levels, implementing work-life balance management strategies such as setting limits, time management, planning and organising. This finding is important for individuals and practitioners because it suggests that interventions aimed at changing behaviour may be effective in improving lower levels of perceived work-life balance.

However, with regard to the concepts of conflict and facilitation, theoretically these results suggest that the inclusion of both measures, over the use of either construct alone, is important if we are to fully understand aspects of the work-family interface. The results of this study show that work-family conflict and family-work facilitation are most salient for perceived work-life balance, suggesting that positive aspects emanating from home life counteract the negative impacts felt from work life. From a practical perspective, these findings suggest that it is important for managers and human resource practitioners to understand the potential negative impact on employees resulting from work-family conflict and to increase organisational characteristics which lead to work-family facilitation. In addition, it is important for individuals to understand and evaluate how their particular personal and contextual characteristics contribute to levels of conflict and facilitation and to seek ways to increase those that lead to work-family/family-work facilitation and reduce those that lead to work-family/family-work conflict.
Practically, compared to the concept of work-life balance, the concepts of conflict and facilitation are not easy to embrace outside of the field of research. Therefore differentiating work-life balance from conflict and facilitation is useful because it simplifies the work-family interface for individuals, organisations and practitioners, providing a more useful tool for the evaluation of viable policies and strategies for promoting and attaining work-life balance. Since work-life balance has been found to be distinct from conflict and facilitation the results provide a degree of conceptual clarity which has been lacking in the work-life literature and suggest that, in future, researchers need to ensure that they include the most theoretically appropriate constructs and clearly differentiate constructs from one another, when designing work-family and work-life research (Carlson et al. 2009).

Turning to Propositions Three, Four and Five, research to date has identified a range of antecedents of work-family (family-work) conflict and more recently work-family and family-work facilitation (Wayne et al. 2007) as discussed in Chapter 2. As outlined in Chapter 3, the current research has integrated the work-family interface scholarship with the demands-and-resources scholarship, proposing that environmental and personal demands are antecedents that are positively related to conflict and environmental and personal resources are antecedents that are positively related to facilitation (O’Driscoll et al. 2006; Voydanoff 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d, 2005e; Voydanoff 2004) as put forward in the third and fourth propositions:

**Proposition 3:** *Demands are positively related to work-family conflict and to family-work conflict.*
The third proposition maintains that environmental and personal demand characteristics are positively related to work-family and family-work conflict. In support of Proposition Three the antecedent variables most strongly associated with work-family conflict include working full-time, the perception of high levels of work demands and a negative work-life balance culture in the workplace together with time spent working outside of business hours and on work-related social activities. In addition, the perception of high levels of home demands together with time spent in childcare were antecedent variables most salient for family-work conflict.

These results support previous research which consistently shows perceived work and family demands to be significant antecedents of work-family conflict and family-work conflict, respectively (Boyar et al. 2007; 2008; Frone et al. 1992; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Lu et al. 2010); the positive relationship between paid work hours and work-family conflict (Aryee 1992; Carlson & Frone 2003; Duxbury et al. 1994; Frone et al. 1997a; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Major et al. 2002; Reynolds 2005) and the relationship between the number of hours devoted to family responsibilities and family-work conflict (Frone et al. 1997a; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Gutek et al. 1991; O’Driscoll et al. 1992; Van der Hulst & Geurts 2001). In addition, Australian research shows that having an unsupportive supervisor or workplace culture, feeling overloaded and working longer hours are circumstances that increase demands on the work front and having more caring responsibilities creates demands on the personal and home front (Skinner & Pocock 2008; Pocock et al. 2009).
Given the strength of the relationships shown between perceived demands and conflict and the impact of conflict on perceived work-life balance in the current study, interventions are required. Ideally, an intervention to address workplace issues would go to the source of the problem and alleviate workload by increasing resources and reducing demands (e.g., increase staff, reduce time pressure, increase time and task control) (Skinner & Pocock 2008). In reality, deadlines, budgets and productivity targets make these interventions difficult, particularly in occupations such as the legal profession. However, for the sake of employees’ health, wellbeing and effectiveness in the workplace, organisations need to provide a range of practical resources to support employers and employees to address these issues. Effective management of workloads should be considered a priority for work–life policies (Skinner & Pocock 2008). Placing greater emphasis on work demands/workload factors by regular monitoring of workloads would at the very least raise the profile of work demands as a work–life issue. Further, implementing strategies that enable employees to have more control over their working time and scheduling and ensuring that employees are able to take sufficient breaks through flexible working arrangements and holiday leave are important resources which would help to reduce the impact of perceived work demands for employed adults and their families (Skinner & Pocock 2008).

**Proposition 4:** *Resources are positively related to work-family facilitation and to family-work facilitation.*

The fourth proposition maintains that environmental and personal resource characteristics are positively related to work-family and family-work facilitation. In support of
Proposition Four, resources most strongly associated with work-family facilitation in this study include the perception of a positive work-life balance culture together with a supportive manager and work schedule flexibility. Resources strongly related to family-work facilitation appear to be those that are more personally driven and include planning and organising strategies, increasing the support from a spouse/partner and engaging in personal benefit activities which include spending time in self-care and managing stress through healthy lifestyle behaviours (e.g., exercise, nutrition, leisure time).

These results are in line with previous studies which have shown a significant relationship between employees' perception of the supportiveness of their supervisor and work-family facilitation (Grzywacz & Marks 200; Karatepe & Bekteshi 2008; Taylor et al. 2009; Thompson & Prottas 2005); studies investigating the positive relationship between work-family culture and the work-family interface (Hill 2005; Peeters et al. 2009; Wayne et al. 2007) and research reporting the benefits of building a culture of flexibility in the workplace (Carlson et al. 2010; Casey & Grzywacz 2008; Hill et al. 2008). While, the findings of this study add to the body of research linking personal resources with family-work facilitation, the results clearly show that we know more about the antecedents of work-family/family-work conflict than we do about the antecedents of work-family/family-work facilitation, suggesting the need for continued research into the individual and organisational characteristics that enable working adults to integrate their work and family lives.

The work-life research has been criticised for not including personality variables along with contextual variables and for not investigating the role of coping (Eby et al. 2005).
The current research included dispositional variables (personality traits and core self-evaluations) together with coping style and strategies. Dispositional variables were found to be directly related to conflict and facilitation. In particular, as shown in Table 6.4, core self-evaluations or positive self-regard is a dispositional variable moderately negatively associated with conflict and moderately positively associated with facilitation. In addition, of note is the strong positive association between core self-evaluations and perceived work-life balance ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.001$). Together these results lend support to research such as that of Beauregard (2006) who concluded that personal self-evaluation characteristics play a key role in predicting the factors associated with the home and workplace environments, suggesting that they are “more important than traditionally investigated factors” (Beauregard 2006, p. 244).

Furthermore, emotional instability was found to be positively associated with work-family conflict and negatively associated with work-family facilitation (see Table 6.4). Conscientiousness was found to be positively related to both measures of facilitation and negatively associated with both measures of conflict, with the strongest relationship between conscientiousness and family-work facilitation. However, the difference between the two personality traits appears to be in their relationship with perceived work-life balance. While regression analysis shows that facilitation fully mediates the relationship between conscientiousness and perceived work-life balance (see Appendix 6.16 and 6.18), conflict partially mediates the relationship between emotional instability and perceived work-life balance (see Appendix 6.10 and 6.12). These results suggest that conscientiousness appears to be a personality trait which acts as a personal resource whereas the direct negative relationship between emotional instability and perceived...
work-life balance sees this trait as acting more like a ‘negative lens’ (Aryee et al. 2005) through which to view the world, in contrast to core self-evaluations which acts as a ‘positive lens’. This finding is in support of previous research which has found emotional instability or neuroticism to have a negative impact on the work-family interface and conscientiousness to act as a personal resource (Halbesleben et al. 2009; Wayne et al. 2004).

The results of the current research also lend support to the fifth proposition as described below.

**Proposition 5:** *Dispositional variables are indirectly related to conflict and facilitation.*

The fifth proposition maintains that dispositional characteristics have indirect relationships with work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation mediated by their relationship with coping style and strategies. The results of the current research show that dispositional traits are predictors of coping style which is in turn related to conflict and facilitation. Emotional instability was found to be associated with the maladaptive coping strategy of self-blame which was found to be most positively associated with work-family conflict. Conversely, conscientiousness was found to be associated with the adaptive strategies of active coping and planning and using instrumental and emotional support, which were found to be positively associated with family-work facilitation as shown in Figure 6.4.

Taken together, the findings in support of the fourth and fifth propositions concur with researchers who emphasise the need to understand the role of individual characteristics such as disposition in relation to work-family outcomes as well as the role of contextual
In particular, the current research highlights the important influence that an individual's particular coping style has on managing their work and family roles and how this style is determined by particular personality traits. These results have practical implications for individuals, managers and practitioners as they provide useful insights into why some people cope better with negative consequences such as work-family conflict and why others do not. In support of Hecht and McCarthy's (2010) research, the current research suggests that interventions aimed at assisting individuals to look more closely at their propensities to use adaptive or maladaptive coping styles and whether their situation is helped or hindered by the strategies they are adopting is recommended. While coping is a stable individual difference, individuals can learn to change their response to specific situations (Hecht & McCarthy 2010). Assisting individuals to increase the use of adaptive strategies such as active coping and planning and utilising emotional and instrumental support suggests a proactive way forward.

Propositions Six and Seven relate to the dependent variables included in the current research as follows:

**Proposition 6:** Independent of conflict and facilitation, perceived work-life balance is positively related to desirable work and non-work outcomes and negatively related to undesirable work and non-work outcomes.

The sixth proposition maintains that perceived work-life balance is positively related to life, job and career satisfaction, personal wellbeing, psychological health and self-rated work performance and negatively related to the intention to leave the legal profession and
psychological ill-health. In support of Proposition Six, perceived work-life balance was found to be positively related to desirable work and non-work outcomes (life, job and career satisfaction; personal wellbeing; self-rated work performance and mental health) and negatively related to undesirable work and non-work outcomes (the intention to leave the legal profession and mental ill-health) (see Table 6.2 and Appendices 6.2 to 6.5).

The current research addresses a fundamental problem in the work-life field, specifically the lack of empirical research to support the claim that employees and organisations benefit from work-life balance (Carlson et al. 2009). The results of this study show that they do indeed benefit. Theoretically, while this study was not intended to be a measurement development study, the need for a measure of work-life balance as a cornerstone for research in this area is highlighted (Carlson et al. 2009). Practically, the results of this research are important because they provide evidence to support and legitimise the need for organisations to help employees balance their work and family lives and emphasise the need for individuals to be proactive in this regard for the sake of their own health and wellbeing.

**Proposition 7:** Perceived work-life balance is directly related to work and non-work outcomes, whereas conflict and facilitation are indirectly related to work and non-work outcomes.

The seventh proposition maintains that perceived work-life balance mediates the relationship between conflict and facilitation and work and non-work outcomes.

Partial support is provided for the seventh proposition. Evidence was found for the mediating role of perceived work-life balance between conflict and facilitation and the
outcome variables (see Appendices 6.6 to 6.10). Perceived work-life balance mediated the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation and life, job and career satisfaction and personal wellbeing except for the cases where partial mediation occurred, namely: between work-family facilitation and life satisfaction; family-work conflict and personal wellbeing; job and career satisfaction and work-family facilitation and job satisfaction. The results suggest that work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation, while having a relationship with perceived work-life balance, also have a relationship with a number of the outcome variables.

Theoretically, the results in support of Proposition Seven show the complexity of interpreting the relationships between work-family conflict and facilitation measures and outcome measures and suggest that using a measure of perceived work-life balance simplifies the model. Practically, the fact that work-life balance fully and partially mediated the relationship between work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation and the outcome measures suggests that work-life balance might be a more important target for intervention than the traditional conflict measures and measures of conflict and facilitation together (Carlson et al. 2009; Valcour 2007).

Proposition Eight reflects the linking mechanisms between the constructs which make up the integrated conceptual model.

**Proposition 8:** Personal and environmental demands and resources are associated with work-family (family-work) conflict and facilitation, which are in turn related to the
perception of work-life balance and perceived work-life balance is a predictor of a range of personal and organisational outcomes.

While the relationships between demands and conflict and between resources and facilitation have been discussed in the literature for several years, the model put forward in the current study is the first to include environmental (work and non-work) demands and resources as well as personal demands and resources as antecedents, together with the relationship of these antecedents with both work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation. In addition, by integrating demands-and-resources theory with work-family interface theory into one theoretical model and differentiating established concepts such as conflict, facilitation and work-life balance the current study has provided the opportunity to consider and evaluate the utility of these theoretical models and concepts. In addition, the inclusion of both antecedent and outcome variables in the model has provided an all encompassing theoretical and empirical approach to the study of work-life balance (Guest 2002).

Empirical evidence to support Proposition Eight and the conceptual model was found and demonstrated in Figures 6.2 and 6.4. Figure 6.2 shows that the perception of high levels of home demands is positively related to family-work conflict and the perception of high levels of work demands is related to work-family conflict. Further, managerial support as a resource is positively related to work-family facilitation and engaging in healthy lifestyle behaviours is a resource that is positively related to family-work facilitation. Work-family and family-work conflict are negatively related to perceived work-life balance and work-family and family-work facilitation are positively related to perceived...
work-life balance. Perceived work-life balance is strongly positively associated with life satisfaction.

While the model is based on solid theoretical underpinnings and evidence was found for the model, the presence of antecedent variables which span both the work and home domains and the many direct and indirect relationships among the variables make the model complicated for empirical purposes. However, practically the results clearly indicate the importance of taking into account both personal and contextual characteristics which can hinder (demands) or help (resources) the achievement of perceived work-life balance and the significance of perceived work-life balance in relation to a range of individual and organisational outcomes.

As noted previously, in answering the research questions the research was informed by investigating how men and women differ in their personal experience of perceived work-life balance and by investigating how participants reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance differ from those reporting lower levels. These findings are outlined in the next two sections.

7.3.1.1 Differences in levels of perceived work-life balance

In this study, the results of comparisons between participants reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance with those reporting lower levels, taken together with the qualitative data provided by participants, show that factors contributing positively towards the perception of work-life balance include a mixture of personal and contextual factors (see Appendix 6.20).
In summary, individuals in the current study who report higher levels of perceived work-life balance are more likely to work part-time, to have a degree of schedule flexibility and autonomy and control over how they go about their job. Also, their workplaces have a culture supportive of work-life balance which includes support from management and colleagues and the availability of family-friendly benefits. At home they are more likely to be single or without dependants, experiencing more social support from family and friends and less family demands and family-work conflict. Personally, these individuals are more likely to have a strong sense of positive self-regard and to be conscientious, a trait which enables access to emotional and instrumental support and the use of active coping strategies for coping with stress.

With regard to specific work-life balance management strategies, participants with higher levels of perceived work-life balance are more likely to engage in a range of personal benefit activities such as: dedicating time to self-care, leisure and personal and professional development activities; maintaining healthy lifestyle behaviours (e.g., exercise, nutrition); using personal management strategies such as time management; setting limits; planning and organising and cognitive strategies such as changing their attitudes (e.g., lowering expectations of what is achievable). In addition when need be, they increase the support received from others and increase their work schedule flexibility. In particular, participants reported the importance of boundary management strategies showing preferences for segmentation or integration, that is, people who engage in a high degree of role segmentation try to keep their work and family domains as separate as possible. In contrast, people who engage in a high level of role integration...
try to blend these two domains and remove boundaries between them (see Section 6.3.3.1).

Importantly, the benefits of higher levels of perceived work-life balance are life, career and job satisfaction, personal wellbeing, positive mental health and higher self-ratings of performance on the job (see Appendix 6.20).

On the other hand, participants in the current study reporting lower levels of perceived work-life balance are more likely to experience high levels of demands at work, low levels of schedule flexibility and autonomy and control and to spend more time at work, working out of business hours and engaged in work-related activities after hours. Their workplaces are more likely to have a culture unsupportive or work-life balance with limited support from management and colleagues and a lack of access to family-friendly benefits. At home these individuals are more likely to: experience high levels of home demands; to spend more time on domestic duties and childcare and less time engaging in personal benefit activities; and to have children under the age of twelve years and limited social support. Respondents in the current study with lower levels of perceived work-life balance were also more likely to feel less positive about themselves and to experience higher levels of emotional instability with a tendency to engage in maladaptive coping behaviours such as self-blame and behavioural disengagement (see Appendix 6.20).

7.3.1.2 Gender differences

While the current study did not set out to test for gender differences, the results clearly indicate that they exist. Although men and women report similar levels of conflict and
facilitation, similar levels of perceived work-life balance and do not differ significantly on any outcome variables, they do differ on a range of personal and contextual independent variables.

In particular, the issue of gender, time and the division of labour in the home continues to be an ongoing theme in the work-life literature with the current results supporting findings found in the literature generally over the past decade (see Bianchi & Milkie 2010) and the results of research involving Canadian lawyers undertaken by Wallace (2010). These findings indicate that men work longer work hours than women, while women continue to be responsible for domestic duties and childcare, reporting higher levels of home demands than men. Of concern is the present finding similar to that of Neal (2010), that women in the Queensland legal profession are seemingly choosing not to marry or to have children, or alternatively are working part-time so that they can manage their home and work responsibilities as women in this sample are less likely than men to be married or to have dependants and are more likely to be part-time workers than their male counterparts (see Section 6.2.3.1).

With regard to the work environment, men in the current study appear to benefit from greater autonomy and control in their jobs, together with workplaces supportive of work-life balance. Women were more likely than men to view their workplaces as unsupportive, a finding which is also in line with Neal’s (2010) work. Evidence of a gender “leisure gap” (Bianchi & Milkie 2010, p. 708) favouring men was also found with men spending more time engaging in self-care and leisure activities and taking time out with their spouse/partner and children where applicable.
In terms of dispositional characteristics, men appear to be advantaged by being more emotionally stable and open to new experiences than women. While women may be more likely to engage in self-blame as a maladaptive coping strategy, they are also more likely than men to use adaptive coping and work-life balance management strategies, including planning and organising and accessing support from their network of friends, family members and work colleagues, according to the results of this research.

The results outlined above suggest that it is in the area of contributing factors that men and women differ and that these factors manifest themselves as characteristics in the work and home environments and as personal characteristics. With regard to the work environment, men in the current study appear to benefit from greater autonomy and control in their jobs, together with workplaces supportive of work-life balance, although they are working longer hours than women. While women opt for part-time work more than men in the current study, men opt for self-employment. On the home front, women appear to be disadvantaged by the burden of home demands, but receive more support from their friends. On the other hand, men spend more time engaging in self-care and leisure activities and taking time out with their spouse/partner and children where applicable.

With regard to dispositional characteristics, men appear to be advantaged by being more emotionally stable and open to new experiences than women. While women may be more likely to engage in self-blame as a maladaptive coping strategy, they are also more likely than men to use adaptive coping and work-life balance management strategies,
including planning and organising and accessing support from their network of friends, family members and work colleagues, according to the results of this research.

The results of the current study lend support to findings of previous research into time and the division of labour in the home that consistently show women spend more time on housework and childcare than their male partners which impacts negatively on their work-life balance (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2008b; Craig 2006; Milkie & Peltola 1999; Skinner & Pocock 2010; Stratton 2003). In addition, the results are similar to the conclusions of Wallace and Young’s (2010, p. 44) study of lawyers practising in Canada: “men spend more time in paid work and leisure and women spend more time in housework and childcare”. In addition, Halpern and Cheung (2008) found that women get and stay organised and find and use social and emotional support as work-life balance management strategies.

In conclusion, the gender differences found in the current study remind us that it is important to take into account the fact that men and women differ with regard to the antecedents of work-life balance (Bianchi & Milkie 2010; Keene & Quadagno 2004). As a result, men and women’s experiences vary because they encounter different barriers and enablers at work and at home and may handle situations in different ways as a result of their personal dispositions (Milkie & Peltola 1999).

7.3.2 Research question two

One of the aims of the current research is to shed light upon the effective strategies that contribute to work-life balance by reporting the perceptions of those who believe they
have made inroads into successfully achieving work-life balance. While there is still much to be learnt and as noted by Lewis et al. (2003, p. 836) “There are no easy or quick fixes and no ‘one size fits all’ solutions”, the findings of this study are informative. The results from the qualitative analysis in this study concur with themes found in previous work-life research such as the importance of flexibility and support (Grzywacz et al. 2008), the need for boundary management strategies (Bulger et al. 2007) and the effectiveness of behavioural strategies (Carver et al. 1989; Folkman & Moskowitz 2004). In addition, credence has been given to emerging themes such as the relevance of leisure (Joudrey & Wallace 2009; Wallace & Young 2010) and technology (Valcour & Hunter 2005) to work-life balance and further insights gained into cognitive and active coping strategies (Carver et al. 1989; Folkman & Moskowitz 2004). Importantly, the current research includes input from individuals who were not partnered and couples with no dependants whereas much of the previous research into work-life balance strategies has focused on dual-career couples with children.

It is suggested that strategies such as engagement in leisure and personal benefit activities and planning also support a new direction in coping research – proactive coping (Aspinwall & Taylor 1997). Proactive coping has to do with the ways people cope in advance to prevent or mute the impact of events that are potential stressors (Folkman & Moskowitz 2004). Proactive coping may go unrecognised because it is difficult to detect – when potential stressors are minimised or averted, little happens and as noted by Aspinwall and Taylor (1997, p. 418) “Nonevents are rarely selected for scientific investigation”. This may be one of the reasons why the focus has been on work-family conflict and successful work-life balance has been under-studied in the literature. It is
recommended that this research imbalance be addressed in the future so that we can more fully understand the dynamics of the work-life interaction.

The importance of the joint contribution of both employers and employees to the successful management of work-life balance is also being recognised. According to person-environment fit theory (Edwards et al. 1998; Edwards & Rothbard 1999; French et al. 1982), an employee’s level of work-family stress is affected by three sets of connected factors: firstly, the extent and intensity of work and family demands; secondly, the accessibility of resources and thirdly, the use of adaptive strategies (Pitt-Catsouphes et al. 2007). As noted by Pitt-Catsouphes et al. (2007) “workplace-based policies, practices, and programs that respond to an understanding of demands and resources as well as the strategies and tactics employees use may be more effective than those that focus on the manifestations of stress alone” (2007, p. 540). However, the onus does not rest solely with organisations. Quick et al. (2004) have suggested that employees need to take an active role in managing their own work responsibilities, family obligations and self-imposed expectations by understanding the source of the demands that lead to conflict, making appropriate choices and using a range of strategies.

7.3.3 Summary

The findings provide valuable insights into the personal and contextual factors that contribute to an individual’s perception of work-life balance and to its consequences and they are summarised in Table 7.1 below.
Table 7.1: Summary of Antecedents and Outcomes of Perceived Work-Life Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enablers of work-life balance</th>
<th>Barriers to work-life balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual factors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contextual factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule flexibility</td>
<td>High work demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work</td>
<td>Unsupportive work-life balance culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/control</td>
<td>Long working hours at the office, out of business hours and attending work-related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and colleague support</td>
<td>High home demands and hours spent on home duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive work-life balance culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal factors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefit activities (time spent in self-care and leisure activities)</td>
<td>Emotional instability, self-blame and disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-regard (core self-evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness, active coping and accessing instrumental and emotional support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance management strategies e.g., time management, planning, organising, setting limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of perceived work-life balance</th>
<th>Indicators of lack of perceived work-life balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher levels of work-family and family-work facilitation</td>
<td>Higher levels of work-family and family-work conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive outcomes of perceived work-life balance**

- Life, job and career satisfaction
- Personal wellbeing
- Higher self-rated performance
- Mental health

**Negative outcomes of lack of perceived work-life balance**

- Intention to leave the legal profession
- Mental ill-health

Source: Developed by the researcher for this thesis.

The enablers of perceived work-life balance are presented in the column on the left-hand side, reflecting a range of contextual and personal contributing factors. Further, the study
has shown that work-family and family-work facilitation are indicators of the levels of perceived work-life balance experienced by individuals – higher levels of facilitation are associated with higher levels of perceived work-life balance. In addition, perceived work-life balance was found to be related to a range of positive outcomes such as life, job and career satisfaction, wellbeing, mental health and work performance.

On the other hand, barriers are presented in the right-hand column showing that contextual characteristics such as high levels of perceived demands at work and at home and personal factors related to disposition and coping style and strategies are contributing factors. Further, the study has shown that work-family and family-work conflict are indicators of the levels of perceived work-life balance experienced by individuals – higher levels of conflict are associated with lower levels of perceived work-life balance. In addition, lack of perceived work-life balance was found to be related to a range of negative outcomes such as mental ill-health and the intention to leave the legal profession. In broad terms, the reason for undertaking this research was to make contributions to knowledge, theory and practice in the area of work-life balance and to provide insights into successfully managing the work and personal life interface in a way that is of value to individuals and organisations alike. The main contributions of this research are put forward in the next section, followed by the implications of the findings, a discussion of the study’s limitations and suggestions for future research directions.
7.4 Research Contributions

According to Greenhaus and Powell (2006), the state of work-life research calls for a variety of new methodologies, development of new measures, and continued exploration of theoretical frameworks. In particular, this study has endeavoured to answer the call for continued exploration of theoretical frameworks by proposing and testing an integrated conceptual model of perceived work-life balance. In so doing, the present research contributes to the work-life literature in a number of ways as outlined below.

First, by including a theoretically-based and psychometrically sound measure to study work-life balance the current research provides one of the few opportunities in work-life research to report on both the antecedents and consequences of work-life balance using a validated measure, rather than using the ‘proxy’ measures of conflict or facilitation. As noted by Carlson et al. (2009, p. 1462) “a theoretically-based measure is a necessary cornerstone for research in this area”. To that end, this research lends support to Joplin et al.’s (2003b) measure of life balance and to van Steenbergen et al.’s (2007) measures of work-family and family-work conflict and facilitation.

Second and importantly, the current research makes a contribution to conceptual and empirical clarity in the work-life field by demonstrating the distinction between work-life balance, conflict and facilitation. In addition, this study examined the utility of a new model of perceived work-life balance (see Figure 6.2). The explanatory power of the model indicates that the use of conflict and facilitation together, provides a better prediction of perceived work-life balance than either one alone. This is important because conceptual confusion and a lack of distinction between constructs in the study of
work-life balance has contributed to confusion in the literature which is considered to have undermined the development of useful theoretical models of the work-family interface to date (Carlson et al. 2009).

Third, few studies have sought to explore successful work-life balance (Clark 2001; Marks & MacDermid 1996). However, the current study moves the research focus away from conflict to learning more about the positive side of the work-family interface, including an investigation of the effective strategies used by study participants to improve their perception of work-life balance. The reason why this is important is because the current findings indicate that work-life balance does matter. The present research provides support for the claim that individuals who experience higher levels of perceived work-life balance are more satisfied with their lives, their careers and their jobs and benefit from higher levels of personal wellbeing and psychological health. From an employer’s perspective, these individuals are also less likely to want to leave the legal profession and are more likely to be better performing employees judging from participants’ self-rated reports of work performance.

Fourth, the current research recognises the bi-directional relationship between work and home – work affects home and home affects work (Bronfenbrenner 1986; Carlson et al. 2006; Clark 2001; Frone 2003; Greenhaus & Powell 2006; Wayne et al. 2007). This perspective theorises that work, family and individual characteristics interact in ways that may be facilitative and conflictual (Frone 2003; Hill 2005). In addition, the demands-and-resources model proved to be useful to illuminate the characteristics of work and home and how they influence the lives of individuals, giving consideration to the degree
to which contextual and personal characteristics act as demands and resources (Pocock et al. 2009). Conceptualising work and home as characterised by demands and resources that combine in complex ways to either facilitate or inhibit work-life balance created the opportunity to better understand the relationship between work and home.

Fifth, with the inclusion of personality trait measures and their association with coping style, the current study adds to the empirical research which supports the link between dispositional variables and the work-family interface and the influence of personality on how individuals perceive and respond to situations (Andreassi & Thompson 2007; Beauregard 2006; Boyar & Mosley 2007; Bruck & Allen 2003; Carlson 1999; Friede & Ryan 2005; McNall & Michel 2010; Rotondo & Kincaid 2008; Sumer & Knight 2001; Wayne et al. 2004). In addition, the results of the current study reveal an overlap between the coping style and strategies used by individuals as a usual way of dealing with stress and as a way of managing the work-home interface, such as active coping and accessing support from others. However, there are also strategies that are specific to achieving work-life balance such as boundary management strategies.

Last, this research has made a valuable contribution to the work-life research from an Australian perspective. The results support those of the most recent Australian Work and Life Index (Skinner & Pocock 2010), in particular the finding that circumstances that increase demands include having more caring responsibilities; an unsupportive supervisor or workplace culture; working longer hours; having a poor quality job with little control and having little flexibility about when and how one works. In addition, the inclusion of the Australian Wellbeing Index provided an informative benchmark for comparisons
between the study sample and the national norms to be made with regard to the important
dependent variables of life satisfaction and personal wellbeing. Importantly, perceived
work-life balance was found to be a strong predictor of both these outcome variables – a
relationship which has not previously been determined.

7.5 Research Implications

A number of implications emerge as a result of this study and they are discussed in this
section. The implications are examined at four different levels of analysis: the societal
level, the organisational level, the individual level and the inter-personal level. The
societal level of analysis focuses on society at large and the socialisation practices that
develop from it, such as the expectations and stereotypes regarding appropriate roles and
behaviour for men and women. The organisational level of analysis focuses on the
organisation's policies and practices that may influence employees' work-life balance.
The individual level of analysis focuses on the characteristics that the individual brings to
the situation. Finally, the inter-personal level of analysis focuses on inter-personal
relationships that may have an impact upon an individual’s perceived work-life balance
(Ragins & Sundstrom 1989).

7.5.1 The societal level of analysis

From a societal level of analysis, the current research indicates that there is room for
improvement when it comes to our attitudes towards gender roles, that is, the “traditional
beliefs about what role behaviours are appropriate for members of each sex” (Powell &
Greenhaus 2010, p. 1012). Some appear to be stuck in the 1950s belief that women’s
proper place is in the home and men’s is in the workplace with women in this study taking the main responsibility for home and childcare duties and men working longer hours. Milkie and Peltola (1999) explored the complex area of gender, roles and work-family balance finding that the combination of full-time employment and young children was ‘imbalancing’ for women because of the demands related to meeting children’s needs. More than a decade later, the current study reflects the challenge that women face as a result of gender role expectations.

Also at a broader level is the international trend towards an increase in part-time work which has become one of the most frequently used flexible work arrangements in Australia to support work-life balance, particularly for women (Bardoel, Tharenou & Ristov 2000; Bardoel, Morgan & Santos 2007; McDonald et al. 2009). Bardoel et al. (2007) and McDonald et al. (2009) report concern about the quality of part-time jobs and the potential disadvantages to women as a result of lower wages, reduced responsibilities, lesser access to high status roles and projects, lack of access to training and promotion opportunities, increased work intensity and poor workplace support. The results of the current study show a positive relationship between part-time work and perceived work-life balance which may reflect that these particular participants experience ‘quality’ part-time work (Bardoel et al. 2007; McDonald et al. 2009) as a result of voluntary, permanent or long-term contracts. Nevertheless, the quality of part-time work and women’s tendency towards it as a work-life balance strategy appears to warrant greater attention (McDonald et al. 2009).
In addition, it appears that there is room for improvement when it comes to the attitudes of employers and the creation of workplace cultures that are positive towards achieving work-life balance. In particular, women more than men in this study perceived their workplaces as unsupportive of work-life balance which is consistent with previous research (Taylor 2010). A further area of concern which continues to be raised nationally (Skinner & Pocock 2010) and internationally (Bianchi & Milkie 2010) is the issue of long working hours and high levels of work demands.

Results from this research show the two factors to be significant predictors of work-family conflict. While the long working hours culture needs to be addressed at a societal level, the results of this study do show that the personal strategies of time management, setting limits, planning and organising are associated with higher levels of perceived work-life balance indicating that individuals can impact upon their own situation.

7.5.2 The organisational level of analysis

In addition to the implications outlined above, this study has implications for those who have an interest in developing the work-life balance of employees, such as managers, human resource management professionals and occupational bodies.

From a human resource management perspective the demands-and-resources framework has utility. Bailyn (2006) concluded that redesigning work so as to increase employees' resources for meeting work and family demands offers great promise for enhancing satisfaction with work-family balance. Similarly, Pitt-Catsouphes et al. (2007) asserted that human resources professionals can enhance the effectiveness of work-life policies and programs by assessing the extent of demands, the availability of resources and the
effectiveness of adaptive strategies and tactics that employees use at home and work to fulfil their responsibilities.

The availability of a validated measure of work-life balance that can be used to evaluate the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of programs designed to promote work-life balance together with the evidence that work-life balance is a predictor of job and career satisfaction, intentions to leave the legal profession and self-rated performance makes for a stronger ‘business case’ for organisations to support employees in combining work and family through work-life balance initiatives (van Steenbergen & Ellemers 2009).

Certainly, the results of the current research indicate that training programs may be effective interventions. Ilies et al. (2009) found that training employees in how to segment their work and family roles, especially when their jobs are frustrating or dissatisfying can minimise the negative impact of their work evaluations on their personal wellbeing. Similarly, Fenner and Renn’s (2010) work shows time management (setting goals and priorities) and boundary management to be effective in helping families where technology-assisted working from home has the potential to have a negative impact in the home domain and Sanz-Vergel et al.’s (2010) results point to the importance of examining strategies that help individuals face stressful situations and to feel recovered. These skills can be learned and training programs may be developed which are aimed at providing people with skills to help them deal with daily stressors and to recover from them (e.g., relaxation strategies and psychological detachment).

Training managers to be more supportive of their employees’ work-life balance was found to be a simple and effective route to improving employee health and satisfaction,
according to Kossek and Hammer’s (2008) study. The training focused on providing emotional support (e.g., acknowledging employees responsibilities outside work); structural support (e.g., working with employees ahead of time to resolve scheduling conflicts); modelling healthful behaviour (e.g., showing it is acceptable attend important family functions during work hours) and partnering with other managers to address work-life issues through initiatives like inter-departmental cross-training.

A major implication of this study for professional and occupational bodies lies in their ability to support their members. The Queensland Law Society is a body which is committed to improving the work-life balance of its members as evidenced by their engagement with the current research and the Proctor articles contained in Appendix B.

The results of this research highlight the need for such support as a third of the participants reported experiencing symptoms of depression. Given the association that was found between perceived work-life balance and mental health, access to counselling and support is imperative for those at risk, in particular, women who have high levels of work and home demands and a tendency towards emotional instability, self-blame and disengagement and men with high work demands, working excessive hours who may not be as likely as women to access support.

7.5.3 The individual level of analysis

From an individual’s perspective, O’Driscoll et al. (2006) suggest that any intervention needs to be based upon an assessment or audit of the demands and resources present, along with their impact on a person’s life. Quick et al. (2004) emphasise that employees need to take an active role in managing their own work responsibilities, family
obligations and self-imposed expectations by understanding the source of the demands that lead to conflict, making appropriate choices and using a range of strategies. In particular, the current research points strongly to the effectiveness of a whole range of work-life balance management strategies: engagement in personal benefit activities such as spending time in leisure, self-care and healthy lifestyle activities; time management (e.g., reducing hours spent on certain tasks and demands and prioritising other activities); setting limits (e.g., avoiding taking on new tasks; limit personal and family commitments), planning and organising (e.g., implementing systems, use a diary); changing attitudes (e.g., lower expectations of what is achievable); increasing flexibility (e.g., change work schedule); increasing involvement from spouse/partner; change lifestyle (e.g., downshift, reduce mortgage); engaging in personal or professional development activities (e.g., coaching, mentoring, training programs); increasing support from family members, friends, work colleagues; utilising technology and hired help (see Table 6.5).

One of the major implications of this study for individuals lies in their being able to better understand their own dispositions and coping behaviour. The results of this study concur with the suggestion made by Parasuraman and Greenhaus (2002) that a more systematic examination of psychological individual difference variables may help us to better understand their contributions to the work-family interface. A further examination of the role of personality characteristics such as core self-evaluations and conscientiousness in empowering individuals to manage work-life balance is warranted. An understanding of the personal and contextual factors that potentially contribute to achieving or hindering work-life balance is a necessary first step to changing behaviour. Positive feedback was
received from respondents who participated in the survey and attended the seminar presentation of the study results indicating that re-evaluating their personal circumstances and learning about practical strategies helped them to improve their work-life balance.

7.5.4 The inter-personal level of analysis

From an inter-personal level of analysis, both the qualitative and the quantitative results outlined in this research clearly show the importance of personal relationships and social support, in line with previous research (Adams et al. 1996; Byron 2005; Erdwins et al. 2001; Gordon & Whelan-Berry 2004; Greenhaus & Parasuraman 1994; Nelson & Brice 2008; Thoits 1995). The extent to which a person has access to support at work and in the family can be critical to improving perceived work-life balance. In the current study those reporting higher levels of perceived work-life balance reported higher levels of support from their spouse/partner, family, friends and work colleagues. In addition, the results of this research also support the notion that accessing support is an effective coping mechanism (Wallace 2004). However, gender differences indicate that it is women who are more likely than men to get support from others, in particular emotional and instrumental support. Further, of interest is the finding that participants in this study were unlikely to utilise hired help as a work-life balance management strategy.

These results suggest that it is important for individuals to build and to access strong support networks at work and at home through their relationships with others, if they are to achieve work-life balance. Interventions that teach working adults how to enhance support may be of great benefit, particularly for men whose tendency may not be to seek support from others.
Limitations of the Research

This study is not without limitations and while they do not seriously detract from the findings, they are acknowledged and warrant specific mention.

The first limitation relates to the nature of the occupation chosen. This study is limited to Australian lawyers who belong to one professional body, namely, the Queensland Law Society. The legal profession is particularly demanding and difficulties encountered in attempting to balance work and personal life are a source of stress and dissatisfaction (Neal 2010; Wallace 1999). The results of the current research may have utility for other occupations such as those found to be associated with high levels of work-family conflict, namely, police, fire-fighters and family and medical practitioners (Dierdorff & Ellington 2008). However, generalisability of the findings such as the efficacy of work-life balance management strategies utilised by the participants in the current study is uncertain, warranting further research involving participants from a broader range of occupations.

Secondly, the study is limited by the sampling frame which was drawn from respondents who were more than likely motivated to participate in the research because of their interest in the topic of work-life balance or the desire to gain credit towards professional development. The issue of non-responders in studies potentially undermines the randomness of the sample because those not interested in the topic will already have been rejected by the sampling procedure which is a limitation acknowledged in the current research (Clark-Carter 2004).
Thirdly, with regard to methodology a cross-sectional design was chosen for the current study as time and resources were limited. The use of a cross-sectional design does not lend itself to conclusions about causality. In addition, the findings rely on single-source data that could result in common method variance (Carlson et al. 2009). While the use of structural equation modelling has facilitated the examination and simultaneous testing of multi-dimensional relationships the techniques used could be considered an improvement on studies that have simply analysed bivariate correlations or undertaken linear regression. However, methods used in the work-life field are becoming increasingly more sophisticated. Recent studies have included the use of longitudinal and time-lagged designs, multi-method and multi-source approaches and the use of daily diary study designs (e.g., Butler et al. 2005).

The final limitation relates to the selection of variables for the study. The variables which appeared to provide the most effective antecedents and outcomes for testing the proposed model of work-life balance were selected, guided by the literature review. However, this has meant that other variables which have been studied in the work-life field have been precluded from the current study, for example, life stage (e.g., Emslie & Hunt 2009) and generational effects (e.g., Beutell & Wittig-Berman 2008). In addition, it would appear from the current study that the antecedents of family-work facilitation have not been well established by research to date and more research is needed in this area if we are to understand the personal and contextual factors that contribute to the work-family interface in a positive way.
7.7 Further Research

Work-life research has been criticised for the failure to develop new conceptual models and for continuing to test previously established relationships among variables (Bardoel et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2007). In answer to this criticism, the present research integrated theory building and theory testing. Theory building included a thorough and comprehensive desk study. Theory testing involved quantitative analysis of survey data for empirical model verification and qualitative analysis to explore the area of work-life balance management strategies.

The model put forward in this thesis provides a useful conceptual framework for integrating current theory in the work-life field and the propositions were supported empirically. However, the presence of variables that span both the work and home domains and the many direct and indirect relationships among the variables makes the model extremely complicated. As a result, the current study supports the findings of recent studies suggesting a more direct approach to measuring the antecedents and outcomes of work-life balance.

For example, Michel et al. (2009) concluded that the inclusion of conflict and facilitation as mediators in the model complicates our understanding of the antecedents of work-life balance and it would be preferable to remove them from the model. Michel et al. (2009) undertook a comprehensive meta-analysis of over twenty years of work-family conflict, conducting a series of path analyses to compare and contrast work-family conflict models. They developed a new model which excluded work-family conflict as the mediator between antecedent and outcome variables finding a more parsimonious model.
that still accounted for a significant amount of variance in outcome variables, concluding that “results indicate that direct effects drive work-family conflict models while indirect effects provide little incremental explanation in regards to satisfaction outcomes” (Michel et al. 2009, p. 199).

In addition, Beham and Drobnč (2010) examined the relationships between various work demands and resources with work-to-family conflict and work-family balance in a sample of German office workers. The present study concurs with the theoretical and empirical approach taken by Beham and Drobnč (2010) who noted the lack of research conducted on employees’ direct assessment of work-family balance. These researchers found support for a mediated model where work-to-family conflict partially mediated the relationships between job demands and their negative relationship with work-life balance satisfaction. Of note, job resources were found to be positively related to satisfaction with work-family balance after controlling for work-to-family conflict, suggesting that resource characteristics may have direct associations with perceptions of work-life balance (Beham & Drobnč 2010).

Given that work-life balance is now able to be measured directly with a validated, multi-item measure, it is recommended that future research investigate the relationships among antecedent variables and work-life balance without including the mediating effects of conflict and facilitation. An experimental regression analysis is shown in Appendix 6.19 including antecedent variables established as significant in the current research (control variables, demand characteristics, resource characteristics, work-life balance management strategies and core self-evaluations). These variables together account for 58% of the
variance in work-life balance and demonstrate a less complicated model without the inclusion of mediating variables.

It would seem that the preoccupation with work-family conflict and the proliferation of other work-family constructs has diverted attention away from simply measuring work-life balance itself. It is also apparent from this study that we need to bring consensus into the discourse about what we are measuring when it comes to work-life balance. As noted by Carlson et al. (2009, p. 1479) “researchers should avoid the temptation to assume that all indicators of work-family experiences are equivalent to ‘balance’, and instead use theory to solidly ground their empirical measurement decisions”. Agreement on a valid, universally adopted measure and taking a direct approach would enable more research time and energy to be put into discovering what helps rather than what hinders the achievement of perceived work-life balance.

In conclusion, it is evident that work-life balance is a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon. At an individual level, employees should be encouraged to be pro-active in the management of their own work-life balance by taking into account their particular set of personal characteristics, demands and available resources and to utilise a range of effective strategies. Despite the presence of multiple work and home demands, many participants in the current study showed themselves to be active agents in creating successful work-life balance and were found to benefit from higher levels of life, job and career satisfaction, general wellbeing and mental health and self-rated work performance.

At an organisational level, participants in the current research revealed that success at managing the work-life interface is often dependent upon contextual factors, in particular,
responsive workplaces where the culture and management are supportive, lifestyle-friendly programs are available and jobs are characterised by reasonable work hours and a degree of flexibility and autonomy. The benefit of this holistic approach lies in its recognition that the responsibility for achieving work-life balance is shared by both the organisation and the individual. At a societal level, it appears that we need to continue to address the imbalances that still exist between men and women on the domestic front and in the workplace.
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