The relationship between work and non-work support and work-life balance in Taiwan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Social Science in Psychology at the University of Waikato

By

Ruby (Yi-Ju) Chang

Te Whare Wananga o Waikato

The University of Waikato

2009

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore the relationship between employees' supportive resource (workplace support and non-work support) and their work-life balance in Taiwan. The roles of work-life balance's four components (work-to-life conflict, life-to-work conflict, work-to-life facilitation, and life-to-work facilitation) in the relationship between support and employee outcomes (psychological wellbeing, turnover intention, affective- and continuance organizational commitment) were examined.

Eight-hundred surveys were distributed to for-profit and non-profit sectors. After eliminating the invalid questionnaires, 658 valid questionnaires were used for further analysis. The findings of this study suggested that three kinds of support (organizational support, supervisor support, and non-work support) were positively related to employees' work-life balance. However, no significant relationship was found between the availability and usage of the work-life balance policies and employees' work-life balance. More importantly, it was found that work-life balance and four components mediate the relationship between supervisor support and all employee outcomes. The relationship between employees' awareness of the policies that organization offered and favourable employee outcomes is also mediated by work-life balance. Interestingly, the availability and usage of the policies were not found to be related to either employees' better work-life balance or favourable employee outcomes. It is thus recommended that emphasizing supervisor support might be a better option than introducing various work-life balance policies for employees to achieve a better work-life balance. Otherwise, the work-life balance policies offered have to meet employees' needs.

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank all of the employees who volunteered to participate in this study. Also my thanks is extended to the people I dealt with in each sectors, for allowing this data collection to be carried out efficiently and their effort involved in distributing the questionnaires.

Secondly, I would like to thank my supervisor Mike O'Driscoll who spent many hours reading and reviewing this thesis, and always replied my enquiries with supporting, encouraging and inspiring word from the beginning to the completion of this thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge Donald Cable who read many drafts and Jim Fulton who is always willing to spent extra time and gave me excellent feedback whenever needed. My thanks to all those that have had accompanied me during the year and provide much needed support and encouragement to keep me going on.

Finally I would like to thank my parents and Fiona for all the love and support they provided, I would not have achieved so far without their support.

Table of content

List of tables

List of appendices

Chapter one

Introduction

Work-family or work-life balance has been of increasing interest in the past few years. Breakspear and Hamilton (2004) suggested that employees nowadays seek a more balanced life and an employee without good well-being could be counterproductive to both the organization and other colleagues. Moreover, Hughes and Bozionelos (2007) in their exploratory study on male bus drivers demonstrated that an imbalance between work and life was associated with job dissatisfaction, high turnover intentions, and absenteeism.

Many organizations try to attract and retain good employees by making their lives easier. Some deliver ready-cooked meals to an employee's door in the evening (Financial Times, 2000). Some offer haircuts, cut-price sushi, and free ergonomic chairs (Financial Times, 2000). The benefits of working at Google ranged from free food to gym membership (Potter, 2007). First Tennessee bank offered their employees a $130 cash bonus if they are seen to be practicing ten specified healthy behaviour patterns (Financial Times, 2000). Those benefits or policies the organization offered were aimed to help employees achieve a better balance between their work and life domains. However, some research indicated that more factors needed to be taken into account than just providing policies alone to achieve a better work-life balance (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2004; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2006).

<u>Work-life balance</u>

The term 'work-life balance' has been widely discussed but it has not been clearly defined. Frone (2003) suggested that people may be involved in multiple roles outside their family life (e.g. leisure roles and community roles). The term 'work-life balance' is more inclusive than 'work-family balance', where balance exists in the latter between work role and family role only. Because most research has focused on 'work-family balance', not much of it clearly distinguishes the term 'work-life balance' from it.

Some researchers defined work-life balance in a different term than just focusing on family role. Blunsdon, Blyton, Reed, and Dastmalchian (2006) suggested that work-life balance means that an individual can manage both work and other aspects of their life, such as the domestic or family sphere, without a conflict or without the opposition of one domain to the other. Guest (2002) believed that work-life balance should be defined in both subjective and objective terms, whereby the subjective measure is the individual's subjective perception of individuals' balance between work and the rest of life and the objective measure is the consequence of behaviour, for example, time devoted to work or other demands.

On the other hand, some research pointed out that work-life facilitation may be the second component of work-life balance (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 1992). Work-life conflict refers to the negative reciprocal relationships existing between work and life domains, whereas work-life facilitation refers to the positive reciprocal relationships. Blunsdon et al. (2006) suggested that work-life balance exists when there is no conflict between domains. However, other studies

suggested that work-life facilitation helps to achieve a balance between the two domains (Van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007). Moreover, Frone (2003) has also suggested that both conflict and facilitation must be considered. I believed that a complete balance involved both work-life conflict and work-life facilitation.

The present study

This study aimed to explore the relationship between organizational culture, the policies the organizations offered and employees' work-life balance. The research was conducted in Taiwan, one of the Four Asian Tigers, which refers to four regions which maintained high growth rate and rapid industrialization between early 1960 and 1990s (IMF, 2008). Furthermore, this study also aimed to discover employees' perception of balance in both for-profit and non-profit sectors.

The number of non-profit organizations in Taiwan increased rapidly since 1980. Most up-to-date research that is related to work-life balance topic has focused on the for-profit organizations. The employees of for-profit and non-profit sectors might behave differently from each other, as the two sectors differ from each other in their mission and approach. Mirvis and Hackett (1983) found that employees in for-profit sector rate their benefits, wages and find their extrinsic reward to be based more upon their performance, whereas Hansmann (1980) and Rose-Ackerman (1996) suggested that employees of non-profit sectors are motivated by an intrinsic value such as idea, vision or quality of the product rather than monetary reward. The employees of non-profit sectors were found to have greater autonomy, task variety and they were also more committed to their job than employees in for-profit sectors (Mirvis & Hackett, 1983). In contrast, Goulet and Frank (2002) found that employees in the

for-profit sector were more committed to their organizations than were employees working in non-profit organization (NPO). Furthermore, higher job satisfaction was also found in non-profit sectors compare to for-profit sectors (Benz, 2005; Mirivis, 2006). Thus, it is worthwhile to discover the work-life balance of employees of NPO as the different nature of NPO sector might lead to different results from the employees of for-profit sectors.

The reasons to conduct this study in Taiwan were firstly it was my home-country, where the idea of 'work-life balance' has been introduced recently (Tsai, 2006) and the relationship between it and an organization's culture is yet to be discovered. Secondly, the study was also conducted to see if the western findings could be generalized to Taiwanese samples. Lu et al. (2009) compared Taiwanese and British samples and found that some results were nicely generalized, while others produced differences; they found that supervisory support had a stronger effect on Taiwanese than on British employees.

In addition, this study is significant for its focus on the relationship between 'the work-life balance of work and non-work' rather than 'work and family balance'. The term- 'family' describes the relationship excluding single peoples' life. According to National Statistics in Taiwan (2008), there were about 43% females and 49% males over age of 15 years old remaining unmarried in 2007; this means that one out of every two people remained single. The median age at entering first marriage of Taiwanese women delayed to 27.7 in 2007 compare to 25.7 in 1998, whereas age of 28.8 in 1998 to 30.3 in 2007 for man (Ministry of Interior, 2008). The marrying age has been delayed in Taiwan. Marriage has become a choice rather than a destination in life nowadays.

Theoretical model

This study measured the balance between work and life from two aspects: work-to-life and life-to-work. The theoretical frame of this research contains three parts: resources, mediators, and criterion variables. The resources described the variables (e.g. organizational support) which contribute to the situation and associated with the occurrence of mediators (e.g. work-life conflict), which then contribute more or less to the appearance of criterion variables (e.g. turnover intention). For example, a work-life balance supportive culture (resource) in an organization is expected to associate with less conflict (mediator) which arises between employees' work and private life domains, and this is expected to relate to employees' less likelihood to leave the job (criterion variable).

The resource variables are: the awareness, usage and availability of organizational WLB policy (details in the following section), organizational support, supervisor support, and non-work support. The mediators are: work-life balance, work-to-life conflict, life-to-work conflict, life-to-work facilitation and work-to-life facilitation. The criterion variables are: organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological well-being. Figure 1 shows the model for this research:

Figure 1

Theoretical model

| Resource variables | Mediators | Criterion variables |

Organizational WLB policy awareness

Organizational WLB policy

Organizational WLB policy usage

Organizational support

Supervisor support

Non-work support

Work Life Balance

Work-to-life facilitation

Work-to-life conflict

Life-to-work facilitation

Life-to-work conflict

Organizational commitment

Psychological well-being

Turnover intention

The resource variables

Resources that an employee may be able to access include the resources in the workplace or in the community as well as at home or in the non-work domain. This research categorized the resources by identifying them separately as those in the workplace and those in non-work place. Resources that may be available at employees' workplace include organizational policies, benefits and direct supervisors, while the resources available in the non-work places include assistance provided by friends, members of the immediate family, and members of the extended family. Family members are often the employees' primary source of social support.

House (1981) suggests that social support is the perceived flow of informational, emotional, appraisal, and instrumental help from different sources. Different forms and sources of social support have been identified; two types of support seen as being relevant to the context of work-life balance are instrumental support and informational/emotional support. Instrumental support includes those tangible helping behaviors such as borrowing money from friends. Emotional support refers to information, advice, affirmation or affection, and concern for the receiver's welfare (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1994). Thus, high instrumental support from the work domain can reduce the burden in the work-role, and enable an individual to devote more time to the work role, equally high instrumental support from the life domain can reduce the burden in the non-work role, and enable an individual to devote more time to the non-work role. High emotional support can enhance individuals' feelings of self-efficacy and thus decrease the perceived severity of work-life conflict.

Social support in prior research (Billings & Moos, 1982; Rudd & McKerny, 1986; Sekaran, 1985) suggests that support received in one domain, such as the non-work domain, may enhance well-being within the other domain, such as the work domain. Most literature also examines the buffering effect of social support on individuals' well-being (Beehr, King & King, 1990; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Greenberger & O'Neil, 1993). However, Carlson and Perrew (1999) suggest there is a 'direct' effect of social support from work colleagues and family members rather than just a buffering effect. They believed that it is better to consider social support as an antecedent rather than as a resource which alleviates the negative effects of stressors such as work-life conflict. They further divided social support into work support and non-work support; in this research work support is described as the organizational support (e.g. work-life balance policy provided to the employees) and supervisor support, whereas non-work support describes support received from anyone and in any form as long as it is outside the workplace.

Workplace support

Support received from a workplace could be from a variety of forms: organizational support, supervisor support and organizational policies the company offered. Recent studies support the view that workplace cultures and initiatives which openly address and support work and family issues may result in valued organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment and lower turnover intentions (Brough, O'Driscoll, & Kalliath, 2005; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness. 1999).

When it comes to define the term 'work-life balance policy' (WLB policy),

some defined it as where an organization uses practices as a tool to assist employees managing the balance in their life between work and family (Eaton, 2003; Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Thompson et al., 1999). Given that this research focused on the balance between work and the off-work domain, the work-life balance policy was defined as the policy which aimed to achieve a better balance between employees' work and life, for example, flextime was offered for employees to have a better control in their time management between work and non-work domains. Detailed information of WLB policies is discussed in the Method chapter.

Many studies suggested that organizations could enhance productivity, reduce employees' stress level, absenteeism, annual medical expense such as health care and medical insurance by applying work-life balance policies efficiently (Smith & Gardner, 2007; Pine, 1994). To make the most out of an efficient policy implementation is to clearly announce the policy, make the policy useful and available to the employees. Wang (2004) suggested two main points that would encourage an organization to adapt work-life balance policies: 1) at an organizational level, applying policies would increase productivity and earn a good business reputation; 2) at an individual level, motivation would increase employees' organizational commitment and loyalty, and help them deal with work-life balance related needs in terms of achieving better performance at work. In sum, the awareness, availabilities and usage of the organizational WLB policy is expected to relate to a better balance between employees' work and non-work domains.

Hypothesis 1a: There will be a positive relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policies and work-life balance.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be a positive relationship between availabilities of the organizational WLB policies and work-life balance.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be a positive relationship between usage of the organizational WLB policies and work-life balance.

Even though WLB policy is expected to bring better balance in employees, some literature showed different opinions on the topic of reasons for applying WLB policy to the workplace (Felstead et al., 2002; Goodstein, 1994; Wood, 1999). The ideas were based on an institutional theory and believed that organizations could be under pressure to achieve social legitimacy, so they apply the policy because of the social norms, social expectations (Goodstein, 1994). Furthermore, some believed that organizations might expect to do so in order to gain higher organizational commitment from the employees.

Generally, research on organizational support showed that employees believed their organization valued their contribution and cares about their wellbeing (Eisenberger, Huntington, Huchinson, & sowa, 1986). Some studies suggested that an organization's culture can inhibit the implementation, availability, and the usage of the work-life balance policy. Allen and Russell (1999) suggested that employees might face negative consequences such as being regarded as less committed to the organization if they visibly show interest in family or personal life. A study showed that managerial advancement was associated with working long hours (Judge et al., 1995). Judiesch and Lyness (1999) found taking family-related leaves of absence was negatively related to subsequent performance ratings, promotions, and size of salary increases for female managers.

As the work-life balance policy aims to help employees manage multiple work and non-work responsibilities, organizational level support appears to be important within the context of work-life balance supportive environment. Thompson, Beauvaiz and Lyness (1999) defined a supportive 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 [non-work] lives." (p. 394). In other words, this culture does not prioritize work above other aspects of employees' life. They believed that employees believe that their careers will not be negatively affected by using WLB policies (Thompson et al., 1999). Furthermore, the workplace support (e.g. organizational support) would be seen as work-related coping resource rather than as a source of conflict (Warren & Phyllis, 1995).

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived organizational support will be positively related to the awareness of the WLB policies.

Hypothesis 2b: Perceived organizational support will be positively related to the availabilities of the WLB policies.

Hypothesis 2c: Perceived organizational support will be positively related to the usage of the WLB policies.

Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that employees whose supervisors supported their efforts to balance work and family were less likely to experience work–family conflict. Supervisor support is as important as having a supportive work-life organizational culture. Thompson et al (1999) found that perceptions of a supportive work-family culture were related to employees' use of work-life balance policies. They

also found that supervisor support was the strongest predictor of work-life balance policy use. They stated that the supervisor is a key role of influencing employee's decisions in using the work-life balance policy because they may encourage or discourage employees from using the policy. Furthermore, they may undermine employees' effort to achieve a better balance between two domains by reinforcing the cultural norms that go against taking advantage of those policies.

Hypothesis 3a: Supervisor support will be positively related to the awareness of the WLB policies' availability and usage.

Hypothesis 3b: Supervisor support will be positively related to the availabilities of the WLB policies.

Hypothesis 3c: Supervisor support will be positively related to the usage of the WLB policies' availability and usage.

In addition, Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman (1996) studied employed parents and found that greater organizational and supervisor support were positively related to better outcomes such as less conflict and stress. Grant-Vallone and Ensher (2001) found that employees who perceived higher levels of organizational support were less likely to report high levels of work-to-life conflict. There is much research to suggest that supervisor support is a strong predictor in reducing conflict between work and non-work life, whereby the existence of supervisor support reduces stress and lack of support increases stress (Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Clark (2001) advocates that supervisor support not only reduces conflict between work and non-work domain, but it also helps individuals to achieve a better balance between

the two domains. Nichol (2004) also found that having a family-supportive supervisor is associated with less work-to-family and family-to-work conflict.

On the other hand, Voydanoff (2004) found that both organizational and supervisor support show significant positive relationships to work-to-family facilitation. Therefore in the present study, the employees receiving support from the workplace were expected to have less conflict and to have one role facilitate another while receiving support from both organization and supervisor. Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1999) suggest that a supportive work environment may enhance employee flexibility, information, and direct help that will facilitate the integration of work and non-work roles. One study also found a weak positive relationship between work-to-family facilitation and the supportive work-family culture in the workplace (Hammer, Colton, Caubet, & Brockwood, 2002). Therefore, workplace support is related to employees' work-life facilitation while reduce role conflict arise from two domains.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and work-life conflict.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and work-life facilitation.

Hypothesis 6: There will be a negative relationship between supervisor support and work-life conflict.

Hypothesis 7: There will be a positive relationship between supervisor support and

work-life facilitation.

Non-work support

Burke (1988) found that social support in the non-work domain may result in less work-family conflict. Holohan and Gilbert (1979) also agree that support from the family has been found to play an important role in reducing work-family conflict. Non-work support in past literature has been focused a great deal on spouse support, whereas support received from friends or other members in the community received much less attention. In a study of dual-earner couples, Greenberger and O'Neil (1993) found that men's well-being was mainly associated with the social support from their wives, whereas women's well-being was linked to social support from husbands and wider relationships such as neighbors. Barnett, Marshall, and Pleck (1992) also suggest that full-time-employed men in dual-earner couples receive less negative influence from the psychological distress associated with poor job quality if they have positive relationships with their wives, children, or both. Previous findings found that interpersonal strengths, such as empathy and helping others (Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, & King, 2002) and emotional or practical support received through family relationships (Frame & Shehan, 1994; Ruderman et al., 2002), benefited work life.

Overall, the main social support received from the non-work domain that mostly has been studied in the past literature is the support received from members of the immediate family. This type of support is associated with reducing individuals' work-life conflict, and enhancing in psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 8: There will be a negative relationship between non-work support and life-to-work conflict.

Hypothesis 9: Life-to-work conflict will mediate the relationship between non-work support and psychological well-being.

No known studies have clearly used the term non-work support to point out the relationship between non-work support and work-life facilitation. However, Adams et al. (1996) found that higher levels of family emotional and instrumental social support were associated with lower levels of family and work interference. Furthermore, O'Driscoll et al. (2003) also indicated that family-to-work interference is associated with reduced levels of family support; and that family support reduces the negative effect of family-to-work interference. They also found that family support is consistently related with decreased symptoms of psychological strain and increased family satisfaction. Therefore, having support from the non-work domain (e.g. family) can reduce both individuals' stress and the interference between work and non-work domains. This relationship has constituted the function of life-to-work facilitation, as non-work support enhances individuals' psychological well-being in the work domain.

Moreover, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) suggest a theoretical premise, which was examined and supported by Hill et al.'s (2007) qualitative exploration, that psychological benefits obtained in Role A (family) can enhance cognitive functioning, motivation, interpersonal activity, and commitment in Role B (work). Thus, according to the theory, social support which generates psychological well-being in non-work

role can enhance the well-being in the work role as well as increasing individuals'

commitment to the employing organization.

Hypothesis 10: There will be a positive relationship between non-work support and

life-to-work facilitation.

Hypothesis 11a: Life-to-work facilitation will mediate the relationship between

non-work support and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 11b: Life-to-work facilitation will mediate the relationship between

non-work support and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 11c: Life-to-work facilitation will mediate the relationship between

non-work support and turnover intention.

Definition of the mediators

Work-life conflict

Since the 1980s, research that relates to work-family conflict such as weekly

working hours, support from spouse, and multiple-role conflict and ambiguity has

gradually emerged (Yuen, 1995). Most work-family research defined work-family

conflict as: "a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and

family domains are mutually incompatible in some respects" (Greenhaus & Beutell,

1985, p.77). Because the present research has not aimed to look at the conflict which

arises between work and family domains only but was discovering the conflict which

arises between work and off-work hours that individuals dedicate to non-work activity, the present research used the term 'work-life' when describe the relationship between the variables. Thus, the definition for work-life conflict would be: a type of role conflict that arises when joint role pressure from work and off-work domains are experienced as participation in one role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985).

More recently, a two directional work-life conflict, that is work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict, was suggested by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) and Frone, Russell and Copper (1992). They believed that work-to-life conflict is where the requirement in the work domain hinders the performance in the off-work/life domain, whereas life-to-work conflict is where the requirement in the off-work/life domain hinders the performance in the work domain.

Work-life facilitation

Even though finding the stressor and dealing with it is an effective and direct way to eliminate the conflict which arises between work and non-work domain, developing resources is considered as another useful method to reduce the conflict (Beehr, Dunseath & King, 1995). In contrast to work-life conflict, work-life facilitation was not actively researched until a growing interest in the positive influences of work on the family and of the family on work in 2000s (Butler et al., 2005; Carlson et al., 2006; Hill, 2005; Voydabsnoff, 2004). Marks (1977) believed people have abundant energy and it is expandable, and that participation in one role can have positive effects on another role's performance. Frone (2003) defined this relationship as " the extent to which participation at work [or off-work life] is made easier by virtue of the

experiences, skills, and opportunities gained or developed at off-work life [or work]" (p.145). Furthermore, some research found people reported stronger organizational commitment, higher job satisfaction, personal growth and better health over time when involved in multiple roles (Kirchmeyer, 1992; Moen et al., 1992).

The terminology and definitions of these positive reciprocal relationships varied across researchers. There are at least four different terms: 1) work-family positive spillover; 2) work-family enrichment; 3) work-family enhancement; 4) work-family facilitation. Positive spillover focused on individuals' moods, skills, values, and behavior being transferred from one domain to another domain, resulting in desired behaviors such as better role performance (Hanson et al., 2006). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined enrichment as the experiences in one role improving the quality of life in the other role. In other words, participating in one role elicits positive consequences for the other role. Enhancement represents the acquisition of resources and experiences that are beneficial for individuals in facing life challenges (Sieber, 1974). The essence of facilitation is that the experience of one role makes it easier to fulfill the requirements of the other (Van SteenBergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007). The present research agreed with Van SteenBergen et al.'s (2007) idea and used the term 'work-life facilitation'. It is defined as a person engaging in a domain which yields gains that enhance functioning in another life domain (Wayne et. al, 2004).

Similar to work-life conflict, work-life facilitation also exists in a two way direction: work-to-life facilitation and life-to-work facilitation. Work-to-life facilitation is where the participation in the work domain enhances the performance in the off-work/life domain, whereas life-to-work facilitation is where the participation in the off-work/life domain enhances the performance in the work domain (Frone, 2003).

Criterion variables

Allen et al. (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of the consequences of work-life conflict and suggest there are three groups of consequences: work-related, non-work related and stress-related outcomes. Work-related outcomes include: organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, absenteeism and so forth; non-work related outcomes include leisure, family and life satisfaction; stress-related outcomes include psychological strain, physical health, substance abuse and so forth. Brough and Kelling (2002) stated that the influence of both work-to-life and life-to-work facilitation have only been considered recently. Grzywacz (2002) developed a preliminary theory of work-life facilitation and suggests that consequences of work-life facilitation include improved individual-level outcomes such as well-being, greater occupational commitment, and job satisfaction.

The following section discusses organizational commitment, turnover intention and psychological well-being as they were outcomes associated with the mediators.

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment is one of the work-related variables that has been studied in association with work-life conflict (WLC) and work-life facilitation (WLF); however, the results were varied across studies. Meyer and Allen (1990) define three specific facets of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment describes employees' emotional attachment to the organization. Continuance commitment reflects employees' motivation to remain with an organization because they have no other choices. Normative commitment describes a

sense of moral obligation in employees and thus makes them feel the responsibility to remain in the organization.

Netemeyer and McMurrian (1996) found that affective commitment decreases when WLC increases. Lyness and Thompson (1997) examined three different types of commitment and found that affective commitment was negatively related to WLC while continuance commitment was positively related to WLC, and it was not related to normative commitment. Casper, Martin, Buffardi and Edwins (2002) found a positive relationship between work-to-family conflict and continuance commitment but unrelated to affective commitment. On the other hand, they found no significant relationship between life-to-work conflict and either form of organizational commitment whereas Netemyer at al. (1996) found a negative relationship between family-to-work conflict and affective commitment. Overall, studies suggest WLC will be negatively related to affective commitment but positively related to organizational continuance commitment; LWC will be negatively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis 12a: Work-to-life conflict will have a positive relationship to continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 12b: Work-to-life conflict will have a negative relationship to affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 13: There will be a positive relationship between life-to-work conflict and continuance organizational commitment

Although not many studies have explored work-to-life facilitation, Tompson and Werner (1997) and Aryee, Srinivas and Tan (2005) found that work-to-life facilitation was positively related to job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Furthermore, Wayne, Randel and Stevens (2006) also stated that work-to-life facilitation positively predicts affective organizational commitment.

On the other hand, Hill (2005) found that organizational commitment has a positive relationship to work-to-family facilitation while negatively relates to family-to-work facilitation. He believes the possible explanation of the negative relationship is that individuals' connection to family may be preeminent and that he/she may be more likely to leave the job when it does not meet his/her family needs. No known studies have examined the relationship between continuance organizational commitment and work-life facilitation. Balmforth and Gardner (2006) found that both work-to-family facilitation and family-to-work facilitation were significant, and positively related to affective organizational commitment. They found that appropriate work skills and positive feelings from work can positively influence an employee's family, and people who experienced more satisfaction with their job had higher affective commitment to the organization. In sum, both work-to-life and life-to-work facilitation are positively associated with affective organizational.

Hypothesis 14: There will be a positive relationship between life-to-work facilitation and affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 15: There will be a positive relationship between work-to-life facilitation and affective organizational commitment.

Furthermore, Smith and Gardner (2007) found that supervisor support was related to less work-to-life conflict, and greater affective organizational commitment. Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002) found work-life conflict was positively related to continuance organizational commitment. Pratt and Rosa (2003) found the work-life balance policy provided by the organization that helped the employees in dealing with their work-life conflict could increase employees' commitment to the organization by reducing this conflict. Since work-life conflict was expected to be negatively related to workplace support and also to organizational commitment, work-life conflict would mediate the relationship between the support received from workplace and employees' organizational commitment. Similar situation was also applied to the relationship between workplace support, organizational commitment and work-life facilitation.

Hypothesis 16a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment

Hypothesis 16b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 17a: Life-to-work conflict will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment

Hypothesis 17b: Life-to-work facilitation will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 18a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between

organizational support and affective organizational commitment

Hypothesis 18b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between organizational support and affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 19a: Life-to-work conflict will mediate the relationship between organizational support and affective organizational commitment

Hypothesis 19b: Life-to-work facilitation will mediate the relationship between organizational support and affective organizational commitment.

Turnover intention

Previous researchers have also been interested in the relationship between work-life conflict and turnover intention. Boyar, Maertz, Pearson and Keough (2003) found both work-to-life and life-to-work conflict positively related to turnover intentions while of the two work-to-life conflict had a stronger relationship to turnover intention. Allen and colleagues (2000) found a moderate relationship between work-life conflict and turnover intentions. Most findings have fairly consistently indicated that greater levels of work-life conflict are associated with greater intentions to leave the organization (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997; Lyness & Thompson, 1997; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Furthermore, Greenhaus and colleagues (1997) examined actual turnover and reported that increased work-life conflict was related to actual turnover behaviours.

Hypothesis 20a: There will be a positive relationship between work-to-life conflict

and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 20b: There will be a positive relationship between life-to-work conflict and turnover intention.

Concerning work-life facilitation, Balmforth and Gardner (2006) found both work-to-life facilitation and life-to-work facilitation were negatively related to turnover intention. Wayne, Randel and Stevens (2006) also discovered that life-to-work enrichment negatively related to employees' turnover intention. The present research expected that turnover intention would be negatively related to work-life facilitation, as past studies found that work-family facilitation positively relates to organizational commitment (Balmforth & Gardner, 2006; Wayne, et al., 2006) and early research also found the level of turnover intention drops while the level of organizational commitment increases (Meyer & Allen, 1990).

Hypothesis 21a: There will be a negative relationship between work-to-life facilitation and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 21b: There will be a negative relationship between life-to-work facilitation and turnover intention.

In addition, workplace support is indirectly related to turnover intention via both work-life facilitation and work-life conflict. More support received from the organization and/or supervisor would enhance facilitation and reduce conflict, resulting in positive emotions and energy boost in the work role, thereby contributing to a desire to stay in the job. In other words, both work-life conflict and facilitation act

as mediators which vary the relationship between organizational and supervisor support, and turnover intention. Boles et al. (2001) noted that individuals who suffer from high levels of work-to-life conflict or vice versa are more likely to leave that job. Studies also suggest that people who perceive workplace as more supportive to their private life report less work-life conflict and are less likely to quit the job (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999).

Hypothesis 22a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between supervisor support, and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 22b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 23a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between organizational support, and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 23b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between organizational support and turnover intention.

Psychological well-being

Most of the findings support the idea that increased work-life conflict can lead to increased health concerns and problems. Much previous research has explored the relationship between psychological issues, and work-to-life and life-to-work conflict (Frone et al., 1992; Frone, Russell et al., 1997; Major, Klein & Ehrhard, 2002). Major et al. (2002) found that increased conflict is associated with increased psychological distress. Similarly, O'Driscoll, Ilgen and Hildreth (1992) found that as job interference with non-work activities increased, psychological strain increased. Thomas and Ganster (1995) also point out that increased work-family conflict is related to increased depression and other psychological issues such as strain anxiety and irritability. Moreover, Lu, Gilmour, Kao and Huang (2006) found both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict were negatively related to psychological wellbeing for employees in both U.K. and Taiwan.

Hypothesis 24: There will be a negative relationship between work-to-life conflict and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 25: There will be a negative relationship between life-to-work conflict and psychological well-being.

In contrast, most research supports the idea that facilitation is positively associated with an individual's psychological well-being (Frone, 2003; Grzywacz, 2000; Hill, 2005; Stephens, Franks, & Atienza, 1997). Frone (2003) and Grzywacz and Mark (2000) suggested that consequences of work-family facilitation may include improved physical health and well-being. Grzywacz (2000) also found that positive

spillover is positively related to better mental health and positive well-being. Hill (2005) looked at both work-to-family and family-to-work facilitation and found a significant negative relationship between work-to-family facilitation and individual stress, whereby enhancement in facilitation would lead to a reduction in stress. However, family-to-work facilitation was not significantly related to individual stress. Furthermore, Stephens et al. (1997) also found that positive spillover is positively related to psychological well-being although the findings were weaker and less consistent than negative spillover. Overall, psychological well-being was found to be positively associated with work-family facilitation.

Hypothesis 26: There will be a positive relationship between life-to-work facilitation and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 27: There will be a positive relationship between work-to-life facilitation and psychological well-being.

Moreover, Lu et al (2008) suggest that support at both organizational level and supervisory level can reduce the conflict which arises between work and family domains. They further state that in Taiwanese culture, the immediate supervisor is a key factor which determines the employee's welfare. Some studies found that a family supportive work environment has been linked with increased psychological well-being (Erdwins, Buffardi, Casper, & O'Brien, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Erdwins et al. (2001) found that supervisor support was very influential in reducing psychological strain in employed mothers. Anderson et al. (2002) also found that the perception of low supervisory support indirectly relates, through work-family conflict, to increased

stress. In sum, workplace support is related to turnover intention via both work-life conflict and facilitation.

Hypothesis 28a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 28b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between supervisor support and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 29a: Work-to-life conflict will mediate the relationship between organizational support and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 29b: Work-to-life facilitation will mediate the relationship between organizational support and psychological well-being.

Work-life balance and associated outcomes

Since a balance between work and non-work spheres is not only perceived as having less stress around managing conflicting role demands but also having one role facilitate another, is it reasonable to infer that work-life balance is related to higher organizational commitment, better psychological wellbeing and lower turnover intention.

Hypothesis 30a: There will be a positive relationship between work-life balance and organizational affective commitment.

Hypothesis 30b: There will be a positive relationship between work-life balance and organizational continuance commitment.

Hypothesis 30c: There will be a positive relationship between work-life balance and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 31: There will be a negative relationship between work-life balance and turnover intention.

On the other hand, it is important to note on the impact that followed the application of the work-life balance policy. Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) points out that the mere existence of the work-life balance policy is related to higher perceived organizational performance. Although the empirical research on employee's actual usages of work-life balance policy is limited, few case studies showed support from the viewpoint that the usage of work-life balance policy is positively related to better work performance. A 1993 University of Chicago study at Fel-pro Inc. found that employees who take advantage of the policy were more active participants in quality of work efforts and business improvements; in the case study of DuPont, Gary M. Pfeiffer, vice president points out that those employees who use the work-life policy showed a higher organizational commitment than others who do not use it (Landauer, 1997). Furthermore, a study at Hoechst Celanese indicates that employees who were aware of available work-life policy were 39 percent less likely to leave the company than employees who were unaware of existing of work-life policy; another study found that employees from companies with a work-life balance policy were less likely to experience stress-related illness (Landauer, 1997).

As discussed previously, the WLB policies is predicted to positively relate to employees' work-life balance, and a good balance is also related to higher organizational commitment, better psychological well-being, and lower turnover intention. It is reasonable to inter that the application, availability and usage of the work-life balance policy is indirectly related to higher organizational commitment, better psychological-welling and lower turnover intention through a good work-life balance.

Hypothesis 32a (i): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and the affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32a (ii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and the continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32a (iii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 32a (iv): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 32b (i): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the availability of the organizational WLB policy with the affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32b (ii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the availability of the organizational WLB policy and the continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32b (iii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the availability of the organizational WLB policy and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 32b (iv): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the availability of the organizational WLB policy and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 32c (i): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the usage of the organizational WLB policy with the affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32c (ii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the usage of the organizational WLB policy and the continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 32c (iii): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the usage of the organizational WLB policy and psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 32c (iv): Work-life balance will mediate the relationship between the usage of the organizational WLB policy and turnover intention.

Chapter Two

Method

This research used a quantitative research method. Surveys were distributed to employees at both for-profit and non-profit organizations. The chapter is divided into two sections; the first section describes the sample, procedure and the measures for the employee survey and the second section of this chapter discusses the method of data analysis used in this research. Ethical approval of the research was gained from the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee at the University of Waikato.

Participants

This research used a self-report questionnaire to examine the employees' perception of the employing organizational culture and their work-life balance. Participants were gathered from two sectors, for-profit and non-profit. The non-profit sector involved only nursing-homes. The not-for-profit nursing organization was a large organization which has 12 sub-divisions in different localities in Taiwan. The data collected from the not-for-profit organization were collected from each sub-division. Organizations in the for-profit sectors included electronics, chemicals, maritime, bank and insurance companies. Fourteen private industrial sectors were chosen from a variety of companies ranging from financial to mechanical manufacturing, to represent industries in Taiwan in general.

Eight hundred surveys were distributed in total. 400 surveys were distributed to the not-for-profit organizations and 400 surveys were distributed to for-profit

companies. The survey was given to 20% of the employees in each company. The number of distributed surveys varied depending on the size of the organization. More surveys were distributed to larger sized companies.

In total 336 surveys from the not-for-profit organizations and 383 surveys from the for-profit organizations were received, a high return rate of 90.1%. After eliminating one third of uncompleted responses which were invalid, the not-for-profit organization sample was composed of 295 participants (response rate = 73.8%), and the for-profit company sample had 363 participants (response rate = 90.8%), and thus acquired a total number of 658.

The participants were asked for their tenure at the current organization, age, number of dependents living with them, gender, marital status and academic level reached, including 267 (42.9%) males and 355 (57.1%) females with a mean age of 37.94 (SD=9.35), ranging from 20 to 61 years. More than half of the participants were married (65.4%) or cohabiting (4.0%) while 27.3% participants were single. The majority (51.0%) of the sample had two to three dependents in their house, while 230 (37.6 %) reported having two children and 250 (43.9%) had two elders living with them. About 10.1% of participants reported having no dependents living with them.

The majority of the sample had either a Bachelor's degree (36.4%) or an educational qualification from a polytechnic (31.9%) while 20.9% of participants had a high school qualification. Over half (74.7%) of the participants were employees, with an average job tenure of 7.44 (SD= 7.55) years, from 0 years to 38 years.

<u>Procedure</u>

A two-month period was used to collect the returned data after the distribution of questionnaire. Surveys for both categories were conducted at the same time. Participants completed structured questionnaires at their leisure and returned them in sealed envelopes either to be collected by the research intermediary, or returned via post to me. SPSS 13 was used to conduct the following: reliability analysis, factor analysis, correlation analysis, and regression analysis.

The survey was anonymous and voluntary; the recruitment method involved sending the survey to each organization. The distribution was completed by a third person so avoiding any conflict of interests that might influence the ethical appropriateness of this research. All employees were made aware of their right not to participate in this survey in the information sheet (see Appendix A) and by verbal explanation. A letter describing the goal of this research was attached on the first page of the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Measures

A composite score on each variable was obtained by calculating the mean across the participants' responses to all the items in a particular measure. A questionnaire is attached in Appendix B.

<u>Organizational work-life balance policy</u>

Organizational work-life balance policy was defined as policies or benefits, both

mandatory and additional, that organizations offered their employees, so that employees may achieve better well-being and control in both their working and non-working domains. Considerable research has focused on work-life balance policy but using different terminologies, such as 'work-life program' (Konrad & Mangel, 2000), 'work family benefits' (Thompson et al., 1999) or 'family friendly policies' (Grover & Crooker, 1995). These practices mainly include four major elements: flexible work (e.g., Bardoel, 2003; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Eaton, 2003; Goodstein, 1994) , dependent care service (Bardoel, 2003; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Konrad & Mangel, 2000), leave program (Bardoel, 2003; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Konrad & Mangel, 2000), and others such as work/family counseling (e.g., Bardoel, 2003; Eaton, 2003) and work/family focus group or training (Osterman, 1995). Because this research was conducted in Taiwan, the selection of policies was based on previous studies (Tsai, 2006; Lee, 2004) that focused on organizational work-family policies in Taiwan.

Twelve items were selected in this research- child care information/referral service; child allowance; elder information/referral service; elder allowance; flextime; work from home; paid maternity leave; breast-feeding time; family emergency leave/ family care leave; unpaid child-care long term leave; and work/family balance training. A description of each policy is attached in Appendix D. Each item was accompanied by three following questions: (1) *Does your organization provide the following policies*? (2) *Is it available to you*? (3) *Do you use it*? A yes/no response was used for each question. A yes was coded as 1, no coded as 0.

Organizational support

The 14-item family-supportive organization perception (FSOP) scale developed by Allen (2001) assesses employees' perceptions of organizational support. Sample items are "Expressing involvement and interest in non-work matters is viewed as healthy", and "Work should be the primary priority in a person's life" (reversed score). Five-point rating scales were used (*1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree*), with high scores representing more favorable perceptions of organizational support. In the present research, an alpha of .73 was obtained.

Supervisory support

Three items developed by Clark (2001) assessed supervisory support. A sample item is "My supervisor listens when I talk about my family". Five-point rating scales were used (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). High scores represent a more favorable perception of supervisory support. The internal consistency of the three items was .83.

Non-work support

Support from other people was assessed by four items developed by O'Driscoll (2000). The original scale was used to assess support that a participant experienced from each of their colleagues and families. Sample items were "helpful information or advice" and "practical assistance". Each item was asked with question: "How often did you get support from your colleague [family]?". In the present study, each item was asked with question: "How often did you get support from people outside of your

work?" A 6-point frequency response scale was used, where 1 = never and 6 = all the time. In the present research, an alpha of .91 was obtained.

Organizational commitment

The 18-items scale developed by Meyer et al (1993) was used to assess commitment to organizations. Items were translated into traditional Chinese by Lin (2002). Items 1- 6 were measuring affective commitment (AC); items 7-12 were measuring continuance commitment (CC); items 13-18 were measuring normative commitment (NC). In the present studies, they had an internal consistency coefficient of .83 (AC), .68 (CC) and .79 (NC). Samples of item were "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization" and "I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization" (reverse coded). Five-point rating scales were used (*1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree*).

Turnover intention

The 3-item turnover intention scale was developed by O'Driscoll and Beehr (1994) to assess employees' thoughts about quitting their job, plans to look for a new job within the next 12 months, and the likelihood they will actively look for a new job. Responses were given on a 6-point scale (*1= very unlikely, 6= very likely*). The scale had an alpha coefficient of .83.

Work-Life balance

The 4-item work-life balance scale developed by Brough, Timms and Bauld

(2009) was used to assess employees' experience in balance between their work and non-work life. Items were "I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non work activity", "I have difficulty balancing my work and non work activity", "I feel that the balance between my work demands and non work activity is currently about right" and "Overall, I believe that my work and non work activity are balanced". Five-point rating scales were used (*1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree*). Alpha coefficient for the overall scale was .81.

Work-to-life conflict

Six items were drawn from the 18-item Work Family Conflict Scale (Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000) to assess work-to-life conflict because they are items focusing on time-based and strain-based conflict. The present research intended to measure both work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict separately. The word "family" was replaced by "non-work" or "people outside of my work" so that it refers to relationship more than just family life. Sample item is "My work keeps me from my non-work activities more than I would like". Five-point rating scales were used (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). High scores represent high levels of WLC. The internal consistency of work-to-life conflict was .89.

Life-to-work conflict

Six items were also drawn from the 18-item Work Family Conflict Scale (Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000) to assess life-to-work conflict because they are items focusing on time-based and strain-based conflict. The present research intended to measure both work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict separately. The

word "family" was replaced by "non-work" or "people outside of my work" so that it refers to relationship more than just family life. Sample item "Due to stress from outside of work, I am often preoccupied with all sorts of matters at work". Five-point rating scales were used (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). High scores represent high levels of life-to-work conflict. The internal consistency of life-to-work conflict was .84.

Work-to-life facilitation

The 18-item work-family enrichment scale developed by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, and Grzywacz (2006) was used to assess employees' perception of the positive influence that they obtain from one domain (e.g. work) and its impact on another (e.g. life). To extend the research area from measuring only family, the word "family" was replaced with "life outside of work" and "all other aspects". Items which measured work-to-life facilitation were provided with a statement: "My involvement in my work helps me to be a better member in all other aspects, because this involvement_____" and sample items were "helps me to understand different viewpoints" and "makes me cheerful". Responses were given on five-point rating scales (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). The present study measured both work-to-life facilitation and life-to-work facilitation; the coefficient alpha was .94 for the work-to-life items

Life-to-work facilitation

The 18-item work-family enrichment scale developed by Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, and Grzywacz (2006) was used. To extend the research area from measuring only family, the word "family" was replaced with "life outside of work" and "all other

aspects". Items which measured life-to-work facilitation were provided with a statement: "My involvement in my life outside of work helps me to be a better worker, because this involvement_____" and sample items were "helps me to understand different viewpoints" and "makes me cheerful". Responses were given on five-point rating scales (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). The present study measured both work-to-life facilitation and life-to-work facilitation; the coefficient alpha was .93 for the life-to-work items

Psychological well-being

Warr's (1990) 12-item scale was used to measure the extent to which people were either *anxious* or *comforTable*, *depressed* or *enthusiastic* in relation to their work. The respondents were asked to think over the past few weeks and indicate the extent to which their job had made them feel tense, uneasy, worried, calm, contented, and relaxed (for job-related anxiety-comfort) , and depressed, gloomy, miserable, cheerful, enthusiastic and optimistic (for job-related depression-enthusiasm). The same set of items with modified questions was used to measure participants' well-being in relation to their non-work life. An example of a question to measure the well-being of the non-work aspect is: "In the past few weeks, how much of the time in your life outside your job have you felt each of the following?" The ratings were done using a 6-point frequency-based response scale, where 1 = never and 6 = all the time. The coefficient alpha for job-related well-being was found to be .89 whereas the coefficient alpha for non job-related well-being was .91.

Data analysis

Factor analysis

The goal of using factor analysis in this research was to make sense of a complex set of variables by reducing them to a smaller number of factors which account for many of the original variables. This research conducted exploratory *principal axis factor analysis (PFA)* with *Oblinque* rotation to extract the main factor from each measure.

Mediation analysis

This research used the method of Baron and Kenny (1986) plus a Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) to assess the mediating effect of the proposed mediator variables (e.g. work/life balance), as this method allows one to determine whether the predictor variables significantly predict the criterion variable.

To examine these relationships, regression analyses were conducted using resource variable such as supervisor support as predictor. Baron and Kenny (1986) suggested that a mediation effect can be tested through examining the following three steps: 1) first, regress the mediator on the predictor variable; 2) then, regress the criterion variable on the predictor variable; 3) regress the criterion variable on both the predictor variable and mediator. (Baron & Kenny, 2008).

Baron and Kenny (1986) further suggested a number of conditions for establishing mediation. They were: 1) the predictor variable must be significantly related to the mediator in the first equation; 2) the criterion variable must be significantly related to the predictor variable in the second equation; 3) the mediator variable must be significantly related to criterion variables; 4) the relationship between

the predictor variable and criterion variable in the third equation must be less than in the second.

Full mediation takes place when the relationship between the predictor variable and criterion variables become insignificant when the mediator is entered. Partial mediation occurs when the direct relationship between all variables remains significant all the time; partial mediation means the relationship remains significant after a considerable decrease. The Sobel test (Sobel, 1982) was used to assess the significance amount of the meditation. The Sobel macro for SPSS developed by Preacher and Hayes (2009) was used.

Chapter Three

Result

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section introduces the descriptive statistics. Section two illustrates the intercorrelations between all variables. The last section provides test of mediation effect.

Descriptive statistics

The Table below illustrates the descriptive statistics for the variables which were examined in this research.

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations

Variables	Response scale	Profit			Non-profit		
		M	SD	Skew	M	SD	Skew
Organizational support	1-5	3.11	.46	-.29	3.10	.45	-.36
Supervisor support	1-5	3.15	.78	-.16	3.25	.75	-.42
Non-work support	1-6	3.51	.90	.62	3.48	.94	.32
Work-life balance	1-5	3.25	.68	-.52	3.34	.65	-.39
Work-to-life conflict	1-5	2.88	.71	.18	2.70	.71	.60
Life-to-work conflict	1-5	2.66	.63	.23	2.41	.57	.52
Work-to-life facilitation	1-5	3.50	.66	-.44	3.62	.58	-.23
Life-to-work facilitation	1-5	3.60	.59	-.63	3.68	.59	-.47
Affective organizational commitment	1-5	3.46	.65	-.03	3.58	.65	-.49
Continuance organizational commitment	1-5	3.22	.58	.34	3.05	.61	.02
Turnover intention	1-6	2.51	1.06	.71	2.53	1.12	.70
Psychological wellbeing	1-6	4.09	.68	-.23	4.30	.66	-.18

Table 1 shows that participants perceived themselves as receiving fairly average level of support in both the for-profit and non-profit organizations; it can be seen that support they experienced from people who are outside of their workplace (OPS) was slightly higher than the workplace support, with supervisor support (SS) being at a slightly higher level than organizational support (OS).

On the other hand, the Table also shows that participants experienced moderate level of work-life balance, work-life conflict and work-life facilitation.   The statistics demonstrate that participants experienced slightly higher facilitation than conflict, as the mean of both work-to-life and life-to-work facilitation were slightly higher than work-to-life and life-to-work conflict. The result shows a mean of 3.25 to 3.34 in work-life balance variable and suggesting participants experienced a slightly-moderate balance when managing their work and non-work life domains.

In addition, I computed a log-transformation to reduce the skew for the variables which have a moderate skew such as life-to-work facilitation and turnover intention (See Table 1). After obtaining transformed scores, I correlated these variables with all other variables, and compared the correlation coefficient obtained using the transformed scores versus the non-transformed scores. There was no difference between the coefficients. Therefore, I used the non-transformed scores for further analysis.

Intercorrelations

Table 2 illustrated the correlation of all variables. The results pointed out to a significant correlation between the two directions of both work-life conflict and work-life facilitation, and other variables. For a correlation to be significant the probability level must be below the .05 level.

Hypotheses

Life-to-work conflict

Hypotheses 6, 8 and 25 predicted that life-to-work conflict would be negatively and significantly related to psychological wellbeing, supervisor support and the support received from people who are outside of the workplace. These hypotheses were supported with a negative and significant correlation of -.48 for psychological wellbeing, -0.11 for non-work support and -0.12 for supervisor support.

Hypothesis 4 predicted a negative relationship between organizational support and work-life conflict. A negative but not significant correlation result was found between organizational support and life-to-work conflict (r = -.04), whereby the result failed to support hypothesis 4.

Table 2 <u>Correlations of all variables</u>

variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Organizational support															
2. Supervisor support	.04														
3. Non-work support	.05	.26**													
4. Work-life balance	.10**	.27**	.16**												
5. Work-to-life conflict	-.10**	-.21**	-.12**	-.57**											
6. Life-to-work conflict	-.04	-.12**	-.11**	-.41**	.70**										
7. Work-to-life facilitation	.03	.40**	.21**	.44**	-.32**	-.26**									
8. Life-to-work facilitation	.04	.21**	.23**	.31**	-.21**	-.23**	.64**								
9. Organizational commitment	-.01	.42**	.23**	.36**	-.24**	-.25**	.52**	.34**							
10. Affective organizational commitment	.02	.46**	.25**	.38**	-.39**	-.41**	.53**	.31**	.84**						
11. Continuance organizational commitment	-.05	-.02	-.02	-.03	.24**	.21**	-.02	.01	.45**	.03					
12. Turnover intention	-.03	-.26**	-.09**	-.34**	.38**	.38**	-.35**	-.23**	-.56**	-.56**	-.08*				
13. Psychological wellbeing	.09*	.20**	.16**	.40**	-.47**	-.48**	.44**	.42**	.23**	.32**	-.18**	-.32**			
14. Policy provision	.07	.20**	.13**	.12**	-.07*	-.04	.21**	.19**	.20**	.16**	.05	-.11**	.11**		
15. Policy availability	.06	-.05	.03	-.02	.06	.11**	-.03	-.04	-.06	-.11**	.04	.12**	-.08	.16**	
16. Policy usage	.04	.03	.10*	.07	-.04	.05	.10*	.05	.07	.03	.02	-.02	-.02	.28**	.30**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Hypothesis 20b predicted a positive relationship between work-life conflict and turnover intention.   This hypothesis was supported with a positive and significant correlation of 0.38, indicating an increase in life-to-work conflict is associated with an increase in the intention of leaving the job.

Hypothesis 13 predicted a positive relationship between life-to-work conflict and continuance organizational commitment. It was supported with a positive and significant correlation of 0.21. Therefore, life-to-work conflict was related to a higher level of continuance organizational commitment.

Work-to-life conflict

Hypothesis 27 predicted a negative relationship between work-to-life conflict and psychological wellbeing. Similar to life-to-work conflict, work-to-life conflict is also negative and significantly related to psychological wellbeing; a significant correlation of -.47 was found. The results suggest that work-to-life conflict is associated with a lower level of psychological wellbeing.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that supervisor support would be related to a lower level of work-life conflict. A significant correlation (-0.21) was found between the work-to-life conflict and supervisor support. The results indicated that work-to-life conflict was negatively related to supervisor support.

Hypothesis 12 predicted that work-to-life conflict would be negatively related to affective organizational commitment but would be positively related to continuance organizational commitment. The hypothesis was supported in that a significant and

negative correlation of -0.39 was found between work-to-life conflict and affective organizational commitment, and a correlation of 0.24 was found between work-to-life conflict and continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 20b predicted a positive relationship between work/life conflict and turnover intention. It was supported with a positive and significant correlation of 0.38 for turnover intention. In other words, turnover intention rises as the conflict increases.

Life-to-work facilitation

Hypotheses 10 and 26 predicted that life-to-work facilitation would be associated with increased level of non-work support and psychological wellbeing. The result shows that life-to-work facilitation was positively and significantly correlated to psychological wellbeing (0.42) and a significant correlation of 0.23 was also found for the support received from others. This illustrates support for both hypotheses 10 and 26 in that a positive relationship exists between these variables.

Hypothesis 14 predicted a positive relationship between life-to-work facilitation and affective organizational commitment. It was supported, as the present result showed a significant relationship between these two variables ($r = 0.31$).

Work-to-life facilitation

Hypothesis 27 predicted a positive relationship between work-to-life facilitation and psychological wellbeing. It was supported since a positive significant correlation of 0.44 was found. This indicates that psychological wellbeing increased as

the level of work-to-life facilitation increases.

Hypotheses 5 and 7 predicted that work-to-life facilitation would be positively related to greater supervisor support and organizational support. Hypothesis 7 was supported with a positive and significant correlation of 0.40 between work-to-life facilitation and supervisor support, whereas the result failed to support hypothesis 5 in that an insignificant correlation ($r = .03$) was found. This suggests that higher supervisor support was related to higher work-to-life facilitation, but higher organizational support is not significantly related to higher work-to-life facilitation.

Hypothesis 15 predicted that work-to-life facilitation would be related to higher affective organizational commitment. It was supported with a significant correlation of 0.53. That is, an increase in work-to-life facilitation was related to greater affective organizational commitment.

Furthermore, hypothesis 21a predicted that work-to-life facilitation would be associated with a reduced level of intention to leave the job. A negative and significant correlation of -0.35 was found between work-to-life facilitation and turnover intention, suggesting support for hypothesis 21a.

Work-life balance

Work/life balance is a central theme of this research, and it was expected to relate to higher organizational commitment, better psychological wellbeing and lower turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the usage and availability of the organizational

WLB policy would be related to greater work-life balance. That is, the higher the usage and availability of the organizational WLB policy, the greater the balance. The results failed to support the relationship between both the usage (r = .07) and the availability (r = -.02) of policy and work-life balance in that an insignificant correlation was found. However, a significant correlation was found between the provision of the policy and work-life balance variables (r = .12).

Hypothesis 30a, 30b, and 30c predicted that work-life balance would be related to greater affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and psychological wellbeing. The hypothesis was partially supported in that a significant correlation of 0.38 was found for affective organizational commitment, and a significant correlation of 0.40 was also found for psychological wellbeing. However, the result failed to support the relationship between work-life balance and continuance organizational commitment as a negative but insignificant correlation was found (r = -.03).

Hypothesis 31 predicted that work-life balance would be associated with a reduced level of turnover intention. It was supported with a negative and significant correlation of -0.34, which means that a greater level of work-life balance was associated with a lower intention to leave the job.

In addition, work-life balance was somewhat more highly correlated with work-to-life conflict and work-to-life facilitation than with life-to-work conflict and life-to-work facilitation.

Mediations

As mentioned in Chapter Two, WLB is composed of four forms of interfaces of conflict and facilitation: work-to-life conflict (WLC), life-to-work conflict (LWC), work-to-life facilitation (WLF), and life-to-work facilitation (LWF). It was predicted that those variables have a mediating effect between the predictor variables and criterion variables. The following section described the mediation results.

Life-to-work conflict

Hypothesis 9 suggested that life-to-work conflict would mediate the relationship between non-work support and psychological wellbeing. Three regressions to test the mediation of hypothesis 9 are illustrated in Table 3. The first step showed that the mediator (life-to-work conflict) was regressed on the predictor variable (non-work support), and a significant result, $\beta= -.11$, $p < .05$, was found. In the second step, the criterion variable (psychological wellbeing) was regressed on the predictor variable (non-work support), and significant result was also found for psychological wellbeing. In the third equation, psychological wellbeing was regressed on non-work support and life-to-work conflict, and the relationships remained significant. There was a decrease in the beta coefficient (.16 to .10) for the non-work support. Moreover, the Sobel test also indicated a significant indirect effect of mediator ($Z= 2.84$, $p < .05$). The results suggested a partial mediation for the relationship.

Table 3

Mediation between non-work support and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work conflict					
1	Life-to-work conflict	Non-work support	-.11*	-2.83	.01
2	Psychological wellbeing	Non-work support	.16*	4.04	.02
3	Psychological wellbeing	Non-work support	.10*	3.00	
		Life-to-work conflict	-.47*	-13.65	.24

Sobel test: Z = 2.84, p < .05

Hypothesis 17a and 19a predicted that life-to-work conflict would mediate the relationship between organizational and supervisor support with affective organizational commitment. In Table 4 (see Appendix C) showed that the mediator (life-to-work conflict) was regressed on the predictors (organizational support). The organizational support was found not to be significant in association with life-to-work conflict. Since a non-significant relationship between organizational support and life-to-work conflict was found, the results failed to support hypothesis 19a.

On the other hand, a significant result, β= -.12, p < .05, was found for supervisor support. A partial mediation was found in the relationships between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment.

In Table 5, the result showed that beta coefficient for supervisor support in association with affective organizational commitment dropped from 0.46 to 0.42 after the life-to-work conflict variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of life-to-work conflict. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, Z= 3.07, p < .05. The result supported hypothesis 17a in that meditation was found in the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment.

In summary, the life-to-work conflict variable was found to have a mediating effect between the supervisor and affective organizational commitment, and between non-work support and psychological wellbeing. In contrast, no mediating effect of the life-to-work conflict was found in any relationships between the organizational support and all criterion variables.

Table 5

Mediation between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work conflict					
1	Life-to-work conflict	Supervisor support	-.12*	-3.15	.01
2	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.46*	13.40	.22
3	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.42*	13.12	
		Life-to-work conflict	-.36*	-11.33	.34

Sobel test: Z = 3.07, p < .05

Life-to-work facilitation

Hypothesis 11 suggested that life-to-work facilitation would mediate the relationship between non-work support with organizational commitment, psychological wellbeing, and turnover intention. Results of the three mediated equations which were use to examine hypothesis 11 are present in Table 6a. The first equation showed that the mediator (life-to-work facilitation) was regressed on the predictor variable (non-work support), and a significant result, $\beta= .23$, $p < .05$, was found. A full mediation was found in each Table 6a and 6b. In Table 10a, step 3 illustrated that non-work support turned insignificant, $\beta= .06$, $p > .05$, after life-to-work facilitation variable is entered; Table 6a demonstrated a full mediation in the relationship between non-work support and life-to-work facilitation, $Z= 5.35$, $p < .05$. Table 6b also illustrated a full mediation in the relationship between non-work support and turnover intention, $Z= - 4.15$, $p < .05$.

A partial mediation was found in the relationship between non-work support and organizational commitment variables. In Table 6c, the result showed that beta coefficient for non-work support in association with organizational commitment dropped from .23 to .16 after the life-to-work conflict variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of life-to-work conflict. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, $Z= 4.86$, $p < .05$. The results suggested that mediation was found in all relationships and support hypothesis 11.

Table 6a

<u>Mediation between non-work support and psychological wellbeing</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work facilitation					
1	Life-to-work facilitation	Non-work support	.23*	6.13	.05
2	Psychological wellbeing	Non-work support	.16*	4.04	.02
3	Psychological wellbeing	Non-work support	.06	1.69	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.40*	11.05	.18

Sobel test: Z = 5.35, p < .05

Table 6b

<u>Mediation between non-work support and turnover intention</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
<u>Mediator = Life-to-work facilitation</u>					
1	Life-to-work facilitation	Non-work support	.23*	6.13	.05
2	Turnover intention	Non-work support	-.09*	-2.38	.01
3	Turnover intention	Non-work support	-.04	-1.03	
		Life-to-work facilitation	-.22*	-5.72	.05

Sobel test: Z = -4.15, p < .05

Table 6c

<u>Mediation between non-work support and affective organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work conflict					
1	Life-to-work facilitation	Non-work support	.23*	6.13	.05
2	Affective organizational commitment	Non-work support	.23*	6.10	.05
3	Affective organizational commitment	Non-work support	.18*	4.53	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.26*	6.91	.12

Sobel test: Z = 4.86, p < .05

Hypotheses 17b and 19b predicted that life-to-work facilitation would mediate the relationship between organizational and supervisor support with affective organizational commitment.   In the first equation, life-to-work facilitation was regressed on organizational and supervisor support separately. Similar to the life-to-work conflict, Table 7 (see Appendix C) showed that the organizational support was found to be not significant in association with life-to-work facilitation; as a result, the results failed to show a significant relationship between organizational support and affective organizational commitment.

Table 8 showed that a significant result, β= .21, p < .05, was found for supervisor support. A partial mediation was found in the relationships between supervisor support and all three variables. The result showed that beta coefficient for supervisor support in association with affective organizational commitment dropped from 0.45 to 0.40 after the life-to-work facilitation variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of life-to-work facilitation. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, Z= 4.17, p < .05.

In summary, life-to-work facilitation variable was found to have a mediating effect between the supervisor and non-work support and proposed variables. However, it was found to be not significant in the relationships between organizational support and all criterion variables, as the first step failed to indicate a significant relationship between the mediator (life-to-work facilitation) and the criterion variable (organizational support).

Table 8

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work facilitation					
1	Life-to-work facilitation	Supervisor support	.21*	5.48	.04
2	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.45*	12.76	.20
3	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.40*	11.52	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.22*	6.22	.24

Sobel test: $Z = 4.17$, $p < .05$

Work-to-life conflict

Hypothesis 16a, 18a, 22a, 23a, 28a and 29a predicted that work-to-life conflict would mediate the relationship between organizational and supervisor support with affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. In Table 9e, the first equation showed that the work-to-life conflict (mediator) was regressed on the organizational support (predictors). The organizational support was found to have a significance relationship to psychological wellbeing. However, the relationship between the organizational support and all other criterion variables (affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, turnover intention) showed non-significant. The relationship between organizational support and turnover intention in Table 9a failed to illustrate a significant mediation, and so does the relationship between organizational support with organizational commitment in Table 9b, with affective organizational commitment in Table 9c, and with continuance organizational commitment in Table 9d (see Appendix C).

A full mediation of work-to-life conflict variable was found in the relationship between the psychological wellbeing and organizational support. The predictor (organizational support) turned insignificant after the mediator is entered in the equation. The Sobel test was used to test the indirect effect of the mediator. The result indicated a significant mediating effect of work-to-life conflict in the relationship between organizational support and psychological wellbeing ($Z = 2.40$, $p < .05$).

Table 9e

<u>Mediation between organizational support and psychological wellbeing</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Organizational support	-.10*	-2.50	.008
2	Psychological wellbeing	Organizational support	.09*	2.31	.01
3	Psychological wellbeing	Organizational support	.05	1.32	
		Work-to-life conflict	-.46*	-13.34	.22

Sobel test: $Z = 2.40$, $p < .05$

On the other hand, a significant result, $\beta= -.21$, $p < .05$, was found for supervisor support. A partial mediation was found in the relationships between supervisor support and all variables except continuance organizational commitment.

In Table 10a, the result showed that beta coefficient for supervisor support in association with psychological wellbeing dropped from .20 to .11 after the work-to-life conflict variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of work-to-life conflict. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, $Z= 5.03$, $p < .05$. Table 10b illustrated a partial mediation in the relationship between supervisor support and turnover intention; the beta coefficient for supervisor support in

association with turnover intention dropped from -.26 to -.19 after the work-to-life conflict variable is entered, Z= -4.71, p < .05. Table 10c also illustrated a partial mediation in the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment, Z= 4.67, p < .05. However, Table 10d did not illustrated a significant mediation in the relationship between supervisor support and continuance organizational commitment; the relationship failed to meet the criterion in second equation (see Appendix C). The meditation was found only in the relationship between supervisor support and all criterion variables except continuance organizational commitment.

These results supported hypotheses 16a and 22a, in that meditation was found in the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment, and between supervisor support and turnover intention variable. The results supported hypotheses 28a and 29a, as the results found mediation between the psychological wellbeing and both the organizational and supervisor support.

In summary, work-to-life conflict variable was found to have a mediating effect between the supervisor support and all criterion variables except continuance organizational commitment. In contrast, it (work-to-life conflict) did not found mediation in the relationships between the organizational support and all outcome variables except its association with the psychological wellbeing, which was found to have full mediation of work-to-life conflict.

Table 10a

Mediation between supervisor support and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Supervisor support	-.21*	-5.46	.04
2	Psychological wellbeing	Supervisor support	.20*	5.24	.04
3	Psychological wellbeing	Supervisor support	.11*	3.04	
		Work-to-life conflict	-.45*	-12.65	.23

Sobel test: $Z = 5.03$, $p < .05$

Table 10b

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and turnover intention</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Supervisor support	-.21*	-5.46	.04
2	Turnover intention	Supervisor support	-.26*	-6.90	.07
3	Turnover intention	Supervisor support	-.19*	-5.21	
		Work-to-life conflict	.34*	9.48	.18

Sobel test: $Z = -4.71, p < .05$

Table 10c

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Supervisor support	-.21*	-5.46	.04
2	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.46*	13.40	.21
3	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.40*	12.00	
		Work-to-life conflict	-.31*	-9.14	.30

Sobel test: Z = 4.67, p < .05

Work-to-life facilitation

On the other hand, hypotheses 16b, 18b, 22b, 23b, 28b and 29b predicted that work-to-life facilitation would mediate the relationship between organizational and supervisor support with affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing.   Firstly, work-to-life facilitation was regressed on each of organizational and supervisor support separately. Table 11a to 11c showed that the organizational support was found to be not significant in association with work-to-life facilitation (see Appendix C); therefore, no meditation was found in the relationship between organizational support and all three variables. The results failed to support hypothesis 18b, 23b, and 29b.

The results of step one in Table 12a showed a significant result, $\beta = .40$, $p < .05$, was found for supervisor support. A full mediation of work-to-life facilitation variable was found in the relationship between the psychological wellbeing and supervisor support. The predictor (supervisor support) turned insignificant after the mediator is entered in the equation. The Sobel test was used to test the indirect effect of the mediator. The result indicated a significant mediating effect of work-to-life facilitation in the relationship between supervisor support and psychological wellbeing ($Z = 7.91$, $p < .05$).

A partial mediation was found in all others relationships. In Table 12b, the result showed that beta coefficient for supervisor support in association with turnover intention dropped from -.26 to -.15 after the life-to-work conflict variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of work-to-life facilitation. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, $Z = -6.05$, $p < .05$. Table 12c also

illustrated a partial mediation in the relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment, Z= 8.19, p < .05. The beta coefficient for supervisor support in association with affective organizational commitment dropped from .45 to .25 after the work-to-life facilitation variable is entered. The results support hypothesis 16b, 22b and 28b in that meditation was only found in the relationship between all criterion variables and the supervisor support.

In summary, work-to-life facilitation variable was found to have a mediating effect between the supervisor support with affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing variables, where a full mediation was found between the supervisor support and psychological wellbeing variables. However, it was found insignificant in the relationships between the organizational support and all three variables, as the first equation failed to indicate a significant relationships between the mediator (work-to-life facilitation) and the predicator variable (organizational support).

Table 12a

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and psychological wellbeing</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Supervisor support	.40*	11.29	.16
2	Psychological wellbeing	Supervisor support	.20*	5.24	.04
3	Psychological wellbeing	Supervisor support	.03	.71	
		Work-to-life facilitation	.43*	11.14	.19

Sobel test: $Z = 7.91$, $p < .05$

Table 12b

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and turnover intention</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Supervisor support	.40*	11.29	.16
2	Turnover intention	Supervisor support	-.26*	-6.90	.07
3	Turnover intention	Supervisor support	-.15*	-3.64	
		Work-to-life facilitation	-.29*	-7.19	.13

Sobel test: $Z = -6.05$, $p < .05$

Table 12c

<u>Mediation between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Supervisor support	.40*	11.29	.16
2	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.45*	12.76	.20
3	Affective organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.25*	7.23	
		Work-to-life facilitation	.42*	12.02	.33

Sobel test: Z = 8.19, p < .05

<u>Work-life balance</u>

Hypotheses 32a to c predicted that work-life balance would mediate the relationship between the availability, usage and the awareness of the organizational work-life balance (WLB) policies with four criterion variables, which were affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, psychological wellbeing, and turnover intention. On one hand, Table 13a to 13d (see Appendix C) illustrated three equations to test the mediating effect of work-life balance. No mediation was found between the availability of the WLB policies and all criterion variables, as the beta coefficients did not meet the criterion in step one, $\beta= -.02$, $p > .05$. On the other hand, Table 14a to 14d (see Appendix C) illustrated three steps to test the mediation between the usage of the WLB policies and all criterion variables. Similarly, no mediation was found between the usage of the WLB policies and all criterion variables, as the beta coefficients also did not meet the criterion in step one, $\beta= .07$, $p > .05$ (see Appendix C).

Tables 15a to 15d tested the mediation between the awareness of the policy and four criterion variables. In Table 15a, a significant relationship was found between work-life balance and the awareness of policies in step one, $\beta= .12$, $p <.05$. A full mediation of work-life balance variable was found in the relationship between psychological wellbeing and policy awareness. The predictor (policy awareness) turned insignificant after the mediator is entered in the equation. Furthermore, the result from Sobel test also indicated a significant mediating effect of work-life balance, $Z= 2.94$, $p < .05$. Table 15b also demonstrated a full mediation in the relationship between the awareness of the policies and turnover intention; the Sobel test was found with a significant indirect effect of work-life balance variable, $Z= 2.91$, $p < .05$.

A partial mediation was found in the relationship between the awareness of policies and affective organizational commitment. In Table 15c, the result showed that beta coefficient for the awareness of policies in association with affective organizational commitment dropped from .16 to .12 after the work-life balance variable is entered, thereby indicating a mediating effect of work-life balance. The Sobel test also found significant mediating effect of mediator, Z= -2.90, p < .05. However, Table 15d (see Appendix C) did not illustrated a significant mediation in the relationship between the awareness of policies and continuance organizational commitment; the relationship failed to meet the criterion in second step. Therefore, the results partially supported the hypothesis 31a in that the mediation of work-life balance was found between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and three criterion variables.

In summary, work-life balance was found to have a mediating effect between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy and the affective organizational commitment, turnover intention and psychological wellbeing. The results failed to find mediation between both the availability and usage of policy with all other outcome variables in that a non-significant relationship was found between the work-life balance variable and the availability and usage of the policy.

Table 15a

Mediating regression equations between policy provision and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy provision	.12*	3.09	.01
2	Psychological wellbeing	Policy provision	.11*	2.71	.01
3	Psychological wellbeing	Policy provision	.06	1.67	
		Work-life balance	.39*	10.56	.16

Sobel test: $Z = 2.94$, $p < .05$

Table 15b

<u>Mediating regression equations between policy provision and turnover intention</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy provision	.12*	3.09	.01
2	Turnover intention	Policy provision	-.11*	-2.68	.01
3	Turnover intention	Policy provision	-.07	-1.74	
		Work-life balance	-.33*	-8.90	.12

Sobel test: $Z = 2.91$, $p < .05$

Table 15c

<u>Mediating regression equations between policy provision and affective organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R^2
<u>Mediator = Work-life balance</u>					
1	Work-life balance	Policy provision	.12*	3.09	.01
2	Affective organizational commitment	Policy provision	.16*	4.17	.03
3	Affective organizational commitment	Policy provision	.12*	3.25	
		Work-life balance	.36*	9.81	.15

Sobel test: $Z = -2.90$, $p < .05$

Chapter Five

Discussion

This chapter is divided into few sections covering discussion, implications, limitations and conclusions. The first section discusses the choice of the questionnaire design and measures, and describes the overall findings. This is followed by more detailed discussion of the correlation and mediation results. Some suggestions for management and limitations of the research are also included. The last section concludes the whole study.

The present study focused on employees' work-life balance from two aspects (work and non-work), and examined its relationship in association with workplace support, non-work support, and variables that might be beneficial to the organization. A work-life supportive organizational culture was measured in terms of organizational support, supervisor support, and work-life balance (WLB) policies. Criterion variables used in the present study were organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. The research focused on the work-life balance variable and the four components: work-to-life conflict; life-to-work conflict; work-to-life facilitation; life-to-work facilitation. It was predicted that workplace support and non-work support would be associated with better work-life balance, and better balance would be associated with employees' favourable outcomes, which are more commitment, better psychological wellbeing, and lower turnover intention.

The overall findings suggested that employees' work-life balance is related to employees' favourable outcomes. This finding is consistent with previous studies

(Clark, 2001; Lu et al., 2008; Nichol, 2004; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Thompson et al., 1999). Interestingly, work-life balance and the four components were mainly found to be related to supervisor support, whereas workplace resource also covers organizational support and work-life balance (WLB) policies. This might suggest that supervisor support had more influence on employees' feelings of work-life balance compared to other workplace resources. On the other hand, non-work support showed a similar result to supervisor support; the only difference was that non-work support had a weaker correlation with work-life balance than did supervisor support. This suggests that supervisor support was the strongest predictor on employees' work-life balance, followed by non-work support.

The awareness, availability and usage of the WLB polices had low correlations with all other variables. The results showed that supervisor support was associated with employees' awareness of the policies. Moreover, the employees who took advantage of the WLB polices also felt more support from their family or friends, as the results indicated usage of the policies was significantly related to non-work support and work-to-life facilitation. O'Driscoll et al. (2003) found a similar finding; plicies only related to less conflict when they created a perception that the organization was supportive. Interestingly, none of the above (awareness, availability and usage of policies) showed significant relationships with organizational support, and employees clearly felt less committed to the organization when the policies were made available to them. This might suggest two possibilities: firstly, the organization neither supports nor discourages the employees from taking advantage of the policies; and secondly, the policies were offered did not meet employees' needs.

Work-life balance and four components had a mediating effect in the

relationship between supervisor support and affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. All mediators were predicted to mediate the relationship between organizational support and these criterion variables.

However, only work-to-life conflict was found to mediate the relationship between organizational support and the criterion variables; it was found to mediate the relationship between organizational support and psychological wellbeing. Unsurprisingly, the results suggest that organizational support predicts work-to-life conflict variable more than other work-life components (work-to-life facilitation, life-to-work conflict, life-to-work facilitation).

Correlation findings

Work-to-life conflict (WLC)

It was hypothesised that work-to-life conflict would be related to various variables such as organizational and supervisor support, psychological wellbeing, turnover intention, and organizational commitment. The rationale behind these hypotheses was that employees who perceived themselves as receiving support from either their organization or supervisors would experience less work-to-life conflict in that support from either organization or supervisor would help the employees to manage their balance between work and life domains. Furthermore, the rationale of the hypotheses was also that employees who suffer from greater work-to-life conflict would experience lower psychological wellbeing and lower emotional attachment towards the organization, along with greater intention to leave the current job and greater continuance organizational commitment. In other words, the employees who

experienced greater conflict and had no other choice but remain in the current job would have a greater feeling that continuance with their current job was a necessity rather than a choice.

The present study found that work-to-life conflict had a significant relationship with psychological wellbeing, turnover intention, affective organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment. This finding was consistent with previous studies in that work-to-family conflict was significantly and negatively related to affective organizational commitment (Van Steenbergen, Ellemerd, Moaoijaar, 2007) and it was positively related to continuance organizational commitment (Casper et al., 2002). The effect size of the present study (.24) is similar to Casper et al.'s (2002) study, which obtained a coefficient of .26 for continuance organizational commitment. Furthermore, much previous literature indicated that work-to-family conflict is positively related to greater intentions to leave the organization (Greenhaus et al., 1997, Lyness & Thompson, 1997, & Netemeyer et al., 1996), and the present findings also support this conclusion. The results support the rationale behind the hypotheses which predicted that employees who experienced greater conflict would have lower emotional attachment towards the organization, and would continue with their current job as a necessity rather than a choice if they have no other opportunity.

Nichol (2004) and Clark (2001) found a significant relationship between work-to-family conflict and supervisor support. Some previous research found significant relationships in relation to psychological wellbeing and work-to-family conflict (Lu et al., 2006; Major et al, 2002; O'Driscoll et al. 1992; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Lu and colleagues (2006) found work-to-family conflict was negatively related to psychological wellbeing and Major and colleagues (2002) found increased conflict

associated with increased psychological distress. The effect size of the present study (r = -.47) is similar to the previous studies (r = -.30, Lu, 2006).

Life-to-work conflict (LWC)

The hypotheses predicted that life-to-work conflict would be negatively and significantly associated with all types of support, psychological wellbeing, and affective organizational commitment while positively and significantly associated with turnover intention. The rationale behind the hypotheses was somewhat similar to the hypotheses under the WLC section. It was expected that employees who received support either from their organization or supervisor would experience less conflict from their non-work domain, and that their psychological wellbeing level would be increased as the conflict level reduced. The reduction of LWC was associated with less intention of leaving the current job.

The present results suggested a significant relationship between life-to-work conflict and each variable discussed above except organizational support. This may suggest that either organizational support was not as an important resource as expected for coping with the conflict or that employees do not sense themselves as receiving sufficient support from their organization.

On the other hand, Nichol (2004) found that the greater the supervisor support, the lower the life-to-work conflict. Ruderman et al. (2002) suggested that practical support and emotional support such as empathy received through family relationships benefits work life. In the present study, supervisor support and the support received from others were both found to be significantly and negatively associated with

life-to-work conflict. This finding is supported by previous research (Burke, 1988; Holohan & Gilbert, 1979; Clark, 2001; Frame & Shehan, 1994; Nichol, 2004; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Ruderman et al, 2002).

Pratt (2003) suggested that providing support for employees would increase employees' commitment by reducing their conflict. Netemeyer and colleagues (1996) suggested a negative relationship between family-to-work conflict and affective organizational commitment. The result of the present research is consistent with these findings in that a significant and negative relationship was found between those two variables. The relationships between life-to-work conflict and psychological wellbeing and turnover intention were also supported by previous findings. Thus, the current findings supported findings from previous studies except in the case of the relationships between life-to-work conflict and organizational support.

Work-to-life facilitation

It was hypothesized that work-to-life facilitation would be associated with greater psychological wellbeing, affective organizational commitment, organizational support and supervisor support and in contrast, it would be negatively related to turnover intention. The rationale behind the hypotheses was that support received from the employing organization and supervisor would help employees in gaining useful experience from their work role, which would make it easier to fulfill other life roles, thus generating a better psychological wellbeing in employees. Furthermore, it was predicted an employee would also have higher commitment and lower intention to leave the organization when they experienced facilitation through their work.

The present results found significant positive relationships between work-to-life facilitation and both supervisor support and psychological wellbeing. The current finding supported previous studies in which supervisor support was found to be significantly related to work-to-family facilitation (Colton et al., 2002; Voydanoff, 2004), and also supported some research (Grzywacz & Mark, 2000; Hill, 2005) that increased psychological wellbeing is accompanied by increased work-to-family facilitation. Moreover, Wayne et al. (2006) and Aryee et al. (2005) suggested a positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and work-to-life facilitation. The rationale was that appropriate work skills and positive feelings from work could positively influence an employee's family life, and those who experienced more satisfaction with their job had higher affective commitment to the employing organization. The present findings are consistent with these studies. Balmforth and Gardner (2006) found that turnover intention was negatively related to work-to-family facilitation, and this was also the finding of the present study.

In contrast, the current finding concerning support received from the organization did not match those of previous studies (Colton et al., 2002; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Voydanoff, 2004). As noted in the previous section on work-to-life conflict, the results suggest the possibilities that employees might be unaware of the organizational support offered or perhaps the kind(s) of support offered did not meet employees' needs.

<u>Life-to-work facilitation</u>

It was predicted that life-to-work facilitation would be positively related to non-work support and psychological wellbeing and affective organizational

commitment. The rationale behind the hypotheses was that support received from employees' non-working domain would be related to life-to-work facilitation, which is associated with a higher level of psychological wellbeing. Furthermore, most previous studies (Aryee et al., 2005; Balmforth & Gardner, 2006; Wayne et al., 2006) found that greater facilitation is accompanied by greater affective commitment to the organization. Affective organizational commitment was expected to be associated with more life-to-work facilitation.

The results of the present finding were consistent with past findings in that life-to-work facilitation was positively related to non-work support, psychological wellbeing and affective organizational commitment. This suggests that support provided from employees' friends and family is related to applying employees' useful experience in non-work role to the work role, and thus related to better psychological wellbeing and higher commitment to the employing organization.

Work-life balance

It was predicted that employees' work-life balance could reach a better level if they were aware of and applied the WLB policies the organization offered. Furthermore, the culture of an organization is also an important factor in determining an employee's action of taking advantage of the policies. It was predicted that workplace support would be associated with higher usage of the policies. In addition, a better work-life balance is associated with several outcomes. It was predicted that greater levels of work-life balance would be related to greater psychological wellbeing and their commitment to the employing organization, and thus associated with less intention of leaving the current job.

The present results partly supported the hypotheses in that work-life balance was found to be significantly related to both affective and continuance organizational commitment, turnover intention and psychological wellbeing. This may suggest that employees who achieved a good balance between their work and life are more likely to have good psychological wellbeing, less intention to leave and will be more committed to their organization. Landauer's (1997) study found that employees who use the work-life policy showed a higher organizational commitment than others who do not use it; furthermore, the same study also suggests that WLB policy is associated with less stress-related illness. It was predicted that the WLB policy would be related to better work-life balance in employees. The result failed to show a connection between those variables apart from a positive relationship between an employee's work-life balance and the mere provision of the WLB policy from the organization. This may suggest that the awareness of the WLB policy in the organization might be associated with advancing employees' work-life balance.

Thompson (1999) suggested a supportive culture and supervisor are related to employees using WLB policy. In the present study, both types of support were found to be significantly related to employees' work-life balance. This finding may suggest that the mere provision of a supportive culture and supervisor support would be a contributor in helping employees to gain a better balance between their work and their life. However, non-significant connections were found between the availability and the usage of the policy with the support gained from the organization and supervisors. Both the availability and usage of policies were found to be not related to work-life balance. The present study also did not find significant connections between the actual usage of the policy and any of the criterion variables. Furthermore, an unexpected

finding showed that the availability of the policy is associated with less commitment and higher turnover intention. This finding might suggest that the policies offered did not meet employees' needs. Employees might find the policies not so helpful when they became available to them. Future research could be focused on this point to clarify the relationship between the actual usage and the availability of the WLB policy with the favorable employee outcomes.

Mediation findings

Work-to-life conflict

It was hypothesized that work-to-life conflict would mediate the relationship between organizational and supervisor support with organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. This was based on the reasoning that employees who perceived support from their supervisor and organization would feel less conflict between their work and non-work domains; therefore they would have better psychological wellbeing, be more committed to the employing organization and have less intention to leave the job. The hypotheses were partially supported as partial mediation was found for supervisor support and all criterion variables; and full mediation was only found between organizational support and psychological wellbeing.

The present results suggest that work-to-life conflict partially mediated the relationship between supervisor support and organizational commitment, and turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing, and this implies that supervisor support has a significant relationship with all criterion variables and the conflict that generates from

employees' work and non-work domain mediates the relationship of support and criterion variables. Full mediation implies that organizational support has an indirect relationship through work-to-life conflict with psychological wellbeing; this result suggests that work-to-life conflict plays an important role in determining employees' psychological wellbeing.

Life-to-work conflict

Similar to work-to-life conflict, life-to-work conflict was also hypothesized to have a mediating effect between organizational and supervisor support with organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. Furthermore, a mediating effect was also expected between non-work support and all criterion variables. The present findings partially supported the hypotheses as a non-significant relationship was again found between organizational support and all criterion variables; and partial mediation was found between supervisor support and non-work support with all criterion variables. Support partially mediated relation between work-to-life conflict and criterion variables. The findings suggested a mediating effect of life-to-work conflict in the relationship between both types of support and organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. These findings imply that both types of support (supervisor support and non-work support) have a significant relationship with all criterion variables but they are mediated by employees' conflict that generates from the non-working to the work domain.

It is interesting to note that in both work-to-life conflict and life-to-work conflict mediation results, partial mediation was found between supervisor support and

all criterion variables, and there were similar findings for the relationship between non-work support and all criterion variables, whereas no mediation was found in the relationship between organizational support and most criterion variables. Smith and Gardner's (2007) study also suggested that an organizational culture that is supportive of work-life balance would reduce conflict between employee's work and their private life domain, and thus result in higher organizational commitment and lessen their intention of leaving the current job.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), the relationships between the predictor and criterion variables have to be significant for a mediating effect to be established. The present research failed to do so and thus obtained a non-mediation result in the relationship between organizational support and all criterion variables. This may suggest that the support provided by the organization does not have a significant influence over those criterion variables. It also does not have as much influence as supervisors or other people from the non-working place when it comes to determining employees' attitudes and wellbeing. This was an unexpected finding, as past studies suggest that an organization's culture would influence an employee's way of behaving, such as taking advantage of the family-friendly policy (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). A possible explanation for the non-significant finding might be that the organization did not offer sufficient support for employees to become aware of it. Future research needs to focus on whether organizational support is necessary for helping employees achieve a better balance between their work and non-work domains.

Work-to-life and life-to-work facilitation

It was hypothesized that work-life facilitation would mediate the relationship between different types of support (e.g. organizational support) and the criterion variables of affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. Moreover, life-to-work facilitation was also expected to mediate the relationship between support received from the employee's non-work place and all criterion variables. These hypotheses were based on the rationale that the support received either from the organization or outside of it would enhance employees' psychological wellbeing, and their commitment to the employing organization, and lower their intention to leave the job.

The findings of the present research suggested a partial mediation. A mediating effect of work-to-life facilitation was found in the relationship between supervisor support and all criterion variables; a full mediation was found between supervisor support and psychological wellbeing. Similar to work-to-life conflict, the results failed to show a significant relationship between organizational support and all criterion variables, as there was not a significant relationships between the mediator (life-to-work facilitation and work-to-life facilitation) and the predicator variable (organizational support).

It is interesting to note that the findings of both work-life conflict and work-life facilitation achieved a similar result. Partial mediation was found between supervisor support and all criterion variables. The results failed to show mediations between organizational support and almost all criterion variables. This suggests that organizational support does not predict much of the work-life facilitation and criterion variables than the work-life conflict. In other words, more organizational support

received is in association with less work-to-life conflict in employees.

Work-life balance

It was hypothesized that work-life balance would mediate the relationship between the organizational WLB policy offered, its availability, and its usage with all criterion variables such as employees' psychological wellbeing and turnover intentions. The rationale behind the hypothesis was that firstly, the employees would achieve a better balance between their work and private life if they were aware of and took advantage of the WLB policy the organization offered; and then, employees would achieve better psychological wellbeing, be more committed to their organization, and have lower intentions to leave the job.

Past studies suggest that employees who are aware of or actually using the WLB policy the organization provided would have increased commitment to the organization and lower intention to leave the job (Landauer, 1997). Furthermore, the WLB policy is also associated with higher perceived organizational performance (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000) and lower stress-related illness employees (Landauer, 1997). The present finding is similar to that of the past studies. Although no mediation was obtained in the relationship between the availability and the usage of the policy with the criterion variables, a mediating effect of work-life balance was found in the relationship between the awareness of the organizational WLB policy with affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and psychological wellbeing. Partial mediation was found in the relationship between the provision of the policy and affective organizational commitment, whereas full mediation was found in the relationships between the provision of the policy and both the employees' turnover

intention and their psychological wellbeing.

The present findings suggest that employees' psychological wellbeing and their intention of leaving the job is related to a good balance between their work and non-work life, and a good balance is also related to the awareness of the WLB policy their employing organization offered. In other words, the findings suggest that it is important to clearly establish the WLB policy and make the employees aware of it in order to help them to achieve a better work-life balance.

Implications

The present study highlighted some implications for management. Firstly, the findings of the current research suggest a significant relationship between the support that supervisor provides and favorable outcomes for employees. Management may emphasize the training of their supervisors to support employees, as the results suggest that support provided from the supervisors is significantly related to less conflict. Having less conflict is associated with reducing both employees' mental strain and intentions of leaving the current job, and also having higher commitment to the employing organization.

Secondly, the support received from others who are not involved in the employee's workplace also plays an important role in balancing an employee's work and private life domain, as this support also achieves a similar result to that of the support received from the supervisors. Since the organization cannot force their friends or families to provide support for the employees, the WLB policy is offered as an option for employees to gain support from non-work domain. For example, policies

such as work-schedule flexibility would enable employees to share their time for important social meetings such as social conferences. In this case the employees would gain more support from their non-working domain if they could invest more time to manage their relationships in the non-working domain.

Thirdly, even though providing the WLB policy would be a step to achieve the goal, an even more important action is to clearly establish and make the policies well-known to the current employees. This study showed that employees' awareness of the WLB policy offered is associated with better psychological wellbeing. Moreover, the employees would be more affectively committed to the organization when they know the WLB policy is there. However, the present study also points out the possibility that employees could become less committed to the organization and be willing to leave the job once the WLB policy became available to them. This was an unexpected finding, I would expect that availability and usage of the policies would be positively related to employees' organizational commitment even if they place their family above work in Taiwan;. Possible explanations might be there were some unintended consequences along with taking advantage of the policies offered. For example, perhaps people who used them were discriminated against (e.g. in performance rating, promotion opportunities). The reason could also be that the policies did not meet employees' need and thus generates a feeling of disappointment after using it. Further research is needed for clarifying the relationship between the actual policy usage and favorable employee outcomes.

Finally, the organization needs to re-evaluate the effectiveness and the aim of the WLB policy they provide. The present finding suggests that making the policies available to the employees does not help them either to achieve a better balance

between their work and non-work domain or guarantee favorable employee outcomes, whereas making employees aware of the existence of the WLB policy and providing them with support from their supervisor is associated with both desired outcomes. It might be worthwhile to find out whether employees appreciate the WLB policy provided as emphasizing supervisor support might be a less expensive and more effective way to achieve the desired outcome.

Strength and limitations

Very limited empirical research known to the researcher has been conducted on the mediating effect of work-life balance between organizational support and the selected criterion variables in the present study. A major strength of the present research is the representative samples in this research. There were approximately six hundred respondents. The 73.8% and 90.8% high returning rates represent a good sample for both the for-profit versus non-profit sectors. The participants involved were general employees across different sectors. However, the majority of the questionnaires were returned with the first section uncompleted. Since it was impossible to eliminate all the uncompleted questionnaires as this would have reduced the data to a minimal amount, I eliminated questionnaires where one-third of questionnaire was not completed.

Strength of the present research is also that it was empirical, and included the off-work life of both single and married employees. Furthermore, the results of the present study were consistent with previous research (Burke, 1988; Hill et al., 2007). In addition, because this research was conducted in Taiwan, where the culture challenges individualism, the consistency of the present result with previous findings

in Western countries indicated the reliability of the psychometric measures used in the present study.

The present research had three main limitations. Firstly, the data obtained through the survey questionnaires were all self-reports from the participants. Therefore, the responses gained may have been subject to common method variance and response consistency effect. Secondly, this was a cross-sectional study which means that the present findings cannot be used to infer the causality of variables in each relationship. It is suggested that future studies use longitudinal research to find out the cause and effect relations between the variables. The third limitation was that the selection of valid data was based on eliminating surveys with no responses over a third of the whole questionnaire instead of eliminating incomplete surveys. The reason for doing so is because that most of the questionnaire were returned with first part uncompleted.

Future research

Some past studies suggest the importance of building up a family or work-life balance supportive organizational culture in helping the application of the WLB policy (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). However, the findings of the present study illustrated that the usage of the WLB policy is not related to the support the organization offered. These may suggest that the support the organization offered might either not be a factor in achieving the supportive organizational culture or it might just not what employees needed. Future research could focus on the variables that constitute a supportive organizational culture and clarify the type of support the employees needed from the organization.

The WLB policies the organizations offered in Taiwan are mostly legal policies to achieve social legitimacy; they tend to discriminate against single workers. For example, leave such as maternity leave and paternity leave are both limited to employed parents. Pulman (1998) also raised a similar point in the New Zealand context and suggested that future WLB policies may need to encompass all employees by changing their focus from family-supportive to work-life balance-supportive. Thus, it is worthwhile to replicate the research once a more encompassing work-life balance policy is ready.

In addition, future research is needed to re-examine the relationship between the usage of the WLB policy and favorable employee outcomes such as high organizational commitment, as the present research produced an unexpected finding that the employees who uses more of the WLB policy had less commitment. Furthermore, discovering the factors which may hinder the usage of the WLB policy would be another goal to aim for.

Finally, future research could focus on the relationship between the supervisor and employees' favorable outcomes in a longitudinal study, as the present findings suggest a significant relationship between supervisor's support and all favorable employee outcomes. Organizations may save the costs of applying a WLB policy if the supervisor's support is sufficient to achieve similar results.

Conclusion

       The overall results suggest that the support provided from both the supervisor and people in employees' non-working domains may influence employees' work-life balance. Organizations that desired to achieve these favorable outcomes in employees should ensure that their supervisors provide sufficient support for the employees, and announce the WLB policies clearly would be an option as well. Although the support offered from the organization might not be as effective as other type of support (supervisor support and other support) in achieving favorable employee outcomes such as high commitment and low intention of leaving the job, it is still associated with lessening conflict in employees and achieving a better balance between their work and non-work domains.

       In sum, employees' work-life balance was found to be significantly related with their supervisors and other people who are involved in their life outside of their workplace. Employees' work-life balance is also related to their awareness of the WLB policy provided in the workplace. Employees with good work-life balance are more likely to experience better psychological wellbeing, have higher commitment to the organization, and lower turnover intention. Future research is encouraged to explore further relationship between organizational support and employee behaviors.

Reference

Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 63, 1–18.

Allen, T. D. & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Parental Leave of Absence: Some Not So Family-Friendly Implications1. *Journal of applied social psychology ,* 29 (1), 166.

Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior ,* 58, 414–435.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S. & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences Associated With Work-to-Family Conflict: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of occupational health psychology ,* 5 (2), 278.

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S. & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal Organizational Initiatives and Informal Workplace Practices: Links to Work-Family Conflict and Job-Related Outcomes. *Journal of Management ,* 28 (6), 787.

Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S. & Tan, H. S. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of applied psychology ,* 90 (1), 132.

Balmforth, K. & Gardner, D. (2006). Conflict and Facilitation between Work and Family: Realizing the Outcomes for Organisations. *New Zealand journal of psychology (Christchurch. 1983) ,* 35 (2), 69.

Bardoel, E. A. (2003). The provision of formal and informal work-family practices: the relative importance of institutional and resource dependent explanations versus managerial explanations. *Women in management review, 18(1/2)*: 7-9.

Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L. & Pleck, J. H. (1992). Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family , 54* (2), 358.

Baron, R. & Kenny, D. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology , 51* (6), 1173.

Baron and Kenny (2008, September 12). *Baron and Kenny Steps*. Retrieved May 25, 2009, from Mediation: http://davidakenny.net/cm/mediate.htm#BK

Batt, R. & Valcour, P. M. (2003). Human resource practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations, 42(2)*: 189-220.

Beehr, T. A., Dunseath, J. & King, D. W. (1995). Job Stress–Social Support Buffering Effects Across Gender, Education and Occupational Group in a Municipal Workfore. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* , 60.

Beehr, T. A., King, L. A. & King, D. W. (1990). Social support and occupational stress: talking to supervisors, Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36, 61-81

Benz, M. (2005, May). Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction?– Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms. *Kyklos, 58*(2), 155-176. Retrieved April 4,

2009, doi:10.1111/j.0023-5962.2005.00283.x

Blair-Loy, M. & Wharton, A. S. (2004). Organizational Commitment and Constraints on Work-Family Policy Use: Corporate Flexibility Policies in a Global Firm. *Sociological Perspectives , 47* (3), 243-267.

Blunsdon, B., Blyton, P., Reed, K., & Dastmalchian, A. (2006). Work, life and the work-life issue. In A. Dastmalchian, B. Blunsdon, K. Reed, & P. Blyton, *Work-life integration, international perspectives on the* (pp. 1-16). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Billings, A. G. & Moos, R. H. (1982). Work stress and the stress-buffering roles of work and family resources, *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 3, 215-232.

Blunsdon, B., Blyton, P., Reed, K., & Dastmalchian, A. (2006). Work, life and the work-life issue. In A. Dastmalchian, B. Blunsdon, K. Reed, & P. Blyton, *Work-life integration, international perspectives on the balancing of multiple roles* (pp. 1-16). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boles, J.S., Howards, W.G. and Donofrio, H.H. (2001). An investigation into the inter-relationships of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and work satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, **13**, 376–90.

Boyar, S. L., Maertz Jr, C. P., Pearson, A. W. & Keough, S. (2003). Work-Family Conflict: A Model of Linkages between Work and Family Domain Variables and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of managerial issues , 15* (2), 175.

Breakspear, C. & Hamilton, C. (2004). *Getting a life: Understanding the downshifting phenomenon in australia.* Canberra: The Australia Institute.

Brough, P. & Kelling, K . (2002). Women, work and wellbeing: An analysis of the work–family conflict. *New Zealand journal of psychology (Christchurch. 1983) ,* 29.

Brough, P., O Driscoll, M. P. & Kalliath, T. J. (2005). The ability of 'family friendly' organizational resources to predict work-family conflict and job and family satisfaction. *Stress and health , 21* (4), 223.

Brough, P., Timms, C. & Bauld, R. (2009). Measuring work-life balance: Validation of a new measure across five Anglo and Asian samples. Proceedings of the 8th Australian Psychological Society Industrial & Organizational Conference. Sydney, Australia. June.

Butler, A. B., Grzywacz, J. G., Bass, B. L. & Linney, K. D. (2005). Extending the demands-control model: A daily diary study of job characteristics, work-family conflict and work-family facilitation. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology , 78* (2), 155.

Carlson, D. S. & Perrew, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship. *Journal of management , 25* (4), 513.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H. & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work–family interface: Development and validation of a

work–family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior , 68* (1), 131-164.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams. L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276.

Casper, W.J., Martin, J.A., Buffardi, L.C., & Edwins, C. (2002). Work family conflict, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment among employed mothers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 99-108.

Clark, S. C. (2001). Work Cultures and Work/Family Balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior , 58* (3), 348.

Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin , 98* (2), 310.

Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations , 42* (2), 145-167.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,*500-507.

Erdwins, C. J., Buffardi, L. C., Casper, W. J. & O'Brien, A. S. (2001). The Relationship of Women's Role Strain to Social Support, Role Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy*. *Family relations , 50* (3), 230.

Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Phizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). Opportunities to

work at home inthe context of work-life balance. *Human Resource Management Journal , 12* (1), 54-76.

Financial Times. (2000). Is there a place for time in corporate Utopia? *Financial Times ,* 1.

Frame, M. W. & Shehan, C. L. (1994). Work and Well-Being in the Two-Person Career: Relocation Stress and Coping among Clergy Husbands and Wives. *Family relations , 43* (2), 196.

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick, & L. E. Tetrick, *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-life conflicts: testing a model of work-family interface. *Journal of applied psychology , 77* (1), 65-78.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M. L. (1993). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology , 70* (4), 325.

Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K. & Markel, K. S. (1997). Developing and Testing an Integrative Model of the Work–Family Interface,. *Journal of vocational behavior , 50* (2), 145.

Galinsky, E. & Stein, P. J. (1990). The Impact of Human Resource Policies on Employees. *Journal of Family Issues , 11* (4), 368-383.

Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T. & Friedman, D. E. (1996). The Role of Employers in Addressing the Needs of Employed Parents. *Journal of social issues , 52*, 111.

Gallos, J. (1989). Exploring woman's development: Implications for career theory, practice and research. In M. B. Arthur, T. D. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence, *Handbook of Career Theory* (pp. 110-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goulet, L. R. & Frank, M. L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: Public, non-profit, and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management , 31* (2), 201-210.

Goff, S. J., Mount, M. K.& Jamison, R. L. (1990). Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeismL a field study. *Personnel Psychology , 43* (4), 793-809.

Goodstein, J. D. (1994). Institutional pressures amd strategic responsiveness: Employer involovement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal , 37* (2), 350-382.

Grant-Vallone, E. J. & Donaldson S. I. (2001). Consequences of work-family conflict on employee well-being over time. *Work and Stress , 15*, 214-226.

Grzywacz, J. & Bass, B. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different

models of work-family fot. *Journal of Marriage and Family , 65*, 248-262.

Grzywacz, J. G. (2002). Toward a theory of work-family facilitation. Paper presented at the 2002 Persons, Processes, and Places: Research on Families, Workplaces and Communities Conference, San Francisco.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 5: 111–126.

Greenberger E. & O'Neil R. (1993) Spouse, parent, worker: role commitments and role-related experiences in the construction of adult's well-being. *Developmental Psychology, 29,* 181–197.

Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: a theory of work-family enrichment. *The Academy of Management review , 31* (1), 72.

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

Greenhaus, J. H. & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: current status and future directions. In G. Powell, *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391-412). CA: Sage.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., Singh, R. & Parasuraman, S. (1997). Work and Family Influences on Departure from Public Accounting,. *Journal of vocational*

behavior , 50 (2), 249.

Grover, S. L. & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciated family-responsive human resource policies: the impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology , 48* (2), 271-288.

Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the Study of Work-life Balance. *Social science information , 41* (2), 255.

Hammer, L. B., Colton, C. L., Caubet, S. & Brockwood, K. B. (2002). The unbalanced life: work and life conflict. In J. C. Thomas, & M. Hersen, *Handbook of Mental Health in the Workplace* (p. 83). SAGE.

Hansmann, H. B. (1980). The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise, *Yale Law Journal*. 89(5): 835-901.

Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B. & Colton, B. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of occupational health psychology , 11* (3), 249.

Hill, J. E., Hawkins, A. J. & Ferris, M. & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an Extra Day a Week: The Positive Influence of Perceived Job Flexibility on Work and Family Life Balance. *Family relations , 50* (1), 49-58.

Hill, E. J., Allen, S., Jacob, J., Bair, A. F., Bikhazi, S. L., Langeveld, A. V., Martinengo, G., Parker, T. T. & Walker, E. (2007). Work-Family Facilitation: Expanding Theoretical Understanding Through Qualitative Exploration. Advances

in Developing Human Resources, 9(4), 507-514,516-526.

Holahan, C.K. and Gilbert, L. A. (1979). Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual-career couples. *Human Relations*, 32, 451-467.

House, J. (1981). *Work Stress and Social Support*. Mass: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Hughes, J. & Bozionelos, N. (2007). Work-life balance as source of job dissatisfaction and withdrawal attitudes :An exploratory study on the views of male workers. *Personnel Review , 36* (1), 145-154.

IMF. (2008). "World economic outlook." Database-WEO Groups and Aggregates Information   Retrieved 2008, from http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2008/02/weodata/groups.htm#ae.

Judge, T. A., Camble, D. M., Boudreau, J. W. & Bretz, R. D. (1995). AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE PREDICTORS OF EXECUTIVE CAREER SUCCESS. *Personnel psychology* , 485.

Judiesch, M. K. & Lyness, K. S. (1999). Left Behind? The Impact of Leaves of Absence on Managers' Career Success. *Academy of Management journal , 42* (6), 641.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Perceptions of Nonwork-to-Work Spillover: Challenging the Common View of Conflict-Ridden Domain Relationships. *Basic and applied*

social psychology , 13 (2), 231.

Konard, A. M. & Mangel, R. (2000). The impact of work: Life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal , 12* (12), 12225-1237.

Landauer, J. (1997). Bottom-line benefits of work/life programs. *HR Focus, 74*(7), 3–4

Lee, C.-L. (2004). The Relationship between Work/Family Policy, Work/Family Balance and Employee Performance. <u>Institute of International Business</u>. Tainan, National Cheng Kung University. Master**:** 92.

Lu, L. (2009). Work Resources, Work-to-family conflict, and its consequences: A Taiwanese-British cross-culture comparison. *unpublished* , 14.

Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S. F., & Huang, M. T. (2006). A cross-cultural study of work/family demands, work/family conflict, and well-being: The Taiwaneses vs. British. *Career Development International , 11*, 9-27.

Lyness, K. S. & Thompson, D. E. (1997). Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 359-375.

Major, V.S. , Klein, K. J. & Ehrhart, M. G. (2002). Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress. *Journal of Applied Psychoogyl, 87,* 427-36.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American sociological review , 42* (6), 921.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology 78*, pp. 538–551

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R. & Viswesvaran, C. (2006). How Family-Friendly Work Environments Affect Work/Family Conflict: A Meta-Analytic Examination. *Journal of labor research ,* 555.

Ministry of the Interior. (2008). *Main statistics indicators by gender.* Retrieved 3 30, 2009, from National Statistics: http://eng.stat.gov.tw/public/data/dgbas03/bs2/gender/2009%20GenderImages(Eng).pdf

Mirivis, P. H. (2006). The quality of employment in the nonprfit sector: An undate on employee attitudes in nonprofits versus business and government. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 3(1)*, 23-41.

Mirvis, P. H. & Hackett, E. J. (1983). Work and work force characteristices in the nonprofit sector. *Monthly labor review*, *April*, 3-12.

Moen, P., Dempster-McClain, D., Williams, R. M. & Jr . (1992). Successful Aging: A Life-Course Perspective on Women's Multiple Roles and Health. *The American journal of sociology , 97* (6), 1612-1638.

National Statistics (2008). *Statistical tables by gender.* Retrieved 2008, from

Marriage and family: http://eng.stat.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=4561&ctNode=1619

National Statistics (2008). *Statistical tables.* Retrieved 2008, from Average age at entering first marriage of married women aged 15 and over: http://eng.stat.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=17761&ctNode=1662

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S. & McMurrian, R. . (1996). Development and Validation of Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict Scales. *Journal of applied psychology* , 400.

Nichol, L. (2004). Relationships between family-supportive eork environments and work-family conflict, family-work conflict and associated outcomes. Social Science in Psychology. Hamilton, Waikato. Master**:** 63.

O'Driscoll, M. P., Brough, P. & Kalliath, T. J. (2004). Work/family conflict, psychological well-being, satisfaction and social support: a longitudinal study in New Zealand. *Equal opportunities international* , *23* (1-2), 36.

O'Driscoll, M. P., Ilgen, D. R. & Hildreth, K. . (1992). Time devoted to job and off-job activities, interrole conflict, and affective experiences. *Journal of applied psychology* , 272.

O'Driscoll, M. P. (2000).   Work and family transactions.   In P. Koopman-Boyden, A. Dharmalingam, B. Grant, V. Hendy, S. Hillcoat-Nallétamby, D. Mitchell, M.

O'Driscoll M. P. & S. Thompson (2003). *Transactions in the mid-life family* (pp. 92-112).   University of Waikato, Hamilton: Population Association of New Zealand.

Osterman, P. (1995). Work/family programs and the emplyment relationship, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 681-702.

Parasuraman, S. & Greenhaus, J. H. (1994). Work-family conflict, social support and wellbeing. *Women in management* , 213.

Pine, D. (1994). Getting more mileage from EAPs. *Business and Health* , 49-53.

Potter, R. (2007, Oct 3). *Google finds a work-life balance*. Retrieved 2008, from Times online:

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/career_and_jobs/top_50_women/article2569088.ece

Pulman, J. A. J. (1998). correlates of family-supportive elements and employee variables. <u>Social Science in Psychology</u>. Hamilton, Waikato. Master**:** 87.

Pratt, M. G. & Rosa, J. A. (2003). Transforming Work-Family Conflict into Commitment in Network Marketing Organizations. *Academy of Management journal , 46* (4), 395.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36(4), 717-731.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. . (2009, January 3). *Macros (SPSS and SAS) and*

Script (SPSS only) for Estimating Indirect Effects in Simple Mediation Models. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from Andrew's homepage: http://www.comm.ohio-state.edu/ahayes/

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). Altruism, Nonprofits, and Economoic Theory, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2): 701-728.

Rudd, N. M. & McKerny, P. C. (1986). Family influences on the job satisfaction of employed mothers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly , 10*, 363-371.

Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., Panzer, K. & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of Multiple Roles for Managerial Women. *Academy of Management journal , 45* (2), 369.

Sekaran, U. (1985). The paths to mental health: An exploratory study of husbands and wives in dual-career families, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 129-137.

Shore, L. M. & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and Employee Behavior: Comparison of Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment With Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of applied psychology , 78*, 774.

Siber, S. D. (1974). Towards a theory of role accumulation. *Americal Sociological Review , 39*, 567-578.

Smith, J. & Gardner, D. (2007). Factors affecting employee use of work-life balance initiatives. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology , 36* (1), 3-12.

Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic intervals for indirect effects in structural

equations models. In S. Leinhart (Ed.), *Sociological methodology 1982*

(pp.290-312). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stephens, M. A., Franks, M. M. & Atienza, A. A. (1997). Where two roles intersect:

spillover between parent care and employment. *Psychology and aging , 12* (1), 30.

The Directorate General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics (DGBAS).

(2002-2007). *National Statistics.* Retrieved 2008, from Statistical tables by gender-

enployment and ecomonics:

http://eng.stat.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=4561&ctNode=1619

Thomas, L. T. & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work

variables on work-family conflict and strain: a control perspective. *Journal of

applied psychology , 80* (1), 6.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvaiz, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family

benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization,

organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vacational

Behavior , 54*, 392.

Tompson, H. B., & Werner, J. M. 1997. The impact of role conflict/facilitation on

core and discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of

Management,* 23: 583–601.

Tsai, T-T. (2006). The study on the relationship among work-family policy, work-family conflict and organizaiotnal commitment. <u>Human Resource Management</u>. Kao Hsiung, University of National Sun Yat-Sen. Master**:** 82.

Van Steenbergen, E. F., Ellemers, N., & Mooijaart, A. (2007). How work and family can facilitate each other: Distinct types of work-family facilitation and outcomes for women and men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 279-300.

Voydanoff, P. (2004). The Effects of Work Demands and Resources on Work-to-Family Conflict and Facilitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family , 66* (2), 398.

Wang, C-Y. (2004). Work/family programs' influence to employee organizational commitment. <u>Human Resource Management</u>. Kao Hsiung, University of National Sun Yat-Sen. Master**:** 84.

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of occupational psychology , 63* (3), 193.

Warren, J & Phyllis, J (1995). "The Impact of Workplace Support on Work-Family Role Strain." Family Relations, 44, p. 163–69.

Wayne, J.H., Musisca, N. & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to

work–family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of vocational behavior , 64* (1), 108.

Wayne, J.H., Randel A. & Stevens, J. The role of identity and work–family support in work–family enrichment and its work-related consequences, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 69 (2006), pp. 445–461.

Wood, S. (1999). Family-friendly management: testing the various perspectives. *National Institute Economic Review ,* 99-116.

Yuen, C. C. (1995). the effect of career salience and life-cycle variables on perceptions of work-family interfoerences. *Human Relations , 48* (3), 265-283.

Appendices

Appendix A

Survey of work and non-work experience

Dear participant:

This questionnaire is designed to examine work/life balance. This project aims to discover the possible influence of your company's organizational culture on the usage of organizational work/life balance policies. The results may be useful in recommending effective organizational behavior and policies that are designed to increase employees' well-being.

Your information will be treated in strict confidence; no one in the organization will be able to view another's responses; your individual information will not be disclosed under any circumstances to anyone.

The questionnaire focuses on a variety of aspects that are relevant to both work and non-work domains. These include the resources available in your job, the relationship between work and non-work life, the support you receive from your organization, your supervisor and your family, and your attitude towards this organization.

General instructions: Please select **one** response that best reflects your opinion in each question. I expect it will take about 30 minutes to answer all the questions. I would be very appreciative of you answering all the questions and returning the questionnaire to me within the next 4-5 days, and by ___date_ if at all possible.

For the purpose of this research I define:
Work = paid employment, including self-employment and part-time employment
Non-work/life = any activities/time/relationships that are outside of work

When you have completed this questionnaire, please 1) return it to me in the postage-paid envelope provided; 2) return it to the box in the sealable envelope provided. If you have any enquiries about the research, please contact me. A souvenir pen will be given in appreciation of your precious time.

Lastly, thank you for your assistance with this project. Your involvement is very valuable and much appreciated.

Best Regards

Student: Ruby Chang
Supervisors: Michael O'Driscoll and Donald Cable
The University of Waikato, Department of Psychology

Email: rc22@students.waikato.ac.nz or wolfalien@hotmail.com
Telephone: (04)26810764

Information sheet

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. The information you submit as part of this survey cannot and will not be used to identify you. The information collected will also be treated as confidential; only people directly involved with the research will have access to this information, and the information will not be disclosed to anyone else under any circumstances.

By participating in this survey, you consent for the information you provide to be used for academic and research purposes. The information you provide will not be used for any other purpose and will be destroyed after the conclusion of the research. You may withdraw your participation at any time, up till when you return your survey questionnaire via mail, after which individual identification

Appendix B

[Part 1]: Organizational work-life balance policy

Please put a √ in the box which indicate whether each of the following is (a) provided, (b) available to you and (c) used by you

Does your organization provide the following policies?			Is it available to you?		Do you use it?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Child care information/ referral service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Child allowance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Eldercare information/ referral service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Elder allowance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Flextime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Work from home	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Paid maternity leave	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Paid paternity leave	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Breast-feeding time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Family emergency leave/ family care leave	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Unpaid child-care leave	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Work/family balance training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[Part 2]: Organizational support and Supervisor support

Please put a √ in box which best reflects your view of each item.

To what extent do you agree that each of the following statements represent the philosophy or beliefs of your organization (*remember, these are not your own personal beliefs*—but to what you believe is the philosophy of your organization).

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
13. Work should be the primary priority in a person's life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Long hours inside the office are the way to achieving advancement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. It is best to keep family matters separate from work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. It is considered taboo to talk about life outside of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Expressing involvement and interest in non-work matters is viewed as healthy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Employees who are highly committed to their personal lives cannot be highly committed to their work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Attending to personal needs, such as taking time off for sick children is frowned upon	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Employees should keep their personal problems at home	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. The way to advance in this company is to keep non-work matters out of the workplace	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Individuals who take time off to attend to personal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

matters are not committed to their work

23. It is assumed that the most productive employees are those who put their work before their family life

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

24. Employees are given ample opportunity to perform both their job and their personal responsibilities well

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

25. Offering employees flexibility in completing their work is viewed as a strategic way of doing business

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

26. The ideal employee is one who is available 24 hours a day

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Please read each of the following statements carefully and then decide the extent that you agree with each statement. Think about the manager/supervisor that you directly report to when answering the items.

	Strongly disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
27. My supervisor understands my demands outside of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. My supervisor listens when I talk about my life outside of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. My supervisor acknowledges that I have obligations as a family member	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[Part 3]: Support from other people

In this section I look at how often people outside of your work (e.g. friends, family, etc.) provide you with support when you are having problems.
Please put a √ in box which best reflects your view of each item.

How often did you get support from people outside of your work?	Never	Very Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	All the time
30. Helpful information or advice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. Sympathetic understanding and concern	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Clear and helpful feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Practical assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[Part 4]: Attitude towards your organization

Please read each of the following statement carefully and then decide the extent that you agree with each statement. Please put a √ in box which best reflects your view of each item.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
34. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

36. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

37. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

38. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

39. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

40. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

41. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

42. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

43. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

44. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

45. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

46. I do not feel any obligation to remain with

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

my current employer

47. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

48. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

49. This organization deserves my loyalty ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

50. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

51. I owe a great deal to my organization ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

52. Thoughts about quitting this job cross my mind.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Never **Sometimes** **Rarely** **Often** **Very often** **All the time**

53. I plan to look for a new job within the next 12 months.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Slightly Disagree** **Slightly Agree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**

54. How likely is it that, over the next year, you will actively look for a new job outside of this firm?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Very Unlikely **Moderately Unlikely** **Somewhat Unlikely** **Somewhat Likely** **Moderately Likely** **Very Likely**

[Part 5]: Work-life balance

Please read each of the following statements carefully and then put a √ in box which best represents your view with each statement. Think about the demands on your time and energy from both your work and your non-work commitments.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
55. I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non work activity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. I have difficulty balancing my work and non work activity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. I feel that the balance between my work demands and non work activity is currently about right	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. Overall, I believe that my work and non work activity are balanced	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
59. My work keeps me from my non work activities more than I would like	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61. I have to miss activities outside of work due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62. The time I spend on non work responsibilities often	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

interfere with my work
responsibilities

63. The time I spend with people outside of my work often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

64. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on non work responsibilities

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

65. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in other (e.g. family) activities/responsibilities

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

66. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family/spouse

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

67. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

68. Due to stress from outside of work, I am often preoccupied with all sorts of matters at work

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

69. Because I am often stressed from other non work responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

70. Tension and anxiety from my life outside of work often weaken my ability to do my job

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

My involvement in my work helps me to be a better member in all other aspects, because this involvement_____	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
71. Helps me to understand different viewpoints	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72. Helps me to gain knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
73. Helps me acquire skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
74. Puts me in a good mood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
75. Makes me feel happy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
76. Makes me cheerful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
77. Helps me feel personally fulfilled	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
78. Provides me with a sense of accomplishment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
79. Provides me with a sense of success	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

My involvement in my life outside of work helps me to be a better worker, because this	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

involvement_____

	Never	Occasionally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time
80. Helps me to gain knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
81. Helps me acquire skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
82. Helps me expand my knowledge of new things	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
83. Puts me in a good mood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
84. Makes me feel happy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
85. Makes me cheerful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
86. Requires me to avoid wasting time at work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
87. Encourages me to use my time in a focused manner	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
88. Causes me to be more focused at work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[Part 6]: Well-being

Please read each of the following statements carefully and then put a √ in box which best represents your view on each statement.

Thinking of the past few weeks, how much of the time has **your job** made you feel each of the following?

	Never	Occasionally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
89. Tense	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
90. Uneasy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
91. Worried	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
92. Calm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Never	Occasionally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
93. Contented	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
94. Relaxed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
95. Depressed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
96. Gloomy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
97. Miserable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
98. Cheerful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
99. Enthusiastic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
100. Optimistic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

In the past few weeks, how much of the time in **your life outside your job** have you felt each of the following?

	Never	Occasionally	Some of the time	Much of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
101. Tense	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
102. Uneasy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
103. Worried	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
104. Calm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
105. Contented	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
106. Relaxed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
107. Depressed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
108. Gloomy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

109. Miserable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

110. Cheerful ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

111. Enthusiastic ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

112. Optimistic ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

[Part 7]: Demographic information
The following questions are designed to enable me to compare the experience of people in different situations. This information will be treated as confidential, and your personal details will not be disclosed or reported to anyone.

113. Years with present company _____ **years**
114. Your age _____ **years old**
115. How many dependents in your family _____ **children**
_____ **elders**

116. Your gender

☐ **Male** ☐ **Female**

117. Your Marital status

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Single **Unmarried/ Cohabiting** **Married** **Divorced/ Separated** **Widowed**

118. Academic level reached

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Junior high or lower **Senior High or equivalent** **Polytechnic** **University** **Master degree or higher**

119. Would you classify your job as (please check one box only)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Top level manager **Middle level manager** **First level supervisor** **Non supervisory**

Please return it to me now in the envelope provided

If you would like to receive a summary on conclusion of this

project, please either:

1) Leave your email address or postal address:

_____

2) or Email me at : rc22@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix C

Table 4

Mediation between organizational support and organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work conflict					
1	Life-to-work conflict	Organizational support	-.04	-.954	.000
2	Organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.01	-.26	-.001
3	Organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.02	-.49	
		Life-to-work conflict	-.25*	-6.51	.06

Table 7

Mediation between organizational support and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Life-to-work facilitation					
1	Life-to-work facilitation	Organizational support	.04	1.13	.000
2	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	.02	.48	-.001
3	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	.01	.14	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.31*	8.34	.09

Table 9a

Mediation between organizational support and turnover intention

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Organizational support	-.10*	-2.50	.008
2	Turnover intention	Organizational support	-.03	-.77	.000
3	Turnover intention	Organizational support	.01	.19	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.38*	10.56	.14

Table 9b

Mediation between organizational support and organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Organizational support	-.10*	-2.50	.008
2	Organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.01	-.26	-.001
3	Organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.03	-.89	
		Life-to-work facilitation	-.25	-6.45	.06

Table 9c

Mediation between organizational support and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Organizational support	-.10*	-2.50	.008
2	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	.02	.48	-.001
3	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.02	-.53	
		Life-to-work facilitation	-.39*	-10.79	.15

Table 9d

Mediation between organizational support and continuance organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Organizational support	-.10*	-2.50	.008
2	Continuance organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.05	-1.30	.001
3	Continuance organizational commitment	Organizational support	-.03	-.73	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.24*	6.23	.06

Table 10d

Mediation between supervisor support and continuance organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life conflict					
1	Work-to-life conflict	Supervisor support	-.21*	-5.46	.04
2	Continuance organizational commitment	Supervisor support	-.02	-.51	.001
3	Continuance organizational commitment	Supervisor support	.03	.82	
		Life-to-work facilitation	.25*	6.36	.06

Table 11a

Mediation between organizational support and turnover intention

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Organizational support	.03	.74	.000
2	Turnover intention	Organizational support	-.03	-.77	.000
3	Turnover intention	Organizational support	-.02	-.56	
		Work-to-life facilitation	.34	-9.36	.11

Table 11b

Mediation between organizational support and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Organizational support	.03	.74	.000
2	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	.02	.48	-.001
3	Affective organizational commitment	Organizational support	.00	.12	
		Work-to-life facilitation	.53*	15.96	.28

Table 11c

Mediation between organizational support and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-to-life facilitation					
1	Work-to-life facilitation	Organizational support	.03	.74	.000
2	Psychological wellbeing	Organizational support	.09*	2.31	.01
3	Psychological wellbeing	Organizational support	.08*	2.22	
		Work-to-life facilitation	.44*	12.47	.20

Table 13a

Mediation between policy availability and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy availability	-.02	-.48	-.001
2	Psychological wellbeing	Policy availability	-.07	-1.78	.004
3	Psychological wellbeing	Policy availability	-.06	-1.71	
		Work-life balance	.40	10.30	.16

Table 13b

Mediation between policy availability and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy availability	-.02	-.48	-.001
2	Affective organizational commitment	Policy availability	-.11*	-2.66	.01
3	Affective organizational commitment	Policy availability	-.10*	-2.68	
		Work-life balance	.38*	9.97	.16

Table 13c

Mediation between policy availability and continuance organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy availability	-.02	-.48	-.001
2	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy availability	.04	.97	.000
3	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy availability	.04	.95	
		Work-life balance	-.04	-.88	.000

Table 13d

Mediation between policy availability and turnover intention

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy availability	-.02	-.48	-.001
2	Turnover intention	Policy availability	.12*	2.94	.01
3	Turnover intention	Policy availability	.12*	2.95	
		Work-life balance	-.34*	-8.77	.23

Table 14a

Mediation between policy usage and psychological wellbeing

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy usage	.07	1.64	.003
2	Psychological wellbeing	Policy usage	-.02	-.44	-.001
3	Psychological wellbeing	Policy usage	-.04	-1.11	
		Work-life balance	.40	10.22	.15

Table 14b

Mediation between policy usage and affective organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy usage	.07	1.64	.003
2	Affective organizational commitment	Policy usage	.03	.69	-.00
3	Affective organizational commitment	Policy usage	.00	.07	
		Work-life balance	.38*	9.80	.14

Table 14c

Mediation between policy usage and continuance organizational commitment

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy usage	.07	1.64	.00
2	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy usage	.02	.38	-.00
3	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy usage	.02	.43	
		Work-life balance	-.03	-.80	-.00

Table 14d

Mediation between policy usage and turnover intention

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy usage	.07	1.64	.003
2	Turnover intention	Policy usage	-.02	-.49	-.001
3	Turnover intention	Policy usage	.00	.06	
		Work-life balance	-.34*	8.52	.11

Table 15d

<u>Mediating regression equations between policy provision and continuance organizational commitment</u>

Step	Criterion Variables	Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	t	Adjusted R²
Mediator = Work-life balance					
1	Work-life balance	Policy provision	.12*	3.09	.01
2	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy provision	.05	1.16	.001
3	Continuance organizational commitment	Policy provision	.05	1.27	
		Work-life balance	-.04	-1.01	.001

Appendix D

Work-life balance policies

1. Dependent care

   a. Childcare information/ referral service: Organization provides the employees with its own specialized childcare centre, or offers a childcare referral service where an employee receives a discount.

   b. Child allowance: Offers employees with financial support for childcare.

   c. Eldercare information/ referral service: Organization provides the employees with its own specialized eldercare centre, or offers eldercare referral service which the employee receives at a discounted rate.

   d. Elder allowance: Offers employees financial support for eldercare.

2. Flextime

   a. Flextime: Provides the employees with flextime so that employees can have more flexibility in adjusting their work time, thus maintaining a better balance between work and off-work life.

   b. Work from home: Provides the employees with the choice to work from home so that employees can maintain a better balance between work and off-work life.

3. Leave program

   a. Paid maternity leave: Providing a female employee with maternity leave before and after childbirth for a combined period of eight weeks; in the case of miscarriage, the organization shall grant maternity leave according to the law.

   b. Paid paternity leave: Providing a male employee paternity leave for a combined period of two days before and after his spouse gives birth to their child.

    c. Family leave: Providing employees with family leave for the purpose of taking personal care of a family member in situations such as when they need inoculating, if they suffer from serious illness, or any other major events.

    d. Parental leave: Employee may apply for parental leave without payment before any of his or her children reach the age of three years old. The period of this leave extends until his or her child reaches the age of three years old but cannot exceed two years.

4. Others

    a. Baby-feeding time: Where an employee is required to feed his or her baby of less than one year of age in person, in addition to the rest period prescribed, his or her employer shall permit him or her to do so twice a day, each for thirty minutes.

    b. Work-family balance training: Providing employees with family and marriage conference, study groups and some occasional work-life balance related meetings.