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ABSTRACT

Thesis title: Antecedents of work-family conflict amongst Hindu working women in South Africa: Stressors, social support, and cultural values.

Author: Ameeta Jaga
Date: 28 August 2014

Little is known about the antecedents of work-family conflict (WFC) among Hindu working women in South Africa, a minority subgroup shaped by a unique set of historical, political, and cultural dynamics. Responding to repeated calls in the literature for the examination of work-family issues in unique cultural contexts, this study began with 20 in-depth interviews to elicit the subjective meaning that Hindu women in South Africa give to their work-family experiences. The qualitative data were analysed adhering to the principles of thematic analysis. These findings, together with a review of extant literature, were used to develop a new and culturally nuanced explanatory model of the antecedents of WFC for this specific context. The antecedents of WFC in the explanatory model include role stressors, sources of social support, and specific individual-level cultural variables. The study’s propositions were tested with survey data from 317 respondents. Psychometric analyses confirmed the portability of the measures and the bi-directional nature of WFC; work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict. Multiple regression analyses showed that a significant amount of variability in work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict were explained by within-domain and cross-domain role stressors; with work overload having the strongest predictive effect on both directions of WFC. The results further highlight the salience of family in Hindu culture, noting that family involvement functioned as an important resource in reducing both directions of WFC and that food-work overload had a distinctive effect on WFC as a significant within-domain and cross-domain stressor. Results of further moderated multiple regression analyses confirmed co-worker support as an important resource for alleviating work-to-family conflict and for buffering the negative effects that work stressors can have on work-to-family conflict. Likewise, the results confirmed spousal support as an important resource for reducing family-to-work conflict; however, paid domestic support increased family-to-work conflict directly and when interacting with food-work overload. Moderated multiple regression analyses additionally showed that work involvement interacted significantly with gender role ideology in predicting work-to-family conflict and that family hierarchy orientation interacted significantly with family involvement in predicting family-to-work conflict. Overall, the results of this study strengthen the argument for the importance of uncovering and examining culturally salient variables in work-family research.
PROLOGUE

Mahadev said: Thou, O goddess, art conversant with what is Supreme and what is not... I desire to question thee about the duties of women...Indeed, that discourse will then become authoritative in the world...Among human beings, that course of conduct which thou wilt lay down will be followed from generation to generation. All the eternal duties of women are well-known to thee. Do thou, therefore, tell me in detail what are the duties of thy sex.

Uma said:...The duties of women arise as created at the outset by kinsmen in the rites of wedding...That woman who is endued with self-control, who has given birth to children, who serves her husband with devotion, and whose whole heart is devoted to him, is regarded as truly righteous in her conduct. That woman who waits upon and serves her husband with a cheerful heart, who is always cheerful of heart, and who is possessed of humility, is regarded as truly righteous in her conduct...

That woman who always supports her kinsmen and relatives by giving them food, and whose relish in gratifying her desires or for articles of enjoyment, or for affluence of which she is possessed, or for the happiness with which she is surrounded, falls short of her relish for her husband, is regarded as truly righteous in her conduct...

That woman who always takes a pleasure in rising at early dawn, who is devoted to the discharge of all household duties, who always keeps her house clean, who always attends to the domestic fire, who never neglects to make offerings of flowers and other articles to the deities, who with her husband gratifies the deities and guests and all servants and dependents of the family with that share of food which is theirs by the ordinances, and who always takes according to the ordinance, for herself, what food remains in the house after the needs have been met of gods, husband and guests and servants, and who gratifies all people who come in contact with her family and feed them to their fill, succeeds in acquiring great merit. That woman who is endued with accomplishments, who gratifies the feet of her father-in-law and mother-in-law, and who is always devoted to her father and mother, is regarded as possessed of ascetic wealth.

From the Mahabhatara, Anusasana parva CXLVI
Translated by Sri Kisari Mohan Ganguli

Mahabharata = An epic of ancient India, that delivers knowledge on religious and moral issues, and that has been compared in importance to the Bible (Johnson, 1998).
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Work and family are important roles in most people’s lives. The burgeoning work-family studies from multiple disciplines in the past decade have to some extent identified the challenges in simultaneously fulfilling roles in these two domains. Although difficulties associated with managing work and family are a common phenomenon in the lives of people across the world, their manifestation tends to be influenced by culture and context (Kulik, 2012). Extant work-family research on the incompatibility of work and family largely reflects the perceptions of samples from Anglo cultural contexts. Shaffer, Joplin, and Hsu (2011, p. 222) argued that this sample bias in work-family studies has led to a “disparate and fractured understanding of the dynamic interplay between work and family for those who live and work beyond the borders of the United States”.

Cultural context gives meaning to the notion of family, guides appropriate role expectations and shapes beliefs about the centrality of a role to one’s self-concept (Casper, Allen, & Poelmans, 2014). As indicated in the passage from the Mahabharata in the prologue, the primary duties of a Hindu woman are embedded in the family domain. Understanding how cultural context shapes the work-family experiences of diverse groups is therefore important in extending work-family literature and for organisational decision makers managing employees from diverse backgrounds (Olson, Huffman, Leiva, & Culbertson, 2013).

South Africa’s context is culturally complex. Despite being a developing country with diverse ethnic groups, South African management and operating practices are largely defined by Anglo-based norms such as rewarding individual success. Anglo values and cultural norms are dominant in countries of English lineage such as the United States (US), Australia and New Zealand (Wierzbicka, 1993). These Anglo cultural values tend to differ from the cultural values common in traditional societies. For example, the focus on the concept of self rather than group is a construct of Anglo culture. The year 2014 marks 20 years of democracy in South Africa (SA). Over the past two decades, an egalitarian constitution and legislated affirmative action policies have encouraged those marginalised in apartheid SA to further their post-school education, pursue professional careers and enter full-time employment. Hindu women represent a subgroup of such beneficiaries. Their success in the South African workplace may, however, be in tension with their salient traditional familial role possibly
producing inter-role conflict. Work-family conflict (WFC), a type of inter-role conflict, is defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985, p. 77) as the extent to which “participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role”. Rooted in role stress theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964), the underlying assumption of this conflict perspective is that multiple role responsibilities are incompatible and lead to negative outcomes. Detrimental outcomes have been reported in the work domain, such as increased absenteeism, in the family domain, such as reduced marital satisfaction, and at a personal level, such as greater psychological strain (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011).

It is acknowledged in the extant literature that WFC exists in samples from Anglo and other diverse cultural contexts. Though despite growing interest in work-family experiences of people in countries outside the US, a focus on diaspora communities are limited (see Davis, Sloan, & Tang’s 2011 study on African America women, Del Campo, Rogers, & Hinrichs’ 2011 study on Hispanics in the US, Rout, Lewis, & Kagan’s study on Indian women in the United Kingdom, and Sav, Harris, & Sebar’s 2013 study on Muslim men in Australia). Hence whilst many individuals across cultural contexts face difficulties in managing work and family demands, those from diaspora communities are likely to face specific pressures associated with maintaining a cultural identity in a country where the dominant cultural and traditional practices are markedly different from their own (Khokher & Beauregard, 2014). In Hindu culture the practice of maintaining cultural identity is an important role of the Hindu woman and hence for Hindu working women in SA these additional cultural and religious accountabilities may intensify the difficulty in the role demands expected from both the work and family domains. Though work-family research focusing on gender and culture can be viewed from other scholarly fields such as sociology (e.g. Hochschild, 1989) and demography (e.g. Bianchi, Robinson, & Milke, 2006), this study is rooted in organisational psychology.

No published work-family literature exists to help understand the dynamics facing South African Hindu working women. Drawing on the above mentioned international studies however, researchers who have examined the WFC experiences of diaspora groups in larger contexts have reported some differences in these experiences compared to those of their Anglo counterparts and in the relationships reflected in recognised WFC frameworks (e.g. Amstad et al., 2011; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992;
Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). Researchers such as Delcampo et al. (2011) attribute these differences or distinctions to cultural context, asserting that cultural factors inform the decisions of individuals in their work and family domains. In the absence of empirical research, it is similarly assumed that cultural contextual factors shape the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA.

**South African Hindu Context**

Several socio-cultural complexities underpin the work-family experiences of Hindu working women in SA. Some discussion of contextual and historical factors is relevant for facilitating an in-depth understanding of this particular cultural group.

**Emigration of Indians to South Africa.**

The mass migration of Indians from colonial India to South Africa in 1860 was motivated by the need for labourers on the sugar cane plantations in the British colony of Natal (now KwaZulu-Natal). Indians were influenced by the prospects of a better life in SA and migrated as indentured labourers. At that time in India, the caste system played a fundamental role in defining Hindu identity. Caste status created a social position for individuals in a social hierarchy. The four castes (Varnas) in order of social status were Brahmin (priests), Kshatriya (warriors), Vaishya (merchants) and Shudra (servants). The “untouchables” were outside the caste system, and caste members who associated with them were deemed “polluted”. Within the castes were sub-castes (Jatis). Extended families were grouped according to their sub-castes, which were deeply ingrained in the social structure. Customarily, Hindus married within their sub-caste, as sub-caste norms dictated a family’s way of life.

When Hindus migrated from India to SA, caste distinctions were eliminated aboard the ships as all caste members and untouchables were treated equally. However, as the caste system was so deeply ingrained in the Hindu way of life, when the indentured labourers arrived in Natal they reconstructed a social hierarchy to maintain some form of communal and spiritual connection with India (Ebrahim-Vally, 2001). Hence, caste distinctions continued to inform the cultural experiences of Hindus in SA.
From 1870 onwards, Hindus came to SA freely as traders to provide commercial services to the indentured population. These *passenger Hindus* regrouped themselves with families from their own villages in India, thus maintaining their original caste hierarchy. As they were able to pay for their own journeys, they enjoyed a sense of freedom and had the option to return to India. They established businesses, which reinforced the hierarchy between themselves and the indentured labourers. Passenger Hindus viewed themselves as the bourgeoisie who interacted with the indentured labourers only through exploitative relationships (Landy, Maharaj, & Valleix, 2004). This led to the development of two distinct identities within the South African Hindu community (Ebrahim-Vally, 2001).

Despite the formal abolition of the caste system in India in 1985, caste and sub-caste concepts continued to be socially relevant among Hindu South Africans in an attempt to maintain social stratification. Sub-caste practices were also reordered through language (Ebrahim-Vally, 2001). Linguistic groups among Hindus in SA were largely based on the village of origin in India. Indentured labourers who departed from Madras were predominantly Tamil- and Telugu-speaking Indians from the states of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Hindi-speaking indentured labourers came mainly from Bihar and the United Provinces. Passenger Indians who came from Gujarat spoke Gujarati and Mehmon, and those who came from Bombay Presidency spoke Konkani (Ebrahim-Vally, 2001). These language groupings were used to build social structures reflective of the norms and practices inherent in the caste system thereby creating a further division among South African Indians. Gujarati-speaking Hindus endeavoured to distinguish themselves politically, socially and economically from the indentured labourers who spoke mainly Tamil and Telugu (Landy et al., 2004). The Gujarati community strove to maintain caste structures and ensured marriages within the same sub-caste by discouraging integration with non-Gujarati-speaking Hindus. Over the years, English began to replace the Indian languages as a result of Hindus needing to conduct business with other South Africans and also as a result of state schools using English as the medium of instruction (Diesel, 2003). However, despite adopting English as the major home language, Hindus in SA continue to identify themselves as members of a language community.
Apartheid legacy.

Apartheid in SA (1948-1990) was used to segregate people on the basis of race. Racial classifications were introduced for social discrimination purposes. At that time, Indians were not given a distinct classification and were grouped with coloureds (individuals of mixed racial decent) as the South African government anticipated that Indians would return to India. Hindu women faced a “triple oppression”, being “non-white”, female, and often poor, further complicating their identity (Diesel, 2007, p.7). In 1961, “Indian” was introduced as a racial category. Despite the transition to democracy in 1994, many South Africans still hold on to their racial classification identity. According to the South African 2011 census, the 51.8 million citizens self-classified into five racial population groups: black African (79.2%), white (8.9%), coloured (8.9%), Indian or Asian (2.5%), and other/unspecified (0.5%). In the Indian group, Hinduism is the most commonly practised religion (47.3%), followed by Islam (24.7%) and Christianity (24.2%) (Census 2001; religious affiliation was not asked about in the 2011 census).

Differences in family traditions and religion contributed to a clear distinction between Indian Hindus and other South African groups (Diesel, 2003). Minority groups had restricted access to rights, which solidified them as a group. Furthermore, the Group Areas Act (No. 42 of 1950) designated racial groups to particular residential areas thus strengthening the view that Indian Hindus were a homogenous community. Religious sites of worship and cultural organisations were established in these “Indian areas” to build a sense of belonging to an “ancient and rich tradition” (Diesel, 2003, p. 40) at the same time created political solidarity in this oppressed community. Religious practices continued, and cultural customs were promoted thereby contributing to the growth of the Hindu community in SA. Traditional foods and dress were followed to maintain the Hindus’ sense of being Indian. Hindu identity in Durban (the biggest city in KwaZulu-Natal) continues to be robust, possibly because Durban has the biggest concentration of Indians in the world outside of South Asia (Landy et al., 2004).

Economic context.

Apartheid practices created a hierarchy with privileges for certain population groups leading to a skewed representation in the workplace. Changes in the South African workforce have
taken place since the introduction of democracy in 1994. Legislation such as the Employment Equity Act (No. 55 of 1998) and affirmative action policies have created opportunities for the entry of previously disadvantaged groups into the labour force. South Africa also has a constitution built on awareness of past injustices. The South African Bill of Rights (1996) promotes gender equality, and the provision of maternity leave in the Basic Conditions of Employment Act (No. 75 of 1997) supports women with work and family roles. This progressive legislation contributed to an increase of 6.3 million people in the South African workforce between 1995 and 2005, according to the Department of Labour, with a greater percentage increase in the female (59%) than in the male (36%) working population (Maja & Nakanyane, n.d). In 2011, 50.9% of the South African population consisted of women, of whom 63.2% were involved in paid work, a 1.3% increase from 2010 (Geldenhuys, 2011). The majority of working women in SA work 40-45 hours per week, which is in line with the average South African work week (Geldenhuys, 2011). Despite this trend, South African working women spend considerably more time on unpaid work such as family and household duties (three hours per day) than their male counterparts (one hour and 20 minutes per day) (Geldenhuys, 2011). No labour statistics data are available specifically for Hindu working women in SA as religious affiliation was not asked about in the 2011 census. However, national statistics indicate that the Indian population, in comparison with other previously disadvantaged groups (blacks and coloureds), has progressed successfully reporting the highest levels of tertiary education, urbanisation, self-employment, and relative affluence, and the lowest levels of unemployment (Leibbrandt, Woolard, McEwen, & Koep, 2010).

**Cultural context.**

Although Hinduism is a religion in SA, the religion functions as a mechanism to identify culturally with others from the Indian diaspora. It also serves to construct social boundaries that become markers of ethnic identity (Sihna, 2010). Indian culture and Hinduism are thus in continual interaction.

The family is the basis of society in Indian culture and the core of the identity development of Hindus. The traditional notion of family is patriarchal and consists of at least three generations: grandparents, parents, and their children, and the married couple live in the husband’s father’s house. The family structure provides social security and plays a key role in
the continuation of cultural patterns (Misra, 2011). Strong family ties of affection, respect for elders and harmony are valued.

Fundamental to Hindu philosophy is the notion of social obligation and duties towards one’s family. Hindus are expected to adhere to a set of social rights and responsibilities (dharma), which, if followed, prevent social disorder (Agarwal, 2007). According to Vedic scriptures, a human being’s life span is divided into four periods of psychosocial evolution, each of 25 years. The first 25 years, brahmacarya, depict the life of academic discipline. The second 25 years, grhastha (household life), are recognised as the principal feature of the Hindu family system and begin with marriage. In this period, the focus is on one’s responsibilities towards one’s family members and children. Central to all of this is the role of the Hindu woman in her family (stri dharma, duties of the Hindu woman). If the Hindu woman fails to behave in the manner prescribed by society, social relations for the entire family may be jeopardised. A good Hindu woman is a woman who, once married, acquires her identity from her husband, gives birth to a son, and serves her husband, parents-in-laws and guests. If she gives birth to a daughter, then her role is to socialise her daughter to be a good Hindu woman by valuing her family and respecting her elders. Marriage is thus regarded as sacrosanct and part of a religious and social duty (Patil, 2011). These periods are followed by vanaprastha (retired life) and samnyasa (religious wanderer).

In SA, the most pertinent alteration to the traditional family system has been the change in the role and status of women as Hindu women increasingly enter paid work. To different degrees, traditions are being reconstructed, and new value patterns are emerging. These women’s behaviours are slowly beginning to challenge the longstanding model of the hegemonic male breadwinner and the deep-rooted traditional structure of patriarchy in Hindu culture. Societal shifts within the Hindu community are reflected in more nuclear and post-nuclear families and the adoption of values such as individualism, egalitarianism and consumerism. South African Hindus’ identities of religion, language and community are evolving due to these Hindus’ exposure to globalisation and their increased interaction with other cultural groups. Even though South African Hindus are still aware of their “Indianness”, weakening ties with India mean that many younger Hindu individuals have only a mythical relationship with the country. Fourth and fifth generation Indian Hindus may have an interest in their roots and the link to an ancient heritage; however, they probably have
no intention of emigrating to India. Instead, Desai and Vahed (2010) state that many Indian professionals seek to emigrate to England, Canada, Australia and the United States.

**Research Objectives**

As a result of the South African national imperative to redress the past discriminatory practices of apartheid, numerous South African organisations are under pressure to transform their workforces. Hindu women contribute significantly to the South African economy, and it is accordingly necessary to understand the culturally salient antecedents of WFC in order to prevent the onset of its associated negative outcomes. Moreover, due to differences in the socialisation of Hindu women in SA, their individual orientations in terms of cultural values may vary thereby contributing to diverse WFC experiences within this seemingly homogenous sub-group.

For these reasons, the objective of this study was to develop a culture-sensitive explanatory work-family conflict model for Hindu working women in SA. The explanatory model was derived from qualitative in-depth interviews that generated ideas for further investigation in a quantitative study aimed at testing contextually based propositions.

**Research Questions**

What are the contextually salient antecedents of work-family conflict for Hindu working women in SA?

**Research sub-questions.**

1. How do Hindu working women in SA make meaning of their work-family interface?
2. What are the contextually salient antecedents of WFC for Hindu women in SA?
3. To what extent do the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA vary depending on their individual orientations to culturally important values?
Significance of Research

Repeated calls have been made for studies on work-family issues in unique cultural contexts, given the predominance of these issues in Anglo societies (Casper et al., 2014). The present study focused on an under-researched community in the larger context of SA, a country with wide ethnic and cultural diversity. The study broadened existing WFC literature by endeavouring to cast light on the contextual factors that contribute to the occurrence of WFC among Hindu working women. It also explicitly examined the effect of cultural orientations on WFC relationships in order to highlight within-group differences and thereby provide a nuanced understanding of WFC in a distinct cultural context.

The research approach adopted for the study represents a methodological contribution to work-family research. The study commenced with in-depth qualitative interviews aimed at providing rich contextual details needed for developing an initial understanding of the meaning that Hindu working women give to their work-family experiences. The explanatory model arose from the concepts that emerged from the qualitative findings together with extant work-family literature. In this way, existing work-family frameworks were adapted to reflect the cultural context. The relationships in the model were tested quantitatively using survey data. The multiple methods of data collection and analysis yielded a comprehensive and sensitive understanding of the work-family conflict phenomenon for this particular group (Shaffer et al., 2011).

By examining the relationships in the explanatory model among Hindu working women in SA, the study could make practical recommendations to South African organisations for attracting and retaining a diverse workforce. Gaining a deeper understanding of the way in which members of traditional sub-groups identify with particular cultural issues, and how this affects their work-family conflict experiences, may help organisations better support these individuals in managing their family obligations while fulfilling their work duties. The findings of the study could inform family-friendly policies and initiatives in the workplace which can consequently redress past discriminative practices needed to transform the South African society.
Delimitations

Research on the work-family interface has predominantly adopted a conflictual orientation, focusing on the difficulties of occupying multiple roles. It is important to recognise that occupying a work and a family role can also give rise to beneficial experiences such that the rewards may exceed any negative outcomes (Sieber, 1974). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) developed a conceptual framework focusing on the “extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 72), which later became known as work-family enrichment. This view holds that having a work and a family role can have positive consequences for individuals, their families and their organisations (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005).

However, the present study focused specifically on WFC among Hindu working women in SA omitting the positive perspective for several reasons: Firstly, traditional Hindu cultural norms stipulate clearly that domestic and childcare responsibilities are the woman’s role. Hence, occupying a work and a family role may lead to competing demands associated with role conflict for these women. This argument supports that of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) who maintain that when work and family roles are important for an individual's self-concept, work-family conflict is intensified. Secondly, Hindu working women’s role responsibilities are further laden with duties arising from extended family and community activities that add to their roles of mother, worker, and wife (Pituc & Lee, 2007). Thirdly, research on Hindu (and other Indian) women over time shows their position of inequality, even in families with modern ideologies and a commitment to gender equality in the home and at work (Buddhapriya, 2009). Men continue to take on the provider role and women the nurturer, domestic role. Finally, as contemporary Hindu family structures shift from extended to nuclear families, support from extended family members is diminishing.

Structure of Thesis

This chapter provided an overview of the study’s context and the objectives of the study. The next chapter explains the nature of WFC and reviews empirical literature on WFC and cultural variables. Chapter 3 describes the approach taken for conducting the initial in-depth interviews. This is followed by a discussion of the findings emanating from the in-depth interviews and, together with findings from existing WFC literature, proposes a culture-
sensitive explanatory WFC model on salient antecedents and cultural variables as moderators of WFC for Hindu working women in SA. Chapter 4 describes the method followed for conducting the quantitative study. The summarised results of the data analyses performed to test the study’s propositions are presented in Chapter 5. The final chapter discusses the results in relation to existing WFC literature, makes recommendations for future research and provides suggestions for management practices in organisations with culturally diverse workforces.
CHAPTER 2: WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

This chapter aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the nature of work-family conflict (WFC) before reviewing the relationships between WFC and the variables in the explanatory model presented in Chapter 3. The chapter is divided into five sections: Section one outlines the theories that underpin the WFC construct; Section two discusses the refinements in the construct’s conceptualisation and measurement; Section three presents a brief summary based primarily on meta-analytical works indicating the antecedents, outcomes and moderators of WFC; Section four considers the role of culture in WFC experiences, and Section five reviews the relationship between WFC and different cultural variables.

Role Conflict Theory, Resource Drain Theory, and the Scarcity Hypothesis

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985, p. 77) define WFC as “[a] form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect”. In other words, involvement in the work (family) role is made more challenging by participation in the family (work) role. The scarcity hypothesis is that the enactment of one’s work role (a) reduces the energy available for performing one’s family role, (b) encourages behaviours that are incompatible with the performance of one’s family role, and (c) interferes with the individual’s ability to perform the family role. These authors also maintain that the finite resources needed to fulfil the multiple role demands of an individual are often in a state of imbalance resulting in conflict between the domains. Stressors arising in the one domain (e.g. family) will lead to preoccupation and loss of energy hindering one’s performance in the other domain (e.g. work). This conceptualisation of WFC is underpinned by role conflict theory, resource drain theory and the scarcity hypothesis.

Role conflict theory.

In sociological, organisational and psychological research, role theory is often used to show that individuals simultaneously occupy multiple roles (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaus, & Brinley, 2005). A role refers to the expected patterns of behaviours and attitudes linked to an identity in different situations (Turner, 1962). Turner (1962) calls family and work roles as
position or status roles as they are linked to statuses in certain settings. When considering roles in formal organisations such as work and family, role theory relates to normative expectations associated with a particular social position (Biddle, 1986). Biddle (1986) argues that these expectations may arise from the actual demands of the role as well as the expectations of other members thereby creating role pressures. When these pressures are incompatible, role conflict occurs, causing strain. In their seminal work in occupational stress literature, Kahn et al. (1964) define role conflict as the occurrence of opposing sets of pressures such that fulfilment of the one will make it unmanageable to simultaneously fulfil the other. They add that the conflict can originate from opposing expectations within a role (intra-role) or from conflict expectations from multiple roles (inter-role). An example of intra-role conflict is when a mother believes she can be a role model for her daughter by having a career while her family members believe that her role as a mother is to be at home during the day to look after her children. Intra-role conflict arises from the opposing conceptions of the role of the mother (Wolf, 2008). Intra-role conflict may also occur when an individual (e.g. a mother) has opposing expectations of herself in a role. For example, a mother should be compassionate towards her children, but when they misbehave, she needs to discipline them. These behaviours are in tension, which can lead to intra-role conflict. An example of inter-role conflict is when an employee has to work late to meet her work demands meaning that she cannot, for instance, attend her child’s school concert. Here the conflict arises because the employee cannot meet both role expectations simultaneously.

**Scarcity hypothesis and resource drain theory.**

The scarcity hypothesis provides a similar perspective of inter-role conflict (Goode, 1960; Marks, 1977). Goode (1960) maintains that individuals possess a finite amount of psychological and physiological resources, and, due to multiple role occupancy, demands on these competing finite resources increase. In other words, when resources are spent in one role, they are depleted and unavailable for use in other roles leading to strain. Resource drain theory is akin to the scarcity hypothesis. Resource drain theory (Rothbard 2000; Staines, 1980) holds that resources are transferred from one role to another, but, because resources are finite, there is a drain on the resources in the transferring role. Resource drain theory and the scarcity hypothesis focus on the alleged difficulty of managing multiple roles because strong commitment to one role requires an individual’s physical and psychological resources thus often precluding attachment to another role because of resource depletion. If the multiple
roles are not negotiated successfully, the individual's total role obligations may be over-demanding. Accordingly, the more roles individuals participate in, the greater the burden on their energy and the further depletion of their resources leading to role conflict.

These theories offer frameworks for understanding the alleged difficulty of managing multiple roles and have overwhelmingly focused on the interface between work and family. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) conceptualised a well-known form of inter-role conflict called work-family conflict to explain the incompatibility of work and family roles due to competing expectations and resources. Since the mid-1980s, researchers have been studying work-family conflict as a form of stress that influences wellbeing (Frone et al., 1992). Other terms for this negative relationship include negative spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), work-home interference (Steinmetz, Frese, & Schmidt, 2008), job-family role strain (Swanberg, 2005), work – non-work interference (Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010), negative work-home interaction (Geurts, Taris, Kompier, Dikkers, Van Hooff, & Kinnunen, 2005), and family-work role incompatibility (Jones & Butler, 1980). The construct “work-family conflict” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) has, however, been the most widely used term in empirical research to describe the inter-role conflict between the work and family domains and accordingly was used in the present study.

Developments in WFC: Directionality, Dimensionality, and Measurement

Quinn and Staines’ (1979) study incorporating the Michigan Quality of Employment Survey was one of the first studies to examine work-family conflict (WFC). This section outlines the developments in the WFC construct by first discussing the bi-directional nature of WFC, then by considering its dimensionality and finally by indicating the advances in its measurement.

Bi-directionality of WFC.

Early explanations of the WFC construct did not distinguish between the directions of conflict. It was initially Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) who conceived a bi-directional reciprocal relationship by asserting that directionality is based on the conflict source. Later researchers validated this view that work and family are distinct domains of an individual’s life and that failing to acknowledge and measure this bi-directionality may limit one’s understanding of WFC. Conflict can thus be derived from the work domain whereby
participation in the family role is made more challenging because of involvement in the work role (work-to-family conflict) (W2FC). For example, a mother has an evening seminar at work and as a result cannot attend a family celebration. Conflict can also be derived from the family domain whereby participation in the work role is made more challenging because of involvement in the family role (family-to-work conflict) (F2WC). For example, a mother with a baby may be sleep deprived thereby reducing her performance at work.

Work-family research has consistently provided empirical evidence of the bi-directional nature of WFC. In 2005, Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) meta-analysed the differences in W2FC and F2WC measures. Using 25 independent samples (total \( N = 9079 \)), they reported a weighted mean observed correlation of \( r_{wm} = .38 \) and, when corrected for unreliability, of \( \rho = .48 \). The 90% credibility intervals ranged from .27 to .69 indicating differing relationships between W2FC and F2WC across the samples. Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran’s research confirmed adequate discriminant validity between W2FC and F2WC, and they therefore concluded that measuring both directions would provide researchers with increased insight into the phenomenon.

Further empirical evidence for the bi-directional nature of WFC was found in meta-analytical works on the antecedents of WFC (Byron, 2005; Michel et al., 2011) and on the outcomes of WFC (Amstad et al. 2011). Distinct antecedents for W2FC and F2WC were reported by Byron (2005) and confirmed by Michel et al. (2011), while Amstad et al. (2011) provided evidence W2FC and F2WC having distinct outcomes (details of these results are presented later in this chapter). The above meta-analyses showed W2FC to be more prevalent than F2WC probably because family boundaries are more permeable than work boundaries thus suggesting that employees will rather make adjustments in their family lives in order to reduce pressures arising from work (Amstad et al., 2011).

In addition to the evidence supporting the two directions of WFC, Byron (2005) also reported a weighted mean corrected correlation of \( \rho = .48 \) between W2FC and F2WC. These results, based on the findings of 47 studies (total \( N = 13 \ 384 \)), imply that an increase in conflict in the one domain is likely to be related to an increase in conflict in the other.
Dimensionality of WFC.

Work-family researchers have demonstrated different approaches to the dimensionality of work-family conflict. A uni-dimensional conceptualisation and measurement of the construct was initially presented by Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly (1983). And, building on their work, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) proposed a multidimensional model resulting from their examination of earlier literature. The latter researchers suggested that the mechanisms of inter-role conflict can be linked to time, strain or behaviour in each direction, W2FC and F2WC (Figure 1). Time-based conflict occurs when the time demands of one role hinder performance in the other role – for example, a parent cannot watch his or her child play in a soccer match due to being at work. The competing time demands make it physically impossible for the parent to be in two places at the same time. Time-based conflict is intensified by long hours spent in a role. Pressures from one role may also preoccupy an individual psychologically when he or she is attempting to fulfil another role.

Strain-based conflict occurs when strain reduces an individual’s personal resources such as energy and physical or mental capacity making it more challenging to meet the obligations of the other role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For example, stressful situations at work may result in frustration with the spouse and children at home. Strain caused by tension, anxiety, depression, apathy and irritability in one role may hinder an individual’s performance in another role. Voydanoff (2004) links strain-based conflict to the way in which strain is psychologically experienced by an individual. For example, individuals who experience strain in the workplace often have a triggered psychological response that is then translated into attitudes and actions that may hinder performance in the family domain.

Behaviour-based conflict arises when behaviours required in one role are incongruent with those required in another role. For example, a woman in a management position at work will be expected to display leadership and assertive behaviours whereas in the home she may be expected to display more subservient behaviours (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Spector, Cooper, Poelmans, Allen, O’Driscoll, Sanchez,.. & Lu, 2004).
Measurement of WFC.

Over the past four decades, major developments have occurred in the measurement of work-family conflict (Table 1). The differences in these measures may explain the frequent discrepancies in research results. Mesmar-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2005) analysed the convergence between measures of W2FC and F2WC and reported that among the 25 studies included in their sample, the internal reliability coefficients of the measures reported ranged from .56 to .95. Furthermore, the number of items in the scales ranged from two to 22 items, and there was also some variability in the content of the scale.

Figure 1. A model of the sources of work-family conflict. Any role characteristic that affects a person's time involvement, strain, or behaviour within a role can produce conflict between that role and another role. From “Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles,” by J. H. Greenhaus and N. J. Beutell, 1985, The Academy of Management Review, 10, p. 77.

Scales such as the Michigan Quality of Employment Survey used by Quinn and Staines (1979) did not differentiate between directions and different dimensions. These scales were followed by scales developed by Kopelman et al. (1983) that specifically measured the direction W2FC, and Burley’s (1989) scale that measured the direction F2WC only. Refinements of these scales led to further scale developments by Gutek et al. (1991) who recognised and measured both directions, W2FC and F2WC.
McMurrian stated that due to past measurement inconsistencies, more rigorous scale development procedures were needed to measure the two distinct directions of WFC. Netemeyer et al. (2006, p. 401) acknowledged the time and strain components of Greenhaus et al.’s (1985) conceptualisation and developed their own scale according to the following definition: “WFC is a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities. FWC is a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities”.

Netemeyer et al. refer to general demands as the responsibilities, requirements, expectations, duties, and commitments required by a role.

Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) stated that a limitation of previous WFC conflict scales was that they did not capture all six dimensions of the construct as conceptualised by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) (time-, strain- and behaviour-based conflict in the W2FC and F2WC directions). Carlson et al. developed and validated a scale that measured the three dimensions as well as the two directions of WFC in order to provide a more accurate interpretation of the construct. Few empirical studies have examined this six-factor structure of WFC or found significant results for these six forms (Eby et al., 2005; Jenkins, Heneghan, Bailey, & Barber, 2014, Olson et al., 2013). Some researchers have also used the bi-directional measure of the Carlson et al. scale without examining its dimensionality (e.g. Tement & Korunka, 2013). One possible reason for the inconsistent use of the scale’s dimensions is because the behaviour-based form of WFC is difficult to operationalise (Dierdorff & Ellington, 2008; Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999). Researchers have argued that more rigorous empirical work on the behaviour-based dimension is needed because of the inconsistent results when measuring this form of WFC (O’Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2006). Dierdorff and Ellington (2008) investigated only the behaviour-based form of WFC and suggested that the challenge of measuring this form may arise from the fact that social factors shape the salient role-related information that defines the behavioural requirements for an individual’s role. These elements from the social environment may be less well understood and context-specific.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and year</th>
<th>Construct name</th>
<th>Distinct directions</th>
<th>Number of items (each direction and total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981)</td>
<td>Job-family role strain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, Weir, and DuWors (1979)</td>
<td>Impact of job demands on home and family life.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Referring to husband’s job demands affecting the wife’s home and family life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000)</td>
<td>Work-family conflict W2FC and F2WC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 items per direction, Total: 18 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1992)</td>
<td>Work-family conflict W2FC and F2WC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 items per direction, Total: 4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham (1999)</td>
<td>Strain-based and time-based work-family conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 items per directions. Total: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and year</td>
<td>Construct name</td>
<td>Distinct directions (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Number of items (each direction and total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koekemoer and Mostert (2010)</td>
<td>Work - non-work interference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 items per direction. Total: 30 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly (1983)</td>
<td>Inter-role conflict</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time-based WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strain-based WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996)</td>
<td>Work-family conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 items per direction. Total: 10 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Michigan Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn &amp; Staines, 1979)</td>
<td>Work-family interference</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Work-home interference (WHI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 items HWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Home-work interference (HWI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 15 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owing to the incongruous empirical evidence for the dimensionality in WFC, Ford et al. (2007) focused only on the two directions in their meta-analytical research. For similar reasons, most empirical studies on WFC have tested either only the time- and strain-based dimensions or found evidence only for those two dimensions using Carlson et al.’s (2000) scale. In addition, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) noted that scales with fewer items are preferable to those with many items when the coefficient alpha and construct validity estimates are similar as they place a lesser burden on respondents. For the above reasons, the present study adopted the conceptualisation and measurement of WFC as presented by Netemeyer et al. (1996) with the focus on the bi-directional nature of the constructs, W2FC and F2WC.

**Summary Review of the Outcomes, Antecedents, and Moderators of WFC**

This section reviews the outcomes, antecedents and moderators of WFC in an attempt to provide a comprehensive understanding of the construct. Several WFC models have been developed reflecting these antecedents and outcomes variables (see Bernas & Major, 2000; Frone et al., 1992; Frone et al., 1997; Fu & Shaffer, 2001; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; Koppelman et al., 1983; Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, & Baltes, 2009; Voydanoff, 2002). Some of the most widely used of these WFC models are Frone et al.’s *Model of the Work-family Interface* (Figure 2) and Frone et al.’s *Integrative Model of the Work-Family Interface* (Figure 3) with many later models reflecting some form of adaptation. Notably, though, these models have been developed with the Anglo notion of work and family in mind (with the exception of Fu & Shaffer, 2001 and Luk & Shaffer, 2005). For instance, stressors indicated as antecedent variables in these models typically reflect the experiences of Anglo samples from industrialised societies who value individualism and egalitarianism. Moreover, these models have been tested on and confirmed mainly for such samples (Casper et al., 2014; Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007; Shaffer et al., 2011).

Accordingly, meta-analyses of the antecedents of (see Byron, 2005 and Michel et al., 2011) and outcomes of WFC (see Amstad et al., 2011) have been conducted on studies predominantly on of Anglo samples. Thus, on the one hand, exclusive reliance on existing published meta-analytical findings is problematic as the sample bias may yield a skewed representation of the experience of WFC in other cultural contexts. On the other hand, a
meta-analysis reduces the complexity and extensiveness of the research and detects patterns in the accumulated results thereby providing an excellent source of synthesised findings across studies (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). For these reasons, this section presents empirical findings on the outcomes, antecedents, and moderators of WFC based primarily on those reported in meta-analyses. The next section reviews the literature on the influence of culture on WFC experiences in an attempt to explicate the similarities and differences in the antecedents and outcomes among diverse samples and contexts.

**Figure 2.** Conceptual model of the work-family interface. Pluses and minuses represent the direction of the hypothesized relationships. Broken lines signify two nested models, one without [Model A] and one with [Model B] paths from work-family conflict to depression. The letter d represents the disturbance term for each endogenous variable. From “Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-family Conflict: Testing a Model of the Work-family Interface,” by M. R. Frone, M. Russel., and M. L. Cooper, 1992, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, p. 66.

**Outcomes of WFC.**

WFC often has detrimental consequences (see Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Amstad et al., 2011; Ford et al., 2007; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Amstad et al.’s (2011) meta-analysis extends Allen et al.’s 2000 work. It is the most recent meta-analysis on the outcomes of WFC and seems the most comprehensive as the
authors examined both directions of WFC by developing matching-hypotheses and cross-domain hypotheses. A matching-hypothesis is where the primary effect of WFC lies in the domain where the conflict originates. In other words, W2FC should have a greater influence on work-related outcomes while F2WC should have a greater influence on family-related outcomes (Amstad et al. 2011). Amstad et al. argued that the plausibility of this hypothesised effect is increased as individuals are more likely to focus on the source of the conflict leading to strain in the same domain. For example, if a mother’s high work demands mean that she cannot relax with her children over the weekend, she may start resenting the organisation she works for. Such resentment may lead to negative work-related outcomes such as reduced commitment and job satisfaction. Conversely, cross-domain hypotheses imply that the primary effect of WFC is not on the originating domain, but on the other domain. In other words, because of the stressors at work, W2FC contributes to negative consequences in the family domain and vice versa.

Amstad et al.'s (2011) findings, based on 427 effect sizes, confirmed significant relationships at the 95% confidence interval between both directions of W2FC and F2WC and three categories of outcomes (Figure 4): family-related outcomes (W2FC: $r_{wm} = .18$; F2WC: $r_{wm} = .22$), work-related outcomes (W2FC: $r_{wm} = .29$; F2WC: $r_{wm} = .16$) and domain-unspecific outcomes (W2FC: $r_{wm} = .32$; F2WC: $r_{wm} = .23$) (see Amstad et al. 2011 for the results of individual outcome variables). These results show that the relationships between each direction of WFC and its outcomes were stronger for the matching-domain outcomes than for the cross-domain outcomes, that is, W2FC was a stronger predictor of work-related rather than family-related outcomes. Similarly, F2WC was a stronger predictor of family-related rather than work-related outcomes, although these latter correlations were weaker in their particular study.
Extending the empirical review of the meta-analyses by Amstad et al. in 2011, the findings from recent individual studies confirm these negative outcomes of WFC in the work, family and unspecific domains. With regard to work-related outcomes, empirical findings confirm reduced job satisfaction (e.g. Kalliath & Kalliath, 2013), reduced organisational commitment (e.g. Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013), turnover intention (e.g. Nohe & Sonntag, 2014), both components of burnout, emotional exhaustion and cynicism (e.g. Reichl, Leiter, & Spinath, 2014); absenteeism (e.g. Zuba & Schneider, 2013), work stress (e.g. Bazana & Dodd, 2013) and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (e.g. Lambert, Kelley, & Hogan, 2013a) as outcomes of WFC.

Fewer studies have investigated family-related consequences of WFC. Nevertheless, recent studies have confirmed Amstad et al.’s (2011) meta-analytical findings that decreases in marital satisfaction (e.g. Carroll, Hill, Yorgason, Larson, & Sandberg, 2013), family satisfaction (e.g. Karimi, Jomehri, Asadzade, & Sohrabi, 2012) and family-related performance (e.g. Carlson, Grzywacz, & Kacmar, 2010) are significant family-related outcomes of WFC.

Similarly, in the unspecific domain (Amstad et al., 2011), researchers have reported consistent findings with regard to decreased life satisfaction (e.g. Zhao, Qu, & Ghiselli, 2011) and wellbeing (e.g. Ohtsuka, Ibrahim, & Aida, 2013), exacerbated health problems (Shockley & Allen, 2013), psychological strain (e.g. Bhagat, Krishnan, Nelson, Leonard, Ford Jr., & Billing, 2010), anxiety (e.g. Mostert, 2009) and depression (e.g. Wang, Schmitz, Smailes, Sareen, & Patten, 2010) as outcomes of WFC.

As a result of these negative consequences associated with WFC, employers and policy makers have introduced various initiatives aimed at alleviating these unfavourable occurrences. For these reasons, it is important to have a clear understanding of the factors that contribute to WFC in respect of research and practice (Michel et al., 2011).
Antecedents of WFC.

In this section, the general antecedents of WFC are summarised from meta-analytical research to give a broad overview of the factors that contribute to WFC occurrences. Chapter 3 provides a detailed review of current literature together with extracts from in-depth interviews on the contextually salient antecedents of WFC for Hindu working women in SA. Influential contributors to WFC stem from the work and family domains and include emotional and physical work (Lu, Kao, Chang, Wu, & Cooper, 2008). Two meta-analyses specifically on the antecedents of WFC have been published in the past decade. Byron’s (2005) work includes studies published between 1987 and 2002 using the broader work-nonwork and work-life conflict measures. Michel et al.’s (2011) meta-analysis is more recent including studies published between 1987 and 2008 that focus specifically on the work-family conflict construct. Further refinements of Byron’s work found in Michel’s meta-analysis include greater conceptual clarity of the work and family antecedent categories (Table 2 and Table 3) and the inclusion of personality variables as antecedents of WFC. Michel et al. (2011) based their results on 1080 correlations from 178 samples. They found that WFC in the W2FC direction resulted mainly from work-related antecedents while F2WC was mainly a result of family-related antecedents, again validating a bi-directional relationship (Michel et al., 2009).

Antecedents of W2FC.
Table 2 summarises Michel et al.’s (2011) findings for same-domain and cross-domain antecedents of W2FC. An example of a more recent (post 2011) single study confirming each antecedent is also presented in the table.

Antecedents of F2WC.
Table 3 summarises Michel et al.’s (2011) findings for same-domain and cross-domain antecedents of F2WC. An example of a more recent (post 2011) individual study confirming each antecedent is also tabulated. A database search on PsychINFO and EBSCO HOST for empirical studies confirming family role conflict, family role ambiguity, and family hours as antecedents of WFC revealed no post-2011 studies. Huffman, Olson, O'Gara, & King (2014) tested the relationship between family hours and time- and strain-based F2WC but no significant results were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent of W2FC (Category in bold face)</th>
<th>Related to F2WC (Cross-domain)</th>
<th>Support from recent finding for within-domain and/or cross domain relationship (post 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work role stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role conflict</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Sahadev, Seshanna, &amp; Purani (2014). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work role ambiguity</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Lambert, Kelley, &amp; Hogan, (2013b). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time demands (work hours)</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Holliday Wayne, Casper, Matthews, &amp; Allen (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work role involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job involvement</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Tharmalingam &amp; Bhatti (2014). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work interest/centrality</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Mihelic (2014). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work social support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational support</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Gurbuz et al. (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor support</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Selvarajan, Cloninger, &amp; Singh (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-worker support</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Mauno &amp; Rantanen (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task variety</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Tement &amp; Korunka (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job autonomy</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Tement &amp; Korunka (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly organisation (including organisational culture)</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>de Janasz, Behson, Jonsen, &amp; Lankau, (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal locus of control</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Haines, Harvey, Durand, &amp; Marchand, A. (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative affect/neuroticism</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Wille, De Fruyt, &amp; Feys (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Antecedents of F2WC from Michel et al.’s (2011) Meta-analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent of F2WC (Category in bold face)</th>
<th>Related to W2FC (Cross domain)</th>
<th>Support from recent finding for within-domain and/or cross domain relationship (post 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family role stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family role conflict</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>No empirical findings according to the researcher’s knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family role ambiguity</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>No empirical findings according to the researcher’s knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family role overload</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Matthews, Winkel, &amp; Holliday Wayne (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time demands (family hours)</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Huffman et al. (2014). Tested but not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental demands</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Lu, &amp; Chang (2014). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of children/dependents</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Minnotte, Minnotte, &amp; Pedersen (2013). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family role involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family interest/centrality</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Bagger, &amp; Li. (2012). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family social support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family support</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Wang, Lin, Tsai (2012). Within-domain only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spousal support</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>Selvarajan et al. (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family climate</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>No empirical findings according to the researcher’s knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal locus of control</td>
<td>not supported</td>
<td>Haines et al. (2013). Within-domain and cross-domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michel et al.’s (2011) findings show that work and family stressors exacerbate the occurrence of WFC while social support and supportive climates reduce its incidence. Resource drain theory (Staines, 1980) and the scarcity hypothesis (Goode, 1960; Marks 1977) help explain the stressor-WFC relationships as individuals are considered to have finite resources. Stressors in one role (e.g. work) exhaust available resources in that role resulting in depleted resources to fulfil the requirements of the other role (e.g. family) thus contributing to WFC. Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and social support resource theory (Hobfoll, Freedy, Lane, & Geller, 1990) facilitate understanding of the support-WFC relationship as they hold that individuals can conserve or gain resources such as social support. As a result, they are likely to experience reduced stress as they are better equipped to manage their various responsibilities in multiple roles, implying a direct protective effect. The support for several cross-domain relationships suggests that future research should explore same-domain as well as cross-domain effects to gain greater insight into the antecedents of WFC.

Michel et al.’s (2011) meta-analysis extended Byron’s work by incorporating personality variables, yet only two were included in the meta-analysis (internal locus of control and negative affect/neuroticism). Dispositional variables as antecedents of WFC have received far less attention in work-family research than stressor and support variables (Allen, Johnson, Saboe, Cho, Dumani & Evans, 2012). Allen et al. (2012) examined the association between dispositional variables and each direction of WFC using meta-analysis. In the direction W2FC, they reported significant effect sizes for agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, locus of control, positive affect, self-esteem, negative affect, neuroticism, optimism, self-efficacy and Type A. In the direction F2WC, significant effect sizes were observed for agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive affect, negative affect, neuroticism and self-efficacy (Allen et al., 2012). Allen et al. (2012) advance several reasons for considering dispositions as important predictors of WFC, the first being that they can serve as a resource (e.g. conscientiousness). In accordance with resource drain theory (Staines, 1980), when resources are required in one role, they become depleted in that role, and it becomes challenging for the individual to fulfil the requirements of the other role resulting in WFC. Secondly, drawing on differential exposure (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995), dispositions (e.g. extraversion) can influence individuals to select particular environments, such as supportive environments, which can help alleviate WFC. Thirdly, in line with differential reactivity
(Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995), dispositions (e.g. neuroticism) can predispose individuals to more stressful situations.

**Modulators of WFC.**

Several moderating variables have been reported to have an effect on WFC relationships, a brief overview of which is provided below. Where meta-analytical findings are presented, they are based on the results of correlations between sample-level moderator variables and effect sizes. Empirical findings on each moderating variable are summarised.

**Gender (used as a proxy for biological sex).**

Inconsistent results have been found for gender as a moderating variable in WFC relationships. Ford et al. (2007) investigated its moderating effect on the cross-domain relationship between W2FC and family satisfaction and between F2WC and job satisfaction but found no significant results. Michel et al. (2011), however, reported that the men in their study experienced more W2FC from work role ambiguity and job autonomy than their female counterparts, which was contrary to their expectations. Byron’s (2005) findings indicated that family stress, family conflict, number of children and marital status related more negatively to W2FC for the men than for the women in his study while flexible work schedules and family support related more negatively to WFC for the women than for the men. Rajadyaksha and Velgach (2009) advocated the use of gender role ideology (GRI) rather than gender in order to understand variations in WFC as gender does not allow for the evaluation of within-sex variation in gender roles. They add that gender influences the identities, behaviour and the roles that individuals select to act and how to act them, which can be captured more accurately through GRI.

**Work hours.**

Amstad et al. (2011) reported significant effects for hours at work on the relationship between W2FC and family-related outcomes (e.g. family satisfaction), and on the relationship between F2WC and domain-unspecific outcomes (e.g. depression). In other words, longer working hours contribute to exacerbated negative effects of WFC on the outcome variable. This may be because longer work hours impose additional strain on individuals and further deplete their finite resources thereby intensifying the negative effects of WFC.
**Dual-earner couples.**
The moderating effect of dual-earning couple status on the cross-domain relationship between W2FC and family satisfaction was examined meta-analytically by Ford and his colleagues (Ford et al., 2007). Their study revealed that individuals in a dual-earning relationship experience greater family satisfaction because of reduced W2FC than those not in dual-earner relationships. This moderating effect may be explained by conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), which holds that dual-earner couples have access to greater financial and social resources that can help them alleviate the unfavourable consequences of WFC. Those in single-earner households may have access to fewer resources to meet their work and family demands.

**Work social support.**
The role of social support in reducing the negative effects of WFC has also been examined. For example, Casper, Harris, Taylor-Bianco, & Holliday Wayne (2011) found that supervisor support is a significant moderator of the relationship between F2WC and continuance commitment, while O’Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath (2004) reported that co-worker support significantly moderates the relationship between W2FC and family satisfaction and psychological strain. Although Michel et al. (2011) tested social support variables for their direct antecedent effects on WFC, they have also been established as moderating variables in the stressor-WFC relationship (e.g. Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999; Beauregard, 2011; Fu & Shaffer, 2001; Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Seiger & Wiese, 2009). A detailed review of various forms of social support as moderators of the antecedent variable-WFC relationship is presented in Chapter 3.

The brief summary above shows that there are important antecedents, outcomes and moderators of WFC and that recognition of these variables facilitates in-depth understanding of the WFC construct. However, missing from these meta-analyses are cultural constructs as antecedents of WFC or moderators of WFC relationships. Galovan, Fackrell, Buswell, Jones, Hill, and Carroll (2010) maintained that work and family factors that affect individuals’ experiences of WFC are shaped by values, beliefs, and role conceptions that arise through socialisation. It is therefore important to turn our attention to studies on the influence of culture on WFC experiences in order to explain similarities as well as differences in WFC experiences among diverse samples and contexts.
WFC and Cultural Dimensions

The aim of this study was to extend the limited literature on WFC and cultural dimensions among a particular cultural sub-group of Hindu working women in South Africa. The cultural context guides individuals’ perceptions of their life roles and their decisions on their interactions with others (Tsai, Chentsova-Dutton, & Wong, 2002). Insight into how culture shapes the work-family experiences of diverse groups is important and extends the corpus of WFC literature that has focused mainly on the experiences of Anglo samples. Distinctions in WFC experiences can be expected across and within diverse samples due to differing socio-cultural beliefs in specific cultural contexts. Yet few researchers have included cultural variables in their WFC models.

Korabik, Lero, and Ayman (2003) were among the first researchers to propose an Integrative Model of WFC (Figure 5) by adapting Frone et al.’s model (1997) to include cultural variables. This adaptation was based on the argument that variation in cultural variables is likely to have an effect in determining the type and prevalence of work and family demands and the support that individuals are likely to experience. Supporting this argument, Powell, Francesco, & Ling (2009) developed culture-sensitive theories and proposed a work-family model incorporating cultural dimensions (Figure 6) to increase our understanding of cultural influences on the work-family interface. To date, few empirical studies have explicitly tested the effects of cultural dimensions on WFC experiences (see Billing, Bhagat, Babakus, Srivastava, Shin, & Brew, 2013; Lu, 2012; Mortazavi, Pedhiwala, Shaftiro, & Hammer, 2009; Olsen et al., 2013; Rajadyaksha & Velgach, 2009; Taylor, Delcampo, & Blancero, 2009; Wang, Lawler, Walumbwa, & Shi, 2004). Inconsistencies have also occurred in the way in which culture has been defined, operationalised and measured in work-family studies making it difficult to compare findings. This section accordingly begins with a discussion on the definitions of culture in work-family research before reviewing research that has incorporated cultural considerations.
Defining culture for work-family research.

Lu (2012) stated that defining culture when examining its influence on the work-family interface poses a theoretical challenge because of the complexity of the concept. Moreover, culture in organisational studies has been defined in different ways based on divergent schools of thoughts in cultural anthropology (Allaire & Firshtrotu, 1984) (Figure 7). The most widely used contemporary understanding of culture from an organisational studies perspective is that of the symbolic school (Geertz, 1973) where culture is seen as a system of shared meaning and symbols. This view is based on the general theory of action developed by Parsons and Shils (1951) who argue that the cultural system comprises cognitive symbols (ideas and beliefs about the world), expressive symbols (communicating emotion) and moral standards (aiding individuals in adhering to common goals). They developed a model of opposing cultural values in order to consider interaction norms and their associated roles (e.g. self-emphasis vs. collectivity – societal and individual actions are prioritised in terms of group goals as opposed to individual goals). This model is based on the premise that values and norms are the major source of integration and that differences between societies are based on the commitment of its members to common value patterns. Parsons and Shils added that different forms of these patterns may play out in different parts of individuals’ lives.

Parson and Shils’ (1951) value patterns formed the basis of the influential cultural frameworks of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), Hofstede (1980), Triandis (1989), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) and Maznevski, Gomez, DiStefano, Noorderhaven, & Wu (2002). However, even among researchers who share this common perspective of culture as a system of shared meaning, variations continue to exist in the way that culture is defined. Hofstede (2001, p. 9) defined culture as “the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from others”. This definition indicates measurement at a national level. Hofstede maintains that citizens of a particular country learn and share the same patterns of values and beliefs that differentiate them from the citizens of other countries. The view that cultural values provide general guidance to behaviour on a national level is also seen in the cultural frameworks of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) and House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004).
However, some researchers (e.g. Triandis, 1988; Maznevski et al., 2002) believe that culture influences the perceptions, values, and behaviours of individuals in a distinct manner to the influence of culture at a societal level. Based on the work of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), Maznevski et al. (2002, p. 276) defined culture as “the pattern of variations within a society, or, more specifically, as the pattern of deep level values and assumptions with societal effectiveness, shared by an interacting group of people”. Culture is thus operationalised at the individual level in this study. The latter perspective and definition of culture was used in this study because individual level cultural dimensions have been shown to be valid and provide the appropriate extent of features in explaining observed variations in individuals’ work-family experiences (Aycan, 2008).
Figure 7. A typology of the concepts of culture. Boldface denotes the most widely used perspective of culture in organisational studies research. Adapted from “Theories of Organizational Culture,” by Y. Allaire and M. E. Firshtrotu, 1984, Organizational Studies, 5, p. 196.
Unfortunately, little attention has been given to these variations in definitions and levels of cultural dimensions when examining the work-family interface. Existing work-family studies vary in the levels at which cultural dimensions are defined and operationalised often without an explication of the level of cultural analysis. Some researchers have examined WFC differences and similarities between two or more countries on a cultural level while others have examined individuals from a particular ethnic group or from non-Anglo countries to provide comparative work-family perspectives. However, in some instances researchers have used national-level cultural dimensions to measure individual-level work-family experiences. Gelfand, Erez, and Aycan (2007) caution against interpreting findings from studies that have applied national-level analyses at the individual-level and vice versa as the findings may not be supported when the equivalent variables are analysed at the individual level. They appeal to researchers to identify and explicitly state the appropriate level of analysis. The limited work-family research at both levels nevertheless suggests that culture influences the occurrences of WFC in different contexts.

The following review is presented in two sections: (1) studies on WFC and cultural dimensions at a national level, and (2) studies on WFC and cultural dimensions at an individual level. This distinction is important because while studies on WFC and national-level cultural dimensions provide empirical results that highlight the influence of context on behaviours, an aggregated measure of culture at a national level may be problematic when explaining individual work-family experiences.

**WFC and national-level cultural dimensions.**

National-level cultural frameworks include those of Hofstede (1980), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), and House et al. (2004). Ollier-Malaterre, Valcour, Den Dulk, and Kossek (2013) argued that work-family experiences of individuals are strongly influenced by national context as macro-level factors such as gender role ideologies, strength of the economy, legislation on family leave, history and culture affect work-life variables for the organisation and the individual. Work-family researchers are increasingly comparing WFC experiences across countries using national cultural dimensions (cf. Billing, Bhagat, Babakus, Krishnan, Ford, Srivastava,... & Nasurdin, 2014; Galovan et al., 2010; Hill, Yang, Hawkins, & Ferris, 2004; Lu, Cooper, Chang, Allen, Lapierre, O’Driscoll,... & Spector, 2010; Lu, Gilmour, Kao, & Huang, 2006; Lyness & Kropf, 2005; Masuda, Poelmans, Allen, Spector,
Lapierre, Cooper,... & Moreno-Velazquez, 2012; Spector et al., 2004; Spector, Allen, Poelmans, Lapierre, Cooper, Michael,... & Widerszal-Bazyl, 2007; Yang, 2005; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000). In these studies, the authors classify the countries included in the studies according to an existing cultural framework (e.g. Fackrell, Galovan, Hill, & Holmes, 2013, used Hofstede’s framework to select an individualistic country, the United States, and a collectivistic country, Singapore).

Billing et al. (2014) conducted a cross-national study that investigated the moderating effect of decision latitude (ability to perform role-related duties to one’s discretion) on the relationship between WFC and psychological strain in five dissimilar countries (based on Hofstede’s 1991 country classification): the United States (US) and Canada (considered individualistic and low on power distance), and India, Indonesia, and South Korea (considered collectivistic and high on power distance) (total \( N = 2371 \)). Their findings showed that decision latitude moderated the relationship for the individualistic countries but not for the collectivistic countries. A possible reason for these findings is that individuals in individualistic countries value autonomy and freedom to exercise decision making, which then enables them to manage the extent to which psychological strain contributes to WFC. However, for individuals in collectivistic countries, decision latitude (control over work process) may be less important in reducing their WFC as they may draw on their strong familial connections as a resource (Billing et al., 2014). In a similar study, Spector et al. (2007) examined differences in relationships between work demands, WFC, and job attitudes across four culturally dissimilar clusters (Anglo, Asia, East Europe, and Latin America) comprising five countries each. The Anglo cluster was classified as individualistic and the other clusters as collectivistic. Moderated regression analyses revealed that the Anglo cluster differed from each of the other three clusters in the relationship between perceived workload and strain-based WFC with the Anglo cluster having the strongest relationship. Country cluster moderated some of the relationships between strain-based WFC and job satisfaction as well as turnover intentions with the Anglo cluster displaying the strongest relationships.

Fackrell et al. (2013) conducted a cross-cultural comparison of the work-family interface among married women in an individualistic country (US) and a collectivistic country (Singapore). Their findings revealed significant differences in WFC experiences. Schedule flexibility decreased F2WC for the married women in the US (\( n = 923 \)) but increased W2FC, F2WC and depression for their Singaporean counterparts (\( n = 467 \)). They also found that
children under the age of seven had a significantly greater impact on F2WC for the US women than for the Singaporean women, despite the Singaporean women working longer hours. Fackrell et al. attributed these differences to the values inherent in individualistic cultures as opposed to those inherent in collectivistic cultures. In other words, for married women in Singapore, their family is of great importance and hence they perceive long working hours as enhancing the welfare of their families because of the financial benefits associated with their working role. Having schedule flexibility may mean taking on more family responsibilities during the day, which could lead to depression. Conversely, married women in the US with individualistic orientations may believe that schedule flexibility will help them deal better with their family demands thereby reducing conflict.

The above studies suggest that cultural differences at a national level result in important variations in WFC experiences. They also suggest that certain organisational practices (e.g. schedule flexibility) intended to reduce WFC based on Anglo-centric models may not have the same effect in other cultural contexts (Billing et al., 2014). Cultural dimensions can also be measured at the individual level with their influence examined among individuals from a subgroup, a single nation or a group of nations (Powell et al., 2009).

**WFC and individual-level cultural dimensions.**

Triandis (1995) operationalised and measured the cultural dimension—individualism-collectivism—at an individual level and reported that variations in cultural variables are often found within subgroups of a given cultural group. Similarly, Maznevski et al. (2002), in a study measuring four cultural variables (human nature orientation, man-to-nature orientation, relational orientation and activity orientation) among participants in five countries, sought to determine whether the variations within and across the four variables were independent. They tested the extent to which variations would be found within cultural variables both within countries and between countries. The results showed that the variations within the cultural variables differed extensively among the countries studied thus indicating the importance of using an individual-level approach to cultural analyses (Maznevski et al., 2002).

Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions are conceptualised at the national level, yet his comprehensive cultural framework has received extensive empirical support for use at an individual level because of its clarity and parsimony (An & Kim, 2007). Kirkman, Lowe, &
Gibson (2006) support this approach provided the data are collected and analysed at the individual level and aligned with individual-level outcomes. They reviewed 64 empirical studies on the relationship between individual cultural values and management and psychological related outcomes such as leadership, conflict management and work-related attitudes. In these studies, cultural variables were examined for having either main or moderator effects. The studies confirmed the appropriateness of using Hofstede’s framework at an individual level of analysis although none of the studies were work-family studies. 

Critiques of the use of Hofstede’s framework for assessing individual level variables are that (1) culture is reduced to a few simplified dimensions, (2) Hofstede’s results are based on poor sample representativeness as only one multinational corporation, IBM, was used, (3) the dimensions inadequately capture the nuances of culture, and (4) it overlooks within-country differences (Kirkman et al., 2006). A further criticism levelled by Roberts and Boyarcigiller (1984) was that the researchers in Hofstede’s study were either American or European. No indigenous researchers from countries studied outside the Anglo contexts were involved.

Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) argued that studies on the relationship between WFC and cultural dimensions at an individual level can be categorised into two primary groups using the terms proposed by Powell et al. (2009): (1) Culture-as-referent studies: in these studies, researchers examine work-family experiences in a non-Anglo context and attribute any differences in the findings to the fact that the non-Anglo context is culturally dissimilar to the Anglo context. Culture is thus not included as a construct and measured; rather the findings are contrasted with those previously presented in research based on Anglo samples. (2) Culture-as-dimensions studies: in these studies, pertinent cultural constructs are included in the study design so that the findings provide valid explanations of the effects of culture on the WFC experiences of individuals.

**Culture-as-referent WFC studies at an individual level.**

Several recent studies have been published on work-family experiences in non-Anglo contexts. The majority of these studies have focused on Asian samples in China (e.g. Lu, Siu, Spector & Shi, 2009), Korea (e.g. Choi & Kim, 2012), Malaysia (e.g. Hamid & Amin, 2014) and India (e.g. Rajadhyaksha & Ramadoss, 2013). More WFC studies are also being conducted in other developing countries around the world including Brazil (e.g. Casper et al., 2011), Nigeria (e.g. Epie & Ituma, 2014), Turkey (e.g. Koyuncu, Burke, & Wolpin, 2012) and Iran (Karimi & Nourie, 2009). In culture-as-referent studies, the authors have interpreted
their findings on WFC relationships in terms of the specific cultural context, highlighting any differences to those found in studies on Anglo samples. Karimi and Nourie (2009), for instance, investigated the effects of work demands and resources on both directions of WFC and work-family enrichment (WFE) (the positive perspective of the work-family interface) among Iranian male employees ($N = 250$). They reported that more social support and autonomy at work contributed to reduced W2FC and that higher work demands were related to more W2FC. These findings were similar to most earlier research conducted in the US among Anglo samples (cf. Michel et al.’s 2011 meta-analysis). However, contrary to extant research, working hours did not significantly predict W2FC and, in fact, enhanced WFE among married Iranian male employees. Karimi and Nourie (p. 200) concluded that these findings, which were “opposed to previous studies conducted in Western countries”, could well be related to culture-specific norms. They concluded that contextual factors such as the economic difficulties in Iran, together with the importance of financial social status for Iranian men, could mean that longer hours at work related to more comfort and pleasure for themselves and their families. Furthermore, expectations of gender roles in Iran are typically traditional in that Iranian men are expected to meet their work demands as a matter of priority, and Iranian women are expected to fulfil their responsibilities in their homes.

Expanding on a second example of a culture-as-referent study, Casper et al. (2011) examined WFC, perceived supervisor support and organisational commitment among 168 Brazilian professionals. Consistent with research conducted with Anglo samples (Michel et al., 2011), their findings revealed that role demands (such as number of hours spent in a role) were related to W2FC. However, when examining the relationship between both directions of WFC and affective commitment, Casper et al. found no significant associations, which is inconsistent with findings among Anglo samples (Amstad et al., 2011). They attributed this difference to cultural differences between the US and Brazil regarding work and family. In other words, in the US, work and family are considered separate spheres that compete for resources (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) while in Brazil the culture is more diffuse (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997) thus emphasising greater integration between work and family. As a result, WFC is less likely to lead to negative consequences such as reduced affective commitment. Interestingly, in Casper et al.’s study, W2FC was associated with higher continuance commitment. Although this finding is consistent with that of a study by Casper, Martin, Buffardi, and Erdwin (2002) on an Anglo sample of working mothers, this relationship in the Brazilian sample could be due to cultural norms, according to Casper et al.
(2011). They argue that given the centrality of family in Brazilian culture, Brazilians who experience W2FC and remain committed to their organisation may interpret their commitment in terms of needing to have a job for the benefit of their family (continuance commitment) rather than wanting to remain with the organisation (affective commitment). This explanation suggests that WFC relationships may be experienced differently in diverse cultures.

In the category of culture-as-referent WFC studies, some researchers have focused more narrowly on a specific cultural group within a country (cf. Grzywacz, Arcury, Marin, Carrillo, Burke, Coates, & Quandt, 2007; Haar, Roche, & Taylor, 2012; Sav et al. 2013). In most instances, the subgroup studied has traditional cultural beliefs that are in some way different from the dominant cultural values of the country. Sav et al. (2013) qualitatively investigated WFC and WFE among Muslim men in Australia. Although workload and work hours increased their WFC experiences, as in Anglo samples, Sav et al. argue that cultural values and beliefs underpinned these experiences. Illustrating this point, they suggest that Muslim beliefs emphasise the role of paid work for men because it provides independence and promotes personal growth. Spending time at work may thus be considered a required duty in providing for the family. In the context of Australian Muslim men, work and family then are not necessarily separate life domains, but rather interconnected domains.

Haar et al. (2012) studied the relationship between both directions of WFC (in terms of time and strain dimensions) and turnover intention among 197 Maori employees, an indigenous cultural group in New Zealand. Maori culture promotes the maintenance of strong relationships with family and whanau (extended family). Because of these collectivist cultural values, the authors expected that F2WC would be more influential than W2FC in turnover intentions for Maori employees. This expectation was in contrast to existing findings in Anglo samples (e.g. Haar, 2004; Pasewark & Viator, 2006) where W2FC was often a stronger predictor of turnover intention than F2WC. Consistent with their expectations, regression analysis showed that the F2WC dimensions (time and strain) explained more variance in turnover intentions than W2FC. Haar et al. believed these findings emphasise the power of family and whanau in influencing job outcomes among Maoris.

While culture-as-referent WFC studies are not generalisable, Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) contended that they contribute to work-family research by interrogating the applicability of
existing work-family constructs in specific cultural contexts. They also elucidate distinctive factors that influence work-family experiences for the members of the cultural group studied. Despite these contributions, Powell et al. (2009, p. 595) argued that “because such studies do not actually measure culture, they do not offer an explanation for the potential influence of cultural dimensions on the work-family interface”. Instead, Powell et al. call for more culture-as-dimension work-family studies in which the effects of cultural dimensions on the work-family experiences of individuals are explicitly tested. They recommend this study design in the belief that the findings will provide greater accuracy by specifying the cultural constructs that explain significant variance. In addition, this design will enable the consideration of subcultures within countries as well as heterogeneity within cultural groups as individuals may hold different attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours to those that by consensus define their culture (Lu, 2012).

Culture-as-dimension WFC studies at an individual level.

Powell et al. (2009) report that their review of culture-as-dimension work-family literature revealed no empirical studies that measured culture at an individual level, and since then few studies have been conducted on the subject (cf. Billing et al., Brew 2013; Lu, 2012; Mortazavi et al., 2009; Olson et al., 2013). Most of these studies have focused on the individualism-collectivism dimension of cultural variability (Hofstede, 1981; Triandis, 1995). At an individual level, individualism relates to individuals who value self-reliance, competition, emotional distance from groups and hedonism while collectivism relates to individuals who have a sense of duty to the group and value interdependence, obedience and harmony (Triandis, 1995).

Olson et al. (2013) investigated the relationship between acculturation, ethnicity, individualism and work-family conflict among 309 employed Caucasian and Hispanic Americans. They focused on the cultural value of individualism as United States culture is predominantly individualistic. Mediation analysis showed that individualism mediates the relationship between language- and social-based acculturation and WFC even when controlling for ethnicity, implying that culture rather than ethnicity explains WFC experiences in a diverse workforce. In addition, individualism significantly predicts strain-based W2FC. Olsen et al. attribute these results to the dynamics in individuals’ cultural norms stating that as Hispanics and Caucasians in the US adopt more individualistic cultural orientations, they place greater emphasis on the success of their work role and hence allow
work to permeate their family role thereby creating conflict. On the other hand, however, their family role appears to be less in conflict with their work role.

Mortazavi et al. (2009) investigated the influence of horizontal individualism and collectivism values held by individuals in their work and family roles (Triandis, 1995) on the relationships between work and family demands, gender and WFC among employees in the Ukraine \((n = 130)\), Iran \((n = 154)\) and the US \((n = 192)\) at both the national level and the individual level. Their results revealed that the differences in WFC experiences between the countries were not significantly different despite the countries having distinct national cultures. In fact, they found that, contrary to their expectations, their American respondents tended to value collectivistic values while the Iranians reported higher levels of individualistic values. Mortazavi et al. admitted the possibility of methodological issues in these results (e.g. the use of subjective measures), yet they also acknowledge that individuals in diverse countries can at the same time value independence and interdependence. Regression analysis revealed that horizontal individualism (at work) predicted F2WC and that individualistic employees experienced less F2WC, which was consistent with Olson et al.’s (2013) findings. They found that horizontal collectivism at work reduced W2FC, implying that employees who value interdependence and harmony at work perceive their work role to interfere less with their family role.

Some work-family studies have also considered the role of gender role ideology (GRI), as a cultural dimension, on work-family conflict experiences (e.g. Drach-Zahavy & Somech, 2007; Kailasapathy, Kraimer, & Metz, 2014, Rajadyaksha & Velgach, 2009). Culture thus transforms biological sex into what is acceptable, and not in a gendered way. These gender role beliefs influence individuals’ choices regarding behaviour, choice of work, parenting roles, and obligations and relationships. Hofstede’s (1981) dimension of masculinity-femininity and House et al.’s (2005) dimension of gender egalitarianism have been used to explore this construct primarily at a national level. At an individual level, gender role ideology refers to the value judgements that individuals make, often formed from early socialisation, on the roles that men and women should occupy (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Rajadyaksha and Velgach (2009) studied the relationships between gender, gender role ideology and both directions of WFC among 405 working men and women in India. They found no significant differences in W2FC between the men and the women; however, the individuals in their study who held a traditional gender role ideology experienced greater
W2FC and F2WC than those holding an egalitarian gender role ideology. Their explanation of these findings was that traditionalists invest more time in their gender-appropriate roles in terms of cultural and social norms, leading to greater conflict between their work and family domains. In this instance, Indian culture promoted the role of the woman as the homemaker and primary caregiver in an extended family system.

The above review supports the argument that cultural values shape individuals’ work-family experiences and that the widely accepted concepts of work and family roles based on Anglo samples do not accurately capture the understanding of work-family issues among non-traditional populations. To this end, this study aimed to extend current work-family research in the following ways: (1) by conducting an indigenous work-family study on a specific cultural group to offer the benefits of *culture-as-referent* studies. The study thus presents a nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to WFC for Hindu working women in SA. Similarities and differences influencing the occurrence of WFC within this group were compared to those found in work-family frameworks based on Anglo samples; (2) by incorporating salient cultural dimensions in the study design to offer the advantages of *culture-as-dimensions* studies. In this way, cultural dimensions were measured along a continuum as a continuous construct to demonstrate the cultural heterogeneity in the work-family experiences of individuals within a specific cultural group.

Chapter 2 attempted to provide insight into the theoretical basis and the nature of WFC. It reviewed and explained extant literature on the relationship between WFC and cultural dimensions. The next chapter introduces an explanatory model of work-family conflict amongst Hindu working women in SA based on the findings of the qualitative investigation as well as existing work-family conflict frameworks.
CHAPTER 3: EXPLANATORY MODEL OF WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT AMONGST HINDU WORKING WOMEN IN SOUTH AFRICA

This chapter proposes an explanatory model (shown in Figure 8) of work-family conflict (WFC) among Hindu working women in South Africa (SA). The constructs included in the model are based on those that emerged as pertinent themes in the qualitative data analysis as well as those presented in established work-family conflict frameworks (e.g. Frone et al., 1992; Frone et al., 1997; Korabik et al., 2003; Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Michel et al. 2009; Powell et al., 2009). The constructs are defined and operationalised to reflect culturally relevant variables for investigation in the context of this study.

This chapter is divided into two sections. Section A describes the method used for the initial qualitative exploration. The section begins with the rationale for adopting this approach and is followed by a detailed explanation of how the qualitative data were collected, analysed and used in developing a culture-sensitive model for the main study. Section B covers the arguments for the proposed relationships in the explanatory model, which are substantiated with extracts from the qualitative data and findings from past work-family studies. The quotes from the qualitative data are verbatim responses of the participants, with only very light editing in order to preserve the authenticity of the responses. Pseudonyms are used to protect respondent identity. Section B is divided into four parts. The first part covers the work and family stressors as antecedents of W2FC and F2WC. The second part covers social support as an antecedent of WFC and as a potential buffer against the negative effects of role stressors on WFC. The third part covers two cultural dimensions, gender role ideology and hierarchy orientation as potential moderators of the relationships between role stressors and WFC. The chapter concludes with part four, which summarises the contextually based propositions.
Figure 8. Explanatory model proposing antecedents and moderators of work-family conflict amongst Hindu working women in South Africa. Solid lines indicate within-domain effects; dotted lines indicate cross-domain effects.
Section A

Rationale for the qualitative exploration.

Regarding the increase in cross-cultural work-family studies, Shafiro and Hammer (2004) state that most of these studies have been conducted on the basis of models developed by researchers in Anglo societies. This raises concerns in work-family research because these models do not always take into account the specific cultural context in question nor do they consider whether the constructs used are meaningful to the individuals being studied. Spector et al. (2004) also contend that a limitation of their work-family study across multiple countries was the adoption of theories and measures developed in Anglo countries. Flick (1998) argues that social frameworks are complex and dynamic and that reliance on theories and models developed in other contexts may result in failure to acknowledge fully the variety of perspectives and experiences regarding the phenomenon being studied. A review of cross-cultural psychology research over 25 years revealed that 93% of the studies used an etic approach, that is, an approach that assumes that the theoretical constructs investigated are applicable in all cultural contexts. Niblo and Jackson (2004) speculate that this may have been because most of the first authors were from Anglo countries and also because research in the US and Western Europe has historically assumed universal traits across cultures. In the case of second and later authors from non-Western cultures, power-distance (acceptance of unequal power relationships) in those cultures may have been high meaning that these authors may merely have followed the approach of the high-status first authors. Considering work-family phenomena, Shaffer et al. (2011) contend that the use of US-based definitions and measures of work-family constructs in contexts outside the US should be questioned because the terms “work” and “family” may hold different meanings in different cultures. Korabik et al. (2003) also call for more indigenous research in order to better understand local contexts in work-family research.

A preliminary qualitative exploration was therefore needed to identify the subjective work-family experiences of Hindu working women in SA and to discover issues that may not be included in current Anglo-based work-family frameworks. This preliminary exploration was also needed to answer Research Question 1: How do Hindu working women in SA make meaning out of their work-family interface? The findings from the qualitative analysis were
firstly used to identify the pertinent variables in explaining the WFC experiences of these women in SA; secondly, they facilitated the development of a culturally sensitive explanatory WFC model from which contextually based hypotheses could be derived (see figure 8), and, thirdly, they promoted greater accuracy in operationalising the constructs to be measured in the survey for the particular context.

A quantitative research approach was required to answer Research Question 2 (*What are the contextually salient antecedents of WFC for Hindu women in SA?*) and Research Question 3 (*To what extent do the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA vary depending on their individual orientations to culturally salient values?*). A full description of the method for the quantitative study is presented in Chapter 4. This study thus contributes to the limited WFC literature using qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and data analysis (Powell et al., 2003). This approach was found to be particularly relevant in the particular context given Balan’s (2009) view that the complexities inherent in the social construction of mothering and careers for Hindu women would be overlooked in a purely quantitative study.

**Qualitative research approach.**

A qualitative approach enabled an initial exploration to determine the views of Hindu working women in SA on their work-family experiences. A qualitative approach refers to research on “persons’ lives, lived experiences, behaviours, emotions, and feelings as well as about organizational functioning, social movements, and cultural phenomena” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 11). Strauss and Corbin (1998) maintain that qualitative research is best used when the method is congruent with the nature of the research problem and when it is used to explore areas about which little is known. Given that Hindu women’s voices have been largely missing from work-family research, a qualitative approach was valuable in gaining insight into the beliefs and perspectives that underlie these women’s experiences. Qualitative research generally has an emergent and flexible design, yet a basic research plan was required for this exploration. The following sections describe this plan.

**Qualitative data collection strategy.**

Given the exploratory nature of the first part of the present study, face-to-face, unstructured, in-depth interviews were conducted to elicit information on the participants’ points of view.
The in-depth interviews can thus be regarded as conversations with the emphasis on knowledge creation through collaboration between the participants and the researcher (Silverman, 2009). Hatch (1993) recommends the use of in-depth interviews when exploring cultural issues as such issues are generally multifaceted and dynamic. A key feature of in-depth interviews is that they combine structure with flexibility allowing topics to be covered in a sequence suited to the participants (Legard, Keegan, & Ward, 2003).

A generative question (Flick, 1998) used to begin a dialogue with the participant permitted the suspension of a priori theoretical knowledge in order to understand the participants’ experiences beyond the constraints of prevailing work-family frameworks. It was important not to let theories and constructs that appeared in existing published studies from Anglo samples influence the conversations and themes that emerged (Thein et al., 2010). Rather, the women were invited to talk about their work-family experiences allowing their subjective viewpoints to create the structure (Gillham, 2005). Probing open-ended questions were asked to stimulate elaboration on unanticipated topics that arose to achieve in-depth understanding and to explore the various factors underpinning the participants’ subjective perspectives (Legard et al., 2003). In addition, the richness of human interactions through face-to-face communication was captured (Flick, 1998).

The choice of individual in-depth unstructured interviews to explore the research topic was favoured over focus groups owing to the sensitive nature of work-family experiences. The participants may not have felt comfortable talking about their personal accounts openly, particularly given the expected traditional role of women in the Hindu community (Boyce & Neale, 2006). In many cases, the women interviewed spoke about delicate concerns such as their frustration at having to fulfil several extended familial duties while holding down full-time jobs. The sharing of such intimate feelings may have been withheld had the participants been among other Hindu women as they could have been exposed to social criticism.

**Sampling methods and participants for the qualitative exploration.**

Purposive sampling (Patton, 2002) was used as the sampling approach for the qualitative exploration in order to meet the aims of the study, which were to gain in-depth information on the phenomenon of work-family conflict among Hindu working women in SA. Twenty participants were selected according to the criteria of self-identification as Hindu women and
simultaneously occupying a full-time paid work and a family role (caring for a child and/or an elderly relative in their home). As little is known about Hindu women’s work-family experiences in SA, variety in the sample was sought to establish the full range of issues involved in the phenomenon (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003). Accordingly, the women interviewed were diverse in age, educational level, job status, Hindu language group, number and ages of children, and Indian immigration status.

Of the 20 participants, ten were located in Cape Town (a city with a small Hindu population of 6505, according to the 2001 census) and ten in Durban (a city with the largest concentration of Indians in the world outside South Asia – 3 090 117 Hindus, according to the 2001 census). As a Hindu woman and member of the Cape Town Hindu community, I used my knowledge of the community to approach a diverse group of Hindu working women with families. Snowball sampling (an approach that involves asking people who have already been interviewed to identify other people they know who meet the selection criteria) was useful in selecting the participants in Durban where the Hindu community is extensive and geographically dispersed (Ritchie et al., 2003). I approached my personal and professional network to identify the first few participants in Durban who referred me to others in their networks. Although a shortcoming of snowball sampling is that it may lead to participants from only one part of the population, diversity was maintained by sampling according to the various characteristics mentioned above and by excluding close relatives and friends (Bryman, 2008) (see Table 4 for a description of the interview sample’s demographics).

Table 4 shows that the sample was diverse in age (33 years to 52 years). Four of the women had one child, 12 had two children, three had three children, and one woman had four children. The children’s ages ranged from three years to 18 years. All the women were married. It was difficult finding single Hindu mothers because divorce rates among the Indian population group in in comparison to the other population groups in South Africa is low (Statistics SA, 2010). Additionally, Hindu culture emphasises values such as tolerance and harmony and divorces is regarded as adharma (against that which upholds a righteous society). The women interviewed had different occupations (e.g. credit controllers, pharmacists, and charted accountants) and job levels (e.g. managerial, non-managerial, business owner, and professional) and were drawn from diverse industries including manufacturing, petrochemicals, and mining. Indian language groups in SA to a large extent still form part of a Hindu’s identity and are likely to influence certain customs and traditions.
Even though some of the women did not speak the Indian language, they still identified with the language group. Eight of the women associated themselves with being Gujarati, five Tamil, two Hindi, and two Telugu. One of the women said she was a Telugu married to a Gujarati, another said she was a Gujarati married to a Hindi, and a third said she was a Tamil married to a Gujarati.

**Qualitative data collection procedure.**

The 20 Hindu women were first approached telephonically in order to establish initial rapport. Follow-up electronic mails were sent to inform them about the voluntary and confidential nature of the study and to arrange the logistics of the interviews. Most of the participants chose to be interviewed at their homes or workplaces. Ethical clearance from the University of Cape Town’s Faculty of Commerce Ethics in Research Committee was granted prior to commencement of this qualitative exploration (see Appendix A). All the women gave written permission for their inclusion in the study by signing the consent forms (see Appendix B) and all agreed to tape recordings of the interviews. The interviews were tape recorded so that I could focus on listening and responding to the participants during the interviews, particularly as the interviews were unstructured. The conversations also flowed more easily as the participants were not distracted by my writing notes on their responses. When one takes notes during an interview, the risk of interviewer bias increases because the interviewer is likely to make notes on comments that make immediate sense or are perceived as being particularly interesting (Gillham, 2005). The tape recordings of the interviews thus facilitated complete and accurate data for later analysis.

I began the interviews by introducing myself and explaining that I was interested in hearing each woman’s own story, in her own words, about her experiences of occupying a work and a family role simultaneously. Hence a single generative question (Flick, 1998) was asked: “Tell me what it is like for you to work and have a family”. This question was broad yet adequately focused on the area of interest and provided sufficient scope for the interviewee to talk about their experiences without imposing a direction (Flick, 1998). I explained to each participant that there were no right or wrong answers, to avoid the possibility of being perceived as judgemental, and told her that I was interested in whatever she felt was important (Flick, 1998).
Table 4

Demographics of Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hindu language group</th>
<th>Age category (in years)</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>A child under the age of six years</th>
<th>Nature/Field of work, educational qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Occupational therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Financial manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Educator (tertiary education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Information technology (IT) manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Financial manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Telugu – married Gujarati</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Legal manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Educator (primary education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IT professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 11</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 12</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Gujarati – married Hindi</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Human resources manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Demographics of Interview Participants (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hindu language group</th>
<th>Age category (in years)</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>A child under the age of six years</th>
<th>Nature/Field of work, educational qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 13</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 14</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 15</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Tamil married Gujarati</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 16</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 17</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 18</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 19</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 20</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to also mention that the participants were not asked specifically to speak about work-family conflict or culture. Rather, they were encouraged to speak freely about how they experienced their multiple role responsibilities in the work and family domain. During the interviews, the participants were frequently probed to elaborate on their views by being asked questions such as “Why do you say that?”, “Would you give me an example?”, or “Could you please tell me more about that?”. On average, the interviews lasted an hour, coming to a natural end when the women had nothing further to share. Throughout the interview, I was mindful of remaining respectful, empathetic and credible by asking relevant and meaningful questions (Legard et al., 2003). At the end of the interviews, the participants were thanked for sharing their experiences and reassured of the confidential treatment of their interview data.

Following the guideline suggested by Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, and Spiers (2002), I engaged in a simultaneous and recursive process of data collection and analysis in order to remain responsive and sensitive to the data and the research question. This reflexive and analytical practice was considered important for meaning making and a refined understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

The goal of qualitative research is to gain a deep understanding of an individual’s experience – generalising his or her experiences to larger populations is not the objective (Silverman, 2009). Data saturation was reached after 20 interviews had been conducted and analysed (i.e. sampling continued until no new information was forthcoming and emerging concepts were confirmed and reconfirmed by the new data) (Morse et al., 2002).

**Qualitative data analysis and development of the explanatory model.**

Thematic analysis facilitated the search for themes and patterns in the data that emerged from the dialogues (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This analytical method was used because of its flexibility in obtaining rich and detailed interpretations of data. Thematic analysis was used to report the WFC experiences of Hindu working women and to give meaning to their lived experiences rather than to develop a grounded theory. This approach was appropriate to answer Research Question 1 and to fulfil the objectives of the first part of the study. Also, because most accounts of the WFC phenomenon have been derived from the perspectives of white middle-class samples, thematic analysis helped facilitate the identification of contextually relevant constructs for the design of the explanatory model and survey.
Atlas Ti version 7 was used as an analytic software tool to assist with the management of the data in the analysis phase. The six steps of thematic analysis recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006) were followed to identify patterns in the data. To begin the process, the in-depth interviews were transcribed verbatim by a transcriber, and the transcriptions were read and re-read by me to familiarise myself with the data. In this first step, I started formulating some tentative ideas about Hindu women’s work-family experiences. From the transcription readings, I began to understand the significance of family in these women’s lives and the important part played by early socialisation in their formulating strong familial values and defining their role of being a woman in the family.

In Step 2, I imported the texts into a hermeneutic unit in Atlas Ti to begin coding. Open coding, in-vivo coding, and versus coding were used to tag and name selections of text within the data (Friese, 2009). Codes that emerged from the data (emic or inductive codes, see Patton, 2002) were integrated with codes derived from existing literature (etic or theoretical codes, see Boyatzis, 1998) and reconfirmed by the women’s stories. Engagement with the literature was helpful in analysing more subtle characteristics of the data (Tuckett, 2005). Open coding allowed me to explore factors such as the participants’ processes, emotions, and values (Saldana, 2009). This initial analysis yielded 118 codes. Once all the interviews had been conducted, I re-read the transcripts and refined the coding. Some of the initial codes were very similar and were accordingly consolidated into 89 codes.

In the third step, I explored the codes for meaningful themes. Seven initial themes were identified which represented my interpretation of the factors shaping the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA. These themes were considered important in relation to the overall research question (Braun & Clark, 2006). The seven themes were: (1) Cognitive preoccupation with one’s work and/or family role, (2) Family and social expectations of a Hindu woman and an employee, (3) time demands on one’s work and/or family role, (4) help from the family, the work environment, and paid domestics, (5) one’s view of one’s role as a Hindu mother, wife, daughter, and daughter-in-law, (6) cooking and entertaining with food, and (7) obedience towards and respect for parents and parents-in-law.

In Step 4, I refined the themes in the light of the entire data set and the research question. Three predominant themes and subthemes remained. Cognitive preoccupation with one’s work and/or family role, Family and social expectations of a Hindu woman and an employee,
Cooking and entertaining with food, and time demands on one’s work and/or family role represented Theme 1: Factors exacerbating WFC. Help from the family, the work environment, and paid domestics represented Theme 2: Factors alleviating WFC. Lastly, one’s view of one’s role as a Hindu mother, wife, daughter, and daughter-in-law, and obedience towards and respect for parents and parents-in-law represented Theme 3: Cultural issues that may shape the WFC amongst Hindu working women in SA.

This was followed by Step 5 in which I defined the key themes and subthemes (refer to Table 5). Based on my interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation, I constructed an explanatory model (Figure 8) of WFC for Hindu women in SA. The work and family stressors (factors exacerbating WFC) and the work and family support resources (factors alleviating WFC) were included in the model as antecedents of WFC. The work and family support resources were also included as potential buffers against the negative effects of the role stressors on WFC. My understanding of the cultural orientations was that, depending on the extent to which the participants held traditional Hindu beliefs regarding their role as women and their duty towards elders, their experiences of WFC would differ. That was because the Hindu women who seemed to be more traditional in their obedience towards elders had greater expectations and demands placed on them regarding their family role, leading to greater tension between the pressures of work and family. Conversely, those who appeared to express egalitarian attitudes and greater ability to voice their views towards elders seemed to experience less pressure. Hence in the explanatory model, I included cultural orientation as moderators of the relationships between the stressors from each domain and WFC.

The qualitative exploration was a preliminary component in this study and hence due to time and resource constraints the use of multiple investigators to determine investigator triangulation was not implemented (Fick, 1998). However to compensate for possible researcher biases or distortions, I engaged in regular conversations with my research supervisor and with scholars in the fields of work-family research, Hindu culture, and qualitative methods regarding my interpretations of the data (Gillham, 2005).

Stage 6 of the thematic analysis process as recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006) is the write-up of the themes identified. In Section B below the relationships in the model based on the emergent themes and findings from existing work-family literature, are described.
Verbatim extracts from the data, with only very light editing in order to preserve the authenticity of the response, are used to capture the essence of the themes and subthemes. To protect the identity of the participants, pseudonyms are used for any names mentioned by the participants in the extracts.

Table 5

*Themes, Subthemes, Constructs, and Definitions based on the Qualitative Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Construct and definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors exacerbating WFC</td>
<td>Preoccupation with a role</td>
<td>Role involvement: The extent to which an individual psychologically identifies with a particular role, or the importance of that role in her or his total self-image (Lodahl &amp; Kejner, 1965).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work</td>
<td>Role overload: When the volume of demands expected of an individual exceed the available time and energy that she or he has to meet them adequately (Reilly, 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations regarding a role and associated time demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family: extended family, children, food-work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors alleviating WFC</td>
<td>Help from others</td>
<td>Social support: Relationships that provide psychological and tangible help in dealing with stressful situations (Caplan et al. 1975).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work: supervisor and co-worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family: extended family, spouse, paid domestic help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues shaping WFC</td>
<td>Culturally stipulated duties of a Hindu woman</td>
<td>Gender role ideology: Culturally defined behavioural norms associated with males and females in a given culture (Mischel, 1967).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obedience and respect for elders</td>
<td>Hierarchy orientation: An individual’s perspective that authority is unequally distributed in a society and that those higher in the hierarchy have power over those that are lower (Maznevski et al. 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflecting on the qualitative exploration.

The validity of the analysis, interpretation, and representation of the participants’ views was enhanced through the process of reflexivity. This process allowed me to consider my role as interpreter of the participants’ stories. Yeh and Inman (2007) point out that in qualitative research the researcher herself or himself is inseparable from the research. Being a Hindu mother, with a full-time job and belonging to a close-knit Hindu community in Cape Town, South Africa, meant that I needed to acknowledge my own personal assumptions about the phenomenon being explored. Conducting research in one’s own community and identity group is problematical as boundaries between the researcher and subject may be crossed. I did, in fact, experience some difficulty in avoiding the imposition of my own cultural meanings. Kanuha (2000) describes the implicit contradiction that indigenous researchers have to overcome in maintaining a connection with the research subjects while distancing themselves from their own identity group. To this end, critical engagement in the reflexive relationship between me and the research topic was important. I was aware of my own subjective experiences and perceptions throughout the data collection, analysis, and interpretation stages. I acknowledged both my similar and distinct experiences and beliefs in respect of those shared with me by the participants.

Nevertheless, having chosen to study a research area that I am deeply situated in by tradition, I believed that my familiarity with the topic helped me capture a deeper understanding of the cultural nuances that emerged in the participants’ work-family experiences. For example, the participants made free use of Hindu cultural terms without feeling that they needed to interrupt their stories to offer an English interpretation and explain the cultural context. Additionally researching this particular topic, meant that the research is meaningful to me as a Hindu working woman in South Africa, beyond its academic endeavour.

Section B

The preliminary qualitative exploration was considered an essential first step in this study as the meanings of work and of family is not static but socially constructed and dependent on context (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000). The exploration thus promoted the development of a more culture-sensitive explanatory model as salient and appropriately defined constructs were included and measured in the main study (Curry, Nemphard, &
Bradley, 2009). Some constructs emerged that had not occurred in earlier work-family frameworks, such as food-work and extended family overload. This section presents the arguments for the proposed relationships in the explanatory model, which are substantiated with extracts from the qualitative data and findings from past work-family studies.

**Antecedents of W2FC and F2WC**

This section proposes role stressors, specifically role involvement and role overload, in the work and family domain as antecedents of W2FC and F2WC. In the family domain, the qualitative data provide a nuanced understanding of the potential dimensions of family overload. Family overload comprises role overload from three distinct sources: from extended family, from parenting, and from food-work. The relationships between role involvement, role overload, and both directions of WFC are argued below.

**Role involvement as an antecedent of WFC.**

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined role involvement as an individual’s psychological preoccupation with a role. Those who place a high value on a role will choose to spend more time in that role in order to fulfil the expectations and responsibilities associated with it (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). High involvement in a role can therefore lead to inter-role conflict because when individuals consider a role important to their self-concept (e.g. family), they invest resources into that role and consequently they may find it more difficult to fulfil the demands of other roles (e.g. work) that they occupy socially. Traditionally, Hindu culture makes the family role a priority for women. When Hindu women marry and have children, they are culturally obliged to assume a number of important family roles including that of wife, daughter-in-law, mother and hostess to extended family and guests. Fulfilling these roles well is believed to bring about family and social order, and inadequately fulfilling these roles is likely to elicit strong criticism. Hindu women are accordingly often highly involved in their familial roles given the importance of family in Hindu culture. Yet, as South African Hindu women increasingly make investments in their education and careers (which to a large extent is encouraged by South African post-democratic legislative practices), their involvement in their work role seems to be growing in importance relative to their self-concept.
Work involvement as an antecedent of WFC.

Work involvement refers to the extent to which individuals’ work role is central to their self-esteem or sense of identity (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Because involvement in one’s work role occupies time and energy resources, meeting one’s family responsibilities becomes challenging, increasing the likelihood of W2FC (Frone et al., 1992). Empirical evidence for this relationship is found in Anglo-based societies (e.g. Adams, King, & King, 1996; Byron et al., 2005; Ford et al., 2007; Frone et al., 1992; Gordon & Rouse, 2013; Higgins et al., 1992) and other cultural contexts (e.g. Adekola, 2010, in Nigeria; Andreassen, Hetland, & Pallesen, 2013 in Norway; Li, Lin, & Korabik, 2010, in China). Meta-analytical findings further support this relationship indicating a stronger relationship for women than for men (Ford et al., 2007).

Contrary to the majority of previous findings, Cohen and Liani (2008) found no support for the work involvement-W2FC relationship in their study conducted among a sample of 168 female employees in two public hospitals in Israel. Interestingly, however, they found that work involvement related negatively to F2WC implying that high levels of psychological preoccupation in one’s work role can help reduce F2WC. Cohen and Liani suggest that Israeli women’s involvement in work gives them a sense of fulfilment that helps them cope with their traditional family role pressures. Considering other cross-domain effects, Aryee et al. (2005) reported that work involvement is positively related to F2WC among Indian parents. This may be because individuals, whose involvement in their work role is important, may perceive that their family duties prevent them from adequately meeting their work role responsibilities.

The women interviewed overwhelmingly spoke of the high value that they placed on their work role. Only a few women spoke specifically about needing to contribute financially to the household income as their primary reason for occupying a full time job, given the increasingly high cost of living in South Africa. Thus despite Hindu cultural beliefs advocating that the women’s primary role is the home maker, the majority of the women voluntarily participated in a work role. Many of the participants went on to articulate that by participating in a work role they experienced a sense of financial independence, intellectual stimulation, and personal fulfilment. Additionally three women spoke about working to escape the home environment, particularly as the home role was associated with obligations to parents-in-laws that lived with them.
The importance of the work role in the lives of these women however meant spending time and energy in their jobs to meet their associated work responsibilities. As one participant commented,

_Two weeks before Keeshan was born I was working ‘till 8 o’clock at night, at the office, not even at home, or working over weekends…[saying to her mother] “I know you’re a working mom but I’m a career girl”, there’s just a little bit of a difference. And my dad, like [will say], “put your phone off when you get home”. I’m like Dad, I’ve got staff, I need to be available. If there’s a crisis in their life, it’s a crisis in my life._

Participant 5

Two participants expressed the importance of their work role to their self-concept:

_You love your job. It might just drive you crazy just being at home and just doing one thing all the time. No matter how much you love your child…I mean I do love my job even though it’s quite demanding and ummm, I realise that I also needed to be a role model for my child._

Participant 8

_I like work. It keeps my mind active, it gives me an out, I’m not sitting there [at home] doing all the work and all of that and then just being this person who’s sole responsibility is house-keeping and cooking and looking after a child. At least I’ve got my independence, yes it’s tough but I’m actually happy. I’m happy to come to work for these eight hours and you know just do my thing, feel appreciated, get paid at the end of the month._

Participant 2

**Family involvement as an antecedent of WFC.**

Family involvement, as an antecedent of WFC, has been investigated to a lesser extent than work involvement. The family involvement-WFC relationship is consequently less clear. Prottas and Hyland (2011) maintain that an understanding of both work and family involvement’s effects on WFC is needed to advance work-family research. Yoge and Brett
(1985) defined family role involvement as the extent to which individuals identify themselves psychologically with their family roles, the importance of their family to their self-image and self-concept, and their commitment to their family roles.

Empirical, although somewhat inconsistent, evidence indicates a positive relationship between family involvement and WFC (Adams et al., 1996; Frone et al., 1992; Matthews, Swody, & Farrell, 2011). Carlson et al. (2000), on the basis of their bi-directional and multidimensional measure of work-family conflict, found that family involvement was positively related to only the behaviour-based dimension of F2WC. In a cross-cultural investigation of married Hong Kong and American employees, Aryee et al. (1999a) reported that family involvement significantly predicted F2WC in their American sample, but, in their Hong Kong sample, this relationship was not significant. They attributed this finding to the centrality of family in Confucianism and to the fact that the investment of time in family does not impede employees’ work responsibilities in Hong Kong. However, no support for the family involvement-F2WC relationship was found by Adekola (2010) in respect of Nigerian executives and by Aryee et al. (2005) in respect of employed parents in India.

Significant cross-domain effects between family involvement and W2FC were found by Duxbury and Higgins (1991) as well as by Parasurman, Purohit, and Godshalk (1996). Hargis, Kotrba, Zhdanova, & Baltes (2011), however, found a significant relationship between family involvement and only the behaviour-based dimension of W2FC. Speculation on these findings is that when individuals experience pressure from high involvement in their family role, and where family is very important, they may perceive that their work role is interfering with the effective fulfilment of their family role responsibilities thereby leading to W2FC.

A key subtheme that emerged in the qualitative data was the importance of the family. In comparison to the work involvement experienced by the Hindu women interviewed, their family involvement still seemed more prominent possibly because of the centrality of family in Hindu culture:

*Ok. I basically look at what’s important in my life, so one is my family is important, my boys come first… family comes first before work, but my work is also important so that becomes a bit of a challenge.*
Participant 8

My role as a mother takes a lot of my time, even during the working hours, if the kids need me if they got sporting activities going on at school then I have to be there. If they get sick even though I run my own business I have to forget about all of that and time, first and foremost is being a mother.

Participant 19

The impression that family involvement is more dominant than work involvement among these Hindu women in South Africa is consistent with the situation of Indian women in India as found by other researchers (Aryee et al., 2005; Ramadoss & Rajadyaksha, 2012). These similarities suggest that Hindu cultural beliefs regarding the importance of family are likely to be experienced by Hindu women in India and in Hindu diasporas. All the women interviewed in the present study stressed the greater importance of their family role compared to their work role, often stating that the mother’s role is the central role as a Hindu woman. Hindu women may reduce their psychological involvement in their work role in order to fulfil their family responsibilities as expected by themselves, their family and their society. This is because Hindu women are generally highly emotionally and culturally invested in their family role largely due to the way they have been socialised. It is consequently more difficult for them to deal with the pressures arising from their work role. Supporting this view, Buddhapriya (2009) reported that Indian women often manage their family demands by being less involved in their work role.

The inconsistent findings on the role involvement-WFC relationships reviewed above call for further clarification. One can draw on role conflict theory, resource drain theory and social identity theory to argue these relationships. According to role conflict theory (Kahn et al., 1964) and resource drain theory (Staines, 1980), when individuals are psychologically involved in a role, they becomes more sensitive to and preoccupied with the issues in that role and accordingly experience increased conflict in the other role resulting in WFC (Greer & Egan, 2012). Individuals’ involvement in one role also depletes the time and energy (physical and psychological) they need to fulfil their responsibilities in the competing domain (Hargis et al., 2011). In terms of identity theory (Stryker & Burke, 2000), the psychological preoccupation and emotional investment that individuals make in one role may make it more
difficult for them to engage psychologically in the other role thereby increasing inter-role conflict (Gordon & Rouse, 2013).

Based on the above reasons it is proposed that work involvement will predict W2FC and family involvement will predict F2WC. However as past research, particularly in traditional cultural contexts, have also shown cross domain effects, it is proposed that work involvement will also explain F2WC and family involvement will contribute to W2FC amongst Hindu working women in SA.

**Role overload as an antecedent of WFC.**

Role overload, a form of role stressor, has been investigated by various disciplines including psychology, sociology, and organisational psychology (Örtqvist & Wincent, 2006). Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) believe that roles originate from expectations about appropriate behaviours for a position in a social structure. These expectations determine what behavioural requirements are attributed to the role either by the individual occupying the role or by others associated with the role (Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). When individuals perceive that their time and resources are insufficient to fulfil these role expectations, they experience role overload (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975).

Work and family role overload reflects high levels of demands that act as negative role stressors because they often cause exhaustion. Work and family role overload is associated with negative affect, which may create undesirable attitudes towards fulfilling multiple role demands and may weaken an individual’s ability to integrate his or her work and family roles (Aryee et al., 2005; Karasek, 1979). Aryee et al. (2005) maintain that the exhaustion and role-associated discontent caused by role overload will spill over from one role to another and will prevent an individual from enjoying his or her participation in that role.

Cultural expectations regarding the role of a Hindu woman as mother, wife, daughter-in-law and hostess, in addition to her work role expectations, can result in high levels of demands that are not always met at the anticipated level. As Hindu women in SA increasingly occupy professional and managerial positions, their associated work demands may clash with their family role expectations thus increasing their levels of WFC.
**Work overload as an antecedent of WFC.**

Work overload as a result of high expectations in the work role has been found to be a significant antecedent of work-family conflict (Aryee et al., 1999a; Booth & Matthews, 2012, Brown & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2013; Burke, Koyuncu, & Fiksenbaum, 2013; Frone et al., 1997; Fu & Schaffer, 2001; Hsiao & Mor Barak, 2013; Parasuraman et al., 1996). This is because as work intensifies in a competitive labour market, organisations expect more work hours and productivity from their employees. Employees may then believe that meeting these expectations is a prerequisite for career advancement or for keeping their jobs (Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994).

Booth and Matthew (2012) investigated this relationship among 680 employees from diverse industries. Structural equation modelling (SEM) analyses showed that work overload is a direct predictor of W2FC and that, although not hypothesised, work overload was also significantly related to F2WC. Jin, Ford, and Chen (2013) found support for this finding in a cross-country study involving a Chinese ($n = 442$) and North American ($n = 408$) sample. In the study, work overload was more strongly related to W2FC in their North American sample than in their Chinese sample. This finding confirmed their proposition that among employees in North America who value individualism and for whom work is very important, their family life will be more disrupted by their high work demands than will be the case with their Chinese counterparts for whom family and collective identity are paramount.

The significant predictive relationship between work overload and WFC seems to be consistent across cultural contexts. Razak, Yunus, and Nasurdin (2011) investigated the relationship in a sample of 391 local doctors working full time in 19 public hospitals in Peninsular Malaysia. Work overload explained significant variance in both W2FC and F2WC in their sample. They suggested that when the doctors perceived their workload was more than they could handle, they were likely to experience exhaustion and fatigue, which negatively influenced their motivation to respond to the demands of their work and family thus contributing to WFC in both directions.

Following democracy in 1994, and the consequent removal of trade and relations sanctions by many first world countries, South Africa as an emerging economy has become highly integrated into the international economy. As a result of pressures associated with global competitiveness and economic interdependence, South African organisations, like others in
emerging economies, are increasingly expecting their employees to work long hours, take work home and travel for work (Billing, Bhagat, Babakus, Krishnan, Ford, Srivastava,... & Nasurdin, 2014). In the context of Hindu culture, where the woman is likely to already have high levels of responsibilities in the family domain, additional work pressures may contribute to work overload and accordingly increase WFC. In the interviews, most of the women described work overload as insufficient time to complete all the tasks and commitments expected of them, and some also reported a sense of exhaustion and not having enough energy to fulfil all their work duties. As stated by one participant:

I’m just feeling that the weekends just fly, like the hours just fly, I feel like there’s so much to do and I’m not getting anything done. I’m having to sit with my work, I’m having to just catch up on what I haven’t done during the week...The marking demands are going to become greater and greater...You have to set tests, you have to mark them, you have to get the marks in by a certain time. These things have to be recorded. I guess I’m also being pressured by expectations that they have of me at work. There’s a certain standard that I think they expect of us and so I always try to see to it that I’m on top of things...So I do feel that pressure.

Participant 3

Family overload as an antecedent of WFC.

Family overload refers to having too many family-related tasks to complete and insufficient time and energy to complete them (Parasuraman et al., 1996). High levels of expectations regarding the family role can result in individuals feeling exhausted, and the resulting sense of family overload can increase WFC. Consistent evidence from empirical studies (c.f. Brotheridge & Lee, 2005; Booth & Matthews, 2012; Ishaya, Ayman, Aycan, Desai, Drach-Zahavy, Hammer, ...& Rajadhyaksa, 2008; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998), supported by meta-analytic research (Byron, 2005; Michel et al., 2011), revealed a significant relationship between family overload and WFC. Li, Ping, and Dan (2006) studied a sample of professional women in China in order to gain insight into the family overload-F2WE relationship. Multiple regression analysis conducted by them showed that family overload was a significant predictor of F2WC. Interestingly, when Jin et al. (2012) compared this relationship in a North American and a Chinese sample, they found, contrary to their expectation, that family overload was more strongly related to F2WC in their North American sample. They speculated that the higher support given by the family members of
Chinese employees, possibly attributable to a collectivist culture, weakens the family overload-F2WC relationship. They also speculated that family support is likely to buffer the negative effects of family overload on WFC.

In addition to the within-domain effects found by Ishaya et al. (2008) among 228 employees in the Midwest US, they also reported cross-domain effects indicating that when individuals experience family overload they may also perceive their work to be interfering with their family role. In a longitudinal study \( (N = 250) \), Matthews et al. (2013) found support for this relationship at Time 1, but not at Time 2.

Earlier findings of the family overload-WFC relationship may have been compromised by either measuring only the work-to-family direction of conflict (e.g., Wallace 1999) or by using parental overload to represent the conceptual domain of family (e.g., Frone et al. 1997). This is problematic for two reasons: firstly, meta-analyses have shown that the two directions (W2FC and F2WC) are distinct with each having its own antecedents (Michel et al., 2011). Secondly, because the notion of family in non-Anglo cultural contexts extends beyond the nuclear structure, expectations that lead to overload in the family domain may stem from sources other than parenting. The concept of family overload may be more complex among Hindu working women in SA. In Hindu tradition, women play an important role as keepers of the household. Fulfilling her duties (\textit{dharma}) as a wife, daughter-in-law and mother successfully in an extended family structure is an important determinant of a Hindu woman’s future actions (\textit{karma}) and her emancipation (\textit{moksha}). Interestingly, from the qualitative data in the present study, the participants’ reference to family included their parents, siblings, in-laws, aunts, uncles, grandparents and cousins. This reference point contrasts with the nuclear family often investigated in work-family studies conducted in Anglo contexts. Existing measures may therefore not fully capture the nuances in the family experiences of members of diverse cultural contexts. Three distinct forms of family overload emerged from the qualitative data: extended family overload, parental overload and overload associated with high expectations regarding food-work. Each form of family overload and its relationship with WFC will be discussed below.

\textit{Extended family overload as an antecedent of WFC.}

Some work-family researchers have defined family as including immediate as well as extended family members (e.g. Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Kelly, Kossek, Hammer,
Durham, Brey, Chermack, Murphy, & Kaskubar, 2008). In these instances, however, the operationalisation and measurement of the extended family have not been explicit. A review of work-family literature yielded no published quantitative studies that explicitly investigated the relationship between extended family as a stressor (such as extended family demands or overload) and WFC. Yet authors such as Griggs, Casper, and Eby (2013), who investigated the extended family as a source of support in reducing WFC, suggest that in diverse samples, the extended family may have a unique influence on members’ work-family experiences and therefore warrants further attention.

While the extended family can serve as a source of social support, Aryee (2005) suggests that extended family obligations can be stressors to an individual. Wharton and Blair-Loy (2006) surveyed samples of urban managers and professionals in the US, London and Hong Kong divisions of the same company and found that extended family obligations in the Hong Kong sample were more intense thus exacerbating their W2FC compared to their United States counterparts. It is therefore likely that individuals belonging to cultures that emphasise close extended family ties experience increased overload from their extended family members thereby increasing their F2WC. Qualitative findings supporting this view are reported by Valk and Srinivasan (2011) who interviewed 13 female software professionals in India and indicated that overwhelmingly the women felt a high sense of family overload from extended families that resulted in strain, making it difficult to achieve a work-family balance. Yet the participants in their study also said that family was more important than career. Similarly, Bhuddhapriya (2009) researched a sample of professional women in India and reported that ninety-five per cent of her respondents felt that commitment to fulfilling their family responsibilities hindered their prospects of career advancement. In contrast, Lareau (2003) found that extended kin ties among a sample of United States professionals and managers were relatively weak with immediate family duties taking precedence over contact with relatives. The above findings suggest cultural differences in the notion of family and associated family expectations, which may influence the occurrence of WFC in diverse cultural contexts.

To further support the relationship between extended family overload and WFC, Poster and Prasad (2005) compared three high-tech firms in India and the US. Their qualitative findings indicated that among the employees in the Indian firms, extended family social obligations, such as attending family weddings, birth celebrations, funerals and hosting relatives at home,
were responsibilities that often outweighed aspects of their nuclear family life such as going to parents’ meetings at school. An Indian woman executive reported that she had declined an overseas assignment due to obligations to her extended family. Similarly, Lan Li, and Roberta (2001) found that among Singaporean female managers, the managers reported that mothers-in-laws made it more challenging for them to further their careers.

In the SA Hindu community, despite increases in nuclear family structures, extended families are still closely connected through regular family visits and cultural gatherings. In addition to meeting immediate family demands of taking care of children, spouse and household, Hindu women are expected also to fulfil their duty of maintaining close family ties. These duties comprise attending family gatherings of second and third cousins, and making regular visits to and assisting extended family members. As one participant reported:

*If it’s a family function, whether it’s the third cousin’s family or whatever we have to go for it. We’ve got kids now where school work is so important but we have to go to functions that we don’t need to be there. They [in-laws] really put a lot of demands on us, and we’ve done it. To date we’ve done it, we’ve been to every function till two in the morning.*

Participant 16

The role of the wife is central in Hindu culture, yet most of the women in the present study reported that their spouses were more understanding and encouraging regarding their work roles than their parents-in-law. The associated pressure from expectations to be a dutiful wife, mother and daughter-in-law in many instances stemmed from the husband’s extended family, especially the mother-in-law:

*I think it's because of my in-laws, they obviously want us to be together all the time and they basically say we must do this, do that, be there, be here. My mother-in-law will phone me and say you have to phone this one, invite this person...We have to invite cousins, uncles, aunts, whoever and you have to cater for adults and for kids and it’s a nightmare. That really becomes too much. So those are the kind of constraints and it’s not all bad because family is important.*

Participant 2
Parental overload as an antecedent of WFC.

Few researchers have investigated individuals’ level of perceived parental overload and its relationship with work-family conflict (Aryee 1999b, Carlson & Kacmar, 2000, Frone et al. 1997; Tatman, Hovestadt, Yelsma, Fenell, & Canfield, 2006). Most work-family researchers have investigated parental demands either by using an objective measure of the number of dependent children and the ages of children (e.g. Ballout, 2008; Beigi, Ershadi, & Shirmohammadi, 2012; Byron, 2005; Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Michel et al., 2011; Nasurdirn & O'Driscoll, 2012; Stoner, Hartman, & Arora, 2011) or by using a perceived parental demands scale such as that developed by Boyar, Carr, Mosley, and Carson (2007). However, because of the importance of the role of mother in Hindu culture, the qualitative data revealed that the women experienced a sense of overload from parenting and not merely that parenting was a demand. Parental overload therefore seemed to be a more appropriate construct to use in this explanatory model than parental demands.

Frone et al. (2007) contended that overload from a role may increase levels of stress, which can reduce an individual’s ability and motivation to fulfil the requirements of other roles. Parental overload is thus likely to relate to WFC because time spent in childcare responsibilities leaves individuals with less time and energy to commit to their work roles. Support for this relationship has been found by several researchers (Aryee et al., 1999b; Frone et al., 1997; Razak et al., 2010; Tatman et al., 2006). In addition, because the role of mother is central to Hindu women’s self-concept, they may feel that parental overload also increases their W2FC because their work demands make it more difficult for them to meet the expectations of being a good mother.

The qualitative data provided unique insight into the parental overload experience of the participants:

_I see to her bathing, putting her to bed, and then I’ll actually do some work...and so someone has got to be there for her, my child._

She continued…
As a mother I’m also, like, I want to do everything for my child and sometimes it’s not possible, it’s not even constraints maybe placed by my mother-in-law, it’s not even that. I feel that I need to take care of her every need [referring to her daughter].

Participant 2

Another participant concurred:

From the time I get up in the morning till the time I go to bed there’s always something to do like making sure things are ready for the next day, school bags are packed, sports kit is packed and you know, tennis rackets and everything is ready for the next day...and when my hubby gets home from work everything is done, kids are ready for bed, they’ve had their supper, they’ve had their bath and you know I just feel that a lot is placed on my shoulders. He gets away with things quite easily.

Participant 20

Food-work overload as an antecedent of WFC.

A review of work-family research indicated only one published study to date that has considered the role of food as a demanding task in one’s family role (see Heslop, Madill, Duxbury, & Dowdles, 2007). Heslop et al.’s (2007) study developed typologies for food task orientations and strategies used by married (n = 390) and single mothers (n = 91) regarding food-related tasks comprising as food shopping and food preparation. All the mothers in their sample were employed in full-time positions and had at least one child younger than 19 years old living at home. They found that some strategies were more successful than others as predictors of WFC. For example, orientations and strategies that required complex combinations of personal sacrifice, multi-tasking, and some reliance on the help of others, was related to WFC. While merely reducing one’s food-work tasks did not relate to reduced WFC. Their findings further suggest that using convenience foods to substitute food preparation was not helpful.

With the exception of this one study, other studies such as Fu and Schaffer (2000) and Greenhaus, Peng, and Allen (2012) have researched general family time demands by ascertaining the hours their respondents spent on cooking and shopping for household necessities. Food-related tasks specifically are demanding undertakings, not only because of their frequency and centrality to family relationships, but particularly among minority cultural groups, it also serves as a purveyor of the culture (Heslop et al., 2007). Sihna (2010),
in her qualitative study on second generation Indian families in the US, found that Indian food remained vital to motherhood as it represented Indian culture to the third-generation children. In cultures that emphasise the maintenance of their ethnic identity (possibly via food), food-work may become a source of intensive time demand and strain for women who occupy a work and family role. de Vault (1991) adds that food-work is a socially and culturally related activity, and therefore social expectations are associated with it. It is argued that this is the case for Hindu working women in South Africa who primarily are responsible for food-work.

The qualitative data supported this relationship. The importance of food and responsibilities related to food was a prominent theme in the qualitative data analysis. An explanation for this may be that food is considered a symbolic expression of maintaining gendered ethnic identities (Narayan, 1995). D’Sylva and Beagan (2011) maintain that in diaspora contexts ethnic identity is emphasised and that in these contexts women are often seen as the purveyors of culture. One way of maintaining one’s culture is through eating traditional food. The interview data suggested that food-work places excessive demands on Hindu women’s ability to manage the work-family relationship. In the present study, food-work seemed to comprise (i) meal preparation and cooking to ensure that the family received healthy nutritional meals, (ii) cooking for entertaining extended family members and guests, and (iii) traditional food preparation to maintain Hindu culture. Two of the women interviewed perceived cooking as a “creative expression” and enjoyed it, yet the majority of the women referred to food-work involving traditional meals as time intensive and stressful. The time and energy devoted to meeting food-work expectations was likely to take time away from their work responsibilities and other familial responsibilities thereby increasing WFC.

Many of the participants compared the time intensity of preparing Indian meals with that of preparing “Western” meals:

“It’s very easy to do chicken nuggets and vegetables and a sauce and that’s supper, whereas if I had to give that to my dad he’d be horrified…I marvel about that, I would love to be able to do the western dishes along the way and not have dahl, rice and braised potatoes and everything, we’re just so conditioned to do that…and there’s this expectation, even my son wants his curry and rice, and if you don’t have it, “well take me to Ma’s [granny’s] house, she’ll have mutton curry and rice”...because how
do you get home [from work], prepare an Indian meal, while one child is hanging on your leg and the other is busy with homework, get them bathed and in bed by 8 o’clock without falling asleep while reading to them.

Participant 5

Some of the participants reported that they had developed their high food-work expectations form early socialisation:

I think it’s those expectations set up by previous generations that for example, there has to be a cooked meal at home every day. Because if there isn’t a cooked meal, then my mother would ask me what are the children going to eat? Pizza is not ok for them for supper and that kind of thing, or my granny will call to find out “why do you just make baked beans for supper, your husband has had a hard day at work, he wants to eat curry and rice, why don’t you”, that kind of thing happens. Ya there is that, subtle pressure, I think that although he’s modernised and we have lots of access to easy convenient living, we still have to make sure we follow some of the traditional rules.

Participant 19

Some of the participants related their food-work expectations to maintaining Hindu culture and meeting cultural expectations:

You still wanna have sort of a culture...Sometimes you fall backwards and you think of your child and how you grew up, and my mom was always in the kitchen you know. And then you feel now you’re not giving your children that...so now and then it happens, but then you realise you’re not superwoman, you can’t do it, it’s impossible.

Participant 12

Another participant added:

And when they [Indian women] come home, they are often preparing for the next day and they are expected to make like brijani and roti and all those things that you don’t have time for when you’re a working mum, but it’s expected. And maybe we put the pressure on ourselves because we want to, it’s a reflection on how well, how good we are as mothers and housewives and wives but it’s also a pressure from society.

Participant 19
Evidence from past studies, together with the qualitative data, supports the relationship between work and family role overload and WFC. The findings for the within-domain role overload predictors of each direction of WFC were stronger and more consistent than those of the cross-domain predictors, yet the latter relationships may provide a more comprehensive understanding of these associations.

In summary, the above section reviewed role involvement and role overload as two forms of stressors that could be possible antecedents of WFC for Hindu working women in South Africa. Although consistent with existing WFC models and meta-analytical evidence for these relationships, the qualitative findings add contextual depth by proposing dimensionality in the family overload construct. On the basis of resource drain theory and role conflict theory, high involvement and overload in one role (family) for Hindu working women in SA will deplete the time and energy resources in that role making it more difficult to fulfil the role requirements in other roles. These women are consequently likely to experience increased WFC, and, accordingly, the following propositions were made in this study.

**Proposition 1:** Work stressors: (a) work involvement, and (b) work overload positively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 2:** Work stressors: (a) work involvement, and (b) work overload positively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 3:** Family stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload positively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 4:** Family stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work positively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Domain-specific Social Support and WFC**

Given the extensiveness of stress literature, it is not surprising that the role of social support has received wide attention in work-family conflict research (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999;
Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Griggs et al., 2012; Michel et al., 2009). Social support is considered a coping mechanism in most stress literature (Aryee et al., 2005). Cobb (1976, p.300), one of the earliest champions of social support, defined it as “information leading the subject to believe that he is cared for and loved, esteemed, and a member of a network of mutual obligations”. According to this definition, social support is a resource that protects individuals from demands that lead to stress, implying a buffering effect. The two forms of social support most often investigated in work-family research are emotional and instrumental support. Emotional support refers to the affection, empathy and concern that one receives while instrumental support refers to tangible assistance with day-to-day responsibilities (Aycan & Eskin, 2005).

Carlson and Perrewe (1999), Michel et al. (2009), and Seiger and Wiese (2009) compare possible models of WFC and social support in their studies to clarify this relationship. Social support occurs in WFC models in diverse roles including those of antecedents (see the meta-analytic work of Byron, 2005, and Michel et al., 2009), mediating variables (e.g. Boyar, Maertz, Mosley, & Carr, 2008) and moderating/buffering variables (e.g. Casper et al., 2011). Results from path analysis conducted on meta-analytically derived validity coefficients by Michel et al. (2009) suggest that social support as an antecedent of WFC provides the best representation of the way in which social support relates to same-domain WFC compared to the independence and mediation models. In other words, both work and family social support are important antecedents of the same-domain role conflict. For example, supervisor support reduces W2FC while spousal support alleviates F2WC. Similarly, Seiger and Wiese (2009) in their study compared an antecedent and moderator model of social support and WFC using survey data and time-diary data. Although the two forms of data provided some dissimilar results, Seiger and Wiese concluded that the antecedent model was more robust than the moderator model. Meta-analytic research (Byron, 2005; Ford et al., 2007; Michel et al., 2011) also shows strong support for same-domain social support antecedents of WFC. Social support thus acts as a protective aid prior to the onset of a stressful experience (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999). Cross-domain relationships have also been reported but have been consistently weaker (Ford et al., 2007; Michel et al., 2011). Social support was therefore regarded as an antecedent of same-domain role conflict in the present explanatory model of WFC among Hindu working women in SA.
However as this particular sample is under-researched and little is known about the mechanisms under which their work-family conflict occurs, the buffering effect of social support on the role stressors-WFC relationships were also explored. The purpose of investigating both the antecedent and buffering effects of social support in the same model contributes to a nuanced understanding of how social support may explain WFC for this Hindu working women in SA given their connectedness to extended family. Casper et al. (2011) suggested that in cultures where kinship is highly valued, individuals may be able to draw on social support from several sources to meet work and family demands. Social support may moderate the effect of these stressors on WFC such that individuals who perceive greater social support may experience a weaker role stressor-WFC relationship than those who perceive less social support (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). Therefore, in addition to the direct effect of social support on same-domain WFC, the present study also explored the buffering effect of social support on the within-domain stressors-WFC relationships for Hindu working women in SA.

The qualitative data pointed to distinct forms of social support that were valued by the participants and that appeared to influence their WFC. The sources of support in the present study seemed to stem from the work domain in the form of supervisor and co-worker support while support in the family domain appeared to be drawn from the husband, extended family and paid domestic help.

**Work social support and W2FC.**

**Supervisor support as an antecedent and moderator of W2FC.**

Several studies confirmed the direct negative relationship between supervisor support and W2FC (Behson, 2005; Greenhaus, Ziegert, & Allen, 2011; Griggs et al. 2012; Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner & Hanson, 2008; Lapierre & Allen, 2006; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Other studies have also reported cross-domain effects in which supervisor support is related to F2WC (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Greenhaus et al., 2011; Muse & Pichler, 2011; Premeaux, Adkins, & Mossholder, 2007; Selvarajan et al. 2013). Supervisors play a key role in reducing W2FC for employees as they can either encourage or discourage them from using available work-family policies to help them manage work and family demands. When supervisors are supportive, employees may feel that they can accommodate their family demands more easily:
My boss is also really cool and he doesn’t mind about a bum on the seat, it’s about output. So we have a general understanding and basically if you’ve got a deliverable, you just need to deliver...that’s why we have laptops and we can work from home, so if she’s sick or if I need to stay home with her for any reason, I can do that and work from home.

Participant 2

Supervisor support can also act as a buffer to the demands-WFC relationship. The few studies that have considered this buffering effect have yielded inconsistent results. For example, Hsiao and Mor Barak (2013) studied a sample of 168 Mexican workers in a former sweatshop owned and managed by Korean expatriates. Moderated multiple regression analyses showed that supervisor support did not moderate the positive relationship between job-related stressors (role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload) and WFC. Similar non-significant findings were also reported by Frone et al. (1995) and Carlson and Perrewe (1999). Fu and Shaffer (2001), however, found that supervisor support interacted with role conflict in reducing strain-based as well as behaviour-based W2FC among 267 academic and administrative university employees in Hong Kong, and these findings were later confirmed by Luk and Schaffer (2005) in a sample of 248 Hong Kong employees and their spouses. Beauregard (2011) found that supervisor support significantly buffered the negative effects of strain on W2FC only for the women in her sample, and not for the men. However, Seiger and Wiese (2009) reported that supervisor support moderated the relationship between partnership problems and F2WC indicating a cross-domain moderating effect. These inconsistent findings warrant further exploration in the cultural context of Hindu working women in SA. Delcampo, Cook, and Arthur (2013) argue that in cultures that value interpersonal orientation, such as the Hispanic culture, individuals may be more responsive to the support offered by their supervisors possibly leading to dissimilar work-family experiences to those of their Anglo counterparts.

The qualitative data in the present study also suggested a buffering effect of supervisor support on the demands-WFC relationship as mentioned by one participant:
I feel that I’m so blessed to be working for someone like him [referring to her manager] and that’s what makes it easier for me to take all that pressure...that really helps me cope with everything else.

Participant 15

Co-worker support as an antecedent and moderator of W2FC.

Lingard and Francis (2006) defined co-workers as the people in an organisation who are not their immediate supervisors but with whom employees work the most. Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran (2009) state that insufficient attention has been given to the role of co-worker support in WFC experiences. Supporting their contention, they suggested that co-workers can contribute uniquely to the reduction of employees’ WFC because they share an understanding of the nature of the stressors faced by their colleagues. Moreover, employees can draw on each other for support in the absence of supervisor support or formal work-family policies (Thompson, Kirk, & Brown, 2005) or encourage their colleagues to use such policies (Allard, Haas, & Hwang, 2011). Empirical evidence for the alleviating effects of co-worker support on W2FC has been consistently found (Bernard & Phillips, 2007; Ford et al., 2007; Karimi & Nouri 2009; Lu et al., 2009; Mauno & Rantanen, 2013; Seiger & Wiese 2009; Van Daalen, Willemsen, & Sanders, 2006). Contrary to their expectations, Ayman and Antani (2008) reported cross-domain effects in that the employees in their study who perceived greater co-worker support experienced increased F2WC.

Many of the women interviewed reported that their co-workers offered advice or acted as sounding boards and in this way alleviated pressures arising from competing work and family demands:

And even like you know a few of my friends, my colleagues at school, with the same situation, the more I talk to them as well, and feel that, or hear that they’re in the same situation as me, it just makes me feel a little easier and a little, you know, confident and you know be able to cope as well.

Participant 20

Another participant concurred:

The work environment is a really good environment to share experiences...we’re going through the journey together because they also got four year olds and husbands and partners who are watching lots of TV...they can actually help you, when I have
my kids party, I've got about five people I can go to over here, [and I ask them] “what did you do, what did you do, and what did you do”, and they’ll all say “I went here, I went there, I did this, I got a magician, I got a whatever”. I just use some of those ideas.

Participant 2

The buffering effect of co-worker support on the work stressor-W2FC relationship is proposed in this study as co-worker support can shield the negative effects of work stressors on W2FC. Although no support was found for this buffering effect by Fu and Shaffer (2005), the qualitative findings from this study indicated such an effect, which was worth exploring in this cultural context:

Even if we’re not teaching in the same department, if I bump into them [co-workers] you know and I ask them a question they will help me or try to arrange a meeting with me and try to give me some guidance. So we’ll get together sometime and they’ll show me how to do this. It’s only my second year there so I’m still feeling like I’m on probation and I want to be accepted and I want to be liked and you know there’s all that...Ya I do feel really stressed out sometimes.

Participant 3

Family social support and F2WC.

Compared to work social support, family social support has received less attention in work-family research. Meta-analytical findings have shown consistent evidence for family social support as an antecedent of F2WC (Byron, 2005; Ford et al., 2007; Michel et al., 2011). In many of these studies, though, the notion of family has either referred to an individual’s nuclear family members consisting of spouse and children or implied family support to encompass the assistance employees receive from immediate and extended family such as spouses, in-laws, parents and siblings. This approach, however, makes it difficult to understand the influence of each source of support in the family domain on the WFC experiences of individuals, particularly in cultural contexts, such as Hindu culture, that emphasise strong family connections and gendered divisions of labour. Three distinct forms of family social support emerged from the qualitative data: extended family support, spousal support and paid domestic support. Each will be reviewed in turn in relation to F2WC.
**Extended family support as an antecedent and moderator of F2WC.**

Hassan, Dollard, and Winefield (2010) maintained that in cultures that value in-group orientation and where family is central, more opportunity may exist for people to receive social support because offering such support is perceived as a duty. Nevertheless, they argued that research on the relationship between extended family support and F2WC has yielded inconsistent results. Few studies have examined extended family support specifically. Griggs et al.’s (2013) research on low-income workers in the United States (N = 193) indicated that extended family support was not related to time- or strain-based F2WC. Interestingly, extended family support was related to lower strain-based W2FC (though not to time-based W2FC). Griggs et al. explained that extended family members may provide empathetic support and offer tangible help by looking after children, which may reduce the extent to which low-income workers experience conflict at home due to work demands. Similarly, Namayandeh, Yaacob, and Juhari (2010) reported a weak but significant negative relationship between extended family and W2FC among a sample of married female nurses in Shiraz-Iran (N = 647). They speculated that these women relied on extended family support to help them reduce the interference of work in their family obligations. In contrast, Van Daalen et al. (2006) investigated social support from relatives and friends among 444 employees who were in a dual-earner relationship. Multiple regression analysis showed that social support from relatives and friends explained no significant variance in F2WC or W2FC. The qualitative findings of Thein, Austin, Currie, and Lewin (2010) seemed to present yet a distinct picture. Exploring the work-family experiences of professional women in Singapore and Hong Kong, they found that support from extended families was available for working women and used as an effective strategy to avoid potential WFC. Parents and extended family members took over household and childcare duties so the women could go to work, suggesting that the support reduced F2WC (Thein et al., 2010).

The qualitative data suggested that the Hindu working women in SA, in this study, still received support from their extended family networks with the result that their family demands were reduced and less likely to interfere with their work role. In the case of many of the participants, extended family members lived in close proximity to one another. Most of the participants said that extended family members assisted them mainly with childcare but also with food-work:
Department of Health allows us three days of family responsibility leave. Three days in a year is not enough for little children especially. So that’s a little bit hard but I hadn’t needed to use more than that thankfully because my mom’s down the road and she looks after them a lot.

Participant 16

Other participants added:

We live on our own but like my mother lives quite close to me now and my mother-in-law lives quite close to me now and my kids often go and spend nights there. And they help a lot with supporting the children and with my duties as well, like taking the children to school and helping with the cooking sometimes.

Participant 19

My daughter and I are going on a health hydro next month for three nights, it’s fine with him [her husband], but that’s how we are in this family, because if anybody wants to go anywhere it’s not a problem, because there’s always the next family that will feed the husband.

Participant 17

The above extracts show that support from extended family members may also affect the degree to which family demands, such as parental overload and food-work overload, may relate to F2WC. Hindu women may draw on their extended families to provide enabling conditions at home to minimise the interference that their family demands may have on their work. However, when Nasurdin and O'Driscoll (2012) investigated the moderating effect of family support on the relationship between parental demands and F2WC among 202 New Zealand and Malaysian university employees, they did not find a significant buffering effect in either sample. As the buffering effect of extended family support on the relationship between family demands and F2WC is unclear, this effect is worth exploring in this cultural context as extended family networks are still prevalent among Hindu families in SA.

Spousal support as an antecedent and moderator of F2WC.

Several studies, confirmed by meta-analytical research, suggest that spousal support helps reduce F2WC (Boyar et al. 2008; Byron, 2005; Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Michel et al., 2011;
Seiger & Wiese, 2009). In fact, Aycan and Eskin (2005), who investigated the effects of spousal support on both directions of WFC in a sample of 434 participants in dual-earner families in Turkey, reported that spousal support emerged as the most important source of support in reducing F2WC for women. Though not hypothesised, they found that men experienced reduced F2WC from spousal support as well. Employees who receive support from their spouses may be less worried about family concerns while at work resulting in decreased F2WC. Michel et al. (2011) also reported cross-domain effects of spousal support on W2FC.

Contrary to the majority of findings, Lu et al. (2009) found no support for the spousal support-F2WC relationship for employed parents in China (N = 189) thus suggesting that cultural contexts may give rise to different results. Rosenbaum and Cohen (1999) argued that spousal support is particularly important for women in societies with low gender egalitarianism. Traditionally, Hindu culture emphasises distinct roles for men and women. Once a woman is married, she assumes the role of homemaker and primary caregiver to her children. For Hindu women in South Africa who also have a work role, any support from the husband, whether in the form of emotional support (such as supporting her in her career) or instrumental assistance (such as assisting with childcare duties at home), is likely to reduce her F2WC. Interestingly, though, Komarraju (1997) established that Indian women prefer independently managing their responsibilities in the home and generally request assistance from relatives and paid domestic support rather than from their spouses. Similarly, Rajadyaksha and Velgach (2009) found that Hindu working women will delegate domestic work to paid domestic help rather than expect their spouses to help with family-related tasks. However, Rout, Lewis, and Kagan (1999) argue that the use of domestic support as a coping strategy for managing family demands among Hindu working women maintains inequalities within Hindu families because paid domestic help provides assistance for the women without bringing about any changes in their husbands’ behaviour.

The interview data showed that most of the participants greatly valued the support from their husbands. When the husband took on additional duties in the home domain, it freed the woman to fulfil her work duties more effectively thereby reducing her F2WC, as indicated in the following extracts:
My husband’s a phone call away at any given time, and I think the advantage of him running his own business is that he can run away whenever he can, whenever we can’t, so in terms of, so he knows that I could never do a drop off of my kids in the morning. He needs to do that. So he’s there, he helps me with the lunches; he helps me with the porridge for my three year old while I do other things.

Participant 11

I’m fortunate my husband gives me that support and he doesn’t mind, I mean I do the cooking, I’ve taught him how to cook. He’s come from a traditional Indian family where he doesn’t know how to cook anything but he’s learnt and you know it’s, we help each other where we can.

Participant 12

Other participants reported that the lack of support from their husbands added to their conflict of being a Hindu working woman:

But I feel more so with the Indian culture, you know the women don’t have that support system from their husbands that they should be having in terms of dealing with the kids and homework...in my case you know, I play all roles and I’ve got to constantly worry about every aspect of the house and the kids and the homework aspect. Like with my hubby, I mean apart from transporting my daughter from school and back and sorting out bills...there’s never been a day where he’s come home and said to her you know, is your homework done?

Participant 20

Many studies have shown the direct predictive effect of spousal support in reducing F2WC, yet few have considered the moderating effects of spousal support on the family stressors-F2WC relationship. Where there are empirical studies, they tend to yield inconsistent findings. In their research, Matsui, Oshawa, and Onglatco (1995), and Aryee, Luk, Leung, and Lo (1999) found significant buffering effects of spousal support in reducing F2WC caused by family demands while Carlson and Perrewe (1999), Fu and Shaffer (2001), and Seiger and Wiese (2009) did not. In the context of Hindu women in South Africa, family demands are generally high given the cultural values that determine the role of the woman in the family domain. Spousal support is thus likely to help prevent family role stressors from
contributing to F2WC because when the husband assists with childcare, for instance, it may reduce the wife’s sense of parental overload thereby diminishing her F2WC.

**Paid domestic support as an antecedent and moderator of F2WC.**

The growing entry of Hindu women into the South African workforce has seen an increase in dependence on paid domestic support as a strategy to help these women cope with their work and family demands. The number of documented paid domestic workers in SA is approximately 878 000 with an estimated 11% of South African households employing domestic workers (StatsSA Quarterly Labour Force Survey, November 2011). Spector et al. (2007) acknowledged paid domestic help as a form of social support alleviating WFC but argued that this phenomenon occurs mainly in societies with large income disparities as higher income earners can afford to pay for low-cost domestic services for housework and childcare. In SA, high unemployment rates, particularly among lower income individuals, and a large supply of migrant workers from SA’s neighbouring countries means that many working women can access this form of support to assist them in reducing their family demands that could result in F2WC.

Empirical findings on paid domestic support have been mixed. One might assume that in the presence of paid domestic help, women particularly from gender-traditional cultures would experience reduced family role stressors and consequently reduced F2WC. Yet Fu and Shaffer (2001) found a significant weak but positive association between domestic support and time-based F2WC as well as time-based W2FC. These results suggest that domestic support increases WFC. Lu et al. (2009) found that paid domestic help had no significant impact on W2FC or F2WC, which was confirmed by Spector et al. (2007). Ren and Foster (2011), who collected survey as well as interview data from female Chinese airline staff, found that many of the women relied on paid domestic labour for household chores, which allowed them to focus on childcare. These findings, though, emerged only in the follow-up interviews and were not analysed in their particular study. Nonetheless, the qualitative data in the present study consistently suggested that paid domestic help served as a form of support in the home domain enabling the Hindu women in the study to focus on their work responsibilities, especially while at work:

*I depend a lot on my *live-in because what she does, she comes in at 6:30am then she gets Kiran ready for school, get’s him to brush his teeth does everything else, has
breakfast and he’s all ready by 7:10am...which is great for me. And then she gets the little one ready as well while I’m already at work. ... If she doesn’t pitch up for one day, then there’s stress in the house, that’s how bad it is. So ya. That’s basically, to be honest, I don’t believe that with the kind of [work] environment I’m in, I don’t think I can do everything that I would like to do in life.

Participant 7

*live in = paid domestic helper who lives on the premises.

Another participant concurred:

I’m fortunate in that I have a nanny that makes sure the washing and ironing is done as well. There’s nothing expected from me, but I expect a lot from myself...ya, the extra help is the nanny that’s there during the day, so I don’t have to spend too much time worrying about Puven and his needs...so, little things that help is her telling me we’re out of rice, we’re out of coffee, we’re out of nappies, so she keeps a list, so I don’t have to do an inventory of the cupboards to see what’s there.

Participant 5

Evidence for the buffering effect of paid domestic support on the family demands-F2WC relationship is also unclear. Fu and Shaffer (2001) found that paid domestic support had an effect on parental demands but in the opposite direction to that anticipated. Thus those with paid domestic support experienced increased levels of F2WC from parental demands. They ascribed these findings to the low level of parental demands among their sample and speculated that employees with older or no children may view their paid domestic helper as an additional strain requiring the time and energy to manage the working relationship. In contrast, Luk and Shaffer (2005) found support for paid domestic helpers helping to decrease the effect of work role expectations on W2FC, but they found no support for domestic helpers moderating the family stressor-F2WC relationship.

The relationships between within-domain social support and WFC seem to vary in different cultural contexts and among diverse samples thus warranting further attention to elucidate the role of social support in WFC experiences. A large body of research has investigated social support as an antecedent of WFC but far fewer studies have investigated its buffering effect. In summary, work social support has the potential to reduce W2FC directly and to have a
buffering effect on the work stressor-W2FC relationships. Similarly, family social support has the potential to reduce F2WC and to have a buffering effect on the family stressor-F2WC relationships. According to conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and social support resource theory (Hobfoll, Freedy, Lane, & Geller, 1990), when Hindu women in SA can conserve or gain resources such as social support, they are more likely to experience less stress as they are better equipped to manage their various responsibilities in multiple roles, implying a direct protective effect. The buffering hypothesis holds that Hindu working women in SA with stronger social support resources will experience a weaker relationship between the role stressors and WFC than those with access to limited or no social support (Cohen & Mckay, 1984). Accordingly, the following propositions were made in this study.

**Proposition 5:** Work social support from one’s (a) supervisor and (b) co-workers negatively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 6:** Supervisor support will buffer the effects of (a) work involvement and (b) work overload on W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 7:** Co-worker support will buffer the effects of (a) work involvement and (b) work overload on W2FC among Hindu working women in South Africa.

**Proposition 8:** Family social support from one’s (a) extended family, (b) spouse, and (c) paid domestic helper negatively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 9:** Extended family support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload on F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 10:** Spousal support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload on F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.

**Proposition 11:** Paid domestic support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload on F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.
Cultural Dimensions and WFC: The Moderating Role of Gender Role Ideology and Hierarchy Orientation on the Role Stressor- Same-domain WFC Relationship

Aycan (2005) acknowledged that work-family experiences reflect individuals’ cultural orientations because cultural patterns shape individuals’ behaviours and consequently their work-family decisions. It would therefore be useful to examine the role of cultural dimensions as moderators of the role demands-WFC relationship to determine how managing the work-family interface for both the individual and the workplace should be adapted taking into account diverse cultural orientations (Kirkman et al., 2006).

A traditional gender role ideology and a hierarchy orientation (respect for authority and elders) are assumed to have an effect on the role stressor-WFC relationships for Hindu working women in SA. Both of these cultural orientations seem to be developed by Hindu women through early socialisation. Although collectivism as a cultural dimension (Triandis, 1995) has been associated with Indian cultures, the qualitative findings indicated that hierarchy orientation more accurately described the participants’ experiences. Moreover, hierarchy orientation is embedded in the vertical component of collectivism, and therefore was excluded to avoid potential confounding effects (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009).

The extent to which Hindu working women in SA hold on to traditional values may vary depending on their exposure to more modern values through education and the workplace. For instance, their individual and family cultural values may be changing from traditional gender roles and respect for authority to egalitarianism and freedom of expression (Inkeles, 1983). Only a few researchers have investigated the moderating effects of cultural orientations on work-family conflict experiences while others have examined direct relationships. The moderating effect that key cultural dimensions in Hindu culture, namely a traditional gender role ideology and a hierarchy orientation, have on the same-domain role demands-WFC relationship are discussed below by combining findings from past studies and the qualitative data analysis.
The moderating effect of gender role ideology on the relationship between role stressors and same-domain WFC.

Gender role ideology (GRI) refers to the perceptions of the appropriate behavioural norms associated with males and females in a given society and are transmitted in a process of socialisation (Eagly, 1987; Mischel, 1967). Culture thus transforms biological sex into acceptable gender roles. These norms influence individuals’ choices regarding behaviour, choice of work, dress code, parenting roles and obligations, and relationships. Gender roles can vary across cultures and within cultural groups (An & Kim, 2006).

The historical division of labour for men and women in both the work and family domains have shaped the roles that they are expected to represent in society today (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). Traditional gender role beliefs promote the notion that work and family are distinct domains and perpetuate men’s role in paid employment and women’s role in unpaid domestic work and caring. Conversely, an egalitarian GRI view promotes equal role sharing for men and women. Traditional gender role views giving rise to the male breadwinner model have come under attack by feminists arguing that neither paid nor unpaid work is related to sex distinctions, even though women’s inclination to be caring has been perceived as “existing by nature” (Crompton, 2006, p. 16). Rather, feminists argue that these distinctions have been economically, legally, and socially constructed. This viewpoint can similarly be argued in the Hindu context. Dating back to ancient Vedic times, women were equally encouraged to be well read and held equal rights in becoming priests. Vedic philosophy indicated no seclusion of women and up until 700BC girls were equally educated (Tripathi, 2007). Since then, institutional and societal developments have reflected norms that emphasised traditional gender roles and that Hindu women leaving the home for paid work will undermines the structure of society.

Hindu culture emphasises the importance of the woman’s role in shaping the intellectual and social order of the family. Not only does she have a role prescribed as wife and mother, but also as daughter and daughter-in-law. During the marriage ceremony, the bride takes on the role of managing the household. This traditionally entailed living with her parents-in-law and looking after them (Tripathi, 2011).
Historically, South African cultural beliefs have also been informed by the ideology of patriarchy, introduced through early colonialism (Uchendu, 2008). However as the post democratic South African constitution promotes gender equality to redress the discrepancies in the active labour force brought about by apartheid, hegemonic patriarchal norms relating to the male breadwinner model are slowly changing. This progress however is hampered by the fact that South African labour law benefits only mother with legislated maternity leave but not father, perpetuating the message that woman are the primary care givers of children in South Africa. Hence progressive changes in the SA constitution has created economic opportunities for Hindu women in South Africa, however it has also contributed to social and psychological implications considering the role of woman in Hindu culture.

Accordingly, the socialisation of Hindu women in South Africa is still predominantly along traditional gender lines:

> And when it comes to my mom at home, she prepares the meals I mean, dad eats, walks away, leaves the plate, that sort of thing, and that’s where I come from, even my older brothers, when they come she gives them their tea in their hands. But I grew up with her so I understand and I’m used to it and like when she comes home and my husband starts cleaning up, she’s so uncomfortable, she’s like totally uncomfortable, she’s sitting on the edge of the seat.

Participant 12

Another participant indicated that her role expectations in the family domain were not imposed on her but were rather what she believed she needed to achieve:

> I mean he’s not the one saying, I need to cook and I need to do all these things. I feel like I need to because that’s my role.

Participant 2

Where gender signifies relations of power in traditional Hindu culture from early childhood, the girl child learns “her place in society and her role in life as an obedient wife, responsible home maker and mother” (O’Connor & Ernest, 2011, p. 59). Despite holding a full-time job, childcare and elderly care remains predominantly the woman’s responsibility. For Hindu men, work takes precedence over family, and women often have to sacrifice their careers in
the interest of their husbands’ careers or children’s education (Chandra, 2010). Many Hindu women are raised to think that this is their motherhood duty.

Indian culture promotes the role of the woman as the homemaker and primary caregiver to an extended family system. Sihna (2010) interviewed urban Indian dual-earner couples living in the US and reported that even among couples who held more egalitarian gendered beliefs, the wives performed more domestic and childcare work than their husbands. She described how the mothers in her interviews referred to their arrangements as “I do everything”. Similar perceptions were shared by the women interviewed in the present study:

*I’m angry a lot of the time because I have to do everything...My mother-in-law just took care of his [her husband’s] every need and I came along and did the same thing...He can you now climb the corporate ladder, I’ve got to find something that sustains us financially but still provides some kind of sane household for her.*

She added:

*I know our responsibilities and we take them seriously whereas with other cultures, like the wife by no means is the only one that does the cooking. It’s not a stereotypical kind of relationship; they fully share everything you know. Whereas in an Indian home it’s a bit different. I am the mother and I am the wife and I am the one who does the cooking and I am the one who does the cleaning and seeing to the child. Rightfully so or wrongfully so, that’s my role.*

Participant 2

For most Hindu husbands, work takes precedence over family. In fact, many Hindu women are raised to think that this is their primary duty. One participant reflected this view as follows:

*It makes me a bit upset because I’m also a working person, I was a house wife for 4 years, I never complained because I was at home...but I’m a working person, it’s very difficult, because getting up at quarter to five, it’s tiring, going to bed after eleven is exhausting you know. And you wait for the weekend, but I can’t sleep late because*
I've got house work to do, my kids like food, you have to cook their food for them...
You know living this way of life is stressful and I mean you know, that should at least
tell my husband that he should help out but he doesn’t. You know he gets up at his
own time, he eats his food, he does his thing, he just won’t do anything in the house.
So it’s my duty, I think he thinks “now I’m married now my wife’s gotta do all that”.
It’s hectic, it’s very hectic, but I feel you know what, I got myself into this…let me do
it for my kids.

Participant 18

Further confirmation for this view came from another participant:

Lots of women manage going to work but the problem is when the work gets more
demanding and if you have to work longer hours then we can’t, and if we have to
study, we can’t…you get pressure from other Indian women and they’ll say why don’t
you wait when your children are older before you study or before you take up a
promotion.

She added:

Traditionally the Indian woman’s role is at home and priority is as a mother and until
her children are older and can fend for themselves and most of the time till they’re 18
and they go off to varsity. There’s an expected, and unsaid expectation that a mother
puts her life on hold until her children are old enough.

Participant 19

Korabik et al. (2003) stressed the importance of enhancing our understanding of how gender
role perceptions influence work-family conflict experiences. Past research on GRI and WFC
has been limited and inconsistent. More researchers have investigated the moderating effects
of gender on work-family conflict experiences (see Chapter 2) although Rajadyaksha and
Velgach (2009) argued that using biological sex as a proxy for gender does not allow for the
evaluation of within-sex variation in gender roles. They added that gender influences
identities, behaviours, and the roles that individuals select to act and how to act them, which
can be better understood through GRI.
In the limited WFC research that has investigated GRI, GRI has been examined mainly as a direct predictor of WFC with gender (used as a proxy for biological sex) as the moderating variable in the relationship. For example, Davis (2011) investigated the predictive effects of GRI on W2FC and the moderating effects of gender on these relationships. She found that individuals with a traditional GRI as opposed to an egalitarian ideology experienced greater W2FC and that this relationship was stronger for the women than the men in her sample. She explained that working women may feel especially ambivalent about their work role if they hold traditional gender beliefs because they have been socialised to believe that their family role is of primary importance thereby potentially increasing their W2FC. These results are supported for both directions of WFC (W2FC and F2WC) by de Luis Carnicer, Sánchez, Pérez, & Jiménez (2004) who surveyed 1182 Spanish employees in diverse industries. Kailasapathy et al. (2014), on the other hand, examined dual-earner couples in Sri Lanka (N = 185) and reported that the participants with spouses who had a traditional gender role orientation experienced greater W2FC and that the spouses’ gender role orientation moderated the relationship between leader-member exchange and W2FC differently for the men and the women.

Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2007) are two of the few researchers who have investigated the moderating effects of GRI on WFC relationships. In their study on the relationship between coping strategies and WFC among employees from various organisations in Israel, they found that GRI had a significant moderating effect. For the traditional women in their sample, coping strategies that allowed them to fulfil their family responsibilities effectively reduced their WFC. However, when these women employed coping strategies that contradicted their values, for instance, delegating their family duties to others, they experienced greater WFC. Regarding the moderating effect of GRI on the relationship between gender and both directions of WFC, Rajadyaksha and Velgach (2009) found in their study that the female traditionalists experienced F2WC to a greater extent than the male traditionalists and the male and female egalitarians, which was contrary to their expectations. Their explanation was that the female traditionalists invested more time in their gender-appropriate roles given their cultural and social norms and that this pressure to act appropriately in the demanding familial role could cause conflict in the work domain.

GRI in essence reflects perceptions of gender roles. On the basis of social role theory (Eagly 1987) it can be expected that GRI will moderate the effect that role stressors have on WFC
because GRI is likely to affect the extent to which work and family are perceived as distinct domains (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2007). In other words, traditionalist women who believe that their primary responsibility is the home domain while their husband’s role is to provide economically, are likely to set high standards for themselves in the home domain. These perceptions are likely to strengthen the effect that family stressors have on F2WC. However, women who have an egalitarian GRI and who believe that women and men are equal both at home and at work are likely to develop a stronger work identity to that of their traditionalist counterparts. Accordingly egalitarian Hindu working women are likely to invest time and energy in their work domain and consequently, they may have a greater propensity to experience W2FC caused by their work stressors.

Proposition 12: GRI moderates the relationship between work stressors and W2FC such that egalitarian Hindu working women in SA will experience a stronger relationship between work role stressors: (a) work involvement and (b) work overload and W2FC than their traditionalist counterparts.

Proposition 13: GRI moderates the relationship between family stressors and F2WC such that traditional Hindu working women in SA will experience a stronger relationship between family role stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work and F2WC than their egalitarian counterparts.

The moderating effect of hierarchy orientation on the relationship between role stressors and same-domain WFC.

Hierarchy orientation is related to when “power and responsibility are naturally unequally distributed throughout society” and, as a result, individuals higher in the hierarchy have power over and responsibility for those lower in the hierarchy (Maznevski et al. 2002, p. 277). This cultural orientation is closely related to Hofstede’s (2001) power distance and Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1997) equality-hierarchy cultural dimension. At an individual level, hierarchy orientation shapes how relationships with authority figures are perceived. When high, the perceived gap between the individual and the person in the seniority position will validate submissiveness from the subordinate.
A review of work-family literature revealed no published studies that explicitly investigated hierarchy orientation or power distance at an individual level and its effects on WFC. Some work-family researchers have selected the countries for inclusion in their studies based on those that have distinct cultural values, including levels of power distance. For example, Joplin, Francesco, Shaffer, and Lau (2003) conducted focus groups in five culturally diverse countries (China, Hong Kong, Mexico, Singapore, and the US) in order to develop a theoretical framework of macro-environment conditions that may influence the experience of WFC across cultures. Their findings led them to believe that people in cultures with higher tendencies towards power distance were more likely to experience higher levels of work-family conflict. Joplin et al. (2003) went on to develop moderating propositions for testing in future research. They proposed that the relationships between rates of change and levels of strain in macro-variables and WFC will be moderated by cultural values such that the countries with high collectivism, high power distance, and high uncertainty avoidance will experience stronger relationships.

Kirkman et al. (2009) argued that individuals with a high hierarchical orientation tend to be more submissive towards people viewed as seniors, such as managers at work and elders in one’s family. Linked to this is the notion of respect and obedience. Hence, such individuals will be less likely to oppose a decision made by a “senior” in either domain. Conversely, individuals with a low hierarchical orientation tend to be more able to voice their opinions thereby increasing their sense of control over a situation. Traditionally, Hindus tend to accept their place in the family and in social and organisational hierarchies. Hierarchical relationships are observed in order to maintain social order, enacted in the family system through respect to parental authority and compliance with parental wishes (Singh, 2011). The high degree of hierarchy in Hindu families is manifested in terms of patriarchy. From their early socialisation, Hindu children learn to be obedient and respectful to their parents, guests and elders and discouraged from voicing any concerns in their home and work domains. Hindu girl children are also socialised to be respectful and obedient to their future husbands. Moreover, the tradition of the caste system reinforces hierarchy in Hindu communities both in India and in the Indian diaspora.

Taking the above into consideration, it can be expected that Hindu working women in SA will have varied WFC experiences based on their hierarchical orientation. Interestingly, the qualitative data suggest that Hindu women, out of respect for their elders (in most cases their
mothers-in-law), will assume a submissive role and accept the obligations placed on them, as illustrated in the extracts below:

*My mom is a traditional Hindu wife and she’s brought me up that way in the sense that you know, you must not get into conflict, or you must be humble with your in-laws. They say something you must go along with it even though you don’t agree with it, you must go along with it you know, that typical style.*

Participant 12

*So for instance my mother-in-law just has to phone and say we’re having dinner tonight, and we all go. We don’t say we can’t do that today, it doesn’t work like that. I think it’s because we’re so respectful of her.*

Participant 11

Another participant concurred with the above sentiments:

*Like yesterday she [mother-in-law] called me for today’s prayer...in this weather, and before I go to my friend’s baby shower, which is very inconvenient. But I do the prayer and we are Hindu so we have to oblige.*

Participant 16

Hindu women in SA with a high hierarchical orientation are therefore likely to experience a stronger relationship between family stressors and F2WC because they have been socialised to withhold voicing any disagreements with elder family members and hence may feel that have no control over reducing their family demands.

Based on the qualitative findings, however, the Hindu women in this study seemed to maintain lower levels of hierarchy orientation in the work domain, possibly because this domain is associated with Anglo-based values of greater egalitarianism and freedom of expression. There was still a sense of respect for their managers, but it did not seem that the Hindu women interviewed were unable to voice their opinions in order to manage their work role expectations. For example, some of the women felt comfortable asking their managers if they could bring their children to work if there was a problem with childcare at home. This observation is supported by Kailasapathy and Metz (2012) who, on the basis of on their
qualitative findings on dual-earner employees in Sri Lanka, found that despite the Eastern cultural values of high power distance, the employees were able to negotiate positive outcomes with their supervisors regarding reducing their WFC.

As Hindu working women in SA may have different levels of hierarchy orientation in their work and their family domains, it was decided to examine the construct separately in each domain. Although Hindu women in SA seem less likely to subscribe to a high hierarchical orientation in the work domain, those who do maintain such an orientation are likely to experience greater W2FC from their work demands as they may feel they are unable to contest their managers’ decisions regarding their work demands and consequently experience greater W2FC.

Proposition 14: Work hierarchy orientation moderates the relationship between work stressors and W2FC such that Hindu working women in SA with a high hierarchical orientation will experience a stronger relationship between work role stressors: (a) work involvement and (b) work overload and W2FC than those with a low hierarchy orientation.

Proposition 15: Family hierarchy orientation moderates the relationship between family stressors and F2WC such that Hindu working women in SA with a high hierarchical orientation will experience a stronger relationship between family role stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (c) food-work overload and F2WC than those with a low hierarchy orientation.
CHAPTER 4: METHOD

This chapter clarifies the method followed in the main study to test the relationships proposed in the explanatory model presented in Chapter 3. This chapter includes the research design, the sampling approach, the data collection procedure and a description of the study participants and the measurement instruments. The chapter ends with an outline of the statistical analysis method used in obtaining the results, which are discussed in the next chapter.

Research design

The main study aimed to test the relationships in the explanatory model of WFC among Hindu working women in SA. The qualitative exploration showed that these relationships comprised antecedents of WFC, as buffering effects of social support and moderating effects of cultural variables on the relationships. A descriptive design was used with a cross-sectional time dimension to investigate the phenomenon. Data were collected through self-report surveys.

Survey research procedure

An electronic survey was created on Qualtrics, and ethics approval was obtained from the Commerce Faculty’s Research in Ethics Committee at the University of Cape Town prior to the survey data collection (see Appendix C). The chairpersons or secretaries of various Hindu societies in KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng, the Western Cape and the Eastern Cape were approached to gain access to their members. Non-probability sampling, rather than probability sampling, was used to draw the sample due to difficulties in implementing the latter approach. Firstly, some Hindu societies have formal telephone directories with each member’s contact details while others have informal electronic contact lists. Secondly, for reasons of maintaining member privacy, the database details could not be made available to me directly. Instead, the participating Hindu societies agreed to distribute the electronic survey link to all the members in their databases on my behalf.
A total of 19 of the 23 Hindu societies approached agreed to distribute the survey link to their members. A cover letter indicated the purpose of the study and stated that eligible participants had to be simultaneously involved in full-time paid work and at least one caregiving family role (either to a child or an elderly family member living in their home). The cover letter provided instructions on completing the survey and emphasised the voluntary and anonymous nature of participation (see Appendix D). The Qualtrics survey statistics indicated that most participants took approximately 35 minutes to complete the survey. For every completed survey, a donation was made to a Hindu society of the participants’ choice.

The initial distribution strategy through Hindu societies yielded a low response of 213 completed surveys. The response rate, based on estimated membership numbers provided by the societies, was approximately 7%. This low response rate might have been because I had no control over when the survey link was sent to the members, the number of members that it was sent to, and whether the reminders electronic mails were sent to the members as requested. A concern was that, given the patriarchal nature of Hindu societies, often the husband’s contact details were captured as the member and head of the family, and therefore he would have received the survey request. Male recipients of the electronic mail were requested to kindly forward the survey link to their working wife/partner. The extent to which this occurred is questionable and could have contributed to the low number of responses. It was also difficult to establish the exact membership numbers in each Hindu society – in order to determine an accurate response rate of completed surveys – due to the variation in levels of formalised databases. In some instances, the contact person from the Hindu society could provide only an estimate of membership numbers. In such cases, where membership numbers were based on electronic mail addresses, one household might have had more than one email address.

In order to increase the sample size, two additional approaches to data collection were adopted. Firstly, field assistants collected data through hardcopy surveys from Hindu working women based in Durban and Johannesburg (cities with large Hindu populations). Using this approach, 131 hardcopy surveys were collected of which 105 were useable. Secondly, while the hard copy data collection was being completed, I approached senior human resource staff members at private and public companies located in Durban and Johannesburg requesting permission to survey the Hindu women in their organisations. This approach, however, was ineffective as none of the nine organisations approached agreed to distribute the electronic
survey link to potential participants in their employ. Reasons for not participating included one organisation embarking on restructuring and the human resources director at another organisation believing that it would raise ethnic and gender distinctions in the organisation. Five of the organisations did not give a reason for their decision not to participate. At two of the organisations, the senior human resource practitioners offered to distribute the survey in their personal capacity to Hindu women in their organisations. In terms of the range of distribution strategies used, data were collected over a four-month period from May to September 2013. The final sample comprised a total of 318 participants.

Survey participant characteristics

Of the 318 participants, the majority were married or living with a partner (79.6) and were parents (83.3%). As prior research indicated that having more children and having young children increased individuals’ levels of WFC, the number and ages of children in the sample were recorded. Of the participants who had children, 19.2% had one child, 43.2% had two children, 13.9% had three children, 5.4% had four children and 0.9% had five children. Forty-three per cent of the participants had at least one child under the age of six years.

In Hindu tradition, it is typical for Hindu couples to live with the husband’s parents. Despite modern nuclear family arrangements, this custom together with the custom of duty towards one’s elders is reflected in the sample characteristics with nearly half of the participants looking after an elder family member living with them in their home (46.9%). Thirty-one per cent of the participants had children as well as an elderly person to look after. Table 6 presents additional demographic characteristics of the sample.
### Table 6
**Demographic Frequencies of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single/ Separated/ Divorced/ Widowed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married/ Living with a partner</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status (have children)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have at least one child under the age of six years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look after an elder family member in the home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>Lower than matric</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate degree/ diploma</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work type</td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours spent on work per week</td>
<td>20-29 hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39 hours</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 hours</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 60 hours</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60 hours</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with Indian language group</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of Indian immigrant</td>
<td>1st generation Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd generation Indian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd generation Indian</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th generation Indian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours spent on childcare and cleaning per day</td>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 hours</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 4 hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Demographic Frequencies of the Sample (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average hours spent on cooking per day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 hours</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid domestic support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No domestic support</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic support</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual household income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R0 - R55 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R55 001 - R150 000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R150 001 - R365 000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R365 001 - R630 000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R630 001 - R865 000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R865 001 - R1 300 000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 3000 001 plus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology and communication</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and engineering</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey measures

The scales to measure the constructs in the explanatory model were carefully selected so that
the items most accurately reflect the women’s dialogues represented by the qualitative
themes. Additionally, scales that had been previously validated for samples outside the US
and demonstrated sound psychometric properties were selected. As English is the dominant
language in the education system and business in South Africa (Davis, 2013), there was no
need to translate the survey. Each subscale included in the survey to measure the variables
studied is described below. The items of the full survey are included in Appendix E.

Role involvement.

Work involvement was measured using a 5-item version of the 21-item Lodahl and Kejner
(1965) job involvement scale. The scale measures the extent of a respondent’s psychological
identification with work, which may contribute to WFC because of the time and cognitive
commitments made by the respondent to that role (Aryee et al., 1999a). Aryee et al. (1999a)
created a 4-item shortened version of the scale due to their concern about the length of the
questionnaire in their overall project. They reported high internal consistency for the scale (α
= .81) in their study on married Hong Kong employees. Narayan and Savarimuthu (2013)
added an additional item to Aryee et al.’s (1999a) 4-item scale, from Lodahl and Kejner’s
original scale, “When I am working, I forget everything else around me”. Narayan and
Savarimuthu’s work-family research was conducted among working mothers in the
information technology industry in Bengaluru, India, and they reported a high Cronbach
alpha (α = 0.867) for this 5-item scale. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from
1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores suggested high levels of work
involvement.

Family involvement was measured using a parallel version of the 5-item job involvement
scale by Narayan and Savarimuthu (2013). The scale was adapted for the family domain so
that it measured the extent of the participants’ psychological identification with their family
role. A sample item was, “The major satisfaction in my life comes from my family”. Aryee et
al. (1999a) also measured family involvement using a parallel measure of their 4-item job
involvement scale and reported a Cronbach alpha of .85.
Role overload.

Work overload was measured using a 5-item adaptation of the 6-item role overload scale developed by Thiagarajan, Chakrabarty, and Taylor (2006). Thiagarajan et al. conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of Reilly’s (1982) 13-item role overload scale (the latter being an adaption of the role stressors scale of Rizzo et al., 1970). The results of the CFA supported a 6-item unidimensional scale to measure role overload. Five of the six items were appropriate for measuring role overload in the work domain. For this reason, the item, “I do not ever seem to have any time for myself”, was excluded. The work overload scale measured the degree to which the participants felt that the expectations associated with their work roles were too great to be met with their available resources. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher responses implied high work overload. Matthews, Kath, and Barnes-Farrell (2010) validated the use of these five items within the work-family context to measure work role overload, reporting a Cronbach alpha of .90. A sample item was, “I have to do things at work that I do not really have the time and energy for”.

Extended Family overload was measured using a parallel measure of the 6-item role overload scale of Thiagarajan et al. (2006). As Hindu culture emphasises maintaining strong extended family ties, the scale was adapted to measure the extent to which the participants perceived too many demands from their extended families with insufficient time and energy to meet them adequately. A sample item was, “I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me by my extended family”. Matthews et al. (2010) reported a high Cronbach alpha (α = .92) when the scale was used for measuring family role overload.

Parental overload was measured using the five items used by Aryee et al. (2005) in their work-family study on full-time employed parents in India. Four items were taken from Aryee et al. (1999b), and the fifth item was taken from Frone et al. (1997). The scale was used to measure the extent to which the participants perceived they had too much to do as parents and insufficient resources to meet their parental demands. Aryee et al. (2005) reported a Cronbach alpha of .83. A more recent study conducted by Razak et al. (2010) on family issues and WFC among medical officers in Malaysian public hospitals revealed a Cronbach alpha of .82 for the five-item scale. The participants in the present study rated the frequency with which they experienced each statement on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1
(never) to 5 (always). Higher responses suggested high parental overload. A sample item was “How often do you feel you have too much work to do as a parent?”

Food-work overload as a form of role overload has not been measured in any previously published work-family studies, yet in the qualitative data analysis it appeared to be a highly prevalent theme occupying Hindu women’s time and energy. Food-work overload was measured using five items. Three items were modified to suit this research context from Poortman and Van der Lippe’s (2009) attitudes towards household labour scale. These items were adapted to, “Cooking is my responsibility at home”, “I set high standards for cooking”, and “It is important to me that the meals I prepare are traditional Indian meals”. The remaining two items were adapted from the role overload scale of Thiagarajan et al. (2006). These items were, “I spend more time on cooking than I would like to” and “I spend more energy on cooking than I would like to”. The participants were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Social support.

Supervisor and co-worker support from the work domain, and extended family and spousal support from the family domain was measured using a parallel measure. Five items were used to measure each form of support. Four items were taken from Caplan et al.’s (1975) social support scale measuring emotional support and instrumental support. One item was added to the scale measuring the level of satisfaction with the support received from each source, “To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your supervisor/co-worker/spouse/extended family?”. Caplan et al.’s social support measure is a well-established measure in work-family research, including studies with samples from particular cultural groups. The original measure was rated on a 4-point scale; however, to maintain the response format of the overall survey, items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Higher scores indicated higher levels of perceived support from the specific source. In a study on work and family support and WFC among married female nurses in Shiraz-Iran, Namayandeh et al. (2010) reported the following Cronbach alphas for each source of support: supervisor (.83), co-worker (.83), extended family (.88) and husband (.89).
Paid domestic support was measured using a single dichotomous item. This item was consistent with that used by Lu et al. (2009). The participants were asked if they employed and paid for domestic help, and the responses were coded 0 for no and 1 for yes.

Cultural variables.

Gender role ideology was measured using a 6-item scale by Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon, and Kiger (2006) adapted from an index developed by Spence and Helmreich (1978). The gender role ideology scale measured the attitudes of the participants towards their perceptions of appropriate roles for men and women in their society. Two items were reverse coded. Lower scores indicated an egalitarian orientation while higher scores suggested a traditional gender role orientation. Stevens et al. (2006) used a 6-point rating scale in their research, which was adapted to a 5-point rating scale in this study to fit in with the overall response format. The participants were asked to rate their agreement with each statement ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item was, “A woman’s most important task in life should be taking care of her children”. A Cronbach alpha of .71 was reported by Stevens et al. for the women in their study.

Hierarchy orientation was measured in the work and family domain using a parallel measure to capture the participants’ perception whether those higher in the hierarchy (e.g. managers and parents-in-law) have more power. Five items used from the 6-item power distance scale developed by Dorfman and Howell (1988) and later validated by Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman (2000). The item, “Managers should not delegate important tasks to employees”, was excluded as it was not adaptable to the family domain. Dorfman and Howell adapted Hofstede's (1980) national culture measures for use at the individual level. Farh, Hackett, and Liang (2007) reported an adequate Cronbach alpha of .74 in their study on supervisors and subordinates in mainland China. The responses in the present study were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicated greater perceptions of hierarchical relationships. A sample item in the work domain was, "Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates", and in the family domain, “Younger family members should not disagree with the decisions made by elderly family members".
**Work-family conflict.**

*Work-family conflict* was measured using the 10-item scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). This scale is widely used in current work-family research even in cross-cultural contexts (e.g. Zhang, Foleya, & Yang, 2013). The Netemeyer et al. scale comprises five items measuring work-to-family conflict (W2FC) and five items measuring family-to-work conflict (F2WC). The original 7-point response Likert scale was reduced to a 5-point response scale to fit in with the format of the full survey. A high score on each subscale suggested high levels of W2FC and F2WC. A sample item for W2FC was, “My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfil family duties”, and for F2WC items, “I have to put off things at work because of demands on my time at home”. Netermeyer et al. reported an average coefficient alpha of .88 for the W2FC subscale and .86 for F2WC subscale across three samples. Zhang et al. reported a Cronbach alpha of .81 for the full scale.

**Control variables.**

*Control variables* were selected based on those suggested by previous literature and those relating to the participants’ identity as Hindu women in SA. The variables were age (in years) (Ferguson, Carlson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012), organisational tenure (in years) (Avery, Tonidandel, Volpone, & Raghuram, 2010), and work-type (measured in four categories: non-managerial, managerial, professional, and business owner). Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) recommend the inclusion of socioeconomic indicators as control variables when researching particular ethnic groups. Total annual household income (Martire & Stephens, 2003) was accordingly measured in eight categories (R0 - R55 000, R55 001 - R150 000, R150 001 - R365 000, R365 001 - R630 000, R630 001 - R865 000, R865 001 - R1 300 000, R1 300 001 plus, and Prefer not to answer), and highest level of education (Galovan et al., 2010) was measured in four categories (Lower than Grade 12 (Matric), Grade 12, Undergraduate degree/diploma, and Postgraduate degree).

Questions relating to distinctions among the Hindu women regarding their Hindu identity were also asked, as such distinctions may lead to spurious results if not controlled for in the analysis. The participants were asked to respond to single items for generation of Indian
immigrant (measured in six categories: 1st generation Indian, 2nd generation Indian, 3rd generation Indian, 4th generation Indian, Other, Prefer not to answer) and identification with an Indian language group (measured in five categories: Gujarati, Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, Other, and Prefer not to answer).

**Demographic variables.**

*Several* other demographic questions were included to describe the characteristics of the sample. These were marital status (measured in two categories: Single/Separated/Divorced/Widowed or Married/Living with a partner), number of children, children under the age of six years (measured in two categories: yes or no), looking after an elderly family member in their home (measured in two categories: yes or no), average number of hours spent in their work role in a week (measured in five categories: 20-29 hours, 30-39 hours, 40-49 hours, 50-60 hours, and More than 60 hours), average number of hours spent per day on housework and childcare (measured in five categories: Less than one hour, 1-2 hours, 2-3 hours, 3-4 hours, and More than 4 hours) and average number of hours spent per day on food-work (measured in five categories: Less than one hour, 1-2 hours, 2-3 hours, 3-4 hours, and More than 4 hours).

The survey concluded with an open section to allow the participants to include any additional comments or feedback.

**Method of statistical analysis**

For analysis, the electronic survey data collected through Qualtrics were downloaded directly into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 22 (IBM Corp., 2013). The data from the hardcopy surveys were captured by a research assistant on a Microsoft Excel (2010) data sheet and imported into the same SPSS file to create a single data set.

**Data screening.**

The data screening process as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) was followed. The checks on the accuracy of the data, missing data, univariate outliers and normality of the data, and multivariate assumptions are presented below.
**Accuracy of the data file.**

Initial data cleaning involved removing incomplete or ineligible cases. Firstly, cases were removed if the participants did not meet the criteria for inclusion. For example, the participants who worked less than 20 hours per week were removed as this suggested that they were not involved in full-time paid work. Similarly, cases were removed if the participant was neither a parent nor looking after an elder in her home. One case, where the participant indicated that she was retired and had answered the survey by reflecting back on her past experience, was also removed. Secondly, cases were removed if more than 50 per cent of their survey responses were incomplete. Thirdly, cases were removed where the participants agreed with all the items using the same rating (e.g. all ratings were a 5 on the 5-point rating scale). Such agreement, found mainly in the hard copy responses, may have been due to the participants wanting to respond in a socially desirable way. The participants may have also agreed with the items because doing so required minimal cognitive effort (Salkind & Rassmusen, 2007). The data set was then checked for data errors by examining the minimum and maximum values from the descriptive statistics and by proofreading the data against the questionnaire to check for data accuracy (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

**Missing data.**

An examination of missing data was done to identify any underlying patterns and relationships that might threaten the validity of the results (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The independent and moderating variables were checked for missing data. Parental involvement \((n = 266)\), spousal support \((n = 277)\) and supervisor support \((n = 297)\) had higher numbers of missing data. This was primarily due to the use of skip logic patterns in the electronic survey and hence expected. The participants who did not have children were not presented with the items on parental overload, reflecting system missing values automatically generated in the data set by the SPSS. Similarly, the participants who did not have a spouse or supervisor responded “not applicable” when presented with the items for spousal support and supervisor support. Next, the W2FC and F2WC variables were inspected for missing data to avoid any artificial increases in relationships with the independent variables (Hair et al., 2010). There was only one case with missing values for F2WC and no cases with missing values for F2WC. On further inspection of the data, no other patterns were detected suggesting that any remaining cases with missing data were missing completely at random (MCAR) (Howell, 2007). As the extent of the missing data was small, subsequent analyses
were conducted with listwise deletion as this approach leads to unbiased parameter estimates when the assumption is that the data are MCAR (Howell, 2007).

*Univariate profiling.*
The variables’ univariate properties were examined in order to understand the nature of each variable. A univariate detection of outliers found only a few observations falling outside the outer ranges of the distributions. These observations did not seem distinctive enough to delete, and the original mean and new trimmed mean values were similar (Pallant, 2010), hence the outliers were retained. The univariate distributions were then inspected for normality using the skewness and kurtosis (peakedness) statistics and visual examinations of the histograms (the results are presented in Chapter 5). Theory-driven tests for normality such as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test available in SPSS are sensitive to even moderately outlying observations, possibly leading to over rejection and hence were not used (Drezner, Turel, & Zerom, 2010). A normal distribution of a composite variable is expected to have a skewness value close to zero and a kurtosis value close to 3 (Field, 2005). Although two variables (family involvement and spousal support) were negatively skewed beyond -1, and one variable (family involvement) was peaked (< 3), Tabachnick and Fiddel (2007) advise that larger sample sizes reduce the negative effect of non-normality. Specifically, they suggest that the influence of positive kurtosis diminishes with a sample size of 100 or more and that the influence of negative kurtosis diminishes with a sample size of 200 or more.

*Multivariate profiling.*
The data were examined to ensure that the assumptions for multivariate analyses were met. When there are no violations of the assumptions, the findings can be generalised beyond the sample in a trustworthy manner (Field, 2013). A number of data examination techniques were used after multiple regression analyses had been done.

*Multivariate outliers.*
To determine if the regression models were stable across the sample, assessments were conducted to establish any extremely influential cases using SPSS regression. Cook’s D values were used to measure multivariate outliers in the model. A case was considered to have an overall influence on the model if the Cook's D value was greater than 1.00 (Field, 2013). Mahalanobis distance was also inspected. This measure assesses the distance of a case
from the centroid of the remaining cases (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The critical value of the chi-square distribution was established with degrees of freedom equal to the number of predictors in the model. Cases with values greater than the critical value were examined to establish whether they should be excluded from the data set as outliers.

Each regression model was assessed for multivariate outliers using the abovementioned techniques. All the cases ($N = 318$) were screened for outliers. None of the cases in each solution had a Cook's D value greater than 1.00. Any case with a Mahalanobis distance greater than $X^2 (15) = 30.58$ ($p < .01$) was detected as an outlier when 15 independent variables were used in the final regression solution. Four cases had a distance value beyond the threshold, yet only one case (Case 205) appeared to have an extreme distance (98.37) and was deleted as an influential outlier among these variables in this data set. Case 205 had four children of which one was under the age of six years, was a 51-year-old second generation Indian immigrant in SA, and was involved in professional work with a tenure of 27 years and an annual total income exceeding R1 300 001. She had very high scores (mean of 5 on 5-point scales) on work involvement, supervisor support, extended family overload, W2FC and F2WC. Conversely, she had very low scores (mean of 1.6 and lower on 5-point scales) for family involvement, food-work overload and gender role ideology (egalitarianism). The results of the multiple regression analyses discussed in Chapter 5 are therefore presented with the one multivariate outlier deleted ($N = 317$).

**Normality.**

It is assumed that the errors in a multiple regression model are normally distributed. These errors are estimated by the residuals. Non-normal distribution of the residuals may yield biased standard errors in the regression coefficients (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residuals were conducted to assess normality. The patterns indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate significantly from normality.

**Homoscedasticity.**

This assumption was checked because in multivariate analysis it is assumed that the distribution of errors in the population will be constant in variance over sets of values of the independent variables (homoscedastic) (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). Heteroscedasticity indicates a distribution where the variance of errors differs at different values of the
independent variables. Violating this assumption can yield incorrect significance levels because the standard error is contaminated. Diagnosis of this assumption was conducted by means of a visual inspection of the residual scatter plots of the standardised residuals by the regression standardised predicted value. The residuals were randomly scattered around zero although slight heteroscedasticity was detected in some solutions where there seemed to be over-prediction on smaller values and under-prediction on larger values. However, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), slight heteroscedasticity, as opposed to marked heteroscedasticity, has a minimal effect on significance tests. Hence no variables were transformed.

**Linearity.**
For multiple regression analysis to estimate accurately the relationships between the dependent and each independent variable, the relationships must be assumed to be linear. Non-linear relationships between an independent variable and dependent variables may yield results with a Type I or Type II error, or over- or under-estimation (Hair et al., 2010). The linearity of the relationships in each multiple regression model was examined through residual scatterplots, and no major discrepancies of linearity were found.

**Multicollinearity.**
Multicollinearity indicates very high correlations \( r > .90 \) is the suggested criterion) between independent variables resulting in unstable results (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). Multicollinearity can be determined by the variance inflation factor (VIF), which is the reciprocal of the tolerance statistic (Hair et al., 2010), hence small VIF values indicate low correlations among independent variables. According to Hair et al. (2010), a VIF greater than 10 and a tolerance statistic below 0.1 indicates a problem. In this study, VIF and tolerance values were all within acceptable ranges indicating no concerns with multicollinearity.

**Independent errors.**
For trustworthy results of a multiple regression analysis, it is assumed that errors are not correlated from one consecutive case to the other. The Durbin-Watson statistic was used to test the assumption of independent errors (Field, 2013). The value of the Durbin-Watson statistic ranges from 0 to 4. A Durbin-Watson statistic of approximately 2 implies that the residuals are uncorrelated (values closer to 0 indicate strong positive correlation; values
closer to 4 indicate strong negative correlations). The Durban-Watson statistic across the regression models ranged from 1.886 to 2.093 thus causing no concerns.

Ratio of cases to independent variable (IV). To determine if there were medium-size relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable, Green’s (1991) simple rule of thumb was used to establish if there was an adequate cases to IV ratio. For the final model, 19 IVs were used. The total cases ($N = 317$) were above the minimum requirement ($50 + 8(19) = 202$) for testing multiple correlations and well above the minimum requirement ($140 + 19 = 159$) for testing individual predictors.

Psychometric properties of the constructs.

The construct validity and reliability of the scales measuring the variables were examined prior to any inferential statistics. Factor analysis was used to establish the dimensionality and validity of the scales. Two protocols were used for the factor analysis: (1) Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on the data relating to the independent variables. The independent variables emerged from the qualitative data and were integrated with evidence from existing studies. However in the case of some salient constructs such as extended family support, foodwork overload, and work and family hierarchy orientation, past evidence of scale replication particularly in different cultural contexts were limited. EFA is of greatest use when conducting an initial exploration of a domain as it allows the discovery and isolation of the major dimensions within the domain (Widaman & Grimm, 2014). (2) A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the data relating to the dependent variable WFC. In contrast to EFA, CFA is theory driven (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and the model tested stipulates in advance the relationship between the observed variables and their underlying latent factors (Van Prooijen & Van Der Kloot, 2001). As a strong theoretical basis for the two directions of WFC exists (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) and several meta-analyses and studies in distinct cultural contexts have confirmed that W2FC and F2WC are distinct constructs (Amstad et al., 2011; Casper et al. 2011; Ford et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2009; Michel et al., 2011), CFA was more appropriate than EFA for this data. The reliability of the scales was determined using Cronbach’s alpha and item-total correlation values.
Exploratory Factor analysis.

EFA (Gorsuch, 1983) was conducted on the data relating to the independent variables. EFA reduced and summarised the data to identify the number of latent constructs (factors). For the extraction method, principal axis factoring rather than principal component factoring (PCF) was applied to the variables as the aim was to identify a solution uncontaminated by error and unique variance in the variables (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007). In contrast, PCF extracts the maximum variance from the data set from each component including common, unique and error variance. EFA also served to assess whether the scales held construct validity in this sample given their primary use in studies with Anglo samples (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007).

Prior to conducting EFA, the data were checked for their adequacy in using this approach. The factorability of the correlation matrix was tested using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin’s (KMO) test for sampling adequacy (> .50) and inspection of the anti-image diagonals (> .5). Although SPSS FACTOR assesses Bartlett’s test of sphericity (p < .05) with the KMO test, these results were not considered as Bartlett’s test is highly sensitive and dependent on the sample size (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007). Bartlett’s test will consequently nearly always be significant even when the correlations between variables are very small – it is recommended as a test if there are fewer than five cases per variable (Field, 2013). A minimum subject to item ratio of at least 5:1 in EFA is recommended (Hatcher, 1994), and Comfrey and Lee (1992) suggest that a sample size of about 300 is good. In this study, at least 10 cases per item were present.

Principal axis factoring with varimax rotation and listwise deletion of missing data were applied to the items. As recommended by Hair et al. (2010), the analyses were also run with an oblique rotation (direct oblimin). The oblique (direct oblimin) solution was compared to the varimax results. Because of the minimal differences between the varimax and direct oblimin solutions, varimax rotations were selected in order to maximise the variance of factor loadings thereby maximising the higher loadings and minimising the lower loadings for each factor (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2007). In addition, by using an orthogonal rotation, the factors could be rotated into positions that made them more readily interpretable. Once the factors had been rotated, the communality of each item was also assessed in relation to the factor. The communality value explained the proportion of the variable’s variance, which, in turn, was explained by all the factors combined.
The size of the Eigenvalues determined the number of factors to be extracted. Kaiser’s rule was applied in terms of which all Eigenvalues greater than one were considered (Kaiser, 1970). According to Hair et al. (2010), the minimal factor loading for a sample between 300 and 350 is .30 for a significance level of .01. However, Stevens (1992) suggests using a cut-off of 0.4, regardless of the sample size for interpretative purposes. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) and Comrey and Lee (1992) recommend the use of the following criteria: 0.32 (poor), 0.45 (fair), 0.55 (good), 0.63 (very good) and 0.71 (excellent). Based on these recommendations, a more stringent criterion of .04 was used in this study as the cut-off for items with practical significance as the aim of using EFA was to establish unidimensionality of the items that loaded significantly onto one factor and to use these results to create composite scales.

**Confirmatory factor analysis.**

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the data relating to the dependent variable WFC. The CFA was performed using STATISTICA 12.0 on the 10-item work-family conflict scale (Netemeyer et al., 1996). In the CFA, the two-factor structure of WFC (W2FC and F2WC) could be assumed a priori and the fit of the model to the sample data evaluated statistically by means of the chi square ($\chi^2$) value. However, as $\chi^2$ is highly sensitive to unrelated factors such as sample size and multivariate normality, the fit of the model was also evaluated by a group of descriptive fit indices including the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) the comparative fit index (CFI), and the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). Models that have a good-fit should produce consistent results across the different indices (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Chi square, RMSEA, GFI, and AGFI are absolute fit indices that determine how well the theory fits the sample data (Hair et al., 2010). The $\chi^2$ value should be close to zero and the p-value non-significant. However as chi square is sensitive to sample size and model complexity, Wheaton et al.’s (1977) normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) is calculated in order to minimise their impact. When the ratio of the $\chi^2$ to the degrees of freedom is 2 or less, it is indicative of a good-fitting model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Lower RMSEA values indicate better model fit relative to the model degrees of freedom, with a recommended a cut-off value close to .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Confidence intervals for the RMSEA are also provided allowing the reporting of the range of RMSEA values for a given confidence level.
Lower limit confidence intervals should be closer to 0 and upper limit confidence intervals should be less than 0.08 for a good-fitting model (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen). GFI relates to the proportion of variance explained by the estimated population covariance (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). However, given the sensitivity of this index, AGFI which adjusts the GFI based upon degrees of freedom is also reported. For both GFI and AGFI, higher values between 0 and 1 indicate a better fit and an acceptable model fit is indicated by a value of 0.90 or greater (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

CFI is an incremental fit index. An incremental fit index establishes how well the model fits to a baseline model and assumes that all observed variables are uncorrelated. CFI values range from 0 to 1 with a larger value indicating better model fit (Hair et al., 2010). CFI values of 0.90 or greater indicate a good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Reliability analysis.**
Scale reliability refers to the ability of a measure to yield consistent results (Blaikie, 2004). Reliability analysis was assessed using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, and a minimum threshold of .70 was deemed an acceptable level for internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Item appropriateness and discrimination was also checked. An acceptable conventional cut-off for corrected item-total correlations is .30 for a sample size between 300 and 350 (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2008). The corrected item-total correlations for the full scale ranged from .440 to .900 indicating very good discrimination.

**Inferential statistical analysis.**
The inferential statistical techniques used to test the propositions derived from the explanatory model are presented below. Pearson-product moment correlation, ANOVA, hierarchical multiple regression and moderated hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted.

**Correlation analysis.**
A bivariate correlation analysis was used to describe the strength of the relationships between paired data under the assumption that the data were linear. Pearson-product moment correlation analysis (or Pearson’s \( r \)) with pairwise deletion of missing cases was used to test the strength and direction of the relationship between all the scale-level measured variables (see Table 13). Pearson’s \( r \) represents how much the variance of one variable coincides with
the variance of another variable (Blaikie, 2004). Pearson’s correlation coefficient ranges between +1 and -1. Correlation coefficients between 0 and .30 are reported as weak, between .30 and .50 as moderate, between .50 and .70 as strong, and greater than .70 as very strong (Cohen, 1988). A bivariate correlation analysis provides a preliminary analysis of the hypothesised relationships and discloses any strong correlations that could result in multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2010) in the subsequent regression analysis. As Family involvement and Spousal support were non-normally distributed, a Spearman rank correlation was also conducted. The results of the two methods were similar. The Spearman rank correlation matrix is presented in Appendix F.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).
As Pearson-product moment correlation analysis was conducted only on the continuous data, and a one-way ANOVA was used to assess the relationship between the categorical variables and the continuous dependent variable WFC. ANOVAs establish differences between group means on a variable. When a null hypothesis is rejected, it is inferred that there are significant differences among the group means on the variable being tested. Since the ANOVA does not reveal among which groups differences exist, the Tukey HSD post hoc test was used for variables that were significant.

Standard and hierarchical multiple regression analysis.
Multiple regression analysis forms linear combinations of variables from estimating regression coefficients for each independent variable (IV) to establish their collective prediction of the dependent variable (DV). It also determines the importance of each IV in the prediction of the DV (Hair et al., 2010). In analysing the regression results, the fit of the overall model is to first establish for significance. In other words, the amount of variation explained by the regression model is more than the baseline prediction ($R^2$ is significantly greater than 0). If this is the case, then the significance of each IV (unstandardised ($B$) and standardised ($\beta$) regression coefficients) is determined (Hair et al., 2010).

Standard multiple regression analysis was used when all the IVs were entered in one step, whereas hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used so that the IVs could be entered in a pre-established order. In the latter case, groups of variables could thus be controlled for. Hence the variance ($R^2$) could be accounted for in each group of IVs so that incremental
predictive power for any additional IVs added to the model ($\Delta R^2$) could be established (Hair et al., 2010).

**Moderated multiple regression analysis.**

Moderation occurs when a third independent variable has an effect on the independent-dependent variable relationship. That is, as the value of the moderating variable changes, systematic changes take place in the relationship between the IV and the DV (Aiken & West, 1991). To execute moderated multiple regression analyses, Aiken and West’s (1991) procedures were followed. Interaction product terms were created between the centred continuous IVs and the centred continuous moderating variables. Using this interaction approach, it could be determined whether the relationship between the IV and the DV varied over the range of the moderating variable. The moderating variable was kept continuous as Stoner-Romero and Anderson (1994) argue that dichotomising or polychotomising the moderator variable leads to the loss of power and consequently increased levels of unexplained (error) variance thereby reducing the likelihood of finding moderating effects. There are opposing views to this approach. For example, Shieh (2009) notes the difficulty of detecting true moderator effects in observational studies with continuous moderator variables.

The variables in the interaction terms of the prediction equation were centred to minimise the likelihood of multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991). When product terms are not centred, they are likely to be highly correlated because of the measurement scales of the component IVs. This view has recently come under criticism. For example, Dalal and Zickar (2012) use derivation of equations and empirical examples to show that mean-centring of predictors reduces nonessential collinearity rather than essential collinearity. They add that mean-centring (1) changes lower order regression coefficients (but not the highest order coefficients), (2) does not influence the power to identify moderating effects, and (3) does not change the reliability of product terms. Despite these concerns, they do acknowledge that mean-centring increases the interpretability of results and that it is important for moderator analysis.

The interaction product terms were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression model after the entry of the main effect variables. To determine if there was a moderating effect, the increment in the proportion of variance explained by the interaction ($\Delta R^2$) had to be significantly greater than 0.
Post hoc power analysis.

Post hoc power for the standard and hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted using the statistical program G* Power 3 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The power \((1 - \beta)\) of the regression analysis is the probability that the statistical significance will be indicated if present. A power level of 80% or more for the multiple regression analysis is recommended at the appropriate significance level (Hair et al. 2010). To determine power, the effect size \((f^2)\) was first calculated for each regression model in G* Power. Following Cohen’s criteria, an effect size of .02 is small, .15 is medium and .35 is large. The \(f^2\), error probability \((\alpha = .5)\), sample size, and number of predictor variable were entered as input parameters for each regression model to calculate the post hoc power.

The next chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses in relation to the study’s propositions.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

The aim of this study was to examine contextually salient antecedents of work-family conflict (WFC) for Hindu working women in South Africa (SA) and to explore within group variations in these experiences moderated by salient cultural dimensions. Qualitative data from twenty interviews with South African Hindu women, who had families and were employed in paid work, were thematically analysed. Together with findings from the existing literature, these qualitative findings were used to develop a new and specific explanatory model of WFC appropriate for the target sample. The model was then tested using a survey questionnaire.

This chapter summarises the results of the quantitative data obtained from the responses of the survey. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section presents the psychometric properties of the scales used to measure the constructs of interest. The second section provides descriptive statistics of all variables and an interpretation of the sample distributions of all of the composite measures. Section three summarises the testing of bivariate inter-correlations and group differences in WFC. Section four presents the results of the analyses that examined each of the research propositions concerning the effects of work and family stressors on WFC and the buffering effects of work and family support on these relationships. The chapter concludes with section five, which presents the results of analyses that examined the moderating effects of salient cultural dimensions on the WFC experiences of the participants.

Psychometric Properties of Variables

As recommended by Hair et al. (2010), the data was examined for its underlying structure and the interrelationship of variables prior to conducting inferential statistics. The dimensionality and internal consistency of each of the multi-item measures were analysed using factor analysis and reliability analysis.
Dimensionality of the role stressor antecedent variables of WFC.

**Work stressors: Work overload and work involvement.**
Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 10 items for a sample of 298 participants (after listwise deletion of missing variables). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .866) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 ($820 < r < 930$), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al. 2010). Using Kaiser’s criterion (1970), two factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one. The cumulative percentage of the variance explained by the two factors was 57.72%. No high cross-loadings were detected. The loadings of each item on the two extracted factors (after rotation) are shown in Table 7. Communality value (see Table 7) did not exceed 1 indicating no problems with the solution. Although it is noted that WINV1 has a lower communality value (.277) in comparison to the other communality values, the item was retained as it met all the set criteria for inclusion. In Table 7, variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. With a cut-off loading of .40 for inclusion of an item in the interpretation of a factor, the items that cluster on Factor 1 represent work overload (all factor loadings are greater than .658) and the items that load on Factor 2 represent work involvement (all factor loadings are greater than .539).

In sum, Factor one was labelled *Work overload* and Factor two, *Work involvement*. Reliability analysis conducted on these composite scales revealed good internal consistency and item-total correlations: *Work overload* ($\alpha = .852$; $.508 < r < .759$) and *Work involvement* ($\alpha = .871$; $.609 < r < .771$).
Table 7

Work Stressors Scales: Work Overload and Work Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stressors</th>
<th>Factor Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOVER3</td>
<td>I cannot ever seem to catch up at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOVER1</td>
<td>I have to do things at work that I do not really have the time and energy for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOVER2</td>
<td>I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOVER4</td>
<td>There are times when I cannot meet everyone’s expectations at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOVER5</td>
<td>I seem to have more commitments to overcome than other people I know at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINV4</td>
<td>My life goals are mainly work oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINV3</td>
<td>The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINV5</td>
<td>The most important things that happen to me involve my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINV2</td>
<td>When I am working, I forget everything else around me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINV1</td>
<td>My work is a large part of my life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual total variance (percent)</td>
<td>29.48% 28.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total variance (percent)</td>
<td>29.48% 57.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 298 after listwise deletion of missing data; Principal factor analysis with varimax normalised data; Each items’ significance loadings are presented in bold face; WOver = work overload; WInv = work involvement.

Family stressors: Family involvement, extended family overload, parental overload, and food-work overload.

Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 21 items for a sample of 308 participants (after listwise deletion of missing variables). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .866) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 (633 < r < 944), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al. 2010). Using Kaiser’s (1970) criterion, four factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one. The cumulative percentage of the variance explained by the four factors was 69.45% however two food-work overload items loaded poorly (factor loadings less than .4). Resultantly, the items Food1 and Food2 overload 2 were removed and the principal-axis factor analysis was rerun.
Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 19 items. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .877) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 (.734 < r < 935), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al., 2010). Using Kaiser’s (1970) criterion, four factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one. The cumulative percentage of the variance explained by the four factors was 74.86%. The loadings of each item on the four extracted factors (after rotation) are shown in Table 8. Communality value (see Table 8) did not exceed 1 indicating no problems with the solution. Although it is noted that Food3 has a lower communality value (.331) in comparison to the other communality values, the item was retained as it met all the set criteria for inclusion.

In Table 8, variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. With a cut-off loading of .40 for inclusion of an item in the interpretation of a factor, five items loaded highly onto Factor 1 (all factor loadings greater than .963) representing parental overload. Six items loaded highly onto Factor 2 (all factor loadings greater than .763) representing extended family overload. Five items loaded adequately on Factor 3 (all factor loadings greater than .507) representing family involvement and three items loaded adequately on Factor 4 (all factor loadings greater than .469) representing food-work overload.

In sum, the four factors representing family demands were labelled Parental overload, Extended family overload, Family involvement, and Food-work overload. Reliability analysis conducted on these composite scales revealed good internal consistency and item-total correlations: Parental overload (α = .929; .699 < r < .872), Extended family overload (α = .943; 755 < r < .866), Family involvement (α = .858; .517 < r < .783), and Food-work overload (α = .825; .477 < r < .777).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POver4</td>
<td>How often do you feel you have too much work to do as a parent?</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POver2</td>
<td>How often do you feel that the amount of work you have to do as a parent is too much?</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POver5</td>
<td>In general, how often do you feel overwhelmed by the demands of parenting?</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POver3</td>
<td>How often do you feel that the amount of time you devote to looking after your child(ren) leaves you with little time for much else?</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POver1</td>
<td>How often do you feel that your child(ren) is/are making too many demands on you?</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver2</td>
<td>I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me by my extended family.</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver3</td>
<td>I never seem to catch up with my responsibilities to my extended family.</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver4</td>
<td>Because of my extended family responsibilities, I do not ever seem to have any time for myself.</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver1</td>
<td>In my extended family I have to do things that I do not really have the time and energy for.</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver6</td>
<td>I seem to have more commitments to my extended family than other people I know.</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFOver5</td>
<td>There are times when I cannot meet all my extended family’s expectations.</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv4</td>
<td>My life goals are mainly family oriented.</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv5</td>
<td>The most important things that happen to me involve my family.</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv3</td>
<td>The major satisfaction in my life comes from my family.</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv2</td>
<td>When I am with my family, I forget everything else around me.</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv1</td>
<td>My family is a large part of my life.</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food4</td>
<td>I spend more time on cooking than I would like to.</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food5</td>
<td>I spend more energy on cooking than I would like to.</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food3</td>
<td>It is important to me that the meals I prepare are traditional Indian meals.</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 308 after listwise deletion of missing data; Principal factor analysis with varimax normalised data; Each item’s significance loadings are presented in bold face; EFOver = extended family overload; POver = parental overload; FInv = family involvement; Food = food-work overload.
Dimensionality of the social support variables.

**Supervisor support, co-worker support, extended family support, and spousal support.**

Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 20 items for a sample of 245 participants (after listwise deletion of missing variables). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .859) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 (805 < r < 915), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al., 2010). Using Kaiser’s criterion (1970), four factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one. The cumulative percentage of variance explained by the four factors was 76.46%. No cross-loadings were detected with a cut-off of .40 for inclusion of an item in interpretation of a factor. The loadings of each item on the four extracted factors (after rotation) are shown in Table 9. Communality value (see Table 9) did not exceed 1 indicating no problems with the solution. In Table 9, variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. The items that cluster on: Factor 1 represent extended family support (all factor loadings greater than .808), Factor 2, supervisor support (all factor loadings greater than .812), Factor 3, spousal support (all factor loadings greater than .815), and Factor 4, Co-worker support (all factor loadings greater than .765).

In sum, the four factors representing support were labelled **Extended family support**, **Supervisor support**, **Spousal support**, and **Co-worker support**. Reliability analysis conducted on these composite scales revealed good internal consistency and item-total correlations: **Extended family support** (α = .946; .811 < r < .900), **Supervisor support** (α = .949; .829 < r < .881), **Spousal support** (α = .944; .803 < r < .870), and **Co-worker support** (α = .926; .764 < r < .845).
Table 9
Social Support Scales: Extended Family Support, Supervisor Support, Spousal Support, and Co-worker Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp5</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your extended family?</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp4</td>
<td>To what extent can your extended family be relied on when things get tough?</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp3</td>
<td>To what extent does your extended family go out of their way to make life easier for you?</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp2</td>
<td>To what extent is your extended family willing to listen to your problems?</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp1</td>
<td>To what extent is it easy to talk to your extended family members?</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp5</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your supervisor?</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp4</td>
<td>To what extent can your supervisor be relied on when things get tough?</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp3</td>
<td>To what extent does your supervisor go out of his/her way to make life easier for you?</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp2</td>
<td>To what extent is your supervisor willing to listen to your problems?</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp1</td>
<td>To what extent is it easy to talk to your supervisor?</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp4</td>
<td>To what extent can your spouse be relied on when things get tough?</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp5</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your spouse?</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp2</td>
<td>To what extent is your spouse willing to listen to your problems?</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp3</td>
<td>To what extent does your spouse go out of his/her way to make life easier for you?</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp1</td>
<td>To what extent is it easy to talk to your spouse?</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp5</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your co-workers?</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp3</td>
<td>To what extent do your co-workers go out of their way to make life easier for you?</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp4</td>
<td>To what extent can your co-workers be relied on when things get tough?</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp2</td>
<td>To what extent are your co-workers willing to listen to your problems?</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp1</td>
<td>To what extent is it easy to talk to your co-workers?</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.594</td>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>2.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual total variance (percent)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative total variance (percent)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 245 after listwise deletion of missing data; Principal factor analysis with varimax normalised data; Each items’ significance loadings are presented in bold face; EFSupp = extended family support; SupSupp = supervisor support; SpSupp = spousal support; CWSupp = co-worker support.
Dimensionality of the moderating variables.

*Cultural dimensions: Family hierarchy orientation, work hierarchy orientation, and GRI.*

Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 16 items for a sample of 309 participants (after listwise deletion of missing variables). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .891) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 (697 < r < 935), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al., 2010). Using Kaiser’s (1970) criterion, four factors after rotation as opposed to the expected three were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than one, explaining 55.58% of the cumulative variance. An inspection of factor loadings indicated that the two items GRI3R and GRI5R did not have a factor loading of above .4 on any factor (highest factor loading for GRI3R was .244 and highest factor loading for GRI5R was .274) (see Appendix G, Table A2). Resultantly, these two items were removed and the principal-axis factor analysis was rerun.

Principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 14 items for a sample of 311 participants (after casewise deletion of missing variables). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .891) and the diagonals of the anti-image correlation matrix were all over .5 (822 > r > 924), supporting the inclusion of each item in the factor analysis (Hair et al. 2010). This extraction yielded three factors with Eigenvalues greater than one based on Kaiser’s criterion (1970). The cumulative percentage of the variance explained by the three factors was 58.42%. No cross-loadings above the .4 cut-off were detected. The loadings of each item on the three extracted factors (after rotation) are shown in Table 10. Communality value (see Table 10) did not exceed 1 indicating no problems with the solution. Although it is noted that the value for GRI1 (.308) was lower in comparison to the other communality values, the item was retained as it met all the set criteria for inclusion. In Table 10, variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. With a cut-off loading of .40 for inclusion of an item in the interpretation of a factor, the items that cluster on: Factor 1, represent hierarchy orientation in the family role (all factor loadings greater than .650), Factor 2, hierarchy orientation in the work role (all factor loadings greater than .475), and Factor 3, gender role ideology (all factor loadings greater than .475).
### Table 10
*Cultural Dimensions Scales: Family Hierarchy Orientation, Work Hierarchy Orientation, and Gender Role Ideology*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FmHier3</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier1</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier2</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier5</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier4</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier3</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier1</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier5</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier2</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier4</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI2</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI6</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI4</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI11</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual total variance (percent)</td>
<td>22.713</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
<td>16.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total variance (percent)</td>
<td>22.713</td>
<td>41.97%</td>
<td>58.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. \( N = 311 \) after listwise deletion of missing data; Principal factor analysis with varimax normalised data; Each items’ significance loadings are presented in bold face; FmHier = family hierarchy; WkHier = work hierarchy; GRI = gender role ideology.
In sum, the three factors representing cultural dimensions were labelled *Family hierarchy orientation*, *Work hierarchy orientation*, and *Gender role ideology (GRI)*. Reliability analysis conducted on these composite scales revealed good internal consistency and item-total correlations: *Family hierarchy orientation* ($\alpha = .911$; $.704 < r < .835$), *Work hierarchy orientation* ($\alpha = .850$; $.537 < r < .712$), and *GRI* ($\alpha = .764$; $.440 < r < .680$).

### Dimensionality of the dependent variables.

**WFC: W2FC and F2WC.**

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using maximum likelihood estimation, was performed on data from the 10-item work-family conflict scale by Netermeyer et al. (1996). Three factor models were examined: A one factor model of WFC, a two-factor model with non-correlating factors, and the theory-based two-factor model with correlating factors. In the two factor models, the two directions of WFC, W2FC and F2WC were separate factors.

Table 11 provides an overview of fit indices for the different factor solutions of each model. As expected, the single factor model and the two factor non-correlational model were not a good fit to the data (see Table 11). The two-factor correlational model was the best representation of the data ($\chi^2 = 89.87$, $N = 317$, $df = 34$, $p < .0001$ $\chi^2/df = 2.64$, GFI = .98, AGFI = .91, CFI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.07) when compared to the other factor models. GFI, AGFI, and CFI values for the two-factor correlational model were all above the .90 benchmark, $\chi^2/df$ approximated the recommended value of 2 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and the RMSEA value was close to the .06 cut-off value with confidence intervals ranging from 0.06 to 0.09 for 90% confidence, indicating acceptable model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

In sum, the two factors representing WFC were labelled *Work-to-family conflict (W2FC)* and *Family-to-work conflict (F2WC)*. Reliability analysis conducted on these composite scales revealed good internal consistency and item-total correlations: *W2FC* ($\alpha = .946$; $.802 < r < .886$) and *F2WC* ($\alpha = .946$; $.818 < r < .882$). The reliability analysis for the full scale yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .948 and item total correlations ranged from .707 to .805.
Descriptive Statistics

This section presents a summary of the descriptive statistics and the distribution of the scores of each variable (refer to Table 12). Composite scores were created for each of the factors, based on the mean of the items with a primary loading on the factor.

Missing data patterns were examined before calculating the descriptive statistics. Parental overload (n = 266), Spousal support (n = 277), and Supervisor support (n = 297) had a higher number of missing cases than the other variables. This may be ascribed to the use of skip logic patterns in the electronic survey. Participants who did not have children were not presented with the items on parental overload and participants who did not have a spouse or supervisor, rated “not applicable” when presented with the items concerning spousal support and supervisor support respectively. The dependent variables were also inspected for missing cases to avoid any artificial increases in relationships with the independent variables (Hair et al., 2010). There was only one missing case identified in the dependent variable $F_{2WC}$ and no missing cases presented in the dependent variable $W_{2FC}$. On inspection of the data, no other patterns in missing data were identified, indicating that they were randomly distributed, and therefore no missing values were substituted. A univariate detection of outliers found only a few observations falling outside the outer ranges of the distributions. These observations did not seem distinctive enough to delete and a comparison between the original mean and new trimmed mean values were similar (Pallant, 2010), hence the outliers were retained.

### Table 11

**Fit Indexes of Confirmatory Factor Analysis: WFC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% CI Low</th>
<th>90% CI High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Factor</td>
<td>870.87***</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factor non-correlational</td>
<td>256.54***</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factor correlational</td>
<td>89.87***</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 317$. ***$p < .001$, df = Degrees of freedom; GFI = Goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = Adjusted-goodness-of-fit index; CFI = Comparative fit index; RMSEA = Root-mean-square error of approximation; CI = Confidence interval
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error of Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Standard Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standard Error of Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.9483</td>
<td>0.05055</td>
<td>0.90141</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.8112</td>
<td>0.05078</td>
<td>0.90561</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family involvement</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.2107</td>
<td>0.04156</td>
<td>0.74000</td>
<td>-1.344</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2.627</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family overload</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>2.9226</td>
<td>0.05961</td>
<td>1.05973</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.789</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental overload</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2.8039</td>
<td>0.06543</td>
<td>1.06717</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.915</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work overload</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.9589</td>
<td>0.05556</td>
<td>0.98928</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.8512</td>
<td>0.06321</td>
<td>1.08943</td>
<td>-.731</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3.8503</td>
<td>0.05451</td>
<td>0.96277</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>-0.458</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal support</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>4.1282</td>
<td>0.06097</td>
<td>1.01478</td>
<td>-1.148</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family support</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3.4155</td>
<td>0.05882</td>
<td>1.04553</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-.626</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hierarchy</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.4871</td>
<td>0.04984</td>
<td>0.88876</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family hierarchy</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.3698</td>
<td>0.05477</td>
<td>0.97675</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender role ideology</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.6562</td>
<td>0.05221</td>
<td>0.93108</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2FC</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.6909</td>
<td>0.05875</td>
<td>1.04766</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-.555</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2WC</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2.2902</td>
<td>0.05329</td>
<td>0.94872</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.4911</td>
<td>0.05103</td>
<td>0.91007</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = Sample Size; W2FC = Work-to-family conflict; F2WC = Family-to-work conflict, WFC = Work-family conflict
With regard to the sample, the majority of means for the composite variables were around or just below the midpoint of three on a five-point scale (see Table 12). The lowest mean was for the variable $F2WC (M = 2.2902; SD = .94872)$, while the sample means for Supervisor support ($M = 3.8512; SD = 1.08943$), Co-worker support ($M = 3.8503; SD = .96277$), and Spousal support ($M = 4.1282; SD = 1.01478$) were relatively high. Sample means for Family involvement ($M = 4.2107; SD = .74000$) was the highest; vastly higher in comparison to Work involvement ($M = 2.9483; SD = .90141$). The standard deviations of the entire composite scale variables were well dispersed around the mean indicating varied responses to the items across cases.

The distributions were inspected for normality using the skewness and kurtosis statistics and visual examinations of the histograms. The majority of the distributions were in the acceptable range of normal, however Family involvement (skewness = -1.344; $SE = .137$) and Spousal support (skewness = -1.148; $SE = .146$) were non-normally distributed. Both distributions were negatively skewed as indicated by their long tails to the left (see Appendix H, Figure A1 and A2). Although non-normality of univariate variables can have unfavourable effects, according to Hair et al. (2010), the effects are likely to be reduced in sample sizes above 200.

Correlation Analysis

This section presents the Pearson product moment correlation analysis (or Pearson’s $r$) between all the scale-level measured predictor- and moderator variables, first with W2FC and then with F2WC (refer to Table 13). Age and tenure, measured continuously, were included as potential demographic control variables. As discussed in Chapter 4, a Spearman rank correlation was also conducted. The results of the two bivariate correlation methods were statistically similar (see Appendix F, Table A1 for the results of the Spearman rank correlation analysis).

Inter-correlations with W2FC.

$W2FC$ had a strong positive relationship with Work overload ($r = .611, p < 0.01$). Whereas $W2FC$ correlated moderately with Extended family overload ($r = .453; p < 0.01$), Parental overload ($r = .377; p < 0.01$), Food-work overload ($r = .373; p < 0.01$), Work hierarchy
orientation \( (r = 0.322; p < 0.01) \) and Family hierarchy orientation \( (r = 0.323; p < 0.01) \). Weak positive correlations were found between W2FC and Work involvement \( (r = 0.284; p < 0.01) \) and between W2FC and GRI \( (r = 0.234; p < 0.01) \). Additionally weak negative relationships were found between W2FC and Family involvement \( (r = -0.179; p < 0.01) \), Supervisor support \( (r = -0.135; p < 0.01) \), Co-worker support \( (r = -0.165; p < 0.01) \) and Spousal support \( (r = -0.214; p < 0.01) \). There was no significant correlation between W2FC and Extended family support \( (r = -0.018; p = 0.639; n.s.) \). In sum, the strongest relationship was between W2FC and Work overload.

**Inter-correlations with F2WC.**

F2WC had a moderate positive relationship with Work overload \( (r = 0.417; p < 0.01) \), Extended family overload \( (r = 0.445; p < 0.01) \), Parental overload \( (r = 0.412; p < 0.01) \), Foodwork overload \( (r = 0.452; p < 0.01) \), Work hierarchy orientation \( (r = 0.457; p < 0.01) \), and Family hierarchy orientation \( (r = 0.429; p < 0.01) \). While F2WC correlated moderately negatively with Spousal support \( (r = -0.301; p < 0.01) \) and was the only form of social support that showed a significant correlation with F2WC. F2WC correlated significantly but weakly with Work involvement \( (r = 0.203; p < 0.01) \) and GRI \( (r = 0.289; p < 0.01) \). The analysis revealed no significant relationship between F2WC and Family involvement \( (r = -0.039; p = 0.495, n.s.) \), Supervisor support \( (r = 0.040; p = 0.490; n.s.) \), Co-worker support \( (r = -0.067; p = 0.239; n.s.) \), or Extended family support \( (r = -0.037; p = 0.514; n.s.) \).

**Inter-correlations of Scale-level Measured Demographic Control Variables (Age and Tenure) with W2FC and F2WC.**

Both Age \( (r = -0.108; p = 0.059; n.s.) \) and Tenure \( (r = -0.023; p = 0.684; n.s.) \) did not significantly correlate with W2FC using \( p < 0.5 \) as the criterion for significance. Similarly Age \( (r = 0.009; p = 0.874; n.s.) \) and Tenure \( (r = 0.050; p = 0.389; n.s.) \) did not significantly correlate with F2WC, hence Age and Tenure were excluded as possible control variables in the subsequent regression analyses.
Table 13  
Inter-correlations and Reliabilities of the Variables in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WInv</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WOver</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flnv</td>
<td>-.194**</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EFOver</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ParOver</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FoodWrk</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.111*</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SupSupp</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.126*</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CWSupp</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EFSupp</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SpSupp</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.122*</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>-.176**</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
<td>-.121*</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. WkHier</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FmHier</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GRI</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.129*</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.146*</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. W2FC</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td>-.179**</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>-.135*</td>
<td>-.165**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.214**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. F2WC</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.301**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.657**</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Age</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.163**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Tenure</td>
<td>.129*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values are Pearson correlation coefficients. Scale internal consistencies (Cronbach alpha) in parentheses on the diagonal; Sample size ranging from N = 245 to N = 318 (pairwise deletion of missing data). **. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). WInv = work involvement; WOver = work overload; Flnv = family involvement; EFOver = family overload; ParOver = parental overload; FoodWrk = food-work overload; SupSupp = supervisor support; CWSupp = co-worker support; EFSupp = extended family support; SpSupp = spousal support; WkHier = work hierarchy; FmHier = family hierarchy; GRI = gender role ideology: low scores indicate egalitarian GRI, high scores indicate traditional GRI; W2FC = work-to-family conflict; F2WC = family-to-work conflict; WFC = work-family conflict.
Antecedents of WFC amongst Hindu Working Women in South Africa

This section presents the analyses conducted to test the propositions that work and family stressors predict both directions of WFC. The first part presents the findings regarding the proposed W2FC antecedents and the second part the findings of the F2WC antecedents. Prior to conducting the hierarchical multiple regression analyses to establish these antecedent effects, one-way Analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted with certain demographic factors to establish their inclusion as control variables in subsequent analyses. The demographic variables comprised Work-type, Indian generation status, Educational level, Income, Indian language group, and Primary identity. The results are presented below:

ANOVAs.

Work type.
The first ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of W2FC and F2WC differed significantly based on the type of work that she was involved in. Four categories of work type were measured: 0 = Non-managerial, 1 = Managerial, 2 = Professional and 3 = Business owners. The results of the one-way ANOVA (Table 14) indicated that there was a significant difference in mean levels of W2FC based on type of work (F(3, 308) = 3.729; p < .05) and a significant difference in mean levels of F2WC based on type of work (F(3, 308) = 4.085; p < .01). Given these significant differences, Work type was included the subsequent regression analyses as a work control variable.

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test determined significant differences between multiple comparisons of the categories of Work type (see Appendix I, Table A3). In the W2FC model, Professional differed significantly across work type from Non-managerial (p < .01), and in the F2WC model Professional differed significantly from Non-managerial (p < .05) and from Managerial (p < .01).
### Table 14
**One-way ANOVA Comparing the Work-type Categories on W2FC and F2WC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2FC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>333.444</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2WC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.873</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.624</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>273.271</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 311$. $df =$ degrees of freedom. $F =$ $F$ distribution statistic

**Indian generation status.**

An ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of $W2FC$ and $F2WC$ differed significantly based on their generation of Indian immigrant status in SA. Four generational categories were measured: first, second, third and fourth generation Indian immigrant was measured. Participants’ levels of $W2FC$ ($F(3, 219) = .703; p = .551$) and their mean levels of $F2WC$ ($F(3, 219) = 1.135; p = .336$) did not differ significantly based on their generation of Indian immigrant status in SA.

**Level of highest education.**

An ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of $W2FC$ and $F2WC$ differed significantly based on their highest level of education. Four categories were measured: less than matric (grade 12), matric (grade 12), an undergrad degree/diploma and a postgraduate degree. Participants’ mean levels of $W2FC$ ($F(3, 310) = 1.552; p = .201$) and their mean levels of $F2WC$ ($F(3, 310) = 1.030; p = .380$) did not differ significantly based on their level of education.

**Annual household income.**

An ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of $W2FC$ and $F2WC$ differed significantly based on their annual household income. Seven categories were measured ranging from R0 - R55 000 income per annum to R1 3000 001 plus income per annum. Participants’ mean levels of $W2FC$ ($F(6, 252) = .775; p = .590$) and their mean levels of $F2WC$ ($F(6, 252) = .842; p = .539$) did not differ significantly based on their annual household income.
Identification with Indian language group.

An ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of W2FC and F2WC differed significantly based on their identification with a distinct Indian language group. Four language group categories were measured: Tamil, Gujarati, Telugu, and Hindi. Participants’ mean levels of W2FC ($F(3, 297) = .269; p = .848$) and their mean levels of F2WC ($F(3, 297) = .692; p = .557$) did not differ significantly based on their identification with a distinct Indian language group.

Primary identity.

An ANOVA was conducted to examine if the participants’ levels of W2FC and F2WC differed significantly based on their perceived primary identification with being more Hindu or more South African. Four categories of perceived primary identity were measured: Hindu, Hindu-South African, South African-Hindu, and South African. Participants’ mean levels of W2FC ($F(3, 302) = 1.113; p = .344$) and their mean levels of F2WC ($F(3, 302) = .245; p = .865$) did not differ significantly based on their perceived primary identity.

As a result of the non-significant results presented from the ANOVAs above, Indian generation status, Educational level, Income, Indian language group, and Primary identity were not included as control variables in the subsequent regression analyses.

Standard and hierarchical multiple regression analyses.

Multiple regression analyses were performed to establish the work and family stressors as antecedents of W2FC and F2WC in order to test Propositions 1(a – b), 2 (a – b), 3 (a – d), and 4 (a – d). The analyses were performed using SPSS REGRESSION and SPSS EXPLORE for evaluating the assumptions. The analyses of the assumptions of regression analysis did not suggest any data transformations but did suggest that one multivariate outlier be removed and this was done (see Chapter 4 for details). All subsequent analyses were conducted on the sample excluding the deleted outlier ($N$ was reduced to 317).

Work stressors as antecedents of W2FC.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to determine if the work stressors, Work involvement and Work overload, explained levels of W2FC beyond that explained by the control variables Work hours and Work type. A two-step model was used. The first step
introduced the two work domain control variables, *Work hours* and *Work-type* (dummy variables). The second step added the within-domain work stressors, *Work overload* and *Work involvement*, as antecedent variables to the model.

Table 15 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals after Step 2, $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and change in $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero after each step. After Step 2, with all the predictors in the equation, $R^2 = .42$, $F(6, 304) = 35.99$ ($p = .0001$), indicating that the overall model was significant.

After Step 1, having introduced the work control variables in the equation, $R^2 = .08$, $F_{inc}(4, 306) = 6.94$, $p = .0001$. After Step 2, with the addition of the work stressor variables, $R^2 = .33$, $F_{inc}(2, 304) = 86.35$, $p = .0001$. The addition of the work stressors to the equation results in a significant increment in $R^2$ ($\Delta R^2 = .332; p = .0001$). This pattern of results suggests that the work stressors explained a third of the variance in *W2FC* above and beyond the control variables.

Table 15

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Work Stressors as Antecedents of W2FC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-to-family conflict</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1 $\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>.229***</td>
<td>.112*</td>
<td>[.024, .221]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>[-.134, .325]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.134**</td>
<td>[.079, .530]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>[-.152, .665]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td>[.034, .244]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>.549***</td>
<td>[.529, .739]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.332***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$. W2FC = work-to-family conflict; CI = confidence interval. $f^2 = .546$; Post-hoc power of this model: 100% (Step 2). $N = 311$.  

Considering the unique variance explained by the individual variables in the equation, in Step 1, *Work hours* ($\beta = .229; p = .0001$) and *Professional work type* ($\beta = .200; p = .002$) were the only significant predictors of *W2FC*. In Step 2, *Work hours* ($\beta = .112; p = .015$) and
Professional work type ($\beta = .134; p = .008$), Work involvement ($\beta = .119, p = .010$), and Work overload ($\beta = .549; p = .0001$) were significant predictors. Therefore propositions 1a and 1b were confirmed, that Work involvement and Work overload are positively related to W2FC amongst Hindu working women in SA, even after controlling for Work hours and Work type.

For a sample of $N = 311$ and a total of six predictors in Step 2 of the hierarchical multiple regression model, post hoc power analysis showed more than adequate power $(1 - \beta) = 100\%$ to detect the significant results for a large effect size of .546 (Cohen, 1988). The assumptions of multiple regression analysis were examined. The ratio of cases to variables, was well above the preferred 20:1 ratio (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residuals (see Appendix J, Figure A3) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about the predicted W2FC scores was about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions. Tests for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.030 – 1.327, which is far below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .751 to .968, which is greater than the suggested .1 cut-off (Hair et al. 2010). A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.

**Work stressors as antecedents of F2WC.**

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to determine if the work stressors, Work involvement and Work overload, explained the levels of F2WC beyond that explained by the control variables Work hours and Work type. A two-step model was performed. The first step introduced the two work domain control variables, Work hours and Work-type (dummy variable). The second step added the within-domain work stressors, Work overload and Work involvement as antecedent variables to the model.

Table 16 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and change in $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero after each step. After Step 2, with all the predictors in the equation, $R^2 = .23$, $F(6, 304) = 14.72, p = .0001$, indicating that the overall model was significant.
After Step 1, having introduced the work control variables in the equation, $R^2 = .02$, $F_{inc} (4, 306) = 2.77, p = .027$. After Step 2, with the addition of the work stressor variables, $R^2 = .21$, $F_{inc} (2, 304) = 37.30, p = .0001$. The addition of the work stressors to the equation resulted in a significant increment in $R^2 (\Delta R^2 = .190, p = .0001)$. This pattern of results suggests that the work stressors explain about a fifth of the variability in $F2WC$ above and beyond the control variables.

Considering the unique variance explained by the individual variables in the equation, in Step 1, *Professional work type* ($\beta = .161; p = .012$) was the only significant predictor of $F2WC$. In Step 2, *Work hours* ($\beta = -.109; p = .038$), *Work involvement* ($\beta = .107, p = .044$), and *Work overload* ($\beta = .408; p = .0001$) explained a significant proportion of variance in $W2FC$. Therefore propositions 2a and 2b were confirmed, that Work involvement and Work overload are significant cross-domain antecedents of $F2WC$ amongst Hindu working women in SA, even after controlling for Work hours and Work type.

Table 16
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis: Work Stressors as Antecedents of $F2WC$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family-to-work conflict</th>
<th>Model 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.109*</td>
<td>[-.211, -.006]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>[-.365, .111]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>[-.005, .463]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>[-.108, .740]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.107*</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.003, .222]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td></td>
<td>.408***</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.315, .534]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.190***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$. F2WC = family-to-work conflict CI = confidence interval, $f^2 = .224$; Post-hoc power of this model: 100% (Step 2). N = 311.

The post hoc power analysis conducted for a sample size of $N = 311$, with $\alpha = .05$, and six predictors in the final step of the hierarchical multiple regression model, yielded more than adequate power of 100% for a medium effect size ($f^2 = .224$) (Cohen, 1988). The ratio of cases to variables was above the preferred 20:1 ratio (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An
inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A4) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity was detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores were about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2007). Tests for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.033 – 1.331, which is far below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .754 to .968, which is greater than 0.1 (Hair et al., 2010). A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.

**Family stressors as antecedents of F2WC.**

A standard multiple regression analysis was performed between F2WC as the dependent variable and the within-domain family stressors, Family involvement, Extended family overload, Parental overload, and Food-work overload as the independent variables. No family domain control variables were included (because of the non-significant ANOVA results presented above).

Table 17 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals, as well as $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero ($F(4, 257) = 29.99$, $p = .0001$), with $R^2$ at .318 indicating that the model was significant. This pattern of results suggests that almost a third of the variability in F2WC was predicted by the family stressors, Family involvement, Extended family overload, Parental overload, and Food-work overload.

Considering the unique variance explained by each predictor variable, all four family stressors, Family involvement ($\beta = -.120; p = .023$), Extended family overload ($\beta = .208; p = .001$), Parental overload ($\beta = .261, p = .0001$), and Food-work overload ($\beta = .263; p = .0001$) explained a significant proportion of variance in F2WC confirming propositions 3a – 3d. Although for proposition 3a (Family involvement is positively related to F2WC), the finding was in the opposite direction to that expected (i.e. Family involvement is negatively related to F2WC).
The post hoc power analysis of the multiple regression model was calculated for $N = 262$, with four predictors variables and $\alpha = .05$, yielding a power of 100% for a large effect size of .466 (Cohen, 1988). Therefore there was adequate power to detect with multiple regression analysis the significant results found. The assumptions of multiple regression analysis were examined. The ratio of cases to variables was above the preferred 20:1 ratio (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A5) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores was about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Tests for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.034 – 1.430, which is far below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .699 to .967, which is greater than 0.1 (Hair et al., 2010). A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.

**Family stressors as antecedents of W2FC.**

A standard multiple regression analysis was performed between W2FC as the dependent variable and the cross-domain family stressors, *Family involvement*, *Extended family overload*, *Parental overload*, and *Food-work overload* as the independent variables. As in the F2WC model shown above in Table 17, no family domain control variables were included, based on the non-significant ANOVA results presented above.

### Table 17

**Standard Multiple Regression Analysis: Family Stressors as Antecedents of F2WC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family stressors</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.120*</td>
<td>[-.328, -.024]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family Overload</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.208***</td>
<td>[.078, .296]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.261***</td>
<td>[.134, .327]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.263***</td>
<td>[.138, .374]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$.318

Adjusted $R^2$.308***

Note. *$p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. F2WC = family-to-work conflict; CI = confidence interval. $f^2 = .466$; Post-hoc power of this model: 100 %. $N = 262$
Table 18 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero ($F(4, 258) = 27.73, p = .0001$), with $R^2$ at .301 indicating that the model was significant. This pattern of results suggests that just less than a third of the variability in $W2FC$ is predicted by the family stressors, Family involvement, Extended family overload, Parental overload, and Food-work overload, confirming cross-domain effects.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family stressors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-.169**</td>
<td>[-.432, -.103]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family Overload</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.272***</td>
<td>[.146, .384]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.220***</td>
<td>[.105, .316]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>[.079, .336]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.290***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. W2FC = work-to-family conflict; CI = confidence interval. $f^2 = .431$; Post-hoc power of this model: 100%. $N = 263$.

Considering the unique variance explained by each predictor variable, all four family stressors, Family involvement ($\beta = -.169; p = .002$), Extended family overload ($\beta = .272; p = .0001$), Parental overload ($\beta = .220; p = .0001$), and Food-work overload ($\beta = .196; p = .002$) explained a significant proportion of variance in $W2FC$ confirming propositions 4a – 4d. Although for proposition 4a (Family involvement is positively related to W2FC), the finding was in the opposite direction to that expected (i.e. Family involvement is negatively related to W2FC).

The post hoc power calculated with $N = 263$, $\alpha = .05$, and a large effect size of .431 (Cohen, 1988) was 100% and therefore adequate power to detect with multiple regression analysis the significant results found. The assumptions of multiple regression analysis were examined. The ratio of cases to variables was above the preferred 20:1 ratio (using four predictor variables) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A6) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity was detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores were
about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Tests for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.033 – 1.430, which is well below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .699 to .968, which is greater than 0.1 (Hair et al., 2010). A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.

Antecedent and Buffering Effects of Social Support on Same-domain WFC relationships

Moderated hierarchical multiple regression analyses.

Moderated hierarchical regression analyses was performed in order to establish whether the work and family social support variables had a direct predictive effect on WFC and whether social support also buffered the negative effects of the roles stressors on the same-domain WFC amongst Hindu working women in SA. To establish the moderating effects, interaction terms were created by multiplying the centred scores (e.g. supervisor support x work overload). Although interactions among continuous variables are less common, they serve the purpose of establishing whether the regression coefficient varies over the range of another independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The interaction terms were added as a two-way interaction effect in a separate step of the hierarchical regression after the main predictors, also mean centred, were entered into the regression equation.

Work social support, work role stressors, and W2FC.

As the hierarchical regression analysis shown in Table 15 and 16 indicated that the control variables Work type and Work hours explained very little variance in W2FC, these control variables were omitted from subsequent analyses. A two-step model was performed. In the first step, the two work stressor variables, Work overload and Work involvement, and the two work support variables, Supervisor support and Co-worker support were entered as main effects. In the second step, the following interaction terms were added:

- Work overload x Supervisor support,
- Work involvement x Supervisor support,
- Work overload x Co-worker support, and
Table 19 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients (β), their significant p-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as R², adjusted R², and change in R². R was significantly different from zero after both steps (F (8, 285) = 25.12, p = .0001) indicating overall regression model significance. In Step 1, having introduced the work stressor and work support variables in the equation, R² = .39, Finc (4, 289) = 46.108, p = .0001. In Step 2 after introducing the interaction terms, change in R² = .024 (Finc (4, 285) = 2.92, p = .022).

In Step 1, Work overload (β = .544, p = .0001) and Work involvement (β = .161, p = .001) explained significant variance in W2FC. Co-worker support was nearing significance (p = .56), and Supervisor support was not a significant predictor of W2FC. In Step 2, Work involvement and Work overload continued to explain significant variance in W2FC (see Table 19). Co-worker support explained significant variance in W2FC (β = -.143; p = .008) confirming proposition 5b, but Supervisor support remained not significant, providing no support for proposition 5a. Of the interaction terms entered in Step 2, Co-worker support interacted with Work involvement to produce a significant increment in the amount of variance explained in W2FC. The direction of the beta weight for Work involvement (B = .206; p = .0001) and the beta coefficient value for the interaction term Work involvement x Co-worker support (B = -.141; p = .043) indicates that the relationship between Work involvement and W2FC approximates zero when Co-worker support is high. However, when Co-worker support is low, the relationship between Work Involvement and W2FC is stronger (see Figure 9 for a visual interpretation of the significant interaction). Additionally, Co-worker support interacted with Work overload to produce a significant increment in the amount of variance explained in W2FC. The direction of the beta weight for Work overload (B = .577, p = .0001) and the beta coefficient value for the interaction term Work overload x Co-worker support (B = .148; p = .007) indicates that the positive relationship between Work overload and W2FC is stronger when Co-worker support is low (see Figure 10 for a visual interpretation of the significant interaction). Therefore, propositions 7a and 7b are supported: Co-worker support has a buffering effect on the relationship between work role stressors and W2FC for Hindu working women in SA. On the other hand, Supervisor support did not interact significantly with Work Involvement or with Work overload to produce significant variance in W2FC. Hence propositions 6a and 6b are not supported.
Table 19

Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Work Roles Stressors and Work Social Support Predicting W2FC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work-to-family conflict</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1 (\beta)</td>
<td>Model 2 (\beta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>.161***</td>
<td>.176***</td>
<td>[.093, .319]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>.544***</td>
<td>.496***</td>
<td>[.459, .695]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.143**</td>
<td>[-.132, .069]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>[-.272, -.042]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement × Co-worker Support</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.031, .204]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload × Co-worker Support</td>
<td>.142**</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.278, -.004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement × Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.074, .138]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload × Supervisor Support</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td>[.041, .255]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted (R^2)</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *\(p < .05\); **\(p < .01\); ***\(p < .00\). W2FC = work-to-family conflict. CI = confidence interval. \(f^2 = .041\); Post-hoc power of this model: 80%. \(N = 294\).

The post hoc power for multiple regression analysis was calculated for a sample size of \(N = 294\) and eight predictors in in the final regression model, yielding adequate power of 80% for an effect size of \(f^2 = .041\). Based on an examination of the multiple regression assumptions for the model with the interaction terms included, the ratio of cases to variables was above the preferred 20:1 ratio (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A7) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores was about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Tests for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.110 – 1.634, which is well below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .785 to .901, which is greater than 0.1 (Hair et al. 2010). A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.
Figure 9. Interaction between Work involvement and Co-worker support in predicting W2FC.

Figure 10. Interaction between Work overload and Co-worker support in predicting W2FC.
Family social support, family role stressors, and F2WC.

Family social support was examined as an antecedent of F2WC and as a buffer to the negative effects of family stressors on F2WC. The moderated multiple regression analyses were first conducted separately for each form of social support (extended family support, spousal support, and paid domestic support) and their interactions with the four family role stressors (family involvement, extended family overload, parental overload, and food-work overload) in predicting F2WC. The results of the separate models were compared to those of the combined model and no major differences were noted. Hence for parsimony, the overall model is used.

Using moderated multiple regression analysis (Aiken & West, 1991), a two-step model was performed. The first step introduced the four family stressor variables (Extended family overload, Family involvement, Parental overload, and Food-work overload) and the three family support variables (Extended family support, Spousal support, and Paid domestic support). In the second step, the twelve interaction terms were added to the model:

- Extended family overload x Extended family support, Extended family overload x Spousal support, Extended family overload x Paid domestic support,
- Parental overload x Extended family support, Parental overload x Spousal support, Parental overload x Paid domestic support,
- Family involvement x Extended family support, Family involvement x Spousal support, Family involvement x Paid domestic support,
- Food-work overload x Extended family support, Food-work overload x Spousal support, and Food-work overload x Paid domestic support.

Table 20 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and change in $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero after each step. After Step 2, with all the interaction terms in the model, $R^2 = .46$, $F(19, 220) = 9.90$ ($p = .0001$), indicating that the overall model was significant.

In Step 1, concerning the main effects of family support variables on F2WC, Spousal support ($\beta = -.185; p = .002$) and Paid domestic support ($\beta = .237; p = .0001$) explained a significant proportion of the variance in F2WC. In Step 2, the change in $R^2$ was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .056$;
Spousal support ($\beta = -.175; p = .005$) and Paid domestic support ($\beta = .212; p = .0001$) continued to explain significant unique variance in $F2WC$ above that of the shared variance. Therefore proposition 8b was confirmed; however regarding proposition 8c, the direction of the beta weight was opposite to that proposed. That is, the availability of paid domestic help appears to increase as opposed to reduce levels of $F2WC$ for women in this sample. Contrary to expectations, Extended family support did not explain any variance in $F2WC$ and there was therefore no support for proposition 8a.

Table 20

Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Family Stressors and Family Social Support Predicting $F2WC$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 $\beta$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>[-.377 .298]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Overload</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>[-.127 .373]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload</td>
<td>.213***</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>[-.107 .370]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload</td>
<td>.273***</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>[-.292 .249]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family Support</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>[-.085 .127]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal Support</td>
<td>-.185**</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
<td>[-.283 -.051]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Support</td>
<td>.237***</td>
<td>.212***</td>
<td>[.252 .747]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement x Extended Family Support</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>[.014 .345]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Overload x Extended Family Support</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>[-.121 .085]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload x Extended Family Support</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>[-.054 .152]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload x Extended Family Support</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>[.051 .190]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement x Spousal Support</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>[-.161 .186]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Overload x Spousal Support</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>[-.090 .139]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload x Spousal Support</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>[-.058 .159]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload x Spousal Support</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>[-.185 .105]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement x Domestic Support</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>[-.404 .342]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Overload x Domestic Support</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>[-.206 .369]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Overload x Domestic Support</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>[-.194 .333]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work Overload x Domestic Support</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>[.041 .641]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ = .404; Adjusted $R^2$ = .386; $\Delta R^2 = .056$. Post-hoc power of this model: 97%. $N = 240$.^

Note. *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$. $F2WC$ = family-to-work conflict; CI = confidence interval. $f^2$ = .104; Post-hoc power of this model: 97%. $N = 240$.^
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Of all the interaction terms entered into the equation, only the interaction term *Food-work overload x Paid domestic support* produced a significant increment in the amount of variance explained in *F2WC*. The results indicate that when there is no paid domestic support, there is no significant relationship between *Food-work overload* and *F2WC* (*B* = -.022, *p* = 0.875). With domestic support in play, the relationship between *Food-work overload* and *F2WC* is positive, inferring that *Food-work overload* is a stressor in the presence of *Paid domestic support* for Hindu working women in SA. Therefore none of the forms of family support were significant buffers on the family role stressor-*F2WC* relationships. Accordingly propositions 9a – 9c, 10a – 10c, and 11a – 11c were not supported. The interaction between *Food-work overload* and *Paid domestic support* in predicting W2FC however produced a reverse-buffering effect.

Post hoc power (1 – *β*) for hierarchical multiple regression analysis conducted on *N* = 240 with 19 predictors in Step 2, was 97% for a small effect size (*f*² = .104) (Cohen, 1988). Therefore there was adequate statistical power to detect a significant result. Based on an examination of the multiple regression assumptions for the model with the interaction terms included, all the assumptions were met. Although the ratio of cases to variables was below the preferred 20:1 ratio (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), the number of cases to IV ratio met the minimum requirement according to Green’s (1991) simple rule of thumb. An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A8) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality, no major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores were about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Regarding tests for multicollinearity between the predictor variables, VIF scores ranged from 1.019 – 8.038 and tolerance statistics ranged between .124 to .709. Including interaction terms induced some multicollinearity, however as it was very low, there was no reason for concerns. A test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample. Figure 11 shows the two-way interaction between *Paid domestic support* (moderator) and *Food-work overload* (independent variable) in the prediction of *F2WC* (dependent variable) in order to interpret the significant interaction visually.
Moderating effects of cultural dimensions on the role stressor – same-domain WFC relationships.

Moderated multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the potential moderating effect of the cultural dimensions on the relationships between role stressors and same-domain WFC. Specifically, GRI, and work hierarchy orientation were examined as moderators on the work stressors-W2FC relationships in order to test propositions 12a, 12b, 14a, and 14b. While, GRI and family hierarchy orientation were examined as moderators of the family stressors-F2WC relationships in order to test propositions 13a – 13d and 15a – 15d.

Work stressors, cultural dimensions, and W2FC.

The possible moderating effects of the cultural dimensions, GRI and Work hierarchy orientation, on the relationships between Work overload and Work involvement with W2FC were examined. A two-step model was performed. The first step introduced the two work demand variables, Work overload and Work involvement, and the two cultural dimensions,
GRI and Work hierarchy orientation. In the second step, the following interaction terms were added to the model:

- Work overload x GRI,
- Work involvement x GRI,
- Work overload x Work hierarchy orientation, and
- Work involvement x Work hierarchy orientation.

Table 21 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and change in $R^2$. $R$ was significantly different from zero after each step. After Step 2, with all the interaction terms in the model, $R^2 = .45$, $F(8, 308) = 9.90$, $p = .0001$, indicating that the overall model was significant. The change in $R^2$ of .02 was small but significant ($p = .021$), the adjusted $R^2$ being .43. In Step 1, Work involvement ($\beta = .108$, $p = .019$), Work overload ($\beta = .551$, $p = .0001$) and GRI ($\beta = .147$, $p = .003$) explained unique significant variance in W2FC. In Step 2, Work involvement ($\beta = .121$, $p = .009$), Work overload ($\beta = .530$, $p = .0001$) and GRI ($\beta = .157$, $p = .001$) continued to explain unique significant variance in W2FC. Only the interaction term Work involvement x GRI produced a significant proportion of variance in W2FC. Therefore even though GRI explained unique variance in W2FC, when interacting with Work involvement it improved the accuracy of predicting W2FC. The beta coefficient of Work involvement ($B = .141$, $p = .009$) and the beta value of the interaction term Work involvement x GRI ($B = -.189$; $p = .001$) indicates that as GRI values get higher (more traditional), the relationship between Work involvement and W2FC gets weaker. That is, Hindu working women in SA with a traditional GRI experience less W2FC from work involvement than their egalitarian counterparts. Thus proposition 12a is supported that Hindu women with an egalitarian GRI will experience a stronger Work Involvement-W2FC relationship than their traditional counterparts. Figure 12 shows the interaction between GRI (moderator) and Work involvement (independent variable) in the prediction of W2FC (dependent variable) in order to interpret the significant interaction visually.

GRI did not moderate the relationship between Work overload and W2FC ($\beta = .054$, $p = .271$, n.s.) and Work hierarchy orientation did not moderate the relationships between Work overload and W2FC ($\beta = -.051$, $p = .430$, n.s.) and between Work involvement and W2FC ($\beta$
=.078, \( p = .227, n.s. \)). Hence the findings of this study provide no support for propositions 12b, 14a, and 14b.

Table 21
Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Work Role Stressors and Cultural Dimensions Predicting W2FC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 ( \beta )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.121**</td>
<td>[.036, .246]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>.551***</td>
<td>.530***</td>
<td>[.507, .714]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hierarchy Orientation</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>[-.020, .221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>[.069, .284]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement x Work Hierarchy Orientation</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>[-.048, .202]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload x Work Hierarchy Orientation</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>[-.177, .076]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement x GRI</td>
<td>-.166**</td>
<td>-.166**</td>
<td>[-.302, -.077]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload x GRI</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>[.048, .172]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \) | .426 | .447 |
\( Adjusted R^2 \) | .419 | .433 |
\( \Delta R^2 \) | .021* |

Note. *\( p < .05 \); **\( p < .01 \); ***\( p < .001 \). W2FC = Work-to-family conflict.; GRI = gender role ideology; CI = confidence intervals. \( f^2 = .038 \); Post-hoc power of this model: 80\%. \( N = 317 \).

The post hoc power calculated with \( N = 317 \) and eight predictors in the final model was 80% (for an effect size of \( f^2 = .038 \)). Therefore there was adequate power to detect with hierarchical multiple regression analysis the significant results found. The model was assessed for meeting the assumptions of multiple regression analysis according to criteria stipulated in the Chapter 4. The ratio of cases to variables was above the recommended 20:1 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A9) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted W2FC scores was about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2007). A test for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores ranged from 1.121 – 2.312, which is well below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics ranged between .433 to .892, which is greater than 0.1 (Hair et al., 2010). The test for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.
Figure 12. Interaction between Work involvement and GRI in predicting W2FC.

Family stressors, cultural dimensions, and F2WC.

The possible moderating effects of cultural dimensions (i.e., GRI and family hierarchy orientation) on the relationships between family stressors and F2WC was examined. A two-step model was performed. The first step introduced the four family stressor variables (Extended family overload, Parental overload, Family involvement, and Food-work overload), and the two cultural dimensions (GRI and Family hierarchy orientation) to the equation. In the second step, the following interaction terms were added to the equation:

- Extended family overload $\times$ GRI, Parental overload $\times$ GRI, Family involvement $\times$ GRI, Food-work overload $\times$ GRI,
- Extended family overload $\times$ Family hierarchy orientation, Parental overload $\times$ Family hierarchy orientation, Family involvement $\times$ Family hierarchy orientation, and Food-work overload $\times$ Family hierarchy orientation.

Table 22 presents the regression model and indicates the standardised regression coefficients ($\beta$), their significant $p$-values, the confidence intervals in Step 2, as well as $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and change in $R^2$. Although $R$ was significantly different from zero after both steps ($F$ (14,
indicating overall regression model significance, in Step 2 after introducing the interaction terms, change in $R^2 = .03$ ($F_{inc} (8, 247) = 1.46, p = .173$) was not significant. Hence the combined variance of the interaction terms did not explain additional variance in $F2WC$.}

In Step 1, Family involvement ($\beta = -.109; p = .032$), Extended family overload ($\beta = .152; p = .012$), Parental overload ($\beta = .262; p = .0001$), Food-work overload ($\beta = .168; p = .008$), and Family hierarchy orientation ($\beta = .254; p = .0001$) explained significant unique variance in $F2WC$. In Step 2, all four family stressors remained significant predictors of $F2WC$: Family involvement ($\beta = -.106; p = .039$), Extended family overload ($\beta = .161; p = .009$), Parental overload ($\beta = .256; p = .0001$), Food-work overload ($\beta = .163; p = .011$) and Family hierarchy orientation ($\beta = .189; p = .006$) explained unique variance in $F2WC$. Of the
interaction terms added in Step 2, only the interaction term Family involvement x Family hierarchy orientation explained unique variance in F2WC. Therefore even though Family hierarchy orientation explained unique variance in F2WC, when interacting with Family involvement it improved the accuracy of predicting F2WC. The direction of the beta weight for Family involvement ($B = -.156; p = .039$) and the beta coefficient value for the interaction term Family involvement x Family hierarchy orientation ($B = .201; p = .040$) indicates that as hierarchy orientation in the family role increases, the negative relationship between family involvement and F2WC becomes weaker. Hence Hindu working women in SA with lower family hierarchy orientation experience reduced F2WC when their family involvement is high than Hindu working women with higher family hierarchy orientation.

Contrary to the expectations, Family hierarchy orientation did not moderate the relationships between the other family stressors (Extended family overload, Parental overload, and Food-work overload) and F2WC. Therefore propositions 15b, 15c, and 15d were not supported. Similarly GRI did not moderate any of the family stressor-F2WC relationships thus propositions 13a – 13d were not confirmed. Figure 13 shows the interaction between Family hierarchy orientation (moderator) and Family involvement (independent variable) in the prediction of F2WC (dependent variable) in order to interpret the significant interaction visually.

The post hoc power calculated with $N = 262$ and 14 predictors in the final model was 74% (for an effect size of $f^2 = .047$), which is nearing the recommended 80%. The ratio of cases to variables was 19:1, slightly below the recommended 20:1 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), however exceeded the minimum cases to IV ratio using Green’s (1991) simple rule of thumb. An inspection of the histograms and normal probability plots of standardised residual (see Appendix J, Figure A10) indicated that the residual distributions did not deviate severely from normality. No major discrepancies for linearity were detected, and the variance of the residuals about predicted F2WC scores was about the same for all the independent variable scores with only slight under and over predictions (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2007). A test for multicollinearity indicated no concerns for multicollinearity between the predictor variables. All VIF scores were far below the value of 10 and tolerance statistics were well above 0.1 (Hair et al., 2010). Tests for multivariate outliers showed that the regression model was stable across the sample.
Figure 13. Interaction between Family involvement and Family hierarchy orientation in predicting F2WC.

Table 23 summarises the main findings of this study based on the analyses of the results in this chapter. The findings are presented with reference to the propositions set out in Chapter 3.
### Summary of the Study’s Propositions and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role stressors as antecedents of W2FC and F2WC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1: Work stressors: (a) work involvement, and (b) work overload positively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Supported (b) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2: Work stressors: (a) work involvement, and (b) work overload positively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Supported (b) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3: Family stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload positively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Significant inverse relationship (b) Supported (c) Supported (d) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4: Family stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work positively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Significant inverse relationship (b) Supported (c) Supported (d) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role support, role stressors and same domain WFC (Antecedent and buffering effects)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 5: Work social support from one’s (a) supervisor and (b) co-workers negatively relates to W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 6: Supervisor support will buffer the effects of (a) work involvement and (b) work overload on W2FC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7: Co-worker support will buffer the effects of (a) work involvement and (b) work overload on W2FC among Hindu working women in South Africa.</td>
<td>(a) Supported (b) Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8: Family social support from one’s (a) extended family, (b) spouse, and (c) paid domestic helper negatively relates to F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Supported (c) Significant inverse relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 9: Extended family support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload on F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported (c) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 10: Spousal support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, and (c) food-work overload on F2WC amongst Hindu working women in South Africa.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported (c) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 11: Paid domestic support will buffer the effects of (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload on F2WC among Hindu working women in SA.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported (c) Significant reverse buffering effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23
**Summary of the Study’s Propositions and Findings (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural dimensions, role stressors, and same domain WFC (Moderating effects)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 12: GRI moderates the relationship between work stressors and W2FC such that egalitarian Hindu working women in SA will experience a stronger relationship between work role stressors: (a) work involvement and (b) work overload and W2FC than their traditionalist counterparts.</td>
<td>(a) Supported (b) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 13: GRI moderates the relationship between family stressors and F2WC such that traditional Hindu working women in SA will experience a stronger relationship between family role stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (d) food-work overload and F2WC than their egalitarian counterparts.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported (c) Not supported (d) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 14: Work hierarchy orientation moderates the relationship between work stressors and W2FC such that Hindu working women in SA with a high hierarchical orientation will experience a stronger relationship between work role stressors: (a) work involvement and (b) work overload and W2FC than those with a low hierarchy orientation.</td>
<td>(a) Not supported (b) Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 15: Family hierarchy orientation moderates the relationship between family stressors and F2WC such that Hindu working women in SA with a high hierarchical orientation will experience a stronger relationship between family role stressors: (a) family involvement, (b) extended family overload, (c) parental overload, and (c) food-work overload and F2WC than those with a low hierarchy orientation.</td>
<td>(a) Significant moderating effect on inverse relationship (b) Not Supported (c) Not supported (d) Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

This exploratory study was a response to repeated calls to examine the cultural dynamics at the work-family interface (Casper et al., 2014). Contextually salient antecedents of WFC were examined for an under-researched cultural subgroup of Hindu working women in South Africa (SA). The explanatory model, which emerged from conceptual themes in the qualitative data and integrated with constructs in existing research, allowed for both similarities and differences to be identified with existing WFC frameworks. It is acknowledged that many of the antecedents in the explanatory model for this study were similar to those captured in current WFC models. This is not surprising given that there is a record of multi-cultural application of established WFC models (e.g. Aryee et al., 2005, Lu et al. 2009). A specific contribution of this study was the identification of a new antecedent of WFC, food-work overload, which emerged from the qualitative data analysis. The inclusion of context-specific cultural orientations in the design of the study provided a nuanced account of the effects of these orientations on WFC experiences and enabled the investigation of within-group WFC differences. Additionally, work and family hierarchy were measured separately. In so doing, this study offers insight that cultural beliefs may differ across the family and work domains for an individual due to different socialisation processes and cultural influences. The findings of the study support the development of “culture-centric” WFC models to gain a refined understanding of the work-family interface (Billing et al., 2013, p 15).

This final chapter begins with a summary of the findings regarding the study’s propositions and discusses these findings in view of current work-family literature. More specifically, it begins with a discussion of the patterns of self-reported WFC by the study participants followed by a summary of the findings on the validity and reliability of WFC in this sample. The findings regarding the relationships in the explanatory model of WFC among Hindu working women in SA are then discussed. The second, third, and fourth parts explain the study’s theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions respectively. This is followed by a discussion of the study’s limitations and recommendations for future research. Finally, concluding notes are presented on the overall significance of the study’s findings.
Patterns of Self-reported WFC among Hindu Working Women in SA

Prior to this study, little was known about the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA. The findings suggest that work and family may have distinct meanings in different cultural contexts. Both the mean levels of W2FC ($M = 2.691; SD = 1.048$) and F2WC ($M = 2.290; SD = .949$) were below the mid-point of three on a five-point scale. Lower levels of self-reported WFC have likewise been reported among samples from more collectivist cultures suggesting that work and family are viewed as more integrated in these cultures (Grywacz et al., 2007; Spector et al., 2004; Thein et al., 2010). The results also show that similar to prior studies, W2FC was higher than F2WC (Casper et al., 2011), although only very slightly. Amstad et al. (2011) explain that this is likely because family boundaries are more permeable allowing work to interfere more easily with the family domain than the other way around. In the case of Hindu working women in SA, their low levels of WFC (particularly F2WC) may also be attributed to their socialisation from an early age to understand their role in the family as a wife, mother, and daughter-in-law. Hence, given the importance of family in this cultural context, when these women decide to pursue their education and work opportunities, they are less likely to perceive their family role interfering with their work.

Portability of the WFC Measure

All the subscales used to measure the constructs in this study were robust in meeting acceptable standards of validity and reliability. In particular, the results of the confirmatory factor analysis show that Netermeyer et al.’s (1996) bi-directional measure of WFC, in which the two factors correlated, was the best representation of the data when compared to a uni-dimensional and two-factor uncorrelated model. The high reliability coefficients shown for this scale in this study (W2FC = .946 and F2WC = .946) were also consistent with Netermeyer et al.’s findings. The reliability and validity findings relating to this measure confirm its portability across contexts in measuring the bi-directional WFC construct.

Antecedents of WFC among Hindu Working Women in SA

Based on the findings of the qualitative exploration and the theoretically and empirically supported relationships found in work-family literature, a set of culturally salient antecedents
was included in an explanatory model of WFC for Hindu working women in SA. More specifically, work and family role stressors (role involvement and role overload) were examined as within- and cross-domain antecedents of WFC. As little is known about the way in which social support affects WFC, distinct forms of work and family social support were examined as antecedents of same-domain WFC and buffers of the role stressor - same-domain WFC relationships.

**Role stressors as within-domain and cross-domain antecedents of WFC.**

The study findings show that a significant amount of variance in W2FC and F2WC can be explained by role stressors in the originating domain of the conflict. Furthermore, the notion that role stressors from work and family are also antecedents of cross-domain WFC is also supported. Examining within-domain as well as cross-domain antecedents of WFC in the study facilitates a more accurate understanding of the factors producing WFC for Hindu working women in SA. Overall, 42% of the variance in W2FC and 23% of the variance in F2WC was explained by work stressors. At the same time, 32% of the variance in F2WC and 30% of the variance in W2FC was explained by family stressors. The relationship between each form of role stressor and WFC is discussed below in the context of this particular cultural milieu.

**Work involvement as an antecedent of WFC.**

The findings of this study support work involvement as an antecedent of both W2FC and F2WC for Hindu working women in SA. Involvement in the work role occupies time and energy resources making it more challenging to fulfil the extensive family responsibilities of Hindu women thereby increasing W2FC. These findings are consistent with those of studies conducted in diverse contexts including the US (e.g. Gordon & Rouse, 2011), in Nigeria (e.g. Adekola) and in China (e.g. Li et al., 2010). Hindu women in SA whose involvement in their work role is high may also perceive that their family duties prevent them from adequately meeting their work role responsibilities thus increasing F2WC. Aryee et al. (2005), in their study, also show support for the cross-domain work involvement-F2WC relationship among Indian parents in India, whereas Michel et al.’s (2011) meta-analytical findings conducted mainly on Anglo samples found no significant relationship. These contrasting findings suggest that the cultural context influences salient antecedents of WFC. In other words, in
Indian culture, family values may underpin the significant relationship between work involvement and F2WC.

**Family role involvement as an antecedent of WFC.**

Family role involvement contributed significantly to reduced F2WC and W2FC in the present study, confirming a within-domain and cross-domain effect respectively. However, rather than being a stressor antecedent (as reflected in several Anglo-based WFC models), family involvement functions as a resource antecedent of WFC for Hindu working women in SA. This finding extends the understanding of the relationship between family involvement and WFC in a distinct cultural context. Culturally, the duties of a Hindu woman (*stri-dharma*) are to attend to her family by being a dutiful wife, mother, and daughter-in-law. Involvement in one’s family role should therefore not be viewed as resource draining, but rather as providing Hindu working women in SA with a sense of fulfilment that helps them cope with their work and family role pressures. Therefore, despite having work commitments, family involvement enables Hindu women in SA to prevent family demands from interfering with work and vice versa. Gordon and Rouse (2011) suggest that high involvement in a role may not be a contributor to increased WFC if the high role involvement matches the desired role involvement. Shaffer et al. (2011) add that constructs in diverse cultural contexts can take on different meanings. When family involvement is interpreted as requiring time and energy, it may be viewed as dysfunctional thereby exacerbating WFC. However, when perceived as a duty or commitment, it may have a beneficial effect thereby reducing WFC.

**Work overload as an antecedent of WFC.**

Consistent with the study’s propositions, past research and meta-analyses, work overload explained significant variance in W2FC and F2WC for Hindu working women in SA (cf. Brown & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2013; Jin et al., 2013; Michel et al., 2011). The work overload-WFC relationship can be understood using the arguments of resource drain theory (Staines, 1980) and conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989). For Hindu women in SA regarding their W2FC, meeting high expectations in the work role is likely to consume time and energy resources that are needed to fulfil various family duties adequately. Although family responsibilities such as visiting elderly family members and cooking are relevant to women across all cultural contexts, in Hindu culture these duties are culturally embedded and therefore more intense. Feelings of exhaustion from high work demands may thus reduce motivation to fulfil important family role responsibilities to the levels culturally expected.
thereby increasing W2FC. A further speculation may be that as a result of high work overload, Hindu working women in SA may make more compromises in the family role, such as cooking less intensive non-traditional meals, thus escalating their feelings of guilt in not meeting culturally expected norms and consequently increasing their W2FC.

Interestingly, the magnitude of the standardised beta for work overload was not only the largest in explaining unique variance in W2FC, which was expected, but also in F2WC (in comparison to the three family domain stressors). The results of the multiple regression analysis also showed that work overload ($\beta = .549, p < .0001$) explained a large amount of unique variance in W2FC above and beyond that of work hours ($\beta = .112; p < .05$). This finding suggests that the relation between working hours and W2FC has less to do with the hours spent at work and more to do with what occurs during those hours (Spector et al., 2007). Accordingly, this relationship may vary in distinct cultural contexts as individuals place different values and meaning on work and family.

As mentioned above, support for the cross-domain work overload-F2WC relationship was also found in this study. These results are consistent with meta-analytical findings (Michel et al., 2011). When additional resources are required in the work role to fulfil the associated expectations, Hindu working women in SA may perceive that their numerous traditional family role duties are depleting their available resources required at work thereby increasing their F2WC.

**Family overload.**
A particular contribution of this study is the recognition that family overload in this specific context is a complex construct. Three distinct forms of overload in the family domain were established from the qualitative data and tested, namely extended family overload, parental overload, and food-work overload. Within-domain and cross-domain relationships were confirmed for all the forms of family overload. These results indicate that the meaning of family may vary across cultural contexts and may accordingly produce variations in its effects on WFC occurrences (Wharton & Blai Loy, 2006).

**Extended family overload as an antecedent of WFC.**
As expected, extended family overload explained significant variance in both F2WC and W2FC. As no known empirical studies have examined the relationship between extended
family overload and WFC specifically, comparisons of this study’s findings with extant literature are made in relation to an overall construct of family overload.

Extended family overload as an antecedent of WFC may be context-specific. In Hindu culture, a strong emphasis is placed on the importance of family. When a Hindu woman marries, she is expected to fulfil her duties in the family role not only to her husband and children but also towards her parents-in-law and her husband’s extended family. In SA, despite a trend in shifts from extended to nuclear family structures among Hindu families, almost half of the participants (46.9%) in the present study lived with and looked after an elderly parent, parent-in-law or relative. In the qualitative interviews, the women spoke about their duties of visiting or entertaining extended family members and attending social functions of several extended family members. These duties are time and energy intensive and are embedded in Hindu culture in order to maintain strong family connections. Meeting extended family social obligations to the required expectations can drain Hindu women’s resources, which consequently prevents them from meeting their work demands thereby resulting in F2WC. These findings are consistent with those of studies conducted mainly in collectivist contexts such as those of Wharton-Blair and Loy (2006) who found that for their Hong Kong sample, family overload was more intense and contributed to increased WFC when compared to their samples in the US and England.

A cross-domain relationship between extended family overload and W2FC was also confirmed in this study. Hindu women in SA who perceive that they are overwhelmed by the expectations of others regarding their extended family duties may think that resources spent at work are rather needed in the family domain, thereby contributing to W2FC. This finding supports Aryee’s (2005) finding that in sub-Saharan Africa, obligations towards extended family members are perceived as stressors. It may not only be the extended family overload that is stressful but the effect that it has on the work and family domain (Gerstel & Gallagher, 1993).

Parental overload as an antecedent of WFC.
The results of the multiple regression analysis confirmed parental overload as a significant antecedent of F2WC and W2FC, as expected. This finding is consistent with findings in diverse cultural contexts (Aryee et al., 1999b; Razak et al., 2010; Tatman et al., 2006), although Nasurdin and O'Driscoll (2012) did not find a significant parental overload-WFC
relationship among New Zealand and Malaysian employees. Nasurdin and O'Driscoll attribute their non-significant findings to the low numbers of children in both their New Zealand and Malaysian samples suggesting that their respondents probably experienced lower parental demands, which might not have been sufficient to produce F2WC.

Although the demands of parenting are a global phenomenon, understanding motherhood in the context of Hindu culture is relevant in view of work-family relationships. Motherhood is portrayed in Hindu scriptures as a spiritual transformation for a wife and several scriptures refer to an idealised state of motherhood. A wife’s duty is to give birth to children and raise them with good values in order to build a righteous society while her husband’s role is to generate an income for the family (Agarwal, 2008). Hence, despite having a work role, Hindu women tend to spend extensive time and energy on their parenting responsibilities because of the parenting expectations inculcated in them from early socialisation. This is comparable to the concept of intensive mothering (Hays, 1996), a discourse on modern motherhood, which encapsulates the notion that raising children is primarily the responsibility of the mother. Highly involved parenting behaviours are accordingly adopted (Liss, Schiffrin, Mackintosh, Miles-McLean, & Erchull, 2012). Balan (2010) adds that beliefs of intensive parenting are heightened when women are members of a minority group, as in the case of Hindu women in SA.

Thus, among Hindu working women in SA, it seems that intense parenting pressures deplete important resources required in their work role leading to F2WC. When Hindu working women in SA believe they have insufficient resources to fulfil their salient parenting responsibilities adequately, they may also see their work role as interfering with their family role resulting in W2FC.

Food-work overload as an antecedent of WFC.

With the exception of Heslop et al. (2007), who examined food shopping and food task orientations and strategies and their relationships to WFC, this is the only other known work-family study that specifically focuses on food-work as a form of stress contributing to WFC. As proposed, food-work overload was found to be a significant antecedent of F2WC and W2FC among Hindu working women in SA. In the qualitative interviews, food-work was indicated as the women’s duty and was described as time- and energy-intensive, especially in relation to traditional Indian meal preparation. Those who opted for convenient “Western”
alternatives to traditional cooked food at times perceived disapproval from family members (extended and nuclear). Culturally embedded expectations for Hindu women to cook for and feed family members and guests places additional pressures on those who require time and energy resources in their work role thereby increasing F2WC. These findings are consistent with those of Heslop et al. (2007) that certain food-task strategies were related to WFC.

The significant cross-domain relationship between food-work overload and W2FC may, however, be because Hindu working women in SA who would like to cook traditional Indian meals for their families and make home-made traditional delicacies for Hindu rituals perceive their work obligations preventing them from doing so. This may be either because working long hours to meet work demands means that they have little time to prepare traditional meals before dinner time or because when they come home from work they are too exhausted to engage in the preparation required for cooking traditional meals. The pressures around food-work are exacerbated because of the little flexibility regarding its timing; especially in families with young children who need to eat at fixed times (Heslop et al., 2007). Moreover, for Hindu working women in SA, these pressures are intensified as food-work is used to uphold a sense of tradition and culture as a minority group in the country as other cultural symbols such as traditional clothing and language are waning. By including this unique construct as a form of family role overload that explains WFC, this research extends the existing literature on antecedents of work-family conflict contributes to a more culture-sensitive understanding of the work-family interface in a particular context.

Exploring Social Support as an Antecedent and a Buffer of Same-domain WFC

A particular contribution of this study is that various forms of work and family social support were explored as antecedents of same-domain WFC and for their buffering effect on the relationships between role stressors and same-domain WFC. The role of each specific form of support in the incidences of WFC for Hindu working women in SA can thus be better understood. Extant research has underlined the beneficial effects of social support on WFC (Griggs et al., 2012; Michel et al. 2011). The findings of this study are to some extent inconsistent with past findings, and these dissimilarities may be attributable to contextual and cultural issues. The study findings relating to each form of social support as an antecedent and a buffer of WFC are discussed below.
Work social support as an antecedent of W2FC.

Supervisor and co-worker support from the work domain were examined as antecedents of W2FC for Hindu working women in SA. Contrary to the proposition and most empirical findings (e.g. Michel et al., 2011; Selvarajan et al., 2013), the results of the multiple regression analysis showed that supervisor support did not explain any significant variance in W2FC. Interestingly, the mean levels of self-reported supervisor support were above the midpoint of three on a five-point scale ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.09$). It may be that despite perceiving their supervisors as supportive, the participants refrained from asking them for support in managing work and family demands specifically. This could be because such a request might have been considered by the supervisors that they were less committed to their work role, thus hindering their opportunities for career advancement (Coffey et al., 2009). Also, a general measure for supervisor support was used in this study. Kossek et al.’s (2012) meta-analysis of workplace support and WFC showed that work-family-specific constructs of supervisor support are more strongly related to WFC than general supervisor support. Their findings may explain the non-significant results in this study – future research should therefore consider more specific conceptualisations and measures of family-focused supervisor support when investigating the work-family interface. These inconsistent findings are, however, similar to those reported by Hsiao and Mor Barak (2013) among Mexican workers. Hsiao and Mor Barak (2013) suggest that supervisor support has no effect on reducing WFC because of minimal corporate leave policies and limited discretion among immediate supervisors, which prevents mothers in particular from meeting family responsibilities. Their suggestions regarding the lack of a relationship between supervisor support and WFC may similarly be applicable for Hindu working women in SA.

However, as expected, co-worker support was found to be a significant antecedent of W2FC in the present study. In terms of conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), social support from co-workers can be seen as resource replenishment through assistance with work duties (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999) thus reducing the likelihood of work interfering with family duties. Hindu working women in SA may perceive their supervisors as supportive but prefer to approach colleagues for help in managing their work responsibilities so that these responsibilities do not negatively affect their family roles. This may be due to the way in which Hindu women are traditionally socialised with a high degree of hierarchy orientation, and hence they may avoid asking for assistance from those in higher levels of authority.
Hindu women with male supervisors may be even more reluctant to approach such supervisors given the patriarchal nature of Hindu culture and gender hierarchy. The sex of the participants’ supervisors was not asked in the survey. Future studies on supervisor support and WFC among culturally specific groups should examine the dyadic supervisor-employee relationship. Lu et al. (2009) similarly reported that for Chinese employees, co-worker support was more beneficial than supervisor support in perceiving work-family balance. They credited this finding to a collectivistic culture, which is characterised by a high reliance on the support of others in the in-group (co-workers) and being helpful and dependable (Triandis, 1995).

**Work social support as a buffer of work stressor-W2FC relationships.**

The propositions that supervisor support buffers the work stressor-W2FC relationships for Hindu working women in SA were not supported. These findings are consistent with those of other studies conducted on non-Anglo samples (Hsiao & Mor Barak, 2013; Luk & Shaffer, 2005). Hsiao and Mor Barak (2013) attribute their non-significant findings to the lack of a supportive organisational culture in accommodating the family-related obligations of their Mexican workers. In SA, most organisations are at the infancy stage of recognising the need for work-family initiatives (Downes & Koekemoer, 2011). It is mainly multinational organisations in SA that have adopted family-friendly policies. Hence supervisors do not readily display family-supportive behaviours, nor have they been trained to demonstrate these behaviours (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson, 2008). However co-worker support buffered the effects of both work stressors, work involvement and work overload, on W2FC. The findings suggest that for Hindu working women in SA, co-workers may be an additional resource that can be drawn on, to shield the negative effects that work stressors can have in producing W2FC. This might be because co-workers share an understanding of the nature of the work stressors faced by their colleagues (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2009).

**Family social support as an antecedent of F2WC.**

Three forms of social support in the family domain, namely extended family, spousal and paid domestic support, were examined as antecedents of F2WC and as buffers of the family stressor-F2WC relationships. Multiple regression analysis revealed that (1) extended family
support was not a significant antecedent of F2WC, (2) spousal support was a significant antecedent of F2WC, and (3) paid domestic support was a significant antecedent of F2WC although the direction of the relationship was opposite to that proposed. With the exception of the spousal support-F2WC relationship, these findings were inconsistent with the results expected and reported in meta-analytical research where the general construct family overload was used (Michel et al., 2011). The study findings in relation to each form of family support are discussed in turn.

**Extended family support as an antecedent of F2WC.**

The non-significant relationship between extended family support and F2WC is contrary to the study’s proposition and to most studies conducted on Anglo samples using a general family support construct. The inconsistency in findings may be attributable to the conceptual distinction in the constructs implying that the meaning of extended family is not necessarily captured in the meaning of general family members, particularly in cultures that emphasise close ties with numerous extended family members. Where some studies conducted in collectivistic cultures have alluded to the beneficial effects of extended family support in reducing F2WC (e.g. Kailasapathy & Metz, 2012; Mortazavi et al. 2009; Thein et al., 2010), they have rarely measured extended family support explicitly, or their findings have been based on qualitative data.

Further reasons for extended family support not being a resource in reducing F2WC emerged from Hsiao and Mor Barak’s (2013) study. They suggest that in Mexican culture, where strong extended family connections are valued, reciprocal obligations among family members are expected. Hence, when people receive support from their extended family members, they feel obligated to reciprocate, which places further resource demands on them. Griggs et al. (2013) found that this phenomenon is likely to occur also in respect of co-worker support among low-income earners for whom resources are particularly scarce; however, in their study, extended family support was associated with lower strain-based W2FC. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) helps to explain this reciprocal relationship by holding that receiving support from extended family members may be accompanied by an expectation to reciprocate. This may help explain the non-significant relationship between extended family and F2WC among Hindu working women in SA who also have the cultural expectation of fulfilling duties towards extended family members although they are already over-extended with their work and family responsibilities.
Spousal support as an antecedent of F2WC.

The results of the multiple regression analysis confirmed spousal support as an important antecedent of F2WC for Hindu working women in SA. Interestingly, support from one’s spouse had the highest reported mean (well above the mid-point) of all the forms of work and family social support ($M = 4.13$). This high mean, however, raises questions about associated socially desirable responses. In the qualitative interviews, although the women spoke of the benefits of a supportive spouse, many of the participants also shared examples of a lack of spousal support, particularly where the husband had been socialised along more traditional gender lines or where the husband was the only child or only son in his family. An alternative view is that the high mean level is indicative of low expectations of spousal support among Hindu women in the context of normative expectations, and therefore, any form of help translates into higher perceptions of support reported (Rout et al., 1999).

Nevertheless, social support as an antecedent of F2WC seems to be consistent with studies conducted across several cultural contexts such as Saher et al.’s (2013) study in Pakistan, Valk and Srinivasan’s (2011) study in India, Mauno and Rantanen’s (2013) study in Finland, and Aycan and Eskin’s (2005) study in Turkey. These findings suggest that even in cultures that emphasise traditional gender role ideologies, support from the husband can help reduce family demands interfering with work. Emotional support, such as talking over problems about childcare or extended family issues, and/or instrumental support such as the wife reallocating some of her family tasks to her husband such as fetching the children from school, are likely to reduce the negative interferences from family to work thereby mitigating F2WC.

Thus, consistent with COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), spousal support is an additive resource gain that helps prevent the onset of F2WC. An alternative framework for understanding this relationship is offered by Valk and Srinivasan (2011) who suggest that relying on support from one’s spouse to reduce WFC can be considered an example of structural role redefinition (Hall, 1972). Structural role redefinition is a coping strategy that involves changing external, structurally obligatory expectations relative to a person's role. In this way, Hindu working women in SA assign some of their family duties to their husbands to reduce family demands conflicting with work.
**Paid domestic support as an antecedent of F2WC.**

Paid domestic support was expected to benefit Hindu working women in SA thereby contributing to reduced F2WC. Although this relationship was statistically significant in the present study, the direction was contrary to that expected. The results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that paid domestic support increased F2WC, which is consistent with the findings of Fu and Shaffer (2001) for employees in Hong Kong. However, this finding is contrary to the sentiments articulated in the qualitative interviews of this study where the participants described their reliance on paid domestic support in helping them manage work and family. Other qualitative studies have also reported that paid domestic support is perceived as an important resource in helping employees negotiate the work-family interface, especially in gender traditional cultures and in contexts where paid help is relatively available and inexpensive (e.g., Cárdenas et al., 2013; Kailasapathy & Metz, 2013; Valk & Srinivasan, 2011).

These inconsistent results lend credence to the view that questionnaire and interview data may assess different levels of experience (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). The findings should therefore be interpreted cautiously against the background of contextual issues. Despite working full time, domestic and childcare responsibilities remain Hindu women’s primary role. Given that 76% of the women in the sample had some form of paid domestic help, the availability of such help may make it easier for Hindu working women in SA to participate in the labour force and pursue careers. However the presence of paid domestic help adds another set of duties that the participants have to manage in the family domain. Such duties may include recruiting and training the paid helper, regularly outlining the helper’s childcare and household duties, and supervising the quality of the helper’s work. These added responsibilities for women flowing from the presence of a paid domestic helper are not uncommon in traditional gendered cultures (Cheung, 2013; Tan & Gibson, 2013).

The positive relationship between paid domestic support and F2WC may also imply that for Hindu women whose husbands have a gender traditional orientation, paid domestic help may not markedly change the distribution of family-related demands for the wife (Cheung, 2013). In these instances, paid help perpetuates inequalities within the family because it is not related to any change in the husband’s behaviour (Rout et al., 1999). Groves and Lui (2012) maintain that some men willingly pay for domestic help to avoid family-related tasks and uphold the gendered division of labour. Employing domestic help to reduce women’s time...
spent on household tasks without changing the division of labour gender inequality, may therefore increase, not reduce, F2WC.

**Family social support as a buffer of the family stressor-F2WC relationships.**

The buffering view is that when an individual experiences high levels of family stressors, support from the family domain may mitigate the effect that the stressors have on F2WC (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999). Moderated multiple regression analysis showed that none of the forms of family social support (extended family, spousal, and paid domestic support) had a significant buffering effect on the family stressor-F2WC relationships in the present study. Unexpectedly, the study results showed that for the Hindu working women in SA who employed domestic help, food-work overload contributed to increased F2WC but that when no paid domestic support was present, there was no significant relationship between food-work overload and F2WC.

The lack of a significant buffering effect on family stressor-F2WC relationships is consistent with the findings of Nasurdin and O’Driscoll (2012). In their study, family support did not buffer the relationship between parental demands and F2WC, which they attribute to low parental demands in their sample. Conversely, Hsiao and Mor-Barak (2013) found that family social support strengthened the positive relationship between job-related stressors and WFC thereby confirming a cross-domain reverse-buffering effect. Such cross-domain buffering effects were not explored in the present study but are recommended for future research. In other words, work social support may buffer family stressor-F2WC relationships, and family support may buffer the work stressor-W2FC relationship.

The reverse-buffering effect found for paid domestic support on the food-work overload-F2WC relationship may be interpreted in terms of the following speculations. The qualitative findings suggest that food-work is generally not delegated to the paid domestic helper and remains the primary duty of the Hindu woman. One participant, who employed several domestic helpers to assist with cleaning the house, looking after the children at home, and driving and tutoring the children, reported that food-work was her duty as a Hindu woman. Hindu women who can devote more time to work because of a domestic helper at home may therefore perceive food-work to be more stressful because of the limited time in the family domain. Given that food-work is entrenched in Hindu culture as a woman’s duty, these
women may believe that they are unable to meet its associated expectations to the level expected, thereby increasing F2WC.

Taken together, the findings of this study show that social support from one’s family domain does not serve as a protective factor against stressors producing F2WC for Hindu working women in SA. The meaning and influence of social support may differ in acute and chronic stress situations (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). Because the overall mean levels of F2WC were relatively low ($M = 2.29$), and because the means of the three forms of family overload were all below three on a five-point scale, it may be inferred that no acutely stressful situations were present.

**Exploring the Moderating Effects of Cultural Orientations on the Relationships between Role Stressors and Same-domain WFC**

Gender role ideology (GRI) and hierarchy orientation were identified through the qualitative data as important cultural dimensions that can shape the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA. Despite being a minority cultural group in SA, Hindu women are to a large extent traditionally socialised along clearly delineated gendered roles with the emphasis on being respectful and obedient to elders’ directions. Variations in socialisation processes, however, may contribute to individual differences in gender role ideologies and hierarchy orientations that give rise to distinct WFC experiences. Hierarchy orientation in the work role was measured separately from hierarchy in the family role as the qualitative data implied that it could occur differently in each domain. The findings in relation to the specific propositions are discussed in turn below.

**GRI and work hierarchy orientation as moderators of the work stressor-W2FC relationships.**

The moderated hierarchical regression analysis showed that in the present study GRI was a significant moderator of the work involvement-W2FC relationship, although it did not moderate the work overload-W2FC relationship. In other words, for Hindu working women in SA with an egalitarian GRI, W2FC is increased when work involvement is high. However, for Hindu working women with a traditional GRI, the work involvement-W2FC relationship is crowded out and becomes non-significant. An explanation for this finding may be that
Hindu working women in SA with an egalitarian GRI are likely to have greater role sharing in their family domain and invest more time and energy resources pursuing their careers because they perceive that these behaviours as socially acceptable. Consistent with resource drain theory, the greater involvement in their work role reduces the resources needed to fulfil their family responsibilities thus increasing W2FC. From an identity theory perspective (Stryker & Burke, 2000), Hindu working women with an egalitarian GRI, who are psychologically preoccupied and emotionally invested in their work role may have greater difficulty engaging in their family role thereby increasing their W2FC (Gordon & Rouse, 2013). For Hindu working women in SA with a traditional GRI, work involvement may not increase W2FC because they are likely to prioritise their family domain over their work domain. Work involvement is therefore less likely to interfere with their family role to produce W2FC.

This significant moderating effect highlights within-group differences in WFC levels along orientations of GRI, thereby promoting the investigation of individual-level cultural dimensions. The findings suggest that gender role arrangements for Hindu women in South Africa are being reconstructed to accommodate societal changes at varying degrees. Modernisation and the increased entry of women in the workplace and dual-earner couples are transforming traditional attitudes towards gender roles. The variations in WFC levels along GRI orientations however may be attributed to differential access to power and resources (Korabik, McElwain, & Chappell, 2008).

A significant direct relationship was also found between GRI and W2FC indicating that GRI can also be a direct antecedent of W2FC. Hindu working women in SA with a traditional GRI are thus likely to experience greater WF2C than their egalitarian counterparts. Traditional GRI Hindu women in SA may accept that, despite having a work role, the full responsibility of managing the household and family remains theirs. As family is accepted as the primary domain of importance, work responsibilities may interfere with important family duties. Similar findings are reported for traditional GRI Muslim Arab women in Israel when compared to their egalitarian GRI Jewish counterparts (Kulik, 2012). GRI as a significant antecedent and moderator of W2FC for Hindu working women in SA supports Gutek et al.’s (1991) gender role expectations model that expectations created by gender roles may influence the perceived level of WFC. These relationships may differ in diverse cultural
contexts as the meaning of family takes on distinct levels of importance (Calvo-Salguero et al., 2012).

Work hierarchy orientation was not a significant moderator of the work involvement-W2FC relationship or the work overload-W2FC relationship in the present study. In this regard, Hindu women in SA may be socialised to respect elders in the family as an important cultural value, and consequently hierarchy orientation is more likely to affect relationships in the family domain than in the work domain. Moreover, these non-significant findings may imply that in the work domain, Hindu women in SA have been socialised in accordance with predominantly Anglo-based organisational values promoting freedom of speech and equality.

GRI and family hierarchy orientation as moderators of family stressor-F2WC relationships.

Contrary to the propositions, the results showed that GRI was not a significant moderator for any of the family role stressor-F2WC relationships in the study. These findings suggest that for Hindu working women in SA, GRI influences the occurrence of W2FC rather than the occurrence of F2WC. However, a significant interaction was found between the cultural value, family hierarchy orientation and family involvement in predicting F2WC. In other words, for Hindu working women in SA with a low family hierarchy orientation, family involvement functions as a resource in reducing F2WC. However, for Hindu working women in SA with a high family hierarchy orientation, the relationship between family involvement and F2WC becomes non-significant. Although this finding shows that family involvement has a reverse effect on F2WC when hierarchy orientation is low, it is nevertheless interesting and improves our understanding of how cultural values shape the occurrence of WFC in a particular cultural context.

In the absence of other WFC studies that have examined hierarchy orientation on an individual level to compare findings, the following speculations are offered. Obedience and respect for elders are valued in Hindu culture, and girls in particular are socialised to expect limited participation in decision-making in their own, and once married, in their husbands’ families. Consistent with Tyler’s (2007) relational model of authority, Hindu women with a high family hierarchy orientation are less likely to challenge requests from parents-in-law and other elders in the family in order to avoid confrontation. They are likely to experience
greater difficulty in developing open relationships with their elders and, accordingly, may feel more obligated to their prescribed social roles (Farh et al., 2006). Whereas Hindu women with a low family hierarchy orientation may perceive greater equality in their relationship with elders in the family, leading to open dialogues in which they can express their opinions. Therefore, among those with a low family hierarchy orientation, family involvement becomes a cognitive resource that provides them with a sense of fulfilment and accordingly helps to reduce F2WC. These speculations may also explain the direct antecedent effect found in this study between hierarchy orientation and F2WC (although not proposed). Higher family hierarchy orientation increased F2WC, which is reflected in the interview data where some of the women spoke about having to attend functions at their mothers-in-law’s requests regardless of whether or not they wanted to. No significant results were found for the moderating effect of family hierarchy orientation on the relationship between F2WC and the family role stressors: Extended family overload, parental overload and food-work overload.

**Contributions of the Study**

This study adds to the understanding of WFC in a distinct cultural context by means of contributing to theory, methodology, and practice. This section discusses each contribution in turn and ends with a discussion on the implications of the findings for social policy.

**Theoretical contribution.**

The study responded to repeated calls to study work-family issues in unique cultural contexts in view of the predominance of studies in Anglo societies (Casper et al., 2014). Hindu women in SA are an under-researched minority subgroup with particular historical, political, and cultural complexities that shape their work-family interactions. Accordingly prior WFC models were refined by integrating findings from in-depth interviews to develop an explanatory model of the antecedents of WFC for Hindu working women in SA.

This study contributes to new theoretical knowledge on work-family conflict in the following ways. The study’s main theoretical contribution is the extension of current work-family conflict models by incorporating new salient variables relating to cultural issues, such as food-work overload and work and family hierarchy orientation. Hence while it is acknowledged from extant literature that white women in the US experience similar
difficulties in managing work and family demands, women from diaspora communities are likely to face specific pressures associated with maintaining a cultural identity in a country where the dominant cultural and traditional practices are markedly different from those of the members’ home country (Khokher & Beauregard, 2014). A nuanced model such as the one presented in this study may be particularly useful for studying diaspora communities.

The explanatory WFC model in this study provides a culture-sensitive framework by considering contextually salient antecedents and moderators of WFC and by refining the dimensionality of certain constructs to reflect the culturally relevant variables more accurately. For example, the complexity of family-domain stressors in this cultural group underlines the need to understand the cultural context in work-family research. Family role stressors such as extended family overload and food-work overload highlight the importance of the family domain and the demands that it makes on the time and energy resources of Hindu working women in SA. Overload arising from expectations regarding extended family members and food-work over and above that arising from expectations regarding parenting are embedded in Hindu cultural values of being a dutiful daughter-in-law and hostess.

This study contributes to the limited “culture-as-dimensions” (Powell et al., 2009) work-family research by explicitly incorporating cultural variables to be tested. This approach assumes that even within particular cultural groups, individual orientations along salient cultural dimensions are likely to alter WFC experiences. Powell et al. (2009) indicate that examining cultural variables at the individual level assists people to generate mechanisms to manage the relationship between work and family in their own culture and organisation. The study’s findings accordingly add to an improved understanding of the influence of cultural orientations on WFC, because stressors that serve as antecedents of WFC are shaped by values, beliefs, and role conceptions acquired through socialisation (Galovan et al., 2010). Understanding the interaction effects of the role stressors and cultural variables in predicting WFC also advances work-family research because it highlights a theory’s boundary conditions (Aguinis & Gottfredson, 2010).

Further theoretical contributions of this study are that within-domain as well as cross-domain stressors of W2FC and F2WC were tested, and all the propositions in this regard were supported. Contextually relevant sub-dimensions of work and family support were also investigated as antecedents and buffers of the same-domain WFC relationships in order to
understand the subtleties of WFC dynamics in this particular cultural context (Adams et al., 1996). Among Hindu working women in SA, co-worker support and spousal support seem to be important resources in reducing W2FC and F2WC respectively. Interestingly, social support from supervisors and extended family members were not found to be resources that help to alleviate WFC. It could be speculated that for Hindu women, the relationship with one’s supervisor and extended family (particularly parent-in-laws) are perceived as hierarchical in nature, hence despite the presence of these forms of support (implied by their mean scores), the support is not influential in alleviating WFC. Rather co-workers and one’s husband, implying more equal status relationships, are perceived as resources to reduce WFC in the work and family domain respectively.

Lastly, given the paucity of WFC research in SA, this study confirms the portability of the bi-directional WFC construct in the context of Hindu working women in SA. The validity and reliability analysis conducted on the Netermeyer et al. (1996) scale yields sound psychometric evidence for the construct and confirms the conceptual distinction between the two directions of WFC (W2FC and F2WC). Use of this bi-directional measure of WFC is recommended for future WFC studies conducted in SA.

**Methodological contribution.**

Shaffer et al. (2011) encourage more qualitative and mixed-method research to elucidate the meaning of work and family in distinct cultural contexts. This study provides a methodological contribution by conducting an initial qualitative exploration using in-depth interviews to generate concepts that were meaningful to investigate more thoroughly in understanding the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA. In addition, the qualitative findings were beneficial in operationalising the constructs and selecting measures that more accurately reflected the sample’s experiences. For example, role overload rather than role demands were incorporated into the model as a form of role stress potentially contributing to WFC. This is because the women spoke consistently about feeling that they did not have enough time or energy to meet the expectations associated with each role (role overload) as opposed to perceiving that the amount of work or time required from them in each role was too much (role demands). These findings show that incorporating qualitative methods into work-family research, particularly when studying specific cultural groups, can
elicit culturally relevant constructs that may otherwise not be reflected in existing Anglo-based WFC models.

This study also responds to Korabik et al.’s (2003) call on indigenous work-family researchers to provide a deeper understanding of the cultural nuances that emerge in the particular cultural context under investigation. Work-family studies conducted by researchers living outside the countries being investigated may lack familiarity with the culture being researched. As a Hindu woman in SA engaged in a work and a family role, I believe that my knowledge of the cultural context was beneficial in capturing the culturally salient factors influencing the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA. The knowledge acquired in this way was used synergistically with existing work-family literature to provide a richer understanding of WFC. As an indigenous researcher, I was aware that being a member of the research group that I was studying may complicate and obscure basic assumptions. Hence throughout the research process, I was particularly cognisant of my personal experiences and beliefs and how these might function as an additional lens when conducting the study and interpreting its findings. This indigenous research contributes to culture sensitive work-family theory in a non-Anglo context.

**Practical implications for management.**

The findings of this study suggest the efficacy of managers being aware of factors contributing to WFC in a diverse workforce. South African organisations face the challenge of rectifying the skewed representation of previously disadvantaged groups in the workplace. South African managers may therefore be able to use the findings of this study to design human resource policies that are more flexible in taking employee diversity into account (Olsen et al., 2013; Trauth, Quesenberry, & Huang, 2009).

**Reducing work overload.**

The finding that work overload was the strongest predictor of both W2FC and F2WC in the study suggests that managers could focus their efforts on alleviating pressures in the work domain that can lead to feelings of “overload”. Organisations could survey employees to establish their perceptions regarding available resources to fulfil required work responsibilities. They can then identify employees at risk of work overload (Casper et al., 2011; Gyrna, 2004). Training on coping behaviours should be offered to such employees.
through employee assistance programmes (EAPs) thereby providing them with the necessary behavioural skills to deal with the pressures arising from their work roles (Mauno & Rantanen, 2013). Managers could aim to reduce overtime and have realistic expectations of what employees can achieve in their work hours (Matthews, Winkel, & Wayne, 2013). Additionally, flexibility in work arrangements and job redesign could be considered by South African organisations attempting to attract and retain a diverse workforce.

With the high cultural expectations placed on Hindu working women in SA to be committed primarily to their family role, they are more likely to adapt their work conditions to accommodate their family role than vice versa (Rajadyaksha & Velgach, 2009). These sentiments were echoed in the interviews where some of the women shared that they had resigned from their work role when their children were young or scaled down to a half-day job that allowed them to fulfil their family role more effectively. This phenomenon is likely to be similar for other family-centric cultural groups. Organisations are therefore at risk of losing skilled employees, particularly in middle management (Gyrna, 2004), when employees experience work overload and perceive that it is interfering with their family role. In SA, the shortage of skilled workers substantially limits the country’s long-term economic growth potential (Adcorp, June 2014). More options for working women regarding their working arrangements are therefore likely to have a positive effect on their wellbeing, intention to stay at their organisation, and the economy of the country (Nätti, Tammelin, Anttila, & Ojala, 2011). Such options include job sharing, reduced working hours, work schedule flexibility, and flexible idiosyncratic deals. A flexible idiosyncratic deal, which is an individualised work design strategy that personalises work hours and scheduling to better fit individual needs and preferences, has been found to reduce work overload and WFC (Hornung, Rousseau, Weigl, & Glaser, 2014). Such interventions can produce opportunities to pursue nonconventional and boundaryless career paths for employees who have different cultural values. South African organisations could experiment with new job designs to enhance the individual and collective sense of wellbeing and engagement required to improve business outcomes (Courtois, Dooley, Kennish, Paul, & Reddy, 2005).

**Developing a family-friendly climate.**

The finding that family involvement functions as a resource rather than a stressor among Hindu working women in SA, suggests that organisations with diverse employees can benefit from being supportive of employees’ family roles, particularly employees whose families are
The finding that high family overload resulting from culturally embedded expectations (such as extended family and food-work) can contribute to exacerbated levels of F2WC and W2FC should also be noted. Based on the study’s findings, it is recommended that senior management develop a family-friendly organisational climate and avoid a culture of “face-time” (Allen, 2001; Mihelic, 2014). A family-friendly climate refers to the extent to which the work environment is understanding and supportive of employees' work-family requirements (Allen, 2001). By promoting the value of fulfilment not only at work but also in the family, organisations can demonstrate, particularly to culturally diverse employees, that career success does not depend on sacrificing family life (Mihelic, 2014). Organisational concern for employees’ families through family-friendly policies can also result in employees with more positive attitudes, even when such policies are in low use (Butts, Casper, & Yang, 2013).

Organisations can promote a family-friendly workplace climate by creating an environment in which employees feel free to talk about their family needs (Mauno & Rantanen, 2013). To achieve this, managers require training on how to incorporate employees’ family needs into daily management practices. Managers could be held accountable and measured on the extent to which they accommodate employees’ family-related needs, not only through promoting the use of formal policies but also through regular communication on family concerns that may be affecting employees’ work and vice versa. Family supportiveness will thus be incorporated into an organisation’s culture as a deeply rooted value. However, when family-friendly policies are implemented superficially, the effectiveness of such policies is undermined (Stepanova, 2013).

**Facilitating co-worker support.**

This study suggests that for Hindu working women in SA, co-worker support, rather than supervisor support, is an important resource in reducing their W2FC. Co-workers may be perceived to be of equal power status whereas supervisors may be perceived to be of unequal power status. Accordingly, in cultures with high collectivist and hierarchy values, individuals may feel more comfortable drawing support from co-workers. Co-workers are also in a unique position to provide family-focused support as they have a clearer understanding of the nature of the stressors faced by their fellow employees (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2009). Organisations can encourage co-worker support by organising work around teams.
When employees perceive that they have social support from their team to help them reduce their W2FC, teamwork is also enhanced (Lieke, Oosterwaal, & Bakker, 2012).

**Training managers to be culture sensitive.**

In culturally diverse contexts such as SA, managers need to be cognisant of inter-cultural as well as intra-cultural diversity and how cultural issues relate to employees’ behaviours and motivations (Gahan & Abeysekera, 2009). The findings of this study infer that salient forms of role overload (e.g. extended family overload) contributes to increased WFC, and that the participants’ WFC relationships vary based on their orientations along individual-level cultural values (GRI and hierarchy orientation). South African organisations could therefore benefit from managers with developed competence in cultural sensitivity and align their leadership and retention strategies accordingly.

Consistent with South Africa’s transformation agenda, organisations could design and implement a diversity strategy that includes family-friendly policies than can reduce stressors leading to WFC. Family-friendly policies have been found to contribute to greater diversity within organisations while their absence often hinders the advancement of a diverse workforce (Michielsens, Bingham, & Clarke, 2014). A diversity strategy can prompt managers to learn about these policies and use them to support diversity (Su & Bozeman, 2013). Family-friendly policies are also likely to promote the employability of a more gender and culturally diverse workforce.

Training for managers to manage diverse employees’ work-family needs can also fall under this realm. Managers need to be aware of their employees’ cultural values and to engage in behaviours that match these values thereby developing their cultural intelligence (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2007). Managers should not assume that an individual holds specific beliefs because he or she is categorised as belonging to a particular cultural group (Olsen et al., 2013). Hence a universal approach to leadership should be replaced by one where managers are trained to display different leadership behaviours according to employees’ varying cultural values (Kirkman et al., 2009). For example, motivating employees with a strong hierarchy orientation may require a leader to provide more specific direction rather than adopt a more participative style (Kirkman et al., 2009). Training programmes for new managers should include a cultural component in which managers can
recognise their own attitudes about members of particular cultural groups and gain insight into cultural differences (Olsen et al., 2013; Wang et al. 2004).

Organisations can identify employees’ cultural values through assessments during recruitment. For existing employees, assessments can help identify the culture-specific needs of employees in managing their work-family interface. In this way, organisations could establish culturally sensitive workplace solutions (Mauno & Rantanen, 2013). For example, organisational benefits such as flexible scheduling depend on the employees’ cultural values. In other words, employees could select a work schedule that will allow them to best meet the needs of the company as well as meet the demands of their family responsibilities (Olsen et al., 2013). Yasbek (2004) confirms that schedule flexibility is an important factor in the retention of female employees.

**Implications for social policy.**

Hindu women in SA are successfully entering the workforce but for many, their expectations of meeting culturally salient responsibilities in the family domain continue to exist. In SA, policies such as affirmative action promote the entry of diverse groups (women and non-white population groups) into the workforce, yet little attention has been given legislatively to the effects that this has on the changing structures of families. As more women enter the South African workforce, particularly from cultures that promote traditional roles for women in the family, family role responsibilities should be more equally distributed between dual-earner couples. This, however, does not seem to be the case in SA, which can possibly be attributed to the lack of legislation and social policies to promote paternal involvement in family life (Field, Bagraim, & Rycroft, 2012). South African working mothers are entitled to four months' maternity leave during which their security of employment is protected, and South African fathers can use the three days of family responsibility leave for the birth of their children (Basic Conditions of Employment Act, No. 75 of 1997). The absence of leave policies specifically for paternal involvement in childcare perpetuates the gendered division of work in the family role making it more difficult for South African women, particularly from traditional cultural groups, to remain in the workforce. Rather a reconsideration of the legislation to provide equal parental and/or family leave is needed to encourage the sharing of family responsibilities between dual-earner couples (CEDAW, 2009). Such leave may be needed not only for childcare, but also for elderly care as is expected in more collective
cultural groups. Given that employment is the driver of economic growth in the country, social policies that can help retain women in the workforce by facilitating equal role sharing in the family domain are urgently required.

**Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

This study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the contextually salient antecedents explaining WFC among Hindu working women in SA. The findings, however, should be considered in the context of the research limitations that pose some threat to the findings’ validity. Future research should address these limitations by considering the proposed recommendations.

The findings of the study were derived from cross-sectional survey data completed by a single respondent at a single point in time. Collecting data from an individual at single point in time on the predictor and criterion variables can produce common method variance due to a variety of systematic response tendencies such as transient mood state, acquiescence and social desirability (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Common method variance assumes the possibility of alternative explanations for results, and hence gaining support for causal inference from observed empirical relations is not possible (Rindfleisch, Malter, Ganesan, & Moorman, 2007). The study however aimed to reduce method biases by allowing the respondents in the survey to remain anonymous and reducing evaluation apprehension by indicating on the cover letter that there were no right or wrong answers (Podsakoff et al. 2003).

To detect the possibility of common method variance on the results of this study, a post hoc Harman single-factor analysis was conducted (Chang, van Witteloostuijn, & Eden, 2010; Podsakoff et al. 2003). An EFA with principal-axis factoring extraction with an un-rotated factor solution was performed on the 15 composite scales to determine whether variance in the data was largely attributed to a single factor. The results indicated five factors inferring that common-method variance did not substantially influence the results of the study (see Appendix K, Table A4).

In order to reduce the internal validity threat of common method variance, researchers in future studies could collect data from multiple sources or adopt a longitudinal time dimension
(Podsakoff et al. 2003). Collecting data from different sources will benefit work-family research, especially when examining constructs such as GRI in diverse cultural contexts. Obtaining perspectives on the construct from one’s spouse can provide evidence for potential cross-over effects thereby enhancing our understanding of the ways in which GRI can have an effect on WFC in different cultural contexts (Kailasapathy et al., 2014).

Future research employing longitudinal designs, in which a time lag is created between the measurement of the predictor and criterion variables (Podsakoff et al. 2003), may yield more definitive assertions regarding the direction and causality of relationships because the predictor and criterion variables are separated. In this study, it was not clear whether role overload caused WFC or vice versa. For example, overload from culturally expected duties regarding parenting, food-work, and extended family responsibilities could be a consequence of WFC as the role pressures from each domain are perceived to be incompatible. As cross-sectional studies cannot assess lag effects, longitudinal studies on the factors explaining WFC for distinct cultural groups are recommended.

A random sample of Hindu working women in SA was not possible as it was established that there were no reliable community directories for this target population. This is not uncommon in work-family research on less established minority population groups or unique samples (see Grzywacz et al., 2007 on using a non-random sample for immigrant Latinos employed in the poultry processing industry). However, as a consequence of the non-random sampling, the external validity of this study’s findings is somewhat limited. Nevertheless, the findings are an initial attempt to understand the antecedents of WFC in this under-researched population of Hindu working women in SA, a developing and multicultural country.

These findings were applicable to only one specific cultural subgroup in one country. The findings indicated some similarities to findings reported for Hindu women in other contexts such as India and the United Kingdom. It would be interesting if future research were to be conducted with Hindu women of the Indian diaspora in countries with distinct cultures to assess similarities and differences at an individual cultural level and at the national level. These findings should contribute to greater clarity on the role of culture in work-family conflict. The countries included should be diverse and differ in respect of more than one cultural dimension (Powell et al., 2009). For example, countries with reasonably large Hindu populations and characterised by distinct national cultures dimensions according to...
Hofstede’s country comparison (e.g. the US, Malaysia, and Trinidad and Tobago) could be sampled. Hence future studies that integrate individual and national levels of cultural analysis can contribute to a more complete understanding of the cultural complexities that shape work-family experiences (Reiche et al., 2010).

South African society is culturally multifaceted. Research is therefore needed on how South Africans of different ethnicities and cultures perceive themselves in relation to others and how this shapes their work-family experiences. The explanatory model of the antecedents of WFC developed in this study can be extended and refined to reflect salient issues of diverse groups in South Africa, and more advanced statistical analyses such as structural equation modelling can be conducted to test the model. The research findings can help South African organisations understand the cultural needs of individuals from these groups and, as a result, attract and retain skilled individuals for a diverse workforce. This can also help South African organisations meet their legislative obligations in respect of employment equity.

The qualitative interviews yielded more accurate construct definitions and dimensionality within the constructs measured. Some concerns regarding scale measurement however should be noted. Domestic support was measured using a single dichotomously scored item. In line with Lu et al.’s (2009) argument, a single item cannot discriminate among varying degrees of the quality of paid domestic help and consequently may have contributed to the finding that paid domestic support exacerbated F2WC for Hindu working women in SA. However, this positive (as opposed to the proposed negative) relationship was consistent with Fu and Shaffer’s (2001) findings for a Chinese sample in Hong Kong. Further exploration is needed to clarify why domestic support may have exacerbated F2WC in this sample and to better understand the nature and role of paid domestic support in work-family experiences. Such research can lead to the development of a more robust measure that includes an assessment of the particular tasks that paid domestic helpers assist with, the quality of support received, and levels of satisfaction related to the help received.

This study found no relationship between supervisor support and WFC which is in contrast to most extant literature in this area. These findings may be attributable to the cultural context, or they may be related to the use of a general measure of supervisor support rather than a work-family specific measure. Work-family specific support seems to function differently with regard to its relationship with W2FC than general support (Kossek et al., 2011). Lastly,
the construct and measure of food-work could be further refined. Food-work is likely to play an important role in many traditional cultures in which it is used for maintaining family connectedness, culture, rituals, traditions and as a symbol of love (Beagan & D’Sylva, 2011). Particularly in gendered societies, food-work is a crucial part of a woman’s family role. Hence its influence on WFC in diaspora and traditional communities warrants greater attention.

Most work-family research on the influence of cultural dimensions at an individual level of analysis has focused on the effects of individualism-collectivism on WFC (Triandis, 1995). This study extends current literature by examining hierarchy orientation as a key cultural dimension in Hindu culture and by adding to the limited work-family research on GRI as a cultural dimension. This field of research will benefit from studies on the effects of other cultural dimensions added to study designs so that they are explicitly measured rather than inferred, as in “culture-as-referent” work-family studies (Powell et al. 2009). For example, specificity/diffusion is the extent to which individuals view relationships and processes as distinct entities (specificity) or as a cohesive whole (diffusion) (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997). Individuals who prefer to segment their work and family roles create impermeable boundaries between these two domains whereas those who prefer to integrate the two domains blur these boundaries and combine aspects of their work and family roles (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). At an individual level, drawing on work-family border theory (Clark, 2000), individuals specify the degree of permeability to which other roles may infiltrate distinct domains. This cultural dimension may be valuable in understanding the WFC experiences of Hindu working women in SA as Hindu culture is characterised by building social capital in all spheres of an individual’s life (Overgaard, 2010). At the same time, traditional expectations of the Hindu woman to be the primary homemaker and caregiver in an extended family may prevent Hindu working women in SA from bringing work home. They may therefore feel a need to keep the work and family domains separate. The role of this construct in influencing individuals’ experiences of the work-family interface is only minimally covered in work-family literature.

The present study focused on WFC as a negative outcome of occupying a work and a family role for Hindu working women in SA. This conflict perspective based on role stress theory presents only one side of the work-family interface. Future research, in parallel with the increasing acceptance of positive psychology and positive organisational behaviour in SA
and internationally, may yield positive outcomes of multiple role occupancy based on role accumulation theory (Donaldson & Ko, 2010). The explanatory model developed in this study can be expanded to include work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) as an outcome. Researchers can then investigate if role stressors, social support, and cultural values contribute to work-family enrichment for this particular cultural group. Few studies have considered the positive side of the work-family interface outside the US. In a review of 219 empirical work-family studies conducted outside the US, Shaffer et al. (2011) found that only nine percent investigated some form of work-family enrichment. Research has consistently shown that WFC and work-family enrichment are distinct constructs that individuals can experience simultaneously rather than being opposites of the same continuum (Aryee et al., 2005; Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Lu et al., 2009). Where conflict is a form of stress resulting from the incompatibility of work and family roles, enrichment is developmental in that resources gained in one role (e.g. work) are transferred to and enhance the quality of life in the other role (e.g. family). Future research could therefore endeavour to design an overarching theoretical framework that captures both the conflicting and benefiting perspectives of the work-family interface. In doing so, future studies can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the interdependencies between work and family among particular cultural subgroups.

**Final Conclusion**

The post-democracy period in South Africa has witnessed a marked increase in Hindu women entering the workforce, attaining financial independence and enhanced status within their families and society. However as Hindu women progress educationally and economically, they often find themselves negotiating competing expectations between their work and family roles. Many Hindu women endeavour to preserve cultural traditions and strong family bonds while pursuing a career. The inter-role conflict experienced by women from traditional cultural groups between their work and family roles is lacking in the extant work-family literature.

This research adds new knowledge about the salient antecedents that contribute to the WFC of Hindu working women in SA. Given the difference between Hindu and Anglo cultural values, it is not surprising that some of the findings of this study were dissimilar from work-family studies conducted amongst Anglo samples. The study elucidates the strongly
entrenched notion of family in Hindu culture, specifically providing evidence that family involvement can be a beneficial resource in managing work and family in this cultural context, rather than a stressor as reflected in current Anglo-based WFC models. Additionally, it shows that for Hindu women in SA, their cultural values as manifested in their orientation toward gender role beliefs and family hierarchy, can affect their levels of WFC explained by their role involvement. The findings of this study and others of its kind (e.g. Grzywacz et al., 2007, Haar et al., 2012., Taylor et al., 2009) also provides support for Casper et al.’s (2011) argument that in work-family research it is important to examine specific relationships in the cultural context of interest rather than assuming relationships will or will not generalise to other cultures.

Finally, this study has implications for South African organisations wanting to attract and retain a diverse workforce and thereby contribute to national imperatives to redress past discrimination experienced by designated groups in the labour market. Management recognition of cultural values salient to particular employees will facilitate productivity because cultural values influence how employees process information and conduct their work (Haar et al., 2012). Accordingly, this approach can have positive implications for individual employees, organisations and the South African society.
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Appendix A: Ethical Clearance for Qualitative Exploration
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Project title: At the intersection of multiple cultures: The work-family experiences of Hindu working women in South Africa

This letter serves to confirm that the project entitled, "The work-family experiences of Hindu working women in South Africa", as described in your final submitted protocol dated 20 February 2011, has been approved. You may proceed with the research.

Please note that if you make any substantial change in your research procedure that could affect the experiences of the participants, you must submit a revised protocol to the Committee for approval.

Best wishes for great success with your research.
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Irwin Brown
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"OUR MISSION is to be outstanding teaching and research university, educating for life and addressing the challenges facing our society."
Appendix B: In-depth Interview Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Dear participant

I need your help to complete my PhD research. I am interested in the experiences of Hindu women in South African who manage work and having a family.

Your participation in this study will consist of an interview and I will need approximately one hour of your time. If you agree, the interview will be tape recorded so that I may accurately capture your insights in your own words. However, your name and identifying information will not be associated with any part of the written research. All of your information and interview responses will be kept confidential. Your participation is voluntary. You also have the right to withdraw from the study at any time following which none of the information collected from you will be used.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact myself or my supervisor, Professor Jeffrey Bagraim.

Contact details of researcher:
Ameeta Jaga  Ameeta.jaga@uct.ac.za  083 379 5921 / 021 650 3423

Contact details of research supervisor:
Professor Jeffrey Bagraim  Jeffrey.bagraim@uct.ac.za  021 650 2823

Kindly complete

By signing below I acknowledge that I have read and understand the above information. I am aware that I can discontinue my participation in the study at any time.

Signature____________________________________________ Date___________________
Appendix C: Ethical Clearance for Survey Study
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Faculty of Commerce
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Telephone: +27 21 650 5943
Fax No.: +27 21 650 4396

UCT/COM/131/2013

7th May 2013

Ameeta Jaga
University of Cape Town
Ameeta.jaga@uct.ac.za

Dear Researcher,

Project title: Culture and Work-family

This letter serves to confirm that the project entitled, “Culture and Work-family” as described in your final submitted protocol 2013, has been approved. You may proceed with the research.

Please note that if you make any substantial change in your research procedure that could affect the experiences of the participants, you must submit a revised protocol to the Committee for approval.

Best wishes for great success with your research.

Regards,

Harold Kincaid
Professor Harold Kincaid
Commerce Faculty Ethics in Research Committee

"OUR MISSION is to be an outstanding teaching and research university, educating for life and addressing the challenges facing our society."
Appendix D: Survey Cover Letter

24 April 2013

Dear Respondent

Survey of Work and Family Issues

Please participate in this important study on the work-family experiences of Hindu working women in South Africa for my PhD, by following the link below.

With your participation, the survey would contribute to ways in which South African organisations can attract and retain a more diverse workforce and help employees to achieve a better work-family balance.

This research has been approved by the University of Cape Town’s Ethics in Research Committee. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you can choose to withdraw from the research at any time. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The questionnaire is anonymous and your name will not appear anywhere on it. Please read each question carefully and answer it according to how you personally feel about it. There are no RIGHT or WRONG answers. For the study to be meaningful, I urge you to answer all the questions on this survey.

Please click on the following link to start the survey:
https://ucpcommerce.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_74gAQWH1aw8WJ6Z

A donation to each participating Hindu society will be made based on the responses of members from the respective societies.

If you have any questions regarding the research please feel free to contact me at Ameeta.jaga@uct.ac.za or my supervisor Prof. Jeffrey Bagraim at Jeffrey.bagraim@uct.ac.za

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Kind regards
Ameeta Jaga
Appendix E: Survey Measures

Work involvement
My work is a large part of my life.
When I am working, I forget everything else around me.
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.
My life goals are mainly work oriented.
The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

Work overload
I have to do things at work that I do not really have the time and energy for.
I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me at work.
I cannot ever seem to catch up at work.
There are times when I cannot meet everyone’s expectations at work.
I seem to have more commitments to overcome than other people I know at work.

Work hierarchy orientation
Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.
It is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with subordinates.
Managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.
Managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.
Employees should not disagree with management decisions.

Supervisor and co-worker support (parallel items)
To what extent is it easy to talk to your supervisor/co-workers?
To what extent is your supervisor/co-workers willing to listen to your problems?
To what extent does your supervisor/co-workers go out of his/her way to make life easier for you?
To what extent can your supervisor/co-workers be relied on when things get tough?
To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your supervisor/co-workers?

Work hours
How many hours would you say you work in an average week? Include the time spent at the office, time spent traveling, and time spent working at home.

Less than 19 hours (these participants were excluded)
20-29 hours
30-39 hours
40-49 hours
50-60 hours
60-70 hours
**Family involvement**
My family is a large part of my life.
When I am with my family, I forget everything else around me.
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my family.
My life goals are mainly family oriented.
The most important things that happen to me involve my family.

**Extended family overload**
In my extended family I have to do things that I do not really have the time and energy for.
I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me by my extended family.
I never seem to catch up with my responsibilities to my extended family.
Because of my extended family responsibilities, I do not ever seem to have any time for myself.
There are times when I cannot meet all my extended family’s expectations.
I seem to have more commitments to my extended family than other people I know.

**Number and age of children**
How many children do you have?
How many of your children are 6 years old or younger?
How many of your children live at home with you?

**Parental overload**
How often do you feel that your child(ren) is/are making too many demands on you?
How often do you feel that the amount of work you have to do as a parent is too much?
How often do you feel that the amount of time you devote to looking after your child(ren) leaves you with little time for much else?
How often do you feel you have too much work to do as a parent?
In general, how often do you feel overwhelmed by the demands of parenting?

**Food-work overload**
Cooking is my responsibility at home.
I set high standards for cooking.
It is important to me that the meals I prepare are traditional Indian meals.
I spend more time on cooking than I would like to.
I spend more energy on cooking than I would like to.

**Family hierarchy orientation**
Elders in the family should make most decisions without consulting younger members of the family.
It is frequently necessary for an elder in the family to use authority and power when dealing with younger family members.
Elderly family members should not ask for the opinions of younger family members.
At family social gatherings, younger family members should mix with their own age group.
Younger family members should not disagree with the decisions made by elderly family members.

**Extended family/spousal support (parallel items)**
To what extent is it easy to talk to your extended family members/spouse?
To what extent is your extended family members/spouse willing to listen to your problems?
To what extent does your extended family members/spouse go out of his/her way to make life easier for you?
To what extent can your extended family members/spouse be relied on when things get tough?
To what extent are you satisfied with the support that you receive from your extended family members/spouse?

**Paid domestic support**
Do you have paid domestic help (e.g., nanny, char, domestic helper, au pair, cook)?
Yes
No

**Family hours**
On your average work day, how much time do you spend on household cleaning and/or child care (excluding cooking)?

- Less than one hour
- 1-2 hours
- 2-3 hours
- 3-4 hours
- More than 4 hours

On your average work day, how much time do you spend on cooking (including meal planning, meal preparation and shopping for food)?

- Less than one hour
- 1-2 hours
- 2-3 hours
- 3-4 hours
- More than 4 hours
**Gender role ideology**
A woman’s most important task in life should be taking care of her children.
A husband should earn more money than his wife.
It should not bother a husband if his wife’s job sometimes requires her to be away from home overnight.
A woman whose husband can support her should not work.
A working mother can have just as good a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.
Even if the wife works, the husband should be the main breadwinner and the wife should carry the main responsibility for the home and children.

**Work-to-family conflict**
The demands of my work interfere with my home and my family life.
The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfil my family responsibilities.
Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.
My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfil family duties.
Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.

**Family-to-work conflict**
The demands of my work interfere with my home and my family life.
The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfil my family responsibilities.
Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.
My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfil family duties.
Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.

**Age (in years)**

**Primary identity**
In what way do you prefer to identify yourself?
Hindu South African
South African Hindu
Hindu
South African
Other, please specify

**Language group identity**
What Indian language group do you identify yourself with?
Gujarati
Hindi
Tamil
Telugu
Other, please specify ____________________
Prefer not to answer
What is your Indian generational status in South Africa?

1st generation Indian
2nd generation Indian
3rd generation Indian
4th generation Indian
Other, please specify ____________________
Do not know
Prefer not to answer

How important is caste/sub-caste status to you? (e.g., Would it be important for you or your children to marry someone from the same caste/sub-caste)

Not important
Slightly important
Neither important nor unimportant
Moderately important
Extremely important
Prefer not to answer

Marital Status
Single/Separated/Divorced/Widowed
Married/Living with a partner

Do you house and care for elderly persons?
Yes
No
If yes, how many? _________________________

What is your highest formal educational level?
Matric
Undergraduate diploma or degree
Post graduate degree
Other, please specify ____________________

What is your main job-related industry?
Finance
Information technology and communication
Health Services
Building and engineering
Education
Operations
Other, please specify ____________________
What is the main function of your work type?
Non-managerial
Managerial
Professional
Business owner

How many years have you been in your current organisation? (in years)

Income
What is your approximate annual household pre-tax income from all sources:
R0 - R55 000 income per annum
R55 001 - R150 000 income per annum
R150 001 - R365 000 income per annum
R365 001 - R630 000 income per annum
R630 001 - R865 000 income per annum
R865 001 - R1 300 000 income per annum
R1 3000 001 plus income per annum
Prefer not to answer
### Appendix F: Spearman rank correlation analysis

Table A1

Inter-correlations of the variables in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WInv</td>
<td></td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOver</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FInv</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParOver</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoodWrk</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupSupp</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.166**</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.138*</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSupp</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>-.164**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSupp</td>
<td>.146**</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpSupp</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.137*</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>-.213**</td>
<td>-.285**</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.163**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-.120*</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2FC</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>-.148**</td>
<td>-.171**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.234**</td>
<td>.239**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2WC</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.383**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.643**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.170**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WrkHrs</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>-.137*</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FamHrs</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.158*</td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.204**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values are Spearman rank correlation coefficients. Sample size ranging from \( N = 245 \) to \( N = 318 \) (pairwise deletion of missing data). **. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). WInv = work involvement; WOver = work overload; FInv = family involvement; EOver = family overload; ParOver = parental overload; FoodWrk = food-work overload; SupSupp = supervisor support; CWSupp = co-worker support; EFSupp = extended family support; SpSupp = spousal support; WkHier = work hierarchy; FmHier = family hierarchy; GRI = gender role ideology: low scores indicate egalitarian GRI, high scores indicate traditional GRI; W2FC = work-to-family conflict; F2WC = family-to-work conflict; WFC = work-family conflict; WrkHrs = work hours; FamHrs = family hours
Appendix G: Initial EFA with all Gender Role Ideology Items

Table A2
*Cultural Dimensions Scales: Family Hierarchy Orientation, Work Hierarchy Orientation, and GRI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FmHier3</td>
<td>Elderly family members should not ask for the opinions of younger family members.</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier1</td>
<td>Elders in the family should make most decisions without consulting younger members of the family.</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier2</td>
<td>It is frequently necessary for an elder in the family to use authority and power when dealing with younger family members.</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier5</td>
<td>Younger family members should not disagree with the decisions made by elderly family members.</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FmHier4</td>
<td>At family social gatherings, younger family members should mix with their own age group.</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI3 Reversed</td>
<td>It should not bother a husband if his wife’s job sometimes requires her to be away from home overnight.</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier3</td>
<td>Managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier1</td>
<td>Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier2</td>
<td>It is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with subordinates.</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier5</td>
<td>Employees should not disagree with management decisions.</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkHier4</td>
<td>Managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI2</td>
<td>A husband should earn more money than his wife.</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI6</td>
<td>Even if the wife works, the husband should be the main breadwinner and the wife should carry the main responsibility for the home and children.</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI4</td>
<td>A woman whose husband can support her should not work.</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI1</td>
<td>A woman’s most important task in life should be taking care of her children.</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI5 Reversed</td>
<td>A working mother can have just as good a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues
- 6.748
- 1.587
- 1.214
- 1.091

Individual total variance (percent)
- 42.175
- 9.918
- 7.590
- 6.820

Cumulative total variance (percent)
- 42.175
- 52.094
- 59.684
- 66.504

Notes. N = 311 after listwise deletion of missing data; Principal factor analysis with varimax normalised data; Each items’ significance loadings are presented in bold face; FmHier = family hierarchy; WkHier = work hierarchy; GRI = gender role ideology.
Appendix H: Histograms for Non-normally Distributed Univariate Variables

Figure A1. Histogram for family involvement.

Figure A2. Histogram for spousal support.
## Appendix I: Post Hoc Tukey HSD among Categories of Job Type

### Table A3

*Multiple Comparisons (Post Hoc Tukey HSD) among Categories of Job Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Job type category (I)</th>
<th>Job type category (J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W2FC</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>-.25751</td>
<td>.14819</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>[-.6403, .1253]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.48652*</td>
<td>.14604</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>[-.8638, -.1093]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-.28196</td>
<td>.26472</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>[-.9658, .4018]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.25751</td>
<td>.14819</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>[-.6403, .1253]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.22901</td>
<td>.15305</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>[-.6244, .1663]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-.02444</td>
<td>.26865</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>[-.7184, .6695]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.48652*</td>
<td>.14604</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>[.1093, .8638]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>.22901</td>
<td>.15305</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>[-.1663, .6244]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.20456</td>
<td>.26747</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>[-.4863, .8955]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.28196</td>
<td>.26472</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>[-.4018, .9658]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>.02444</td>
<td>.26865</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>[-.6695, .7184]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.20456</td>
<td>.26747</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>[-.8955, .4863]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2WC</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>.08561</td>
<td>.13416</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>[-.2609, .4321]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.35708*</td>
<td>.13221</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>[-.6986, -.0156]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-.24995</td>
<td>.23965</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>[-.8690, .3691]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>-.08561</td>
<td>.13416</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>[-.4321, .2609]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.44269*</td>
<td>.13856</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>[-.8006, -.0848]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-.33556</td>
<td>.24321</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>[-.9638, .2927]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.35708*</td>
<td>.13221</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>[.0156, .6986]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>.44269*</td>
<td>.13856</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>[.0848, .8006]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.10713</td>
<td>.24214</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>[-.5183, .7326]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>.24995</td>
<td>.23965</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>[-.3691, .8690]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>.33556</td>
<td>.24321</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>[-.2927, .9638]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>-.10713</td>
<td>.24214</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>[-.7326, .5183]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. DV = dependent variable. CI = Confidence interval.
Appendix J: Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardised Residuals

Figure A3. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis: Work stressors as antecedents of W2FC.

Figure A4. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis: Work stressors as antecedents of F2WC.
Figure A5. Standard multiple regression analysis: Family stressors as antecedents of F2WC.

Figure A6. Standard multiple regression analysis: Family stressors as antecedents of W2FC.
Figure A7. Moderated hierarchical regression analysis: Work roles stressors and work social support predicting W2FC.

Figure A8. Moderated hierarchical regression analysis: Family stressors and family social support predicting F2WC.
Figure A9. Moderated hierarchical regression analysis: Work role stressors and cultural dimensions predicting W2FC.

Figure A10. Moderated multiple regression analysis: Family stressors and cultural dimensions predicting F2WC.
Appendix K: Harman's Single-Factor Test on Composite Scales

Table A4

Harman’s Single-Factor Test on Composite Scales in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work involvement</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family involvement</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family overload</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental overload</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-work overload</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family support</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal support</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>-.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hierarchy orientation</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family hierarchy orientation</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender role ideology</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.446</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-family conflict</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-work conflict</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.307</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Variance Explained %</td>
<td>28.714</td>
<td>15.485</td>
<td>9.760</td>
<td>7.299</td>
<td>6.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Variance Explained %</td>
<td>28.714</td>
<td>44.199</td>
<td>53.959</td>
<td>61.258</td>
<td>67.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>