

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY-FOCUSED ORGANISATIONAL
AND SUPERVISOR SUPPORT AND POSITIVE WORK-OUTCOMES**

MAPALO MOHASI

MHSMAP001

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the
Degree of Master of Commerce in Organisational Psychology

Faculty of Commerce
University of Cape Town
2010

COMPULSORY DECLARATION:

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:

Date:

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between family-focused organisational and supervisor support and the positive work outcomes, job satisfaction, affective commitment, continuous commitment and work-family enrichment. Social Exchange theory and Leader-member exchange theory were used to understand the relationship between family-focused organisational support and supervisor support and positive work-attitudes amongst South African employees in the hospitality industry (N= 110). No support was found for the hypotheses that family-focused organisational support explains a significant proportion of the variance in any of the work outcomes. The findings however indicated that family-focused supervisor support explained a significant proportion of the variance in continuous commitment and work-family enrichment, but not in affective commitment and job satisfaction. Implications for management are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my supervisor, Ameeta Jaga, thank you for your support and for guiding me through this research process. The learning had been profound.

Thank you to the participating organisation for the unrestricted access to the employees. In particular, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation and gratitude to all the employees who took the time to complete the questionnaires, and in doing so, contributed to my research findings.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for the support and UCT for allowing me to have a life changing experience; you will forever be in my prayers.

University of Cape Town

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Motivation	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Structure of the Dissertation	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Chapter Introduction	4
Theoretical Framework	4
Social Exchange Theory (SET)	5
Organisational Support	5
Perceived Organisational Support	6
Family-focused Organisational Support	6
Leader-member exchange (LMX) Theory	7
General Supervisor Support	9
Family-focused Supervisor Support	9
Outcomes of Family-focused Organisational and Supervisor Support	11
Organisational commitment	11
Job Satisfaction	13
Work-family enrichment	14

Research Hypotheses	15
Summary	15
CHAPTER 3: METHOD	16
Chapter Introduction	16
Research Design	16
Procedure	17
Participants	17
Measuring Instruments	18
Organisational Commitment	19
Job Satisfaction	19
Family Supportive Organisational Perceptions (FSOP)	19
Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviour (FSSB)	19
Work-Family Enrichment	19
Demographics	19
Data Analysis Techniques	20
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	21
Exploratory Factor Analysis	21
Organisational Commitment Scale	21
Job Satisfaction Scale	22
Family-focused Organisational Support	23
Family-focused Supervisor Support Scale	24
Work-family Enrichment	26
Reliability Analysis	26
Descriptive Statistics	26
Correlation Analysis	28

Regression Analysis	29
CC as an Outcome of Family-focused Supervisor Support	29
Work-family Enrichment as outcome of Family-focused SS	30
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	31
Family-focused supervisor support and positive outcome	32
Limitations of the study	34
Management Implications	35
Future Recommendations	35
Conclusion	36
References	37
Appendix A	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: <i>Demographic Frequencies of the Sample</i>	18
Table 2: <i>Factor Loadings of Affective and Continuance Org. Commitment</i>	22
Table 3: <i>Factor Loadings of Job Satisfaction</i>	23
Table 4: <i>Factor Loadings of Family-focused Org. Support</i>	24
Table 5: <i>Factor Loadings of Family-focused Supervisor Support</i>	25
Table 6: <i>Factor loadings of Work-family enrichment</i>	27
Table 7: <i>Descriptive Statistics</i>	28
Table 8: <i>Correlation Matrix</i>	29
Table 9: <i>Work-family Conflict and Family-work Conflict Scale</i>	30
Table 10: <i>Regression Model for Work-Family enrichment</i>	30

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background and Motivation

Significant changes in the demographics of the workforce all over the world have led to an increase in research on the work- family interface. These changes include widespread gender integration in the workplace such as dual income families, single parents, and working mothers (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001; Cook, 2008; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005; Jaga, 2007). For many individuals, such changes have simultaneously led to greater challenges in juggling work and family roles (Haar & Roche, 2008) as the need for men and women to share both household and work responsibilities have increased (Allen, 2001; Gilbert, Hallet, & Eldridge, 1994; Haar & Roche, 2008; 2010; Kelly, Kossek, Hammer, Bary, Chermack, & Kaskubar, 2008).

Research from multi disciplines such as psychology, organisational behaviour, economics, and management have focused on the work-family interface (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001; Behson, 2002; Haar & Roche, 2008; 2010; Hammer et al., 2005; Heiland & Macpherson, 2005; Jaga, 2007; Liu, 2004). The majority of research however has been studied from a conflict perspective, advocating a view that managing work and family demands leads to negative outcomes such as stress and dissatisfaction (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Constructs explaining this perspective have included work-family conflict, negative spillover and work-family interference (Behson, 2006).

A focus on the negative side of the work-family relationship has left a gap in a holistic understanding of the work-family interface because it ignores the possibility that work and family roles can be mutually beneficial and can lead to positive outcomes (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008; 2010; Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner & Hanson, 2008; Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006). Organisations have begun acknowledging the benefits of such positive outcomes as well as the detriments of the negative outcomes resulting from work-family conflict. Consequently they have started introducing family-focused organisational practices such as flexible work schedules, telecommuting and condensed working weeks to help employees

manage the growing demands of work and family roles (Allen, 2001; Glass & Estest, 1997; Haar & Roche 2008; 2010; Hammer et al., 2008). These family-focused organisational practices are further aimed at increasing productivity and retaining valued employees. (Williams, McDaniel, & Nguyen (2006). Thus, the need to juggle the demands for work-family roles has led organisations to care for and pay more attention to employees needs outside of work through provision of family-focused practices.

Research has evidenced that such practices lead to positive work outcomes such as increased organisational commitment (Allen, 2001; Hammer et al., 2008), increased job satisfaction (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008; Haar & Spell, 2004) and work-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Karatepe & Bekteshi, 2008; Wadsworth & Owens, 2007). In line with these findings, Baltes et al. (1999) in a meta-analysis illustrated that flexible work schedules are associated with less absenteeism and greater job satisfaction. Haar and Spell (2004) and Lambert (2000) explored employees' perceptions of family-focused practices, and found these to be significant in explaining employees' job attitudes (Haar & Roche, 2008). Thompson and Prottas (2005) however found that the formal availability of work-family practices alone had modest association with important work-outcomes.

Hammer et al. (2008) went on to add that even though the adoption and implementation of family-focused practices can be beneficial to employees, they are alone insufficient in reducing the rising work-family demands and needs for increased flexibility. Without support from the organisation and more specifically the employee's supervisor, most of the practices in the work place are not effectively utilised. This is because employees fear that the use of such practices may negatively affect their careers (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008). Thompson and Prottas (2005) found that organisations that value a healthy work-family interaction have benefited from positive work-outcomes amongst their employees.

Research on work-family issues in the hospitality sector has received little attention (Karatepe & Canozar, 2003). The nature of work in the hospitality sector requires employees to have irregular and inflexible work schedules, limited time-off on weekends, and excessive job demands due to frequent face-to-face interaction with customers and providing quality service

(Deery & Jago, 2009; Harris & Reynolds, 2003; Karatepe & Canozar, 2003; Karatepe & Kilic, 2007). Where studies have been conducted, results have found that work role demands lead to negative work-outcomes such as increased turnover intentions and reduced job satisfaction (Allen, 2001). In a highly competitive arena, service firms are challenged to identify ways to create a satisfied and committed workforce (Allen, 2001; Cleveland et al., 2001).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to contribute to the limited literature on work-family support by examining the relationship between family-focused organisational and supervisory support and important organisational outcomes namely job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and work-family enrichment, amongst South African hotel employees. Furthermore, this study aims to provide recommendations to management to enhance supportive behaviours in order to foster work environments that help employees manage the dual demands of work and family.

The findings of this study should contribute to an in-depth understanding of the benefits of organisations engaging in work-family roles and effectively supporting employees through the provision of informal workplace support (Allen, 2001) and supportive supervisor behaviour (Hammer, et. al., 2008).

Structure of the Dissertation

This chapter provides an introduction to the research topic, the background and purpose of the study. Chapter two provides an overview of the main theories used to understand the constructs under study and provides a review of the literature on the relationships between family-focused organisational and supervisor support and positive work outcomes. Chapter three discusses the method employed in order to fulfil the main purpose of the study. Chapter four follows with a presentation of the statistical analyses of the data obtained. The concluding chapter, chapter five, provides a discussion of the findings as well as management recommendations and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature on family-focused support has generally distinguished between two levels of support: organisational and supervisor support (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008, 2010; Hammer et al., 2008). Organisational support refers to the perceptions employees hold regarding how supportive their organisations are toward their family role demands. Supervisor support is a source of social support that is directed towards employees with the intention to promote healthy work-family interaction (Hammer & Kossek, in press; Lapierre & Allen, 2006). Specifically in this study, supervisor support is assessed in relation to the behaviour which is perceived by employees as being supportive to their family needs.

Unlike the general support on work-family issues (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhodes & Eisenberger, 2002) family-focused organisational and supervisor support looks at the unique nature of family-focused support. The aim of this chapter is to review the literature regarding the nature of work-family organisational and supervisor support and the resulting positive work-outcomes. The theoretical framework that is used to better understand the relationships between the constructs under study follows.

Theoretical Framework

In this study two main theories are reviewed. The first, Social Exchange Theory describes the reciprocal social relationships that employees develop within their employing organisations (Blau, 1964). Social Exchange Theory (SET) provides an understanding into the relationship between family-focused organisational support and employee work attitudes (Allen, 2001; Brandes, Dharwadkar, & Wheatley, 2004; Haar & Roche, 2008; Haar & Spell, 2004). The second theory, Leader-member Exchange (LMX), refers to the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate, and provides an understanding into the relationship between family-focused supervisor support and employee work attitudes (Brandes et al., 2004; Graen & Cashman, 1975). Each theory will in turn be discussed.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory (SET) is defined as a “mutual exchange between effort and loyalty for the tangible benefits and social rewards which is used to illustrate the interactions that employees have with their employers’ organisations” (Blau, 1964, p. 7). Researchers argued that employees assess their social interactions with the organisation and feel obligated to reciprocate in the future (Gouldner, 1960; Brandes et al., 2004; Haar & Roche, 2008). Unlike an economic exchange, where an employee performs work knowing that he/she will be rewarded for his/her effort, the reciprocal nature of a social exchange is not specified in advance (Chen et al., 2005; Haar & Roche, 2008). Blau (1994) suggested that social exchange theory explains a relationship that is beyond economic forces. The relationship includes social factors such as supportive work climates (Allen, 2001; Thomas & Gangster, 1995; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999), social support (Eisenberger et al., 2001), and psychological support (Orthner & Rose, 2009). Some organisations have introduced family practices such as job sharing, flexible work arrangements and family health care benefits, placing a high value on the quality of their employees’ work-family relationship (Crover & Crooker, 1995; Ngo, Foley, & Loi, 2009). Few researchers have studied family-focused organisational support from a social exchange theory perspective. Liu (2004) used social exchange theory as a framework to understand employees’ perceptions of organisational support and found that employees with high levels of perceived family focused organisational support reported increased levels of positive attitudes. Hammer et al. (2008) however argued that the availability of the practices alone are insufficient in assisting employees in managing their work and family demands, and that the use of such practices should be supported by the organisation. Similarly, Liu (2004) found that employees with high levels of perceived family focused organisational support reported increased levels of positive attitudes.

Organisational Support

The majority of literature on work-family support has focused on general organisational support such as perceived organisational support. Thus, a number of scholars like Allen (2001), Haar and Roche (2008) started shifting their attention towards specific organisational support such as family-focused organisational support which is discussed hereunder.

Perceived organisational support

Perceived organisational support (POS) is grounded in social exchange theory (Bishop et al., 2005; Eisenberger et al., 1990). It is defined as the “belief concerning the extent to which the organisation values their employees’ contributions and cares about their employees’ well-being” (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 501). Eisenberger et al. (1986) found that when employees feel highly valued and cared for in the organisation, they perceive their organisation as supportive and view it more favourably. Employees may feel the need to reciprocate such behaviour through enhanced work-outcomes such as increased organisational commitment and job satisfaction (Haar & Roche, 2008).

Allen (2001) and Haar and Roche (2008) however noted a criticism regarding the generalised nature of POS in work-family studies. They argued that POS describes attitudinal responses which employees may have regarding their organisations as a whole and fails to explain the unique focus on family support perceived by employees (Allen, 2001; Behson, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008, 2010; Hammer et al., 2008; Kossek & Hammer, 2008; Lapierre et al., 2008). In line with this, Kossek et al. (in press) conducted a meta-analysis and developed a model examining the relationship between employees’ perceptions of general support versus their perceptions of family-focused support. The results of their study showed that family-focused support explained more of the variance in work-family interaction than general support. The results support Allen’s (2001) argument for developing a unique family-focused organisational support construct. Other similar constructs have been developed and in turn will be reviewed.

Family focused organisational support

Thompson et al. (1999) described the construct work-family culture. They referred to the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organisation is family-supportive. This construct comprises three elements, namely (1) family-focused managerial support, (2) career consequences associated with using family-focused practices and benefits, and (3) organisational time-based demands that may cause conflict between work and family roles. Thompson et al. (1999) found that employees who perceived their organisations as more

family-friendly utilised more family-focused practices than those who perceived their organisations as less family-friendly. These employees also reported greater positive organisational outcomes.

Grounded in social exchange theory, Allen (2001) proposed the construct Family Supportive Organisational Perceptions (FSOP). It is defined as the “global perceptions that employees form regarding the extent the organisation are family-supportive” (Allen, 2001, p. 414). Allen argued that this construct is distinct from the more general POS that had been used in work-family studies. Allen (2001) and Kossek et al. (in press) argued that family-focused organisational support minimise workplace challenges, and provides employees with resources to support them in a more holistic manner. Allen reported that employees who perceived their organisations as family-supportive utilised more family-focused practices.

Jahn, Thompson, and Kopelman (2003) suggested that family-focused organisational support can be divided into two variables; tangible support which indicates resources like instrumental and informational support while intangible support include components like emotional support. While other authors assessed different elements of support (Allen, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999) Jahn et al. (2003) suggested that incorporation of these dimensions to family-focused organisational support can lead to employees’ commitment to their organisations.

Hammer et al. (2009) however reported that supervisors play a critical role in influencing employee’s perceptions on how family-supportive the organisation is. Supervisor support will be viewed through the lens of Leader-member exchange theory.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

Leader-member exchange (LMX) has been widely used to understand the relationship and interaction between a supervisor and a subordinate. LMX refers to the quality of the interpersonal relationship between a supervisor (the leader) and a subordinate (the member) in an organisation (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995; Major, Klein & Ehrhart, 2008). Increased leader-subordinate exchange can be demonstrated through provision

of frequent advice, shared support, flexibility, and autonomy (Cook, 2009; Liden & Graen, 1980).

LMX is used as a framework to explain the relationship between supervisors and subordinates such that subordinates will receive recognition and reward from their supervisor, when they engage in and demonstrate behaviours that meet their supervisors' expectations. Gerstner and Day (1997) argued that the quality of the relationship between the subordinate and supervisor can be dependent on factors including personal compatibility, subordinate competencies and level of subordinate independence. As a result, subordinates can fall into two categories namely high quality LMX and low quality LMX. Gerstner and Day (1997) found that subordinates who belong to the high quality LMX category received greater benefits, recognition, and support than those in the low-quality LMX category and consequently reported increased job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Supervisor behaviours are thus likely to strongly influence employees' behaviours and attitudes (Major et al., 2008). For example, immediate supervisors may discourage the use of family-focused practices despite the availability of such practices in the organisation. This may negatively influence the employee's perception and attitudes on how supportive the organisation is on family issues (Major et al., 2008; Schneider, 1993). High levels of LMX and family-focused supervisor behaviours thus foster relationships of trust and support beyond existing formal organisational systems (Wayne et al., 1997; Liu, 2004) which may lead to positive organisational outcomes.

LMX help explain the support that is perceived by the employee on a supervisory level. The following section reviews the constructs that have been researched in explaining supervisor support in the work-family interface.

General Supervisor Support

Supervisor support refers to the general expression of concern by the supervisor which is aimed at increasing the employee's well-being (Kossek et al., in press). According to Hammer et al. (2009) supervisor support is a form of workplace social support.

Supervisor support can be viewed from two dimensions; willingness and ability. Willingness describes the degree to which a supervisor is willing to offer support to subordinates' and ability refers to the know-how and skills of the supervisor to identify subordinate needs (Hsu et al., 2008). Social recognition from the supervisor, such as compliments and encouragement can help increase work-family enrichment. For example, Brink and de la Rey's (2001) study on the strategies used by South African women in coping with the work-family interface, found that social support and supervisor support significantly influenced employees' emotional and problem-focused coping strategies. That is to say, a supervisor who is willing and able to identify employees' challenges can significantly influence their emotions and coping strategies through provision of appropriate and specific family-focused practices and support.

Extensive research on supervisor support and work-family literature has been based on the general measures of emotional support (Hsu et al., 2008), as opposed to addressing specific family-focused supervisor behaviour (Kossek et al., 2007). Hammer et al. 2008 has contested this generalised construct in the context of work-family studies and developed a multi-dimensional construct, family-supportive supervisor behaviour (FSSB), to assess family-focused supervisor support.

Family-focused Supervisor Support

The literature on family-focused supervisor support has shown that supervisors can enhance the positive effect of family-focused practices (e.g. telecommuting and flexitime) or can undermine such practices through non-supportive supervisory behaviour (Ryan & Kossek, 2008; Lautsch et al., 2009) which in turn can result in decreased job satisfaction and commitment. One aspect that Thompson et al. (1999) noted with regard to family supportive organisational culture was

managerial support. In their study, managerial support refers to the extent to which an employee's manager was willing to accommodate the employees' family needs. The results of the study showed that managerial support was related to an increased use of family-focused practices which lead to increased job satisfaction for employees.

FSSB is another construct used to assess family-focussed supervisor support. FSSB is defined as those "behaviours exhibited by supervisors that are supportive of families" (Hammer et al., 2008, p. 3). Such behaviours include empathy, advice, shared support, flexibility, and autonomy (Thompson et al., 1999). Unlike the generalised supervisory support that refers to the overall behaviour of supervisors Hammer et al. (2008) argued that FSSB empowers employees with the skills and abilities to jointly manage work and family relationships. They identified four aspects that make up family-focused supervisor support: emotional support, instrumental support, role modelling behaviours, and creative work-family management.

Emotional support incorporates social networks in the organisations that extend beyond work related issues such as showing concern, empathy, and sensitively regarding family responsibilities (Hammer et al., 2008).

Role modelling refers to the behaviour which the supervisor demonstrates to employees in achieving desired work-family outcomes. According to Regan (1974) a supervisor has the ability to influence organisational culture and enhance work-family relationships by what they say and do. In other words, supervisor behaviour as a role model illustrates attitude and actions of how everyone has to behave, thus, creating a consensus of the 'right way' and 'wrong way' to acting.

Supervisors can improve employees' organisational commitment through providing employees with resources in helping them to manage their day to day demands. Such resources can include supporting employees' use of practices such as telecommuting and flexible scheduling Kossek and Hammer (2008) reported that job satisfaction was positively associated to family focused supervisor behaviour through provision of such work-family practices.

Creative work-family management refers to the innovative strategies that the supervisor develops in order to increase the subordinates efficiency and effectiveness (Hammer et al., 2008). Such strategies include increased flexibility in working- hours, place, and ways work is done to accommodate unique individual and group work-family demands. To date, Hammer et al.'s (2008) construct, FSSB, is the only empirically validated construct measuring supervisor support specifically related to work-family concerns (Hammer et al., in press). However, in a review of the literature, all studies on supervisor support were used to explain family-focused supervisor behaviour.

Family-focused organisational and supervisor support sends a message to the employee that the organisation cares for them. Such perceptions have been found to lead to positive organisational outcomes. Literature on the positive work outcomes related to family focused organisational and supervisor support is reviewed below.

Outcomes of Family-focused Organisational and Supervisor Support

Organisational Commitment

Robbins (2008, p. 181) defined organisational commitment as the “degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organisation and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organisation.” Meyer and Allen (1991) and Dunham, Grube, and Castaneda (1994) identified three elements of commitment; affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment is defined as the “emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organisation and goals” (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1993). Affective commitment occurs when there are signs of employees’ emotional attachment to the organisation together with strong identification with the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Reichers (1985) explained continuance commitment as the willingness to remain in an organisation because leaving can be associated with loss of valuable job resources. For instance, an employee who has been with the organisation for a long time may feel reluctant to leave the organisation because of the benefits or rewards they will stand to lose, such as retirement benefits and work-place social support. Thus, it can be concluded that

continuous commitment is cognitive in nature as one stays with the organisation after mental analysis of the pros and cons of leaving the organisation. Normative commitment refers to a feeling of obligation that one may have to stay with the organisation. Past work-family research has predominantly found significant results with affective and continuance commitment and not normative commitment, hence normative commitment has been excluded from this study (Meyer & Allen, 1993; Mowday et al., 1982; Thompson et al., 1999).

Thompson et al. (1999) examined the relationship between family-focused organisational culture and affective commitment and found that employees' perceptions on family-focused organisational culture were positively related to affective commitment. Specifically, perceptions of lower working-hours were related to increased affective commitment. These findings were supported by Allen (2001) who found that FSOP was positively associated with affective commitment. Similarly, Eisenberger (2002) found that organisations that are perceived to be supportive of their employees are highly competitive, and manage to retain their most valued employees. In a meta-analysis (Eisenberger, 2002) argued that there was a significant relationship between employees' general perceptions on the availability of organisational support practises and organisational commitment and job satisfaction (Brandes et al., 2004). In addition, Ahmad & Omar (2010) reported a positive relationship between a family-focused supportive work environment and organisational commitment. In contrast however, Behson (2002) examined the relationship between family-focused support and organisational commitment and found that the relationship was not significant.

With regard to family-focused supervisor support, Hammer et al. (2008) and Hsu et al. (2008) suggested that such support can help reduce work pressures and facilitate employees experiencing increased organisational commitment. Supporting these findings, Truckenbrodt (2000) reported a positive relationship between supervisor support and organisational commitment. In a study by Major et al. (2008), their results suggested that supervisor support influences affective commitment.

Chen et al. (2008) presented a study on nurses' perceptions on supervisor support and the effect of the relationship between supervisor and subordinates, and the results showed an association of

high level of family-focused supervisor behaviour with enhanced organisational commitment. The study suggested that the quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinates can improve through sharing of information, resources, emotional support, and the facilitation of increased trust, which can ultimately lead to commitment.

Furthermore Hammer et al. (2008) and Hsu et al. (2008) found that supervisor support helps reduce work pressures and result in increased job satisfaction and organisational commitment for employees. For example, a supervisor can provide family-focused practices and resources to employees to help employees balance their work-family roles demands. Truckenbrodt (2000) found that a supportive relationship between an employee and his/her supervisor positively influences the employee's use of family-focused practices resulting in positive work-outcomes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their job” (Spector, 2008, p. 223). Haar and Spell (2004) and Lambert (2002) examined employees' perceptions on family-focused practices and found these to be important indicators of job attitudes. These results were supported by Thomas and Ganster (1995) who found that supervisor support led to increased job satisfaction.

In line with this, Thompson et al. (1999) examined the three aspects related to work-family culture indicating that a family-focused supportive culture improved usage of family-focused practices which resulted in more satisfied employees. Allen (2001) showed that employees who perceived their organisations as less family supportive experienced less job satisfaction. Similarly, Haar and Roche (2008) and Haar and Roche (2010) found that family-focused organisational support was positively related to job satisfaction. In line with this, Behson (2002) found a positive relationship between perceptions of family supportiveness and job satisfaction.

Numerous studies investigating family-focused supervisor support and positive organisational outcomes reported increased job satisfaction amongst employees (Allen, 2001; Jahn et al., 2008;

Thomas & Gangster, 1995; Thompson & Prottas, 2005). Similarly, Hammer et al. (2008) found that family-focused supervisor behaviour predicted job satisfaction. Thus, the quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinates can predict how satisfied employees can be with their job. This can be seen through increased utilisation of job resources like improvement in shared information regarding career development, emotional support, and better facilitation and management of telecommuters.

In line with this, Gerstner and Day (1997) illustrated that high LMX quality is associated with increased job satisfaction. Brunnetto et al. (2010) argued that employees who experience high LMX are likely to develop a good relationship with their subordinates, thus facilitating positive feedback opportunities and access to decision-making and information-sharing. The results of their study indicated that employees' perceptions of the quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinates improved through better facilitation of family-focused practices.

Work-family enrichment and work-family support

Work-family enrichment is defined as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in another role through performance or affect (Carlson et al., 2006). According to Greenhaus and Powel (2006), work-family enrichment occurs when resources gained in Role A promotes improved individual performance in Role B. There is a paucity of research on work-family research as a positive organisational outcome. Aarde and Mostert (2008) examined the relationship between supervisor and subordinates and work-family enrichment amongst South African working females. They found that a supportive relationship with one's supervisor was a strong predictor of work-family enrichment.

Consistent with the above results, Kossek et al. (in press) found that workplace social support that is family focused leads to work-family enrichment, as employees with increased social support feel more comfortable approaching their organisations for help in managing their work and family roles. Thompson et al. (1999) made an important contribution in family-focused organisational studies showing that managerial support significantly contributed to increased work-family enrichment. O'Neill et al. (2009) further supported these findings by assessing the

supervisors' influence in establishing work-family climate in hotel industry on work-outcomes. The findings suggested the importance of the relationship between family-focused supportive climate and work-family enrichment. Furthermore, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) and Sui et al. (2010) found that a proactive supervisor can have a well thought out strategy in place to accommodate the needs of different employees they supervise thereby enhancing work-family enrichment.

A review of the literature on family-focused organisational and supervisor support has led to the development of the following hypotheses:

Research Hypotheses

Family-focused organisational support and work outcomes

- Hypothesis 1a: Family-focused organisational support predicts affective commitment
- Hypothesis 1b: Family-focused organisational support predicts continuance commitment
- Hypothesis 1c: Family-focused organisational support predicts job satisfaction
- Hypothesis 1d: Family-focused organisational support predicts work-family enrichment

Family-focused supervisor support and work outcomes

- Hypothesis 2a: Family-focused supervisor support predicts affective commitment
- Hypothesis 2b: Family-focused supervisor support predicts continuance commitment
- Hypothesis 2c: Family-focused supervisor support predicts job satisfaction
- Hypothesis 2d: Family-focused supervisor support predicts work-family enrichment

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the development of the family-focused organisational and supervisor support in context of the social exchange and leader-member exchange theories. Specifically, the review explored the impact of family-focused work and supervisor support on job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family enrichment. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the hypotheses for this study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the research method used in the study. The first section describes the research design, procedure and participants of the study. This is followed by a description of the measuring instruments and the data analysis techniques used.

Research Design

The study followed a quantitative research method and it was descriptive in nature. A cross-sectional research design was conducted to allow data to be collected at a single point in time (Hair et al., 2007). The purpose of the research design was to ensure the successful completion of the study in that, it aimed to establish the relationship between the variables (Hair et al., 2003). More specifically, a survey data collection method which involved the use of a structured questionnaire was used.

Procedure

Ethical clearance regarding the nature, purpose and expected results of the study was obtained from the University of Cape Town's Commerce Faculty Research Ethics Committee. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the managers at three hotels based in the Cape Town metropolitan area.

Non-probability convenience sampling techniques were employed due to cost and time constraints. Data was collected through a self-administered anonymous questionnaire. A pilot study was conducted with five hotel employees from varying job levels and positions. The main aim of the pilot study was to identify any problems regarding the questionnaire perceived by the sample. Based on the feedback, comments and recommendations from the participants, the revisions to the questionnaire were made. A cover letter was attached to each questionnaire indicating the purpose of the study as well as to assure the respondents about maintaining anonymity and confidentiality regarding their responses.

The researcher delivered paper-based copies of the questionnaires to the hotel managers who distributed the questionnaires to their respective employees. To increase the response rate, a raffle was conducted and an incentive of R200 was provided for a lucky questionnaire which was randomly drawn. A unique identification number was attached on each questionnaire with a corresponding sticker for the participant to claim the money while still maintaining their anonymity.

Data was collected for a period of three weeks. The participants completed the questionnaire during their leisure time and questionnaires were returned in sealed boxes conveniently placed within the respective hotels.

Participants

The participants of the study were hotel employees from three hotels based in Cape Town. A hundred and fifty self administered questionnaires were distributed, of which 110 were returned yielding a response rate of 73 percent. The hotel managers encouraged their employees to participate in the survey. This together with the inducement may have contributed to the high response rate.

Of the 110 respondents, there were 63 women (57%) and 42 men (38%). Respondents' age ranged from 18 years to 59 years ($M= 34.01$, $SD= 9.00$). Of the respondents, the majority spoke English (54%), Afrikaans (27%) and IsiXhosa (19%). Sixty four percent of the respondents were married as opposed to being single and 85% worked full-time as opposed to part time. However, most reported living with at least one extended family member. Those employees with children had an average of two children ($M= 0.58$, $SD= 0.86$). Refer to Table 1 for the above analysis.

Table 1*Demographic Frequencies of the Sample*

Demographic	Category	Frequency	%
Sample	Total number	110	100
Gender	Male	42	60
	Female	63	57.3
Marital status	Married / living together	64	52.1
	Single	37	35.9
Parental status	Have at least one child	28	27.2
	No children	35	34.0
Employment status	Full time	85	82.5
	Contingent	13	12.6

Measuring Instruments

Organisational Commitment: Organisational commitment was measured using an adapted version of the 12-items scale developed by Bagraim (2001). Four items measured affective commitment (AC) and four items measured continuance commitment (CC). The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Bagraim (2001) reporting a Cronbach Alpha of ($\alpha = .79$) and ($\alpha = .85$) for affective commitment and continuance commitment respectively.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured using six items from the seven-item scale developed by Clark (2001). The items were rated on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (all of the time). A sample item for this scale was “I get a lot of satisfaction from carrying out my responsibilities at work”. The Cronbach Alpha reliability reported by Clark (2001) was high ($\alpha = .91$).

Family Supportive Organisational Perceptions (FSOP): Family-focused organisational support was measured using an adapted version of Allen's (2001) family supportive organisational perceptions (FSOP) scale. Six of the original 14 items measured individual's responses on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item was "it is best to keep family matters separate from work" (reversed score). The Cronbach alpha reported by Allen (2001) for this scale was high ($\alpha = .91$).

Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviour (FSSB): Family-focused supervisor support was measured using Hammer et al.'s (2008) multi-dimensional 14-item scale. Responses were indicated on a 5 point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample question was "My supervisor is willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and nonwork life". The Cronbach Alpha reported by Hammer et al. (2008) was high ($\alpha = .95$).

Work-Family Enrichment: The work-family enrichment was measured using Jaga (2007) measure of a 12-item scale adopted from Carlson et al. (2006). Specifically, the scale has three dimensions; affect, development, and capital. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The sample item for the scale was "My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better member". The Cronbach Alpha reliability reported by Jaga (2007) for their full scale was high ($\alpha = .95$).

Demographics: Demographic information was requested from the respondents in order to assess whether demographic variables contributed to the prediction of the work-outcomes. Demographic variables represented separate items measuring gender, age, home language, work status, weekly hours, tenure, job level, and marital status, number of children, children's age, and number of extended family members in household. All of these variables have consistently accounted for variances in explaining family-focused support (Hammer et al., 2008; Jahn et al., 2003).

Data Analysis Techniques

Data was analysed using SPSS version 18. The data was analysed using various statistical techniques including factor analysis, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter presents the data analysis and the results. First, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to test the dimensionality of the scales. Next, the reliability analyses are presented using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, followed by the descriptive statistics. The final section presents the correlation and multiple regression analyses in order to test the hypotheses.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis was used to identify the factor structure of the scale and to examine the internal reliability (Pallant, 2002). Principal axis extraction with Oblique rotation was performed. A minimum value of 1.0 was set for the Eigen value of each factor.

Organisational Commitment Scale

The Principal-axis extraction with Oblique rotation revealed two significant factors with Eigen values greater than 1.0, accounting for 43.703% and 14.656% of the total variance for the affective commitment and continuance commitment respectively. The affective commitment items revealed factor loadings greater than .70, ranging from .718 to .810. Continuance commitment items presented factor loadings greater than .60, ranging from .614 to .937. The two factors explained 58.358% of the cumulative variance.

Table 2:*Factor Loadings of Affective and Continuance Organisational Commitment*

Variables	Items	Factor 1 ACOM	Factor 2 CCOM
ACOM1	I feel a strong connection to this organisation	.718	.282
ACOM2	I feel emotionally attached to this organisation	.810	.399
ACOM3	I feel like part of the family at this organisation	.768	.373
ACOM4	This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me	.799	.497
CCOM5	It would be very costly for me to leave this organisation right now	.314	.614
CCOM6	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided that I wanted leave this organisation now	.319	.756
CCOM7	I would not leave this organisation right now because of what would stand to lose	.407	.937
CCOM8	For me personally, the cost of leaving this organisation would be far greater than the benefit	.399	.634
Eigenvalues		3.496	1.172
variance (percentage)		43.703	14.656
Cumulative variance (percentage)		43.702	58.358

Notes: N = 110. Principal-axis factoring with Oblique rotation; Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text; ACOM = Affective Commitment; CCOM= Continuance Commitment.

Job Satisfaction Scale

The job satisfaction scale revealed one significant factor with Eigen values greater than 1.0 accounting for 53.785% of the total variance (refer to table 3). Principal-axis factoring showed that all the items loaded highly on one factor, revealing a factor loading greater than .60, ranging from .603 to .847. Taken together, the results provided support for the reliability of the measure and suggested that the items were measuring a single construct.

Table 3:*Factor Loadings of Job Satisfaction*

Variables	Items	Factor 1 JST
JST 1	My activities at work are interesting	.603
JST 2	I get a lot of satisfaction from carrying out my responsibilities at work	.624
JST 3	I find my activities at work to be personally Meaningful	.736
JST4	I love what I do at work	.730
JST 5	Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job	.827
JST 6	I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job	8.47
Eigenvalues		3.227
variance (percentage)		53.785%
Cumulative variance (percentage)		53.785%

Notes: N = 110. Principal-axis factoring; Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text; JST = job satisfaction.

Family-focused Organisational Support Scale

Principal-axis extraction revealed one significant factor with Eigen values greater than 1.0 accounting for 25.022% of the total variance (refer to table 4). The items loaded on one factor, revealing all factor loading greater than .30, ranging from .359 to .667.

Table 4:*Factor Loadings of Family-Focused Organisational Support*

Variables	Items	Factor 1
ORGSUP1	Work should be the primary priority in a person's Life	.481
ORGSUP2	Long hours inside the office are the way to achieve advance	.452
ORGSUP3	It is best to keep family matters separate from work at my organisation	.371
ORGSUP4	Individuals who take time off to attend to personal matters are not committed to their work	.667
ORGSUP5	It is assumed that the most productive employees are those who put their work before their family at my organisation	.594
ORGSUP6	The ideal employee is the one who is available 24 hours a day at my organisation	.359
Eigenvalues		1.501
variance (percentage)		25.022%
Cumulative variance (percentage)		25.022%

Notes: N = 110. Principal-axis factoring; Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text; ORGSUP = organisational support.

Family-focused Supervisor Support Scale

Principal-axis extraction revealed one significant factor with Eigen value greater than 1.0 accounting for 65.022% of the total variance (refer to table 5). The items loaded highly onto factor 1 with factor loading greater than .63, ranging from .631 to .865.

Table 5:

Factor Loadings of Family-Focused Supervisor Support

Variables	Items	Factor 1: S-Sup
S-Sup1	My supervisor is willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and family	.717
S-Sup2	My supervisor takes the time to learn about my personal needs	.631
S-Sup3	My supervisor makes me feel comfortable talking to him or her about my conflicts between my work and family roles	.780
S-Sup4	My supervisor and I can talk effectively to solve conflicts between work and family issues	.839
S-Sup5	I can depend on my supervisor to help me with scheduling work and family conflicts if I need it	.844
S-Sup6	I can rely on my supervisor to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated family demands	.829
S-Sup7	My supervisor works effectively with workers to creatively solve conflicts between work and family demands	.839
S-Sup8	My supervisor is a good role model for work and family balance	.865
S-Sup9	My supervisor demonstrates effectively behaviours in how to juggle work and family balance	.810
S-Sup10	My supervisor demonstrates how a person can jointly be successful on and off the job	.826
S-Sup11	My supervisor thinks about how the work in my department can be organized to jointly benefit employees and the company	.822
S-Sup12	My supervisor is able to manage the department as whole team to enable everyone's needs to be met	.842
Eigen values		
Variance (percent)		7.803
Cumulative total variance (percent)		65.022
		65.022

Notes: N = 110. Principal-axis factoring; Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text; Rotation converged in 3 interactions; S-Sup = supervisor support.

Work-Family Enrichment Scale

Principal-axis extraction revealed one significant factor with Eigen value greater than 1.0 accounting for 62.933% of the total variance (refer table 6). The items loaded highly onto one factor, showing factor loading greater than .60, ranging from .686 to .875. The overall results provided support for the reliability of the measure and suggested that the items were measuring a single construct and not the three dimensions reported by Carlson et al. (2006).

Reliability Analysis

The reliability of each sub scale is presented in Table 8. The reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α). The conventional level of an acceptable alpha coefficient is .70 (Hair et al., 2003). The results of this study revealed that five of the six subscales exceeded the acceptable level of reliability (alphas ranged from .82 to .96). The family focused organisational support however was found to have a coefficient alpha of .65. The researcher acknowledges that this alpha coefficient is below the acceptable level, however past studies using adapted versions (Allen, 2001) of this scale have reported high coefficient alphas and thus on a theoretical basis the researched included the scale in further analyses of the data.

Descriptive statistics

Table seven illustrates a summary of the descriptive statistics in order to examine the distribution of the reported levels of the variables. The affective and continuance commitment had a mean of 3.64 (SD = .83) and 3.52 (SD = .88) respectively. Job satisfaction had a high mean of 4.03 (SD = .73) while work-family enrichment had a relatively high mean of 3.63 (SD = .68). Family-focused organisational and supervisor support revealed means of 3.01 (.83) and 3.52 (.91) respectively.

Table 6:

Factor Loadings of Work-Family Enrichment

Variables	Items	Factor 1 WFE
WFE1	...helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member	.686
WFE2	...helps me to develop my abilities and this helps me be a better family member	.754
WFE3	...helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better family member	.686
WFE4	...helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member	.754
WFE5	...puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family Member	.784
WFE6	...makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member	.769
WFE7	...helps me to have a positive outlook and this helps me be a better family member	.759
WFE8	...makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better family member	.827
WFE9	...provides me with a sense of security and this helps me be a better family member	.831
WFE10	...helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member	.875
WFE11	...provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member	.869
WFE12	...provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better Family member	.813
Eigen values		7.552
Individual total variance (percent)		62.933%
Cumulative total variance (percent)		62.933%

Notes: N = 110 Principal-axis factoring; Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text; Rotation converged in 3 interactions; WFE = work- family enrichment

Table 7:*Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
OS	109	3.011	.8329	-.214	-1.088
S-SUP	108	3.522	.9086	-.712	.048
AC	110	3.641	.8257	-.812	.816
CC	109	3.518	.8804	-.379	-.366
JST	108	4.028	.7380	-.897	1.360
WFE	106	3.633	.6813	-.127	.481
Valid	104				

(listwise)

Notes: N = 110 (listwise deletion of missing data); **p <.01, *p < .05; Cronbach Alpha coefficients are represented in boldface on the diagonal in parenthesis; OS = organisational support; S-SUP = supervisor support; AC = affective commitment; CC = continuance commitment; JST = job satisfaction; WFE = work-family enrichment

Correlation Analysis

Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to determine relationships between the variables (refer to Table 8). The purpose of conducting a correlation analysis was to establish the , the significance and the strength of the relationship between the variables (Hair et al., 2003). In this case, the correlations analysis with list wise deletion of missing data was conducted to assess the relationship between both levels of support (organisational and supervisory) and the variables commitment, job satisfaction, and work-family enrichment.

A moderate positive correlation (Cohen, 1988) found was between family-focused supervisor support and continuance commitment ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$) as well as between family-focused supervisor support and work-family enrichment ($r = 0.40$; $p < 0.1$). There were no significant correlations found for the relationship between family focused organisational support and the positive organisational outcomes namely: job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family enrichment. Thus hypotheses 1a, b, c and d were not supported.

Table 8:*Correlation Matrix*

	OS	S-SUP	AC	CC	JST	WFE
OS	(.65)					
S-SUP	.259**	(.96)				
AC	-.118	.143	(.86)			
CC	.114	.400**	.432**	(.82)		
JST	-.187	.142	.474**	.357**	(.87)	
WFE	-.042	.395**	.341**	.246*	.400**	(.95)

Notes: N = 110 (listwise deletion of missing data); **p < .01, *p < .05; Cronbach Alpha coefficients are represented in **boldface** on the diagonal in parenthesis; OS = organisational support; S-SUP = supervisor support; AC = total affective commitment; CC = total continuance commitment; JST = job satisfaction; WFE = work-family enrichment

Regression Analysis

As there was no significant relationship found between family focused organisational support and the outcome variables in this study, the following regression analysis only considered one independent variable, family-focused supervisor support and the two dependent variables continuance commitment and work-family enrichment. A simple linear regression analysis was therefore performed to determine whether family supportive supervisor support explained any variance in the outcome variables.

Continuance Commitment as an outcome of Family-focused Supervisor Support

Simple linear regression analysis was conducted with continuance commitment as the dependant variable (refer to Table 9). The results showed that family-focused supervisor support explained 16% of the variance of continuance commitment ($\beta = .400, p < 0.01, F = 19.970$). Therefore the proposition that family-focused supervisor support predicts continuance commitment is confirmed.

Table 9:*Simple Regression Summary for Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment*

Variables	Step 1
SUPERVISOR SUPPORT	.400**
R2	.160
Change in R2	.152

Notes: N = 110 (listwise deletion of missing data); *p < .05, **p < .01

Work-Family-Enrichment as an Outcome of Family-focused Supervisor Support

A simple linear regression was conducted to determine the effect of family-supportive supervisor behaviour on work-family enrichment. The results of the study showed a significant positive association between work-family enrichment and family-focused supervisor support ($\beta = .424$, $p < 0.01$, $F = 22.601$). Family-focused supervisor contributed 18 % of the total variance explained in work-family enrichment. This finding supports hypothesis 2d that family supportive supervisor behaviour predicts work-family enrichment.

Table 10*Simple Regression Summary for Dependent Variable: Work-Family Enrichment*

Variables	Step 1
SUP SUPPORT	.424**
R2	.180
Change in R2	.172

Notes: N = 110 (listwise deletion of missing data); *p < .05, **p < .01

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the limited literature on work-family support by examining the relationship between family-focused organisational and supervisor support and important organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and work-family enrichment among South African employees in the hospitality sector. The findings aimed to contribute a more complete understanding of the benefits of fostering a family supportive organisational culture so that employees engaging in multiple roles feel that they can use the policies and practices available without jeopardizing their careers. This chapter presents the discussion of the results with specific reference to the hypotheses of the study and the current literature on work-family support.

Family-focused organisational supports and positive outcomes

This study used social exchange theory as a guiding theoretical framework to examine the relationship and attitudes of family supportive organisational perceptions with positive work outcomes, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, job satisfaction, and work-family enrichment.

Family-focused organisational support was assessed using Allen (2001) six-scale measure of FSOP. Taken together, the findings of the present study indicated that FSOP was not significantly related to affective commitment, job satisfaction and work-family enrichment.

Specifically, hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d assessed the relationship between family-focused organisational support and affective commitment, continuance commitment, job satisfaction and work-family enrichment respectively; the results of the study did not support these hypotheses. These findings were in contrast to previous studies that reported significant positive relationships between family-focused organisational support and positive work outcomes (Allen, 2001, Haar and Roche (2008, 2010).

One of the contributing factors related to insignificant results could be associated to the nature of family-focused organisational support which is normally targeted towards skilled labour force or top management rather than lower level of employees which made up the majority of the respondents. According to Thompson et al. (1999) support provided on an organisational level generally include the provision of family focused practices such as child care facilities and telecommuting. For individuals occupying lower level of employment however, such practices may not be highly valued or relevant to their needs. In this study, the majority of respondents reported having children under the age of 6 (61%), at least 2 children (12%) and more than half (51%) of the respondents reported staying with the extended family member, thus suggesting that these respondents may value other forms of family-friendly practices which could further be explored through qualitative methods. These findings are therefore similar to those found by Behson (2002) in which family supportive supervisor behaviour did not account for any of the variance in employees job attitudes.

Family-focused Supervisor Supports and positive work outcomes

This study used the leader-member exchange theory as a guiding theoretical framework to examine the relationship and attitudes of the family-focused supervisor behaviour with positive work outcomes, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, job satisfaction, and work-family enrichment. When the quality of the relationship between work-family supervisors behaviour is high, it can lead to positive organisational outcomes.

Family-focused supervisor support was assessed using Hammer et al.'s (2003) measure of FSSB. Taken together, the findings of the present study indicated that FSSB was not significantly related to affective commitment and job satisfaction, therefore no support was found for hypotheses 2a and 2c. However the result of the study showed that family supportive supervisor behaviour predicted continuous commitment and work-family enrichment, supporting hypotheses 2b and 2d. This means that employees who felt that their supervisors helped them to manage their demands from their work and family roles, felt more committed to their organisation in terms of maintaining organisational membership when there may be a lack of available employment alternatives, and felt that their multiple roles contributed to a better quality

of family life. These findings have been inconsistent with previous findings in the literature. For example Hammer et al. (2008) found that family-focused supervisor support explained affective commitment which was contrary to these findings.

The results of these hypotheses could have been influenced by the fact that the outcomes are attitudinal in nature, indicating that employees are bound to develop different perceptions regarding how supportive their organisations and supervisors are towards their family roles. In this study, the results showed a unique variance between family-focused supervisor support, continuous commitment and work-family enrichment indicated that supervisor support is crucial in enabling work-family enrichment and continuous working relationship between the employer and the employees.

These findings are supported by study of pay it forward that looked at positive spillover effects of supervisors' support on work-family enrichment (Whitten et al., 2009). The results of the study demonstrated that when supervisor's own work-family enrichment compels him/her to create a more family-focused work environment for subordinates, eventually "pay it forward" arrangement whereby supervisors attempt to replicate their own experience for their subordinates. In other words, when employees witness their supervisors' behaviour of managing their own flexibility time schedules to attend to family roles (such as taking time off from work to attend their child's soccer match) employees will feel more comfortable to modify their schedules to be more harmonious with family roles.

A positive correlation was found between family-focused supervisor support and work-family enrichment ($r = .395$, $p < 0.01$). This correlation indicates that family-focused supervisor behaviour is important in as much as employees experience positive spillover from work to family. Such family roles require greater schedule control. Research has demonstrated that subordinates who have more autonomy over their scheduling show high work-family enrichment. In illustration, the results of the study showed that about 65% of the respondents had children, reporting an average of at least two children ($M = 0.58$, $SD = 0.86$). For employees to effectively manage their work and family roles, supervisors have to allow subordinates to manage their own schedules and to have greater flexibility in planning their work. In this study,

the respondents who received beneficial resources from their work roles, which has a positive impact on their family role may feel a sense of obligation towards the organisation thus allowing positive spillover towards family roles (Haar & Roche, 2008).

The findings of this study supported hypotheses 2d which also contributes to the existing literature on family-focused supervisor support and work-family enrichment (Carlson et al., 2006; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Carlson et al. 2006).

Greenhaus and Powel (2006) found that resources promoted work-family enrichment through instrumental and affective components. The instrumental pathway indicate that when employees are provided with relevant resources, like career path and development, they are more likely to learn new strategies of approaching life thereby allowing them to apply such practices in their lives in general. Thus, managers must learn effective strategies to be supportive, especially while implementing family-focused practices to increase employee job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family enrichment.

Limitations of the Study

A limitation for this study was the use of a cross-sectional design due to cost and time constraint. It is recommended that future studies should use a longitudinal design to establish causal effects.

Specifically, the data collection instrument used in the present study was. A further limitation was the use of a self-administered questionnaire in which common method variance could have occurred. It is suggested that data collection methods other than self-administered questionnaires should also be used in future research. Furthermore, the family-supportive organisational support scale had a low reliability rate ($\alpha = .65$). According to Hair et al. (2003) the conventional level of an acceptable alpha coefficient is .70.

Management implications

This study has shown that a supervisor who is supportive of employees in managing their work and family roles can foster environments in which employees can experience continuance commitment and work-family enrichment. It is important for supervisors to understand that they have such an influence on their employees' attitudes. It is important that supervisors understand their role in influencing the subordinate's views of their work and family lives and should therefore aim to promote work-family enrichment amongst their employees. Organisations that have supervisors that display family supportive behaviours are more likely to then retain talented employees.

Future recommendations

The study looked at the relationship between family-focused organisational and supervisor support with positive work-outcomes like job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family enrichment. Hypothesis regarding family-focused organisational support were not supported. It is recommended that future research investigate whether the results of this study generalize to different outcomes related to family roles, e.g. life satisfaction, career satisfaction and family-work enrichment (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2010) as much variance from this study was explained by other variables. By considering family-focused organisational supervisor support, it is also important to assess family roles as life at home affects work attitude and outcomes.

Future research should also consider the role of demographic variables on family-focused organisational and supervisor support as this study did not test the impact of demographic variables on work-family support. This way, organisations can be able to make immediate adjustment in their organisations, which allow increase work-family enrichment. In addition, research in the hotel industry in South Africa is limited; as a result, further research is needed to identify unique characteristics of the service sector in South Africa.

Conclusion

The dominant perspective of work-family relationship has been one of conflict. This study sort to contribute to the limited research on the positive side of the work-family relationship assessing family-focused organisational and supervisor support and positive work-outcomes. The findings of the study indicated that family-focused supervisor behaviour plays a big role in ensuring utilisation of the family-focused practices and positive work-outcomes. The work-family enrichment results further suggested a need to focus on multiple roles of employees (Haar & Roche, 2010). As more women enter the work place, their role demands increase (Allen, 2001; Haar & Roche, 2008) which indicate that both men and women roles change. Further studies in work-family enrichment will allow organisations to develop more improved strategies to better support their employees work and family roles.

References

- Aarde, A. V., & Mostert, K. (2008). Work-home interaction of working females: What is the role of job and home characteristics? *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34 (3), 1- 10.
- Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2010). Perceived family-Supportive Work Culture, Affective Commitment and Turnover Intentions of Employees. *Journal of American Science*, 6, 12, 839-846.
- Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2008). Gender differences in work-family conflict and family-friendly employment policy practices. *The International Journal of the Humanities*, 2008, 6 (3), 15- 26.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organisational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 58, 414-435.
- Allen, T. D. & Mayer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 1-18.
- Bagraim, J.J. (2001). Measuring Organisational Commitment: a South African application. Unpublished manuscript, School of Management Studies, University of Cape Town.
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Coping with family-to-work conflict: The role of informal work accommodations to family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 324-341.
- Behson, S. J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organisational work-family support. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 66, 487-500.
- Behson, S. J. (2000, August). *Informal work accommodations to family: A potential coping strategy for reducing the stress associated with work-family conflict among professionals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto.
- Batt, R., Valcour, P.M. (2003). Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations*, 42, 189-220.
- Bishop, J.W., Scott, K.D., Goldsby, M.G., and Cropanzano, R. (2005), 'A Construct Validity Study of Commitment and Perceived Support Variables: A Multifoci Approach across Different Team Environments,' *Group and Organisational Management*, 30, 2, 153-180.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.

- Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Wheatley, K. (2004). Social exchange within organisations and work outcomes: The importance of local and global relationship. *Group and Organisation Management*, 29, 276-301.
- Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R., Ramsay, S., & Shacklock, K. (2010). Supervisor relationships and perceptions of work-family conflict. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 48 (2), 212-232.
- Casper, W.J., Martin, J.A., Beffardi, L.C., Erwins, C.J. (2002). "Work-family conflict, perceived organisational support and organisational commitment among employed mothers", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7, 99-108.
- Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M, M., Kacmar, Grzywacz, J. G. & Whitten, D. (2009). Pay it forward: The positive crossover effects of supervisor work-family enrichment. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.
- 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 Behaviour*, 68, 131-164.
- Chen, Z. X., Aryee, S., & Less, C. (2005). Test of a mediation model of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 66, 457-470.
- Clark, S. C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational behaviour*, 58, 348-365.
- Cohen, S. & Willis, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 310-357.
- Cleveland, J. N., O'Neill, JW., Himelright, J. L., Harrison, M. M., Crouter, A. C., & Drago, R. (2007). Work and family issues in the hospitality industry: Perspective of entrants, managers, and spouses. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 31, 275-298.
- Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organisations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organisational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dunham, R., Grube, J., & Castaneda, M. (1994). Organisational commitment: The utility of an interaction definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370-380.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organisational support, employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (1),

- 51-59. Glass, J. L. & Estest, S. B. (1997). The family responsive workplace. *Annual Review Sociology*, 23, 289-313.
- Gilbert, L. A., Hallett, M., & Eldridge, N. S. (1994). Gender and dual-career families: Implications and applications for the career counseling of women. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career counseling for women* (pp. 135–164). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Graen, George (2003). *Dealing with Diversity*. Charles Wankel, St. John's University, New York.
- Graen, G. & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organisations: A developmental approach. In James G. Hunt & Lars L. Larson (Eds.). *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143–165). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Grandey, A. A., Cordeiro, B. L., & Michael, J. H. (2007). Work-family supportive organisational perceptions: Important for the well-being of male blue-collar hourly workers? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 71, 460-478.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.). *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391-412). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- Gouldner, A. (1960), 'The Norm of Reciprocity,' *American Sociological Review*, April, 161–178.
- Haar, Jarrod M. and Roche, Maree A. (2010) 'Family supportive organisation perceptions and employee outcomes: the mediating effects of life satisfaction', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 7, 999 — 1014.

- Haar, J. M., & Spell, C. (2004). Work-family conflict and turnover intentions: exploring the moderating effects of perceived work-family support. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33 (1), 35- 39.
- Haar, J. & Spell, C. (2004). Program knowledge and value of work-family practices and organisational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 15, 6, 1040-1055
- Haar, J. M., & Bardoel, E. A. (2008). Positive spillover from the work-to-family interface: A study of Australian employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 46 (3), 275-287
- Hair, J.F., Babin, B., Money, A. H., (2003). *Essentials of Business Research Methods*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Newsom, J. T., Brockwood, K. J., & Colton, C. L. (2005). A longitudinal study of the effects of dual-earner couples' utilization of family-friendly workplace supports on work and family outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 799-810.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2008). Development and validation of multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB). *Journal of Management*.
- Hammer, L., Kossek, E., Yragui, N., Bodner, T., & Hanson, G. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 35, 837-856.
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Bodner, T., Anger, K. & Zimmerman, K. In press. Clarifying Work-Family Intervention Processes: The Roles of Work-Family Conflict and Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3): 249-265.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- Hom, P., & Griffeth, R. (1995). Employee turnover. *Cin-cinnati: South-Western*.
- Jahn, E. W., Thompson, C. A., & Kopelman, R. E. (2003). Rationale and construct validity evidence for a measure of perceived organisational family support (POSF). *Community, Work & Family*, 6, 123-140.

- Jaga, A. (2007). The nature and outcomes of work-family enrichment. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Masters of Commerce in Organisational Psychology, Faculty of Commerce, UCT.
- Karatepe, O. & Bekteshi, L (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation among frontline hotel employees. *International journal of Hospital Management*, 27, 517-528.
- Karatype, O. M., & Kilic, H. (2007). Relationships of supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface with the selected job outcomes of frontline employees. *Tourism Management*, 28, 238-252. Karatepe & Canozar, 2003.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Uludag, O. (2008). Supervisor support, work-family conflict, and satisfaction outcomes: An empirical study in the hotel industry. *Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 7, 115-134.
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Bary, J., Chermack, K., & Kaskubar, D. (2008). Getting there from here: Research on the Effects of Work-family initiatives on Work-Family Conflict and Business outcomes. *Journal of the Academy of Management*. 2, (no issue)
- Kossek , E.E., & Hammer, L.B. (2008). Family supportive supervisor behaviours (FSSB) Intervention Study: Effects on Employee's Work, Family, Safety, & Health Outcomes. Summary of findings from the National Institute for Employee's Work, Family, Safety, & Health Outcomes. Summary of Findings from the National Institute Occupational Safety and Health Grant # U010H008788. Portland State University and Michigan State University.
- Kossek, E.E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. (in press). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family specific supervisor and organisational support. *Personnel Psychology*.
- Kossek, E. E., Lewis, S. & Hammer, L. 2010. Work-life initiatives and organisational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream, *Human Relations*, 63, 1-17.
- Lambert, S.J. (2000), 'Added Benefits: The Link between Work-Life Benefits and Organisational Citizenship Behavior,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 5, 801-815.
- Lapierre, L.M. and Allen, T.D. (2006), 'Work-Supportive Family, Family-Supportive Supervision, Use of Organisational Benefits, and Problem-Focused Coping: Implications for Work-Family Conflict and Employee Well-Being', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 169-181.

- Liu, C., Borg, I., & Spector, P.E (2004). Measurement equivalence of the German Job Satisfaction Survey used in a multinational organisation: Implications of Schwartz's culture model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1070- 1082.
- Linden, R. C. & Graen, G. (1980). Generalisability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 451-465.
- Ngo, H. Y., & Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2009). Family friendly work practices, organisational climate, and firm performance: A study of multinational corporations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 30, 665-680.
- Major, V.S., Klein, K.J. (2008). Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 87, 427-436.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace. Theory, Research, and Application*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organisation Linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press
- O'Neill, J. W., Harrison, M., M., Cleveland J., Almeida, D., Stawski, R., Crouter, A.C. (2009). Work-family Climate, Organisational Commitment, and Turnover: Multilevel Contagion effect of Leaders. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74 (1), 18-29.
- Orthner, D. K., & Rose, R. (2009). Work Separation Demands and Spouse Psychological Well-Being. *Family Relations*, 58, 392-403.
- Pallant, J. (2002). *SPSS SURVIVAL MANUAL. A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows (Version 12)*. Ligare, Sydney.
- Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organisational Support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4, 698-714
- Reichers, A.E. "A Review and Reconceptualisation of Organisational Commitment," *Academy of Management Review* (10), 1985, pp. 465-476.
- Robbins, S.P, Odendaal, A and Roodt, G (2008). *Organisational Behaviour: Global and Southern African Perspectives*. Pearson education. South Africa
- Schneider, B., & Bowen, D.E. (1993). "The Service Organisation: Human Resources Management is Crucial" *Organisational Dynamics*, 21 (4), 39-52.

- Spector, P.L. (2008). *Industrial and Organisational Behaviour*. 5th edition. USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thomas, L., & Gangster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. (2005). Relationships among organisational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100-118.
- Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Z.-X., Wang, H., Xin, K. R., & Wu, J. B. (2006). Unpacking the relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organisational culture. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 113-137.
- Truckenbrodt, V. B. (2000). The relationship between leader-member exchange and commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Acquisition Review Quarterly*.
- Wadsworth, L. L., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The effects of social support on work-to-family enhancement and work-to-family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 67 (1), 75-77.
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work-family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resources Management Review*, 17, 63-76.
- Williams, M. L., McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2006). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 392-413.
- Voydanoff, R (2005). Work demands and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26 (6), 707-726.

Appendix 1:

University Of Cape Town

School of Management Studies

Dear Participant

I am conducting research on employees' perceptions of work-family support and its outcomes. This research is required for the completion of my Masters dissertation.

This is an **anonymous questionnaire** (your name does not appear anywhere on it), and your answers cannot be linked to you. You have a right to withdraw from answering this questionnaire at any time during the process and there will be no penalty for doing so.

The questionnaire will take you about ten minutes to complete. Please respond to all the questions honestly and return the completed questionnaire to the designated boxes. Deadline for this questionnaire is 07th September 2010. On a random draw, one lucky participant will receive R200 cash redeemable within 10 days after the closing date. Please take attached sticker to claim your money.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Regards
'Mapalo Mohasi-Phali

YOUR WORK

About your commitment to my organisation <i>Please show how much you agree with each of the following statements by ticking a number from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).</i>		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I feel a strong connection to my organisation					
2	I feel emotionally attached to my organisation					
3	I feel like part of the family at my organisation					
4	My organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me					
5	It would be very costly for me to leave my organisation right now					
6	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided that I wanted to leave my organisation now					
7	I would not leave my organisation right now because of what I would stand to lose					
8	For me personally, the cost of leaving my organisation would be far greater than the benefit					
How you feel about your job <i>Please show how often you have experienced each statement in the past year by ticking a number from 1 to 5 (1= never; 5 = Always).</i>		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
9	My activities at work are interesting					
10	I get a lot of satisfaction from carrying out my responsibilities at work					
11	I find my activities at work to be personally meaningful					
12	I love what I do at work					
13	Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job					
14	I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do at my organisation					

Support from my organisation		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
<i>Please show how much you agree with each of the following statements by ticking a number from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).</i>						
15	Work should be the primary priority in a person's life					
16	Long hours inside the office are the way to achieving advancement					
17	It is best to keep family matters separate from work at my organisation					
18	Expressing involvement and interest in non-work matters is viewed as healthy at my organisation					
19	Individuals who take time off to attend to personal matters are not committed to their work					
20	It is assumed that the most productive employees are those who put their work before their family life at my organisation					
21	Employees are given ample opportunity to perform both their job and their personal responsibilities well at my organisation					
22	Offering Employees flexibility in completing their work is viewed as a strategic way of doing business at my organisation					
23	The ideal employee is the one who is available 24 hours a day at my organisation					
Support from my supervisor		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
<i>Please show how much you agree with each of the following statements by ticking a number from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).</i>						
24	My supervisor is willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and family					
25	My supervisor takes the time to learn about my personal needs					
26	My supervisor makes me feel comfortable talking to him or her about my conflicts between my work and family roles					
27	My supervisor and I can talk effectively to solve conflicts between work and family issues					
28	I can depend on my supervisor to help me with scheduling work and family conflicts if I need it					
29	I can rely on my supervisor to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated family demands					
30	My supervisor works effectively with workers to creatively solve conflicts between work and family demands					
31	My supervisor is a good role model for work and family balance					
32	My supervisor demonstrates effectively behaviours in how to juggle work and family balance					
33	My supervisor demonstrates how a person can jointly be successful on and off the job					
34	My supervisor thinks about how the work in my department can be organised to jointly benefit employees and the company					
35	My supervisor is able to manage the department as a whole team to enable everyone's needs to be met					

About your involvement in your work		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
<i>Please show how much you agree with each statement by ticking a number from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). You must agree/disagree to both parts of the question.</i>						
My involvement in my work _____						
36	...helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member					
37	... helps me to develop my abilities and this helps me be a better family member					
38	... helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better family member					
39	...helps me acquire skills and this helps me be a better family member					
40	... puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member					
41	... makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member					
42	... helps me to have a positive outlook and this helps me be a better family member					
43	...makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better family member					
44	...provides me with a sense of security and this helps me be a better family member					
45	...helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member					
46	...provides me with a sense of accomplishment and this helps me be a better family member					
47	...provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member					
Biographical Data						
48	Gender:	Male		Female		
49	Home Language					
	Afrikaans					
	English					
	IsiXhosa					
	Other (please specify)					

50	Age:	
	Please specify:	
51	Work Status	
	Full time	
	Part-time	
	Other (please specify)	
52	Job Level:	
	Top management	
	Senior management	
	Middle management	
	Other (please specify)	
53	Employment information:	
	No. of years with company	
	Hours worked per week	
54	Marital status	
	Married/living with partner	
	Single	
55	Do you have children? (Your own)	
	Yes	
	No	
	If Yes, how many children live with you?	
	How many children are under the age of 6 years?	
56	Do you have any extended family members that live with you? (e.g. parents, relatives, children of other family members)	
	Yes	
	No	
	If yes, how many relatives live with you?	