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Abstract
This study examines work–family enrichment among manufacturing workers within the South Africa. It further investigates whether family-friendly supervisory support and family–supportive benefits and services positively influence work–family enrichment. Self-report questionnaires were distributed by the researcher to human–resource practitioners at seven manufacturing sites. An online survey was also developed and the link to this questionnaire was disseminated to four additional organisations via e–mail. A total of 314 employees (N = 314) complete the questionnaire. The results indicate that work-family enrichment is bi-directional and that supervisory support explains significant variance in work to family enrichment. Implications for future research are also discussed.
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Introduction

The world of work has evolved considerably and the modern South African workplace has not been isolated from these developments. Workplaces are generally integrated and diverse and organisations (Wager and Hollenbeck, 2015) need to be responsive to the needs of employees with diverse work-life responsibilities so that competitiveness and innovation is not adversely affected.

Work–family research – specifically focusing on a positive perspective of the work and family interface – is more prevalent now than previously. This prevalence is reflected in the next section, the literature review. Although strides have been made in this regard, particular worker populations and industries remain understudied. It may be argued that South Africa is no exception. There is a need for more localised, South Africa–oriented research with regard to the positive side of the work-family interface. This study addresses this need and also addresses the limitations of previous studies by investigating the work-family enrichment of a neglected group of workers, operational manufacturing employees.

This study aims to establish the nature and extent of work–family enrichment (hence WFE) amongst manufacturing operational staff. The directionality of WFE is investigated. Work–family enrichment is evaluated in terms of work-to-family enrichment, and family-to-work enrichment. Furthermore, this study examines whether supervisory support is related to work–family enrichment amongst manufacturing operational staff.
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The findings of this study may enable organisations in the manufacturing sector to make more informed decisions with regard to the human-resource management policies offered and promoted among their staff. It may also result in a more tactical deployment of supervisory development solutions, tailored to the requirements of the manufacturing operational employees.

Work–family enrichment research is a relative new addition to positive organisational behaviour. Over the past decades, meaningful research has been conducted in this topic. However, these studies have predominantly focused on white-collar workers within the labour force. Furthermore, these studies have been primarily undertaken in Western countries.

The central purpose of this study is to establish the nature and extent of work–family enrichment amongst operational workers in South Africa. Furthermore, it seeks to evaluate which family–supportive benefits and services respondents most often utilise in order to empower organisations in the region to make tactical decisions regarding the types of resources which will optimally support the overall employee well–being – be it at work and in their private capacity.

Outline of the research

The structure of this study follows the conventional and dominant structures of academic writing. It is therefore structured logically in five sections.

Section 1 introduces the reader to the topic of this study and the reasons why it was completed. 2 aims to synthesise the leading pedagogical literature on the topic.
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Section 3 aims to engage the reader on the research methodology and methods used for this dissertation. This section is divided into five sub-sections which describes the research design, participants, procedures followed, measures utilised and the data analysis techniques applied, respectively.

Section 4 aims to present the results on the topic. This section is divided into six categories. It begins with a general descriptive analysis demonstrating the significant alpha values. Secondly, the exploratory factor analysis process followed is explained and the results are presented. Thirdly, reliability analysis results are described including the Spearman Rank Order correlations generated. Fourthly, the relationship between family–supportive benefits and work–family enrichment is presented. Finally, the results of the regression analysis conducted are presented.

Section 5 gives a detailed discussion on the findings, notes limitations of the research and suggests topics for future research.
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Literature Review

Numerous workplace studies have been conducted relating to the work–family enrichment. These will be discussed hereafter. However, the focus of the particular participants in the manufacturing industry remains understudied. This section aims to define work–family enrichment and demonstrate its application in the various workplace settings. It will further reflect on the disproportionate amount of research based on the workers within Westernised countries. Based on these pedagogical studies reviewed, it becomes apparent that this phenomenon is of interest across the diverse industries and within many countries. Pedagogical literature relating to the relationship between the work–family enrichment, supervisory support and family supportive benefits will be reviewed. Finally, research propositions will be articulated.

The expansion of work–family enrichment data

It may be argued that social studies are needed to establish the nature and extent of work–family enrichment amongst the manufacturing workers in the South African organisations. From Western countries, this research has evolved considerably and relates particularly to the positive constructs within the work–family literature. As we broaden our understanding of this previously overlooked sphere of work–family research, various aspects of the work–family enrichment construct – applied in varying workplace settings and relative to a variety of workplace outcomes – stimulates curiosity among researchers regarding the potential benefits to be derived through the appropriate application of these findings.
Theoretical framework

Role accumulation.

Sieber (1974) acknowledged that multiple roles held by an individual generated potential for role strain. However, his theory of role accumulation proposed that there may be four categories of distinct "reward" which could be derived by an individual's participation in multiple roles. Firstly, role-related privileges refer to the 'institutional' rewards received by an individual as a result of a formalised role they occupy. Secondly, the overall status security as a form of reward refers to the different relationships participated in through multiple roles that can be leveraged at different times as a means of offsetting negative relationships for the ones that are more positive. Thirdly, there are resources for status enhancement and role performance which refer to the advantages yielded by an individual because of their social relationships. The last reward category refers to the enhancement of the personality and an experience of the ego gratification.

This latter reward category is most aligned to the concept of work–family enrichment, as it is comparable to the two pathways described by Greenhaus and Powell (2006), namely the instrumental and affective pathways. The instrumental pathway describes one's skills and knowledge acquired within one domain, work or family, influencing their successful performance in a different domain. Differently stated, this pathway is activated when a resource generated in one role is transferred directly from one role to another and, in doing so, it enhances the performance in the receiving role (Molino et al, 2013). The affective pathway describes one's positive emotional experiences in one domain and enhances their emotional experience within the alternative domain positively. Molino, et al. (2013) described the affective pathway as an instance during which a resource generated in one role
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promotes positive affect in that role, which in turn produces high performance and results in a positive affect in the second role.

Work–family enrichment.

Work–family enrichment is borne out of the work of Greenhaus and Powell (2006). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined this construct as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role", (p.73). Work–family interactions are commonly understood to be bi-directional, (Lingard, Francis, & Turner, 2012). The term work–family refers to an overall bi-directional relationship between the work and family domains, as opposed to the terms such as work-to-family and family-to-work— which refer to uni-directional relationships (Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

Work–family enrichment, as a construct, is considered to be bi-directional— meaning that it is possible for the work-to-family enrichment to occur and, likewise, family-to-work enrichment to occur (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). It has been demonstrated that work–family enrichment is more strongly related to the work-related variables, and that family–work enrichment is more strongly related to non–work–related variables, (McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010).

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined five core resources which— when provided in a given role, and within one domain— is able to effect higher performance and/or the perception of positive affect in the alternate domain. A resource is defined as skill or mechanism that may be drawn on when needed to solve a problem or cope with the challenging situations, (Greenhaus, & Powell, 2006). The five resources specified within their model are skills and perspectives, psychological resources, physical resources, social–capital resources and flexibility material resources (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), as depicted
in Figure 1 below. The model itself further indicates the directions of influence in the relationships between variables as illustrated in Figure 1 below. Their model depicts the two dimensions of enrichment previously mentioned, namely the instrumental and affective pathways of enrichment from one domain to another. This study will focus specifically on the instrumental dimension of work–family enrichment as the point of departure. The rationale for this scope within the study is to provide a focused view of the tangible workplace levers that organisations may influence in order to improve the quality of work life of their employees.

The instrumental pathway is depicted by the resources generated in Role A, which are directed into high performance in role A (as indicated by arrow 3), and which may in turn result in the positive affect in role A. The affective pathway is depicted by the resources generated in Role A, which are directed into positive affect in role A (as indicated by arrow 2), and which in turn translates into the high performance in the latter role B (as indicated by arrow 5) and positive affect in role B.

By the way of illustrative example, the instrumental pathway can be practically explained with reference to an individual who fathers his first child and acquires a new psychological resource such as greater depth of patience owing to his new familial role. This skill translates into “high performance” in his capacity as a parent (role A) – which in turn generates positive feedback or appreciation from his spouse and resultant affirming affect. This elevated level of interpersonal skills i.e. patience is transferred into his work domain (role B) – where he applies the skill and delivers improved performance in terms of his interpersonal skills.

Utilising another practical example, in reference to the affective pathway an employee who underwent training on time management (material resource) may find that she
experiences increased confidence in her ability to perform her work duties (affect in role A)—
and these feelings may transfer to her personal life (role B) where she may apply the same
skills (high performance), and which in turn result in the affirming feelings (positive affect in
role B) in this domain.

Figure 1. Greenhaus & Powell’s Model of Work–Family Enrichment (2006)

Work and family within the scope of this study.

Bianchi and Milkie (2010) conducted a meta–analysis of work–family research and
noted an increase in the diversity of families and workplaces. For the purposes of the current
study, the descriptions of work and family are provided as a contextual parameter. The work
domain refers to the type of activities which are associated with paid employment, (Eby,
Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). The current study will include traditional family structures with dual career parents – with one or more children, but also with other types of families such as gay and lesbian families; divorced parents with joint custody and single parent families and stepfamilies, a defining descriptor in reference to the work of Bianchi and Milkie (2010).

**Work–family enrichment examined in various parts of the world.**

In reviewing the literature surrounding work–family enrichment, a breadth of perspectives pertaining to the application of the construct was noted with a variety of organisational settings across different countries.

In Spain, Boz, Martínez, and Munduate (2009) examined the work–family enrichment and supervisory support as the moderators of relationship conflict among the professionals in a public organisation. Their research demonstrated that work–family enrichment was able to moderate and at times reduce the negative effects of relationship conflict on employees' job satisfaction.

Malaysia. Sabil and Marican (2011) examined the relationship between the working hours with work–family conflict and work–family enrichment among professional women in Malaysia. This study found no relationship between the average working hours per week and the participants' experience on work–family enrichment. Given the average working hours per week – being comparable to those of the South African manufacturing environment, it is of interest in the present study to understand whether similar findings will emerge.

Fung, Ahmad and Omar (2014) conducted a study with the participation of the Malaysian teachers to test their mediation model examining work–family enrichment as the mediator and antecedent factors such as job autonomy, job involvement and workplace
outcomes. They have also found a positive relationship between the participants in the study who had reported higher intensities of work–family enrichment also tended to experience higher levels of job satisfaction.

United States of America. In the United States of America (USA), Wayne, Randel, and Stevens (2006) assessed the antecedents of work–family enrichment and family–work enrichment among workers in the insurance industry. Interesting findings emerged from this study which suggested that the informal, organisationally supportive workplaces practice more strongly influenced employees' experience of work–family enrichment in comparison to the formal workplace practices.

Another study aimed to study the public organisations within the USA investigated the impact of social support on work–family conflict and work–family enhancement, (Wadsworth & Owens, 2007). Various sources of supervisory support, specifically the co-worker and organisational ones, were found to have a positive influence on the overall employees experience on work-to-family enhancement.

Odle-Dusseau, Britt, and Greene-Shortridge (2012) tested their model which proposed that organisational resources may predict job attitudes and supervisor ratings of performance through the mechanisms of work–family conflict and work–family enrichment amongst workers in an American hospital. Their study found that work–family enrichment and family–work enrichment were both mediators of the relationships between family-supportive supervisory behaviours and various organisational outcomes including job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Carlson, Ferguson, Kacmar, Grzywacz and Witten (2011) conducted a study to examine crossover effect of supervisors' work–family enrichment on their subordinates and job performance across multi-disciplinary organisations in the USA.
New Zealand. In New Zealand, Allis and O’Driscoll (2008) conducted a study with employees from the local government organisations to better understand facilitation and conflict from the family to the work domain. With the specific regard to the facilitation, a positive relationship was found between non-work to work facilitation and positive well-being.

Australia. Lingard, Francis and Turner (2010) measured and explored the occurrence of work-family enrichment among construction workers in Australia. Their study confirmed that the work-family enrichment construct was bi-directional and that several job resources included in their study – such as supervisory support and schedule flexibility – were positively related to work-family enrichment.

Slovenia. Tement and Komnka (2013) conducted an interesting study that examined work and family role players in the context of caregiving, with a multi-disciplinary sample group of participants. They found relationships between job resources (including autonomy and co-worker support, but not job demands) and work-family enrichment. The relationship was partially moderated by the different types of caregiving responsibility.

Korea. Lim, Choi, and Song, (2012) developed and applied the Korean version of the work-family enrichment scale in academic institutions and private sector organisations. Their study validated that the scale and by extension, the work-family enrichment construct, could be demonstrated in a non-Westernised culture.

China. Siu, Lu, Brough, Lu, Bakker, Kalliath, O’Driscoll, Phillips, Chen, Lo, Sit and Shi (2010) proposed a theoretical model of work-family enrichment which tested the mediating role of work engagement among employees from local hospitals and factories in Guangzhou and Dongguan regions in China. Their study found that work engagement was
positively related to work–family enrichment and further mediated the relationship between family–friendly organisational policies and work–family enrichment. Interestingly, they found no difference between the results of male and female participants in the study.

The Netherlands. In a study conducted by Steenbergen, Kluwer and Karney (2014) in the Netherlands examined whether the participants' work–to–family enrichment experiences had any influence on their own and their spouses’ marital satisfaction. Their findings confirmed that the participants’ work–family enrichment had a positive relationship to their related marital satisfaction. However, the spousal marital enrichment was of specific value to the spouses of the male participants but not to the female participants’ partners.

Italy. In an Italian study conducted by Molino, Ghislieri and Cortese (2012), researchers drew participants’ from across occupational sectors and investigated the mediating role of organisational resources with the specific reference to opportunities for professional development, between jobs resources such as supervisory and co–worker support, and work–family enrichment. Their findings showed that these job resources increased opportunities for professional development and played a mediating influence on job resources and work–family enrichment.

Russo and Buonocore (2012) tested their work–family enrichment model amongst staff in an Italian hospital to understand if it was associated with lower levels of professional turnover – through higher levels of job satisfaction and professional commitment. The participants of their study provided a scarce skill in the country at the time of the research undertaking and showed that where evidence was present of work–family enrichment, those employees’ turnover intentions were reduced.

China. Tang, Siu and Cheung (2012) conducted a study with Chinese participants to investigate whether work–to–family enrichment functioned as a mediator between work
support, which they categorised into supervisory support, co-worker support and organisational support, and job satisfaction – and found these to be related. Their findings showed that organisational support in particular played the most influential role on work-to-family enrichment.

India. Baral and Bhargava (2010) conducted their study of the role of work-family enrichment in the relationships between organisational interventions for work-life balance (including work-life benefits and policies and supervisory support) and job outcomes among their staff within the manufacturing and information technology organisations in India. Among their findings, they noted that there were no significant relationships between work-life benefits and policies and any of the job outcome measures they included. They also found that supervisory support was positively related to work-family enrichment.

There is clearly an interest in the work-family enrichment that transcends global and sectorial boundaries. These studies and the findings they have generated may indeed be generalizable to the South African manufacturing working environment, but this remains to be established.

Work-family enrichment and manufacturing.

The manufacturing industry is considered as an important role-player in generating growth within the South African economy. This is predominantly achieved through its influence on the creation of employment and the ability to stimulate demand in the service sector – which is another significant contributor to the overall prosperity of the country (Tregenna, 2008). It has been argued that in the future, talented human capital will become such a critical differentiator for the prosperity of organisations and even countries that their
ability to attract, develop and retain the highest skilled talent – including technicians and skilled production workers – will be considered a priority (Bosch et al., 2012).

Extensive research on work–family enrichment and its related constructs have been conducted to date. It is hoped that the learning identified in other working environments may be explored and replicable in the manufacturing working environment within a South African context.

The workers within a manufacturing environment may be broadly categorised into managerial and administrative staff, as well as machine and process operators who work on production lines that require continuous operation and sequential task performance in order to deliver outputs, (Bond & Galinsky, 2011).

In their study *Mentoring, supervisor support, and perceived organizational support: what matters most?,* Dawley, Andrews, and Bucklew (2008) described an organisational culture within an American manufacturing organisation as being characterised by high stress, operations responsive to varying customer demands with minimal lead time and lean staff compliments to fulfil these operational needs. They further emphasised the importance placed upon managing productivity and effective cost management to ensure competitive advantage within this sector. This description is consistent with South African manufacturing work settings and is significant in that it illustrates the contextual workplace demands that employees typically encounter.

Given the operational demands of the manufacturing environment, it stands to reason that the potential exists for the inordinate strain to occur among employees. There are opportunities to provide work–family support such as workplace flexibility to manufacturing employees that are in occupations at the managerial, office–based, or conceptual–technical positions in nature, (Bond & Galinsky, 2011). Operational staff, many of whom are
constrained by shift work patterns, are however less likely to benefit from the internal supportive mechanisms.

Work and family studies have largely been focusing on the managerial level staff. The intent of this study is to investigate work–family issues and the potential resources linked to work–family enrichment that influence the under-researched population of operational staff. Existing research has demonstrated that manufacturing workers who perceived support of their work–family balance in their working environment felt less negative influence from the work–related roles to home–related roles, and resultanty more positive job attitudes relative to those workers who perceived their workplace as unsupportive of their efforts to balance their work and family roles, (Grandey, Cordeiro, & Michael, 2007). They further noted that even individuals who were single, and thus not benefiting from all family–supportive practices, did not feel dissatisfied or less advantaged with workplaces, (Grandey et al., 2007).

These findings are useful in that they provide a frame of reference relative to the context of this category of worker within the appropriate work setting. They demonstrate that there is a potential benefit to explore the situations of whether work–family enrichment could exist within the scope of the target population in the current study. This study will therefore seek to understand whether work–family enrichment occurs among the South African manufacturing workers – including both male and female participants, and staff with and without dependents.

**Work–family enrichment and supervisory support.**

Line managers within the manufacturing environment are uniquely positioned to provide readily accessible, visible organisational support to the operational staff. They interact with operators at the proverbial coalface, and provide a point of contact through
which the organisation has the opportunity to elicit employee needs and address them through different communication channels created by the line management and employee relationship. Research supports the rationale that informal support plays an important role in influencing the work–family enrichment (Siu et al., 2010) – and that supervisory support is a particularly important form of organisational support (Muse & Pichler, 2011). Furthermore, it could also be argued that the enhanced supervisor supportiveness is a more attractive resource to organisations, as it is a relatively inexpensive and practical measure compared to the more costly alternatives such as improving the employee compensation, training and career development, (Newman, Thanacoody, & Hui, 2011).

Dawley, Andrews, and Bucklew (2008) conducted a study to examine the relative impact of mentoring, supervisory support, and the perceived organisational support on other work outcomes such as the organisational commitment and job search behaviour. They found that mentorship and supervisory support could be effective in dealing with the retention-related challenges. The perception of the organisational support was considered more significant, and this was consistent across a multidisciplinary sample comprising of workers from the public service, financial institutions and manufacturing sectors.

Dikkers, Geurts, Dulk, Peper, Taris and Kompier (2007) categorised work–home culture into five dimensions. These include the organisation's support, the supervisor's support, support of colleagues, career consequences, and organisational time demands. Their findings concluded that employees who perceived higher levels of organisational, supervisory and peer responsiveness to work and family issues were considerably more likely to make use of family–supportive benefits and services such as flexible work–time, part–time work and subsidised childcare services, (Dikkers et al., 2007).
Boz, Martinez, and Munduate (2009) delved more specifically into the relationship between the work-family enrichment and supervisory support in terms of their moderating influence on the relationship conflict. Their findings confirmed that the relationship conflict is negatively related to job satisfaction, and that the work-family enrichment and supervisory support may actually play a buffering effect on this relationship.

A study was conducted within the healthcare industry which tested whether the organisational resources aimed at improving individuals’ ability to manage their work and family responsibilities could predict numerous outcomes such as their job attitudes and the performance review ratings through the phenomenon such as work-family enrichment, (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012). They found that work-family enrichment and family-work enrichment both mediated relationships between the supportive supervisory behaviours and various organisational outcomes. In addition, employees’ perceived experiences of work-family enrichment were related to their experience of the supportive supervisory behaviours, (Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012). Their findings suggest that when employees perceive their supervisors to be facilitating an environment where work and family could be successfully managed then the employees’ job performance and attitudes to their work could be predicted over a specific period of time.

Tuzun and Kalemci (2012) examined the relationship between organisational support, supervisory support and work outcomes such as turnover intentions among staff within the insurance industry. Their findings showed that when the supervisory support is high, perceived organisational support becomes a weaker predictor of turnover, (Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012). Conversely, low supervisory support elevated the importance and influence of the perceived organisational support, (Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012).
Mills, Matthews, Henning and Woo (2014) investigated the specific process which enables work–family–supportive organisations and supervisory support to influence the organisational outcomes. Their model successfully demonstrated that family–supportive organisation perceptions were influenced by family–supportive supervisor behaviours – which in turn influenced their subordinate’s self-efficacy, the subordinate affective commitment to the organisation and subordinate perceptions of supervisors’ work effort. These findings are supported by the study of Choi, Cheong and Feinberg, (2012) and Newman, Thanacoody and Hui, (2011) who found that the supervisory support does moderate the relationship between workplace outcomes such as job burnout and turnover. They also found that supervisory support aggravated the adverse effect of depersonalisation on turnover intentions.

A study consisting of business professionals has demonstrated the relationship between family–supportive supervision and work–family balance, (Greenhaus, Ziegert & Allen, 2012). Their findings indicated that this relationship was mediated by work–family enrichment. They found the relationship to be stronger for the staff in family–supportive organisational environments than in the unsupportive organisational environments, (Greenhaus et al., 2012).

In their study of the indirect effects of positive affect on family domain outcomes such as family satisfaction, Dunn and O’Brien (2013) demonstrated that organisational support was related to have positive affect at work for both male and female participants. Wayne, Casper, Matthews, and Allen (2013) conducted a study to understand the processes through which family–supportive organisational perceptions related to employee affective commitment. Among their findings, the study confirmed that family–supportive organisational perceptions were positively related to the employee work–to–family
enrichment – which in turn was positively related to the employee affective commitment. Two of these processes, namely the supervisory and co-worker support are also credited with enhancing work-to-family enrichment through the positive affect they had created for the participating employees.

What these various studies illustrate is that the work–family enrichment may be positively related to the supportive supervisory practices. It further indicates that together, work–family enrichment and supervisory support may increase the likelihood of employees experiencing positive workplace outcomes ranging from the positive job performance to the reduced turnover intentions.

**Work–family enrichment and family–supportive benefits and services.**

McNamara, Pitt–Catsouphes, Brown and Matz–Costa (2012) propounded that “...workers do not utilize the flexible work options to which they have access nor do they necessarily have access to all options officially provided by their organizations”, (p. 936). McNamara et al. (2012) investigated various demographic characteristics and attempted to better their understanding on whether access and utilisation were positively or negatively correlated. They posited that generally the management has greater access to opportunities for organisation support associated with the flexible work arrangements, and that employees deemed of a lower financial status, with the potentially more manual work routines, were not afforded equal access to these. Another study demonstrated that flexible work arrangements do not always have a relationship with workplace outcomes such as the turnover intentions and psychological strain, (Timms, Brough, O’Driscoll, Kallith, Siu, Sit & Lo, 2014).

Organisations employ different types of work–life policies and programmes including flexible work schedules, flexible workplace locations, support with care responsibilities, and
the informational and social support resources, (Kossek & Friede, 2005). In the current study, family-supportive benefits include but are not limited to the dependent care, flexible alternative work schedules (Eby et al., 2005), employee assistance programmes, healthcare and advisory services.

Baral and Bhargava (2010) examined the role of work-family enrichment on the relationship between organisational work-life balance efforts and job outcomes. They found no significant link to work-life policies. Their rationale for this outcome is that these policies are too general and that in future studies a more accurate reflection of the impact should be assessed if the policies relating to the various types of organisational support were further divided into the distinct categories such as policies, benefits and services. This has been taken into consideration in the current study, however based on the varying literacy levels of the sample; a decision was taken to maintain the broad, encompassing descriptor of family-supportive benefits.

Muse and Pichler (2011) tested their model which sought to understand if multiple forms of social support, both formal (i.e. work-life benefit use) and informal (work-family supervisory support and family support), relate to work-to-family and family-to-work performance. Their study showed that supervisory support was the key to both task and contextual performance outcomes. Theirs is one of only a few studies which focused on a sample of lower-skilled workers. In the current study, it must be noted that the operational staff within the modern manufacturing organisations may be highly skilled – irrespective of their level of work within the organisational structure.

Within a manufacturing working environment, working hours of the operational staff in particular are usually highly regulated. It was of interest to note that in their investigation of the association between hours worked per week and employees perceived satisfaction with
their work–family balance, (McNamara, Pitt–Catsouphes, Matz–Costa, Brown, & Valcour, 2012), that a significant negative relationship was found between hours worked per week and satisfaction with the work–family balance. These findings suggest that the average relationship between long work hours and satisfaction with work–family balance may underestimate the important influence of long work hours for workers with lower satisfaction levels (McNamara et al., 2012).

In a study by Muse and Wadsworth, (2012), the relationship between the traditional workplace benefits and non–traditional workplace benefits were compared to understand their relative value and influence on the employees’ experience of support within their organisations. They found that employees who perceived greater organisational support generally belonged to the organisations that offered them non–traditional benefit offerings. They found that the traditional benefits were not related to the perceived organisational support. They speculated that this was likely due to the non–discretionary benefits not being considered significantly enough to constitute support.

Butts, Casper and Yang (2013) conducted a valuable meta–analytic study on the value of work–family support policies and their effect on the employee outcomes. Although their study centred upon work–family conflict – which is beyond the scope of the current study – one of their noteworthy objectives was to evaluate how the workers’ attitudes were affected by availability and utilisation of family–supportive policies. Their findings revealed that the availability and use of family–supportive organisational policies showed small but favourable relationships with work attitudes. They had also demonstrated that availability had a stronger influence on the relationship.

McNamara, Pitt–Catsouphes, Matz–Costa, Brown, and Valcour (2013) conducted a study with a sample of American participants – across several local and multinational
organisations – to understand the relationship between hours worked per week and satisfaction with work–family balance. As would be expected, they found a negative relationship between extended hours worked per week and lower satisfaction with work–family balance.

Carlson, Grzywacz, and Kacmar (2010) sought to enhance an understanding of the relationship of flexible work schedules with outcomes in both the work and family domains. One of their findings was that work-to-family enrichment fully mediates mechanisms in the relationship of schedule flexibility with positive affect in the workplace and partially with job outcomes.

Behson (2005) proposed that informal means of organisational work–family support, such as managerial support, are more useful than formal means of organisational work–family support. His results revealed that informal means of work–family support explain more variance in the employee outcomes than formal mechanisms do. One of the outcomes of the current study would be to identify whether the formal support resources in the form of benefits and family–friendly services, or informal, subtle support resources, such as supervisory support, exerted a greater influence on workers in the manufacturing work environment.

Summary

Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) proposition of the construct, work–family enrichment, has generated substantial focus in the academia across the world. Work–family enrichment has been evaluated across a multitude of work environment contexts, and among the diverse employee sample groups. Supervisory support has been demonstrated as being positively related to work–family enrichment. Workplace outcomes related to work–family enrichment
have also been noted. These promising findings give credence to the need to further explore and encourage work-family enrichment.

Baral and Bhargava (2011) made a salient point in cautioning the generalisability of findings derived from the samples of studies in the developed Western countries relative to the developing countries. With this in mind, exploring the manufacturing work place – within a South African context, and demonstrating work family enrichment’s presence in this environment – creates a platform for further exploratory research regarding the work-family context of this unique sample group.

**Research propositions**

The following propositions, based on the literature, are made for this study:

**Proposition 1.** Work-family enrichment is bi-directional amongst manufacturing workers.

**Proposition 2.** A significant positive relationship exists between supervisory support and work-to-family enrichment amongst operational manufacturing workers.

**Proposition 3.** A significant relationship exists between the provision of family-friendly benefits and services and the work-family enrichment experienced by operational manufacturing workers.
Research Methodology

The research methodology adopted for this research paper comprises of three broad stages as follows:

Stage 1. A literature research to determine the research focus.

Stage 2. A general survey, applying cross-sectional research design was adopted with respondents who were workers within the multi-sectorial manufacturing work environment from the Western and Eastern Cape regions of South Africa.

Stage 3. A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted on the collected data.

The focus of this research is to explore whether operational workers in the manufacturing work environment experience work-family enrichment. Furthermore, this thesis seeks to understand whether a relationship exists between the supervisory support and family-supportive organisational benefits, and work-family enrichment among this population. This section is divided into five sections which describe the research design, participants, procedures followed, measures utilised, and the data analysis techniques applied, respectively.

Research design

A descriptive research design is applied in this study. The data collection approach applied was a structured questionnaire containing specific items which asked the targeted respondents to select from a fixed number of choices which is aligned into this design.

As a cross-sectional study, data was collected at a single point in time across various industries, (Hair, Black, Babin, & Andersen, 2010). A survey was developed and
administered using a questionnaire designed to elicit responses which would indicate the population characteristics, (Hair et al., 2010). Sample measurement techniques such as simple frequency counts (how many), group means (means by group) and correlations were conducted, (Hair et al., 2010). Data were collected, results were tabulated and summarised statistically, and conclusions drawn, (Hair et al., 2010).

Participants

Three hundred and fourteen respondents participated in this survey (N=314). All the respondents were workers within the manufacturing work environment. The sample comprised of employees from the various sub–sectors including the food and beverage, clothing textiles, packaging, printing and automotive industries.

Table 1

Demographic frequencies of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status*</td>
<td>Married / Living with partner</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single / Divorced / Widowed</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children living with you</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>No Children living with you</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Note: Marital Status demonstrated overlaps across categories. Some respondents were divorced and living with new partners.

Frequency tables were also generated to demonstrate the distribution of the following variables: number of children, number of children under the age of six, gender, marital status, and number of people who supported financially.

Table 2

*Percentage of respondents who indicated the number of children living with them.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt; 5 children</th>
<th>5 children</th>
<th>4 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>1 child</th>
<th>0 children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Percentage of respondents who indicated the number of children under the age of six years old living with them.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 children</th>
<th>4 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>1 child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Percentage of respondents who indicated they have financially supported dependents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt; 5 children</th>
<th>5 children</th>
<th>4 children</th>
<th>3 children</th>
<th>2 children</th>
<th>1 child</th>
<th>0 children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the respondents took 39 minutes to travel from home to their place of work. Respondents reported an average workweek of 43 hours.
Frequency table for marital status of the respondents, listed in Appendix B, demonstrates the marital status of the respondents. Category zero represents the unmarried respondents, and alternatively category one represents the married respondents. The majority of operational workers who participated in the survey were married. 270 respondents answered the demographic question pertaining to their marital status, and 167 reported that they were married.

The number of people supported by the respondents varied as per table four, included in appendix B. The majority of the respondents indicated that they had between one and four other people who are financially dependent on them. Non-integer values were ignored.

In Appendix B, demonstrates the gender of the respondents. Category zero represents male respondents, and category one represents female respondents. The majority of the operational workers who participated in the survey were male. Out of the 260 respondents answered the demographic question pertaining to gender, 176 of them were male.

The number of children under six who are supported by the respondents varied as per the results demonstrated in Appendix B. The majority of the respondents indicated that they had no children.

The number of children who are supported by their respective respondents varied, listed in Appendix B. The majority of respondents were equally distributed among those respondents who have no children, those who have one child and those who have three children.
Procedure

Permission for the study was obtained from the participating organisations electronically and ethical clearance was granted by the University of Cape Town's Human Research Ethics Committee. A cover letter was prepared which informed the potential participants about the rationale of the study. Participants were assured of anonymity. Self-report questionnaires were distributed by the researcher to the human resource practitioners at the respective manufacturing sites, and designated boxes were provided across these sites for collection of the completed questionnaires.

An online survey was also constructed and the link to this questionnaire was disseminated to the additional organisations via e-mail. For the online questionnaire, a customised cover letter was generated with the same measures utilised in the paper-based questionnaire. It must be noted that the participating organisations received only paper-based or online questionnaires, never both. The rationale behind this decision was that the researcher contracted with various organisations regarding the mode that would be least operationally disruptive to them. This was a precondition stipulated by the organisations for agreeing to participate in the survey.

Measures

Work–family enrichment.

The fourteen-item scale consisting of seven items relating to the work–family enrichment and seven items measuring family–work enrichment was utilised for the present study, (Dyson–Washington, 2006). The work–family enrichment measure included statements such as “I have developed skills in my job that are useful at home”. The family–work enrichment measure included statements such as “Feeling good about my family life
puts me in a good mood at work”. The respondents answered each item relative to a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (5) “strongly agree”. The Cronbach alpha for the original study was 0.78 for work-to-family enrichment, and 0.73 for family-to-work enrichment, (Dyson–Washington, 2006).

Supervisory support.

Supervisory support was assessed by an eight-item scale used by Lambert (2000). Responses were arranged in a five-point Likert scale, by “strongly disagree” (1) and “strongly agree” (5). The measure included statements such as “My supervisor is understanding when I have personal or family problems that interfere with my work” and “My supervisor appears to know a lot about company policies that could help employees manage their family responsibilities”, (Lambert, 2000). The higher the respondents scored the items; the greater degree of supervisory support indicated.

Family-supportive benefits and services

Based on the approach applied by Allen (2001), respondents were given a list of family-supportive benefits commonly offered by the participating organisations. This list included the following benefits:

- Primary Health Care services (e.g., screening for diabetes, high blood pressure etc.);
- Counselling services (e.g., Stress, Violence, Substance Abuse, Trauma);
- Telephone counselling service and face-to-face counselling service by a social worker.
- Shift work transport;
- Workshops: how to manage my finances;
• Flexible work times;
• Educational bursaries;
• Flexible leave;
• Assistance to plan for the retirement;
• Information/referral services for child care;
• Information/referral services for elder care;

The above list was included in the questionnaire and the respondents were asked to indicate whether each benefit was offered by their organisations – by way of ticking “yes” or “no” response options. They further indicated whether they currently or in the past had used these benefits offered by their organisations – by way of ticking “yes” or “no” response options. Benefits that were not available or not used were coded as 0, and benefits that were available or were used were coded as 1 (Allen, 2001).

Control variables.

This study has similarly incorporated various control variables that were included in the questionnaire because of their potential relationships with the dependent variable. The variables included were as follows:

• the number of children living with the respondent;
• the number of children under six years old living at home;
• marital status;
• gender;
• average number of hours worked by the respondent per week;
• average hours of childcare and household duties expended per week;
• number of people you support financially; and
the time taken in minutes to travel to work from home in the morning.

Gender was coded as a 0 for male respondents and 1 for female respondents. Marital status was coded as a 0 for unmarried (single, divorced, separated or widowed) respondents and 1 for married (or living with a partner) respondents.

Data analysis

Physical questionnaire data collected was captured manually, cleaned, and coded. Online questionnaire data was cleaned and collated with the manual data. Statistica (Version 10) was used to analyse the data. And all the quantitative data was statistically analysed by way of descriptive statistics, factor analysis, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis. The results are presented in the next section.
This section is divided into four sub-sections. First, the exploratory factor analysis of each scale is explained and the results are presented. Second, reliability analysis results are presented. Third, the correlation analysis is presented. Fourth, the regression analyses are presented.

Family-supportive organisational benefits and services most commonly offered were healthcare services at eighty two percent, counselling services at seventy one percent, shift work pattern transportation at sixty two percent, flexible work arrangements at sixty five percent, educational bursaries at sixty six percent, flexible leave arrangements at seventy seven percent, retirement planning guidance at sixty seven percent and social worker services at sixty two percent. Interestingly, eight of the twelve family supportive benefits and services demonstrated high awareness responses; however their utilisation varied according to their availability. An example of this is counselling services, an employee supportive service which seventy one percent of the participants are offered, yet twelve percent of respondents make use of.

Table 5

Summary of the descriptive statistics for family-supportive benefits and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Supportive Benefit or Service Offered</th>
<th>Total Number Offered</th>
<th>% of Employees who are offered this benefit or service</th>
<th>Family Supportive Benefit or Service Used</th>
<th>Total Number Used</th>
<th>% of employees who utilise this benefit or service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Services Offered</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>82.79%</td>
<td>Health Care Services Used</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>54.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling Services Offered</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>71.27%</td>
<td>Counselling Services Used</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Transport Offered</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>62.53%</td>
<td>Shift Transport Used</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Workshops Offered</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>45.35%</td>
<td>Financial Workshops Used</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Offered</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>64.67%</td>
<td>Flexible Work Used</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>35.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Bursaries Offered</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>60.34%</td>
<td>Educational Bursaries Used</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Leave Offered</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>Flexible Leave Used</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Planning Offered</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>67.03%</td>
<td>Retirement planning Used</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>21.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about Child Care Offered</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>Information about Child Care Used</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about Elder Care Offered</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>36.26%</td>
<td>Information about Elder Care Used</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker services Offered</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>45.35%</td>
<td>Social worker services Used</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Descriptive Statistics

Mean is defined as the sum of values, divided by total number of values $N$, (Bluman, 2012). Median is defined as the middle point in data set that has been ordered, (Bluman, 2012). Mode is defined as the most frequent data value, (Bluman, 2012). A confidence interval is defined as a specific interval estimate of a parameter determined by using data obtained from the respondents and by using the specific confidence level of the estimate, (Bluman, 2012). The confidence interval used in this study is 95%, and provides an indication of the extent to which the population mean is contained within this interval when the values of the variable are normally distributed in the population, (Bluman, 2012). The level of significance is defined as the maximum probability of committing a type I error, (Bluman, 2012).

The average work hours were 43.27 (SD = 8.54). The average childcare hours at home were 18.78 (SD = 20.90). The time taken to travel to work in minutes had a mean of 38.84 (SD = 28.78). Supervisory-support had a mean of 3.67 (SD = 0.8). The work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment had a mean of 3.7 (SD = 0.77) and 3.7 (SD = 0.76) respectively.

Factor analysis

In order for it to be interpretable, a factor needs to demonstrate significant loadings for more than 3 items. Loadings are considered significant in this study at approximately 0.7, based on the size of the study's present sample. The factor loadings also need to make intuitive sense and to be distinct, (Hair, Black, Babin & Andersen, 2010).
Table 6

*Factor loadings for work-family variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Multiple R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. I have developed skills in my job that are useful at home (WF)</td>
<td>-0.659</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My job has given me access to facts and information that are useful at home (WF)</td>
<td>-0.601</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The self-confidence I have developed on my job makes me more effective in my family life (WF)</td>
<td>-0.549</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I have developed skills in my family life that are useful at work (FW)</td>
<td>-0.786</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My family has given me access to facts and information that are useful in my job (FW)</td>
<td>-0.774</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The self-confidence I have developed in my family life makes me more effective on my job (FW)</td>
<td>-0.655</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The flexibility of my schedule at home allows me to spend more time at work</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have invested money received from my family/spouse/inheritance into my career (FW)</td>
<td>-0.483</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My family life provides me with contacts that help my career (FW)</td>
<td>-0.597</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.52</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explained variance</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.519</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.391</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Principal components factor analysis with Varimax normalised rotation. Each items' significant loadings are presented in bold face. WF = Work to Family; FE = Family to Work.

Through an iterative process, Varimax normalised factor loadings were generated. One factor made the most intuitive sense in terms of the loadings generated, and the scope of the study. Certain items were removed because of the loadings being not significantly distinct by demonstrating high loadings one factor, or demonstrating low communalities. Factor analysis was re-run, and items were eliminated. Scree plot analysis validated one factor which was appropriate. Each item's significant loadings are presented in the bold face.

Eigen values greater than 1.0 emerged for work-family enrichment, accounting for 35.19% of the total variance. The factor loadings onto this factor demonstrated the lowest factor loading as 0.432. N = 314 after Casewise deletion of missing data.
Table 7

Factor loadings for supervisory-support variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Is concerned about me as a person</td>
<td>-0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Feels each of us is important as an individual</td>
<td>-0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Would help me to figure out how to solve a problem</td>
<td>-0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is helpful to me when I have a family or personal emergency</td>
<td>-0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is helpful to me when I have a routine family or personal matter to</td>
<td>-0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is understanding when I have personal or family problems that interfere with my work</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Appears to know a lot about company policies that could help employees manage their family responsibilities</td>
<td>-0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My supervisor would probably rate my performance as above average</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue: 4.828
Explained variance: 4.828
Proportion of total: 0.603

Notes: N = 314. Principal-axis factoring. Each item's significant loadings are presented in bold text. Super = Supervisory support variable.

Eigen values greater than 1.0 emerged for supervisory support, accounting for 48.28% of the total variance. The factor loadings onto this factor demonstrated the lowest factor loading as 0.641.

Correlation analysis

Correlations were conducted to determine the relationships between the variables (refer to Table 8 below). The purpose of conducting a correlation analysis was to establish the significance and the strength of the relationship between the variables. In this case, the correlations analysis with casewise deletion of the missing data was conducted to assess the
relationship between the variables' supervisory-support, work-to-family and family-to-work enrichment, and the average working hours, average childcare hours at home and time taken to travel to work.

Significant positive correlations were found between supervisory-support and work-family enrichment ($r = 0.38, p < 0.000$), as well as the supervisory-support and family-to-work enrichment ($r = 0.31; p < 0.000$).

Non-significant correlations found for the relationship between work-family enrichment and the demographics, namely the average working hours ($r = -0.02; p = 0.819$), average childcare hours at home ($r = -0.02; p = 0.759$). There was a significant correlation between time taken to travel to work ($r = -0.15; p = 0.021$) and work-family enrichment.

Table 8

Correlations between work-family variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Average Work Hours</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average Childcare Hours at Home</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time taken to travel to work</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisory Support</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family to Work Enrichment</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work to Family Enrichment</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $N = 225$. Marked correlations are significant at $p < .05000$. Casewise deletion of missing data.
Regression analysis

Work-family enrichment was non-normal, and the dependent variable in the regression analysis. Ordinarily, the dependent variable is assumed to be normal. Although the actual regression assumption of normality refers to the distribution of the error, and not the dependent variable. Normality of the dependent variable is most likely to result in normality of the errors. However, regression as a method is reasonably robust to slight skewness, and residual checking indicates that all necessary assumptions for the use of regression analysis were reasonably well met with regard to normality and constant variance.

Table 10 below details the R squared, which is the proportion of variability in work-family enrichment explained by the model: at 17.2%. The overall F-statistic for the model is significant (p<0.0001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (2, 223)</td>
<td>23.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 226; Standard Error of estimate: .69673

The b* values in Table 10 below are standardised beta coefficients. They allow the researcher to compare between independent variables to determine where the relationship lies. In this study, the relationship between work-family enrichment and supervisory support is significant. The b values are the actual coefficient values, and indicate the change in y (work-family enrichment) for a 1 unit change in the independent variable. Thus, for the
supervisory support, the $b$ value of 0.04 indicates that if this factor increases by 1 unit, work–family enrichment will increase by 0.04 units.

The relationship between work–family enrichment and family–supportive benefits was also measured. The value of 0.28 for flexible work arrangements offered indicates that when this variable is offered as opposed to not, the value of work–family enrichment increases by 0.28 units. Other family supportive benefits and services were not statistically significant. Variables were considered for inclusion in the regression analysis–based on univariate test results.

Table 10
*Regression summary statistic for work–family enrichment (N = 226)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Work Arrangements Offered</th>
<th>$b^*$</th>
<th>SE $b^*$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE of $b$</th>
<th>t(223)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Support</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 below details the $R$ squared, which is the proportion of variability in work–family enrichment explained by the model: at 17%. The overall $F$–statistic for the model is significant ($p<0.0001$).

Table 11
*Summary statistic for family-work enrichment (dependent variable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ (2,223)</td>
<td>22.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 226; Standard Error of estimate: .70376
The $b^*$ values in Table 12 below are standardised beta coefficients. The relationship between family-work enrichment and supervisory support is significant. The $b$ values are the actual coefficient values, and indicate the change in $y$ (family-work enrichment) for a 1 unit change in the independent variable. Thus, for the supervisory support, the $b$ value of 0.02 indicates that if this factor increases by 1 unit, work–family enrichment will increase by 0.02 units.

The relationship between family-work enrichment and family–supportive benefits was also measured. The value of 0.35 for flexible work arrangements offered indicates that when this variable is offered as opposed to not, the value of work–family enrichment increases by 0.35 units. Other family supportive benefits and services were not statistically significant. Variables were considered for inclusion in the regression analysis–based on univariate test results.

Table 12
Regression summary statistic for family-work enrichment (N = 226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$b^*$</th>
<th>SE $b^*$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE of $b$</th>
<th>$t(223)$</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Arrangements Offered</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Support</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This section presented the results of the data analysis, which will be discussed in the following section. Factor analysis, reliability analysis, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis were performed in addition to the presentation of the descriptive statistics for each variable.
Discussion

The aim of this study was to understand the work–family interface from the perspective an understudied worker population – specifically operational manufacturing workers in an African working environment. Results yielded evidence of the presence of moderately high levels of work–family enrichment and demonstrated a bi-directional relationship. They also confirmed that supervisory support was positively related to the work–family enrichment. Finally, certain family supportive services and benefits were significantly related to work family enrichment.

Work–family enrichment

Proposition 1 was supported, thus demonstrating that enrichment does occur from work–to–family domains among local, manufacturing workers. It further demonstrated that enrichment occurs from family–to–work domains. Hence, their dual directionality was established. This bi–directional nature of the construct was described in Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) model. This is significant because establishing the existence of this phenomenon, amongst this sample, creates a platform from which the related workplace outcomes may be examined, and their contribution to increase the quality of work–life evaluated and applied.

Supervisory support

Proposition 2 was supported as the supervisory support was demonstrated to be positively related to work–family enrichment among the manufacturing workers. Findings showed that work–family enrichment and supervisory support were statistically significantly
related. This is consistent with Lingard, Francis, and Turner’s (2012) Australian study that demonstrated that work–family enrichment was positively correlated with social support received from employees’ respective supervisors.

High supervisory support was shown to result in the positive work outcomes such as reduced turnover, (Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012). In organisations with demonstrated work–family enrichment and supervisory support, workplace relational conflict is generally lower, (Boz, Martinez and Munduate, 2009). Given that this proposition has been evidenced, it creates the potential for further research regarding the workplace outcomes that may occur relative to the manufacturing workers in South Africa. A study of manufacturing employees in another developing country, India, demonstrated that supervisory support is positively related to the job outcomes such as job satisfaction and affective commitment, (Baral & Bhargava, 2010).

**Family–supportive benefits and services**

Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux and Brinley (2005) noted that few studies had examined the role of family–supportive organisational policies which they believed were a necessary stepping stone toward the cultivation of family–supportive working environments.

Mcnamara, Pitt-Catsoupes, Brown, and Matz–Costa (2012) found that amongst other variables, demographic factors and supervisor support affect both access to and utilisation of flexible work options – but that their influences differ relative to the specific flexible option in question. Their study demonstrated that in addition to access, supervisory support had a strong influence on the employees’ utilisation for the specific family–supportive benefits and services. This study sought to enhance understanding in this sphere by establishing the prevalence of this type of organisational support, and demonstrated disproportionate
investment by organisations in family-supportive benefits and services such as health care services, flexible leave, and counselling services. These were rated the highest in terms of employee awareness. It also demonstrated that employees' awareness regarding the availability of these resources within the workplace did not necessarily result in optimal utilisation thereof. Interestingly, health care services (54.63%), and flexible leave (53.73%) showed high utilisation whilst counselling services had a relatively low participation rate (12.38%) by employees.

Furthermore, it sought to understand whether family-supportive benefits help to explain work-family enrichment among the manufacturing workers. Of the various benefits offered to employees, flexible work arrangements demonstrated a relationship with work family enrichment and family work enrichment.

Dikkers, Geurts, Dulk, Peper, Taris and Kompier (2007) found that employees who perceived supervisory support in response to work-and-family issues were considerably more likely to make use of mechanisms such as the flexible work time and subsidised childcare services. In this study, higher work-family enrichment was found in organisations where the flexible work schedules were offered. The utilisation of this benefit however did not influence work-family enrichment significantly among employees. Lambert (2000) suggested that depending on how much value workers place on various work-life benefits, they would experience a perceived obligation to reciprocate through their work efforts and the more supportive they perceive their organisations to be. One of the respondents noted that flexible work arrangements enabled them to provide parental support to his children who do not live with him. As such he deemed his working relationship with his supervisor to be a positive and reciprocated one.
Muse and Wadsworth (2012) concur regarding the assessment of the perceived importance of benefits when organisations are making decisions about their benefit programs. Health care and counselling services offered were not found to influence work–family enrichment. The utilisation of these services did not significantly influence work–family enrichment. A likely reason why this may have occurred is that the informal mechanisms aimed at work–family support may have a greater influence on the employee outcomes than formal benefits do (Behson, 2005).

Demographics of interest

The sample was predominantly male and this is congruent with the national statistics that estimate that male employees account for roughly 68% of the manufacturing labour force in South Africa, (Lehohla, Statistics South Africa, 2008). Employees’ perceptions of work–family enrichment did not vary across gender – which supports Hakanen, Peeters and Perhoniemi’s (2011) argument that similar enrichment processes may take place among both women and men.

Employees’ perceptions of supervisory support did not vary across gender. This finding is supported by previous work of Muse and Wadsworth (2012) who had found out that gender presents no moderating effect on the relationship between the employees’ perception on the value of benefits and the perceptions of support from their employing organisations.

In this study, employees’ perceptions of neither their work–family enrichment nor their perception of supervisory support received varied according to their marital status. Employees’ perceptions of neither their work–family enrichment nor their perception of supervisory support received varied across families with different numbers of children.
Employees' perceptions of neither their work–family enrichment nor their perception of supervisory support received varied across families with different numbers of children under the age of six years old. The above results are not uncommon, as Hassan, Dollard and Winefield (2009) found that demographic variables such as gender, marital status, number of children and working hours did not demonstrate a relationship with work–family enrichment.

De Janasz, Forret, Haack and Jonsen (2011) investigated whether employees without dependents had negatively influenced perceptions regarding the supportive nature of their organisation. They found that no significant difference between those staff that the potential to more readily benefit from family supportive mechanisms provided by the organisation, and those who did not. Employees with child dependents, for whom the majority of family supportive resources were intended, did not necessarily utilise them even though they were aware that these were on offer. This study demonstrated high utilisation family supportive services and benefits where awareness of these was equally significant.

**Work Family Enrichment and organisational outcomes**

In light of the evidence demonstrated that significant levels of the work family enrichment phenomenon occur, it is important to take note of the potential organisational benefits that may be derived if the organisations are willing to invest in understanding work–family enrichment related needs of their employees. McNall, Nicklin and Masuda (2010) examined the relationship between work–family enrichment and work outcomes, and found out that both directions of enrichment, work–to–family enrichment and family–to–work enrichment, were positively related to the workplace outcomes such as job satisfaction, affective commitment and family satisfaction.
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When employees perceive that their organisations are helping them to integrate work and family roles, they will perceive their organisations as more supportive and consequently feel obligated to reciprocate with favourable attitudes toward their job and the organisation, (McNall, Nicklin & Masuda, 2010). Research has shown that employees who are able to perceive positive interactions between their work and life domains are generally more satisfied with their jobs and life in general, (Masuda, McNall, Allen, & Nicklin, 2012). They propose that organisations educate employees on the benefits they can obtain from participating on the multiple roles, and develop interventions to facilitate resource generation across work and family domains.

Russo and Buonocore (2012) examined whether work–family enrichment was associated with lower levels of professional turnover among nurses based on job satisfaction and professional commitment as mediators. They found out that employees experiencing high levels of work–family enrichment demonstrated lower turnover intention, thus demonstrating the relationship between work–family enrichment and job outcomes. What these studies demonstrate is the value of manufacturing organisations establishing the significant presence of Work Family Enrichment among their operational workers and that in doing so, we may have the potential to influence business levers that will not only provide for improved staff morale as well as tangible business benefits.

Summary of the research

This study sought to understand the work–family interface from the perspective of an understudied worker population – specifically the operational manufacturing workers. Results yielded evidence of the presence of moderately high levels of work–family enrichment. They
also confirmed that supervisory support and particular family-supportive benefits were positively related to the work–family enrichment.

Work–family enrichment has the potential to directly influence the employees’ experience of quality of work–life. The positive workplace outcomes that result from these favourable phenomena have been demonstrated amongst staff in other working environments. If the manufacturing organisations were to invest in developing their line managers – particularly their first line managers who interface with the operational staff regarding particular outcomes such as coaching skills relating to their interactions with employees – then work–family issues could better equip them to support their staff. Additional training–related outcomes could also include the awareness by line managers of the full spectrum of resources available for the organisations staff, and enable supervisors to act as the point of reference if they are not appropriately placed to respond to the challenges facing the organisations employee.

Another opportunity that these findings present is for the human resources practitioners within these organisations to undertake the employee awareness programmes regarding family–supportive benefits. The emphasis would be to ensure that these campaigns reach the shop floor, or the assembly line, as these employees may not be able to readily access knowledge resources such as the electronic media or plenary meetings in which the office staff only are able to participate in. Simultaneously, the human resource function, in collaboration with the designated line managers, would be required to actively work and enable accessibility and utilisation of family–supportive benefits by their operational staff.

In addition, if organisations share the findings of this study with the respondents they may be able to create enormous opportunities to validate the findings that resonated most
with their staff and which benefit and enhance their experience of work–family enrichment. Disproportionate investment and encouraged utilisation of less benefits but ones more desirable or valued benefits may prove to be more meaningful to staff in terms of their perceived organisational supportiveness; rather than the broader offerings which do not necessarily serve the needs of their staff. Dawley, Andrews, and Bucklew (2008) also recommended that with this target audience in mind, other aspects of perceived organisational supportiveness such as fair operating procedures, rewards, and job conditions could further enhance family–supportive culture.

Finally, organisations that acknowledge multiple roles employees experience, and reinforce the message that the organisation is in favour of and utilise these benefits will further encourage work–family enrichment within their working environments.

Recommendations for future research

There are several recommendations that emerge from this study. Firstly, a longitudinal study, similar to the study conducted by Lu (2011) with multiple phases of data collection could yield richer insights relating to the experience of work–family enrichment among this population. In addition, the researcher could physically distribute the study to respondents, thus providing greater reassurance to the respondents of the external nature of the study, and greater trust in the anonymity inherent in the process. Every care has been taken to ensure the simplicity of language of the questionnaire to ensure correct interpretation of the questions by participants. Nonetheless an opportunity remains for future research to be conducted with consideration of other national languages. Furthermore, the employee awareness of family–supportive benefits was considered to be of a potential limitation of this study, and to this end, future studies may benefit from the addition of sourcing data linked to
the internal awareness programmes ran as well as utilisation rates of various benefits. This information, in relation to the questionnaire data, could provide a more informed perspective of their relative value to employees. Finally, this study was biased towards the specific workplace support resources and their relationship to work-to-family enrichment. This decision was made intentionally, as the potential business impact of the work-family enrichment is believed to be fundamental to organisations for future research-related investment and focus on this phenomenon. Nonetheless, family-to-work enrichment was demonstrated, and as such, the relationship between family-supportive resources could be a further area of exploration.
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Dear Participant,

I need your help to complete my research. I am conducting a research on how people experience their work and family roles, for my degree in organisational psychology. Please complete all the questions on this survey. You will need about 15 to 20 minutes. This is an anonymous questionnaire, your name does not appear anywhere on it and your answers cannot be linked to you. Your co-operation is greatly appreciated.

The data collected will provide useful information in understanding employees in the manufacturing industry.

This study has received approval from the Ethics in Research Committee of the Commerce Faculty at the University of Cape Town. Participation is voluntary, and you may choose to stop participating at any time.

When you have completed this questionnaire, please put in the box labelled: “UCT WFE Research Project”.

Sincerely,

Bianca Solomon
UCT Masters Student

If you have any questions or concerns please contact me on 021-6587314
Or email my supervisor at Jeffrey.Bagraim@uct.ac.za
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My supervisor</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Is concerned about me as a person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feels each of us is important as an individual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Would help me to figure out how to solve a problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Is helpful to me when I have a family or personal emergency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Is helpful to me when I have a routine family or personal matter to attend to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Is understanding when I have personal or family problems that interfere with my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Appears to know a lot about company policies that could help employees manage their family responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 My supervisor would probably rate my performance as above average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Family</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 I have developed skills in my job that are useful at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 My job has given me access to facts and information that are useful at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 The self-confidence I have developed on my job makes me more effective in my family life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Feeling good about my job puts me in a good mood with my family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The flexibility of my work schedule allows me to spend more time with my family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 My income from work enables me to make purchases that meet my family's needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 My job provides me with contacts that help my family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 I have developed skills in my family life that are useful at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 My family has given me access to facts and information that are useful in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 The self-confidence I have developed in my family life makes me more effective on my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Feeling good about my family life puts me in a good mood at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 The flexibility of my schedule at home allows me to spend more time at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 I have invested money received from my family/spouse/inheritance into my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 My family life provides me with contacts that help my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My company offers me the following services:</th>
<th>Please tick:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offered by my company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Primary Health Care services (e.g., screening for diabetes, high blood pressure etc.)</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Counselling services (e.g., Stress, Violence, Substance Abuse, Trauma)</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Shift work transport</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Workshops – how to manage my finances</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Flexible work times</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Educational bursaries</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Flexible leave</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Assistance to plan for retirement</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Information / referral services for child care</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Information / referral services for elder care</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Telephone counselling service</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Face-To-Face counselling service by a social worker</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General

D1. Number of children living with you (total):

D2. Number of children under 6 years old living at home:

D3. Marital Status (tick one):
   - Gender
   - Married / living with partner
   - Unmarried (divorced, separated, single or widowed

D4. Average number of hours you work per week?

D5. Average hours of childcare care and household duties you do per week:

D6. Number of people you support financially?

D7. On a typical morning, how long does it take you to get to work?

Please note any additional comments in the space below

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your results are anonymous and the information that you have provided will be kept confidential.
Appendix B: Frequency Tables

**Table 13**

*Frequency table for marital status of the respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative count</th>
<th>Percentage of validity</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of validity</th>
<th>Percentage of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of all cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38.00738</td>
<td>38.00738</td>
<td>33.01282</td>
<td>33.01282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.12915</td>
<td>13.14103</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.14103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14**

*Frequency table for the number of people who are financially supported by the respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative count</th>
<th>Percent of validity</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of validity</th>
<th>Percentage of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td>61.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>75.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>88.81</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>81.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>93.36</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>85.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>87.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>97.20</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>89.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>97.90</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>89.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>98.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>90.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>98.60</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>90.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>90.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>99.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>91.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>99.65</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>91.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>99.68</td>
<td>99.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15
Frequency table for gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative count</th>
<th>Percentage of validity</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of validity</th>
<th>Percentage of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of all cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16
Frequency table for the number of children under the six years of age supported by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative count</th>
<th>Percentage of validity</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of validity</th>
<th>Percentage of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of all cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55.36</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>49.68</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
Frequency table for the number of children supported by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative count</th>
<th>Percentage of validity</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of validity</th>
<th>Percentage of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of all cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.562</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>26.502</td>
<td>54.06</td>
<td>24.038</td>
<td>49.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>26.502</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>24.038</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>10.954</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>9.936</td>
<td>83.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>96.82</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>87.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>98.59</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>89.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>90.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>10.247</td>
<td>9.295</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63