

Combining Work and Family: Experiential and Empirical Lessons from Project 3535

Presented by

Karen Korabik
and
Roya Ayman

On behalf of the Project 3535 Research Team

Project 3535 Team Members

- Zeynep Aycan***, Koc University, **Turkey**
- Roya Ayman**, Illinois Institute of Technology, **USA**
- Anne Bardoel**, Monash University, **Australia**
- Tripti Pande Desai**, Institute for Integrated Learning in Management, **India**
- Anat Drach-Zahavy**, University of Haifa, **Israel**
- Leslie Hammer**, Portland State University, **USA**
- Ting-Pang Huang**, Soochow University, **Taiwan**
- Karen Korabik**, University of Guelph, **Canada**
- Donna S. Lero**, University of Guelph, **Canada**
- Artiwati Mawardi**, University of Surabaya, **Indonesia**
- Steven Poelmans**, IESE University of Navarra, **Spain**
- Ujvala Rajadhyaksha**, St. Mary's University-USA, **India**
- Anit Somech**, University of Haifa, **Israel**

Names appear in alphabetical order. * indicates the Project Coordinator.

Process: Guiding Principles

- Best practices for conducting cross-cultural research (Gelfand, Raver, & Erhart, 2002)
 - Multicultural & multidisciplinary team of endogenous researchers to assure deep understanding of issues & how they apply in different cultural contexts (Ayman, 1994; Gelfand et al., 2002)

- Principles that embodied our value system
 - Collaborative, egalitarian, supportive
 - Consultative & consensus-oriented decision making (Aycan, 2005)

Advantages & Disadvantages

- Challenges: (Aycan, 2005)
 - Dealing with cultural differences in values & beliefs (e.g., assumptions about meaning of constructs)
 - Maintaining communication
 - Procuring funding

- Resulted in slower progress & less efficiency

- Benefits:
 - Hopefully better quality result with more *emic* understanding
 - Friendships formed & support we provided for each other when team members experienced personal challenges (Aycan, 2005)

Data Collection: Guiding Principles

- Employed multiple methodologies
 - Multilevel approach ranging from micro - macro
 - Both emic (culture specific) & etic (pancultural) components (Gelfand et al., 2002)

- Collected: (Korabik, Lero, & Ayman, 2003)
 - Social policy data
 - Qualitative, focus group data
 - Quantitative, survey data with both standardized scales & items/scales we created (e.g., W-F guilt)

Data Collection: Continued

- Comprehensive, theoretically-based strategy to variable inclusion
 - Both antecedents & outcomes of W-F interface
 - Important cultural moderating variables
 - Positive spillover, personal coping initiatives & organizational W-F policies (Frone, 2002)

- 9 cultures selected based on theoretically important dimensions (Gelfand et al., 2002)

- Sampling criteria:
 - Men & women
 - Managerial & non-managerial positions

Advantages & Disadvantages

□ Challenges:

- Unable to control for industry
- Unable to implement prospective design
- Different data collection methods: face-to-face vs. on-line focus groups; paper & pencil vs electronic surveys
- Difficult to find women managers in some countries
- More difficult to obtain data in Western countries (US, Canada, Australia) due to ethics/privacy regulations
- Concern about complexity of research, number of variables & length of survey (Aycan, 2005)

□ Careful attention to proper research methodology (e.g., translation/back-translation, pilot testing, establishment of measurement equivalence) delayed progress & increased our own W-F conflict (Aycan, 2005)

Social Policy Results

(Aycan, 2005; Lero & Bardoel, 2008)

- Australia, US & Canada high government & workplace policy support
 - high human/gender development index
- India, Indonesia & Turkey
 - high extended family & paid worker support
 - low human/gender development index
- Institutional support provided by governments & organizations perceived to be insufficient
- Developed countries better than underdeveloped countries
- Similar laws exist in underdeveloped countries, but enforcement is a problem

Focus Group Results: Common Themes

- Sample: employed women (all countries) plus men in US & Canada
- Those in all countries found combining work & family to be challenging, but WIF > FIW (Aycañ, 2005)
- Most conflict between worker & parent roles (Aycañ, 2005)
- Many demands on women; being a proper mother deemed very important in all societies (Aycañ, 2005)
- Negative & positive spillover; W-F guilt; coping & social support reported in all countries
- But, different issues in different cultures

Focus Groups: Culture Specific Results

- Spain: lack of fit between work hours & family hours (Poelmans, 2004)
- Some cultures (e.g., US & Canada) heavier work demands & more sacrifice of family time
- Others (e.g., Turkey & Taiwan) heavier family demands & more career sacrifices
- Collectivistic cultures (e.g., India, Turkey, Spain), more extended family support; can be strain as well as support (Aycaan, 2005)

Focus Groups: Culture Specific Results

- Economically underdeveloped countries, more paid household help. But, quality not always high (Aycan, 2005)
- In some cultures (e.g., India, Turkey) children's academic achievement extremely important (Aycan, 2005)
- In some cultures (e.g., India, Arab Israelis Australia) pressure to be a “superwoman”

Results: Measurement Equivalence

- Measurement equivalence established for:
 - **Positive Spillover:** 2 factors (WIF & FIW)
 - **Vertical Collectivism**
 - **Horizontal Collectivism @ home & @ work**
 - **Work & Family Control**
 - **Work Overload**
 - **Satisfaction:** 4 factors (job, family, life, turnover intent)
 - **Guilt:** 2 factors (WIF & FIW)
 - **Conflict of work & nonwork roles**

- Still working on other measures

- Problem with WIF & FIW
 - Other research comparing US with Australia/NZ has called into question measurement invariance of Carlson et al scale (Hearst, 2004)

Quantitative Survey Results

- Role Overload & Job Demands
- Job & Family Satisfaction; Turnover Intent
- Positive Spillover
- Gender-Role Attitudes
- Coping & Gender-Role Attitudes
- Work-Family Guilt
- Satisfaction with Supervisor & Policies

Role Overload & Job Demands

- US (Ishaya & Ayman, 2008)
 - More work & family overload, more time- & strain-based WIF
 - More family overload, more time- & strain-based FIW

- Canada (Korabik & Lero, 2004; Korabik, McElwain & Lero, 2009)
 - More work overload, more WIF conflict & WIF guilt
 - More family overload, more FIW conflict and WIF & FIW guilt
 - More job demands, more WIF conflict
 - More family demands, more FIW conflict

- Canada (Oliver, McElwain, Korabik, & Lero, 2008)
 - Managers: reduced work hours associated with lower work overload & less WIF
 - Non-managers: flexible scheduling associated with higher job control & less WIF

Job & Family Satisfaction; Turnover Intent

- US (Velgach, Ishaya, & Ayman, 2006)
 - More time-based FIW, less job satisfaction
 - More strain-based WIF, less family satisfaction
- Canada (Korabik et al., 2009)
 - More WIF, less job satisfaction
 - More FIW, less family satisfaction
 - More job demands, more WIF; more WIF, more turnover intentions
- Taiwan (Huang, 2009)
 - More work & family overload, more WIF & FIW
 - More WIF & FIW, less job & family satisfaction

Positive Spillover

- **Australia:** (Haar & Bardoel, 2007, 2009)
- **More work-family positive spillover:**
 - more job satisfaction
 - Less psychological distress & turnover intent
- **More family-work positive spillover:**
 - more family satisfaction
 - less psychological distress
- **Positive spillover originating from both work & home buffered effects of negative spillover on job satisfaction & psychological distress**

Gender-Role Attitudes

- Spain, Taiwan, India, US & Canada (Poelmans, Ayman, Korabik, Rajadhyaksha, Huang, Lero & Desai, 2006)
 - N. America & Europe > Asia in egalitarianism
 - Traditionals > egalitarians in both WIF & FIW

- India (Rajadhyaksha & Velgach, 2009)
 - Both men & women traditionals > egalitarians in WIF & FIW

- US (Velgach, Ayman, Antani, & Ishaya, 2006; Velgach, Ishaya, & Ayman, 2006)
 - Gender role attitudes better predict WFC than gender
 - Traditionals > egalitarians in both time- & strain- based WIF & FIW

Coping and Gender-Role Attitudes

- **Israel** (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2007)
- 8 categories of coping
- Differentially related to WIF & FIW for men & women with traditional vs. egalitarian gender-role attitudes

	Higher WIF	Higher FIW	Lower WIF	Lower FIW
Traditional Men	None	Delegate @ work	None	Good enough @ home; super @ work
Egalitarian Men	Good enough @ work	Good enough @ home	Delegate @ work	Delegate & prioritize @ work
Traditional Women	Good enough @ home	Good enough & delegate @ home; super @ work	Good enough & delegate @ work	Delegate & prioritize @ work
Egalitarian Women	Good enough @ work	None	Good enough @ home	Good enough & delegate @ home; super @ work

Work-Family Guilt

- **Canada** (Korabik & Lero, 2004; Korabik et al., 2009)
 - More WIF conflict, more WIF guilt
 - More FIW conflict, more FIW guilt
 - WIF guilt partially mediates the relationship between WIF conflict & psychological distress

Satisfaction with Supervisor & Policies

□ US (Velgach, Ishaya, & Ayman, 2006)

- Organizational policies related to lower strain-based WIF & time-based FIW

□ Canada (Lero, Korabik, & MacElwain, 2006)

• For men

- More satisfaction with supervisor & satisfaction with organizational policies, less WIF
- Less WIF, more job satisfaction, better ease of balancing & less turnover intent

• For women

- More satisfaction with policies, less WIF
- Less WIF & FIW, better ease of balancing

Thank You!

For more information
visit our website:

www.worklifeconflict.ca

References

- Ayman, R. (1994, June). Beyond imperialism in cross-cultural research: a Jigsaw puzzle model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of SIETAR, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Aycan, Z. (2005, July). A Cross-Cultural Approach to Work-Family Conflict. International Conference on Work and Family, Barcelona, Spain.
- Frone, M.R. (2002). Work-family balance. In J.C. Quick and L.E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. Washington D.C.: APA Press.
- Gelfand, M.J., Raver, J.L., & Erhart, K.H. (2002). Methodological issues in cross-cultural organizational research. In S. Rogelberg (Ed.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Harr, J. & Bardoel, A. (2009, April). Work-Family Negative And Positive Spillover And Outcomes: Direct And Moderating Effects. Communities, Work and Family Conference. Utrecht, The Netherlands.

- Harr, J. & Bardoel, A. (2007). Work-family Positive Spillover Predicting Outcomes: A Study of Australia Employees. Inaugural Work-Life Research Workshop: Australian Centre for Research in Employment and Work (ACREW).
- Hearst, D. (2004, April). Cross-Cultural Measurement Invariance of Work/Family Conflict Scales Across English-Speaking Samples. Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL, USA.
- Huang, T-P. (2009, July). Personal communication.
- Ishaya, N., & Ayman, R. (2008, August). Predicting work-family conflict via perceived involvement and overload. American Psychological Association, Boston, MA, USA.
- Korabik, K., McElwain, A. & Lero, D.S. (2009, November). Does Work-Family Guilt Mediate Relationships Between Work-Family Conflict and Outcome Variables? Work, Stress and Health Conference, Puerto Rico.
- Korabik, K. & Lero, D.S. (2004, August). The Work-Family Interface in Canada: Preliminary Quantitative and Qualitative Findings. International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Xi'an China.

- Korabik, K., Lero, D.S., & Ayman, R. (2003). A Multi-level Approach to Cross Cultural Work–Family Research A Micro and Macro Perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3 (3), 289-303.
- Lero, D.S. & Bardoel, A. (2008, October). Including the Social-Cultural and Policy Contexts in our Multi-level, Multi-National Study of Work-Family Conflict. Report to the International W-F Workshop. Guelph, ON.
- Lero, D.S., Korabik, K., & MacElwain, A. (2006, July). Workplace Support, Workplace Culture and Work-Family Conflict in Canada. 26th International Congress of Applied Psychology, Athens, Greece.
- Oliver, T., McElwain, A., Korabik, K. & Lero, D.S. (2008, June). Workplace policies and work interference with family: The effects of job type. Canadian Psychological Association, Halifax, N.S., Canada.
- Poelmans, S. A.Y. (2004, April). Work-Family Conflict in Anglo-Saxon and European Cultural Context: The case of Spain. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL, USA.

- Poelmans, S., Ayman, R., Korabik, K., Rajadhyaksha, U., Huang, T-P., Lero, D.S. & Desai, T.P. (2006, July). How Far is Too Far?: Comparing Spain, Taiwan, India, US and Canada on Work- Family Conflict. 18th Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece.
- Rajadhyaksha, U. & Velgach, S. (2009, August). Gender, Gender Role Ideology and Work-Family Conflict in India. Academy of Management, Chicago, IL, USA.
- Somech, A. & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2007). Strategies for coping with work-family conflict: The distinctive relationships of gender role ideology. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (1), 1-29.
- Velgach, S., Ishaya, N., & Ayman, R. (2006, April). Multi-Method Approach to Investigate Work-Family Conflict. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA. USA.
- Velgach, S., Ayman, R., Antani, A., & Ishaya, N., (2006, July). Impact of GRI on WFC: case of a health organization in the USA. International Congress of Applied Psychology, Athens, Greece.