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Abstract

This study examined the influence of parental role modelling on female business students’ anticipated work-family conflict. Anticipated work-family conflict refers to the perception of the conflict young adults expect to experience between their future work and family roles. The three forms of parental role modelling examined were parental employment, perceived work-family coping of parents and parental role sharing. Data collected for female business students at a tertiary education institution in South Africa ($N = 256$) was recoded and analysed. Findings supported the bidirectionality of anticipated work-family conflict: anticipated work-to-family conflict and anticipated family-to-work conflict. Female business students experienced higher levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict than anticipated family-to-work conflict. Correlation analysis indicated that of the three forms of parental role modelling, only maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were related to anticipated work-to-family conflict. None were related to anticipated family-to-work conflict. Multiple regression analysis showed that egalitarian role sharing of housework was a stronger predictor of anticipated work-to-family conflict than maternal employment. Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict was not found to moderate the relationship between maternal employment and either direction of anticipated work-family conflict. The implications of these findings for future research and management are discussed.
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Anticipated work-family conflict amongst female business students: The influence of parental role modelling

For many young women, the transition from late childhood to early adulthood is a challenging time (Arnett, 2000). It is a time spent exploring different career opportunities and relationships and considering future family aspirations. Thinking about one’s future work and family can evoke many concerns amongst emerging adults, especially female students who plan to pursue demanding careers. This is a global phenomenon and South African female students are no exception (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013). Anticipated work-family conflict (AWFC) has received some attention amongst researchers due to the potential impact AWFC can have on students’ decision making (Barnett, Gareis, James, & Steele, 2003; Coyle, Van Leer, Schroeder, & Fulcher, 2015; Michael, Most, & Cinamon, 2011; Westring & Ryan, 2011). Over the past few decades, there has been a global increase in women entering the workforce (Blau & Kahn, 2007; Goldin, 2014). This has resulted in an increase in dual-earner families as both men and women have become co-breadwinners. Despite a shift in shared work responsibilities, many women still feel that taking care of their family is their primary responsibility (Askari, Liss, Erchull, Staebell, & Axelson, 2010). The added pressure that women experience in balancing both work and family domains highlights the importance of better equipping female students with the necessary resources and support as they transition into early adulthood.

Not all students experience the same levels of AWFC (Barnett et al., 2003; Coyle et al., 2015). Identifying the key contributors to students’ AWFC has therefore generated a small body of research, which still requires further development. The limited research on students’ perceptions of the work-family interface includes research on several influencing factors, such as gender (e.g. Weer, Greenhaus, Colakoglu, & Foley, 2006); maternal employment (Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006), parental education (O'Shea & Kirrane, 2008), self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict (Cinamon, 2006) and parental role sharing of childcare and housework (Cinamon, 2006). A common thread across the literature is the influence of parents on their children’s perceptions of work and family. Socialisation into the work-family interface begins from early childhood and continues beyond adolescence, with parents shaping their children’s views of work and family life (Levine & Hoffner, 2006; Wiese & Freund, 2011).
Anticipated work-family conflict refers to “the belief that participation in one’s future work role will interfere with participation in one’s future family role, and vice versa” (Westring & Ryan, 2011, p. 597). This interference between work and family is known as work-family conflict, which is a well-researched construct amongst adults (Byron, 2005; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011; Wayne & Casper, 2016). By extension, anticipated work-family conflict (AWFC) is the level of work-family conflict young adults expect to experience once fully transitioned into their adult roles. These expectations may affect the decisions students make about their future, especially female students because of the role pressures primarily placed on women to balance both work and family responsibilities (Weer et al., 2006). Female students who anticipate that they may experience high levels of work-family conflict in their career of choice may decide to select a less demanding career path, despite their capabilities being well-suited to their primary career choice (Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015).

Early seminal work by Pleck (1977) suggested that there are gender differences between the perceived permeability of work-family boundaries for men and women. Pleck (1977) suggested that because home responsibilities are generally considered to be a woman’s responsibility, women will experience greater family-to-work conflict (e.g. leaving work early to look after a sick child) than work-to-family conflict (working late hours instead of attending a child’s school play). Later research, however, found that women experience greater work-to-family conflict than family-to-work conflict (Carlson & Frone, 2003; Cinamon & Rich, 2005; Frone, 2003). Views on gender-based role expectations have shifted over time and this adds to the complexity of the decisions made by female students when thinking about their future career and family aspirations.

Despite changing gender role expectations, many families still find themselves in family role situations where the mother is considered the primary caregiver and the father the primary breadwinner (Askari et al., 2010; Fulcher, Dinella, & Weisgram, 2015; Goldberg, 2013; Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). This is of particular interest because young adults tend to expect the same family model of responsibilities as displayed by their parents (Cinamon, 2006; Fulcher et al., 2015). Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory helps explain this phenomenon. Social learning theory suggests that children learn from their parents through role modelling and that daughters are more likely to learn from their mothers, and sons from their fathers (Bandura, 1977). Many parents of today’s students were raised during
a time when the traditional-gender role model was still considered the norm and while attitudes towards the sharing of work and family roles are shifting, there does appear to be some discrepancy between these attitudes and how they play out (Askari et al., 2010). Children who observed their parents function in a traditional-gendered household might expect the same role sharing model, despite having a dual-earner family. With many women still viewing the family domain as their primary responsibility, they are therefore more likely to experience higher levels of anticipated work-family conflict than men (Askari et al., 2010).

South Africa has a female labour force participation rate of 53.6% and a female unemployment rate of 29.8% (Statistics South Africa, 2017). Prior to 1994, Apartheid resulted in black South Africans being severely disadvantaged and their access to economic, educational and political resources restricted (Bosch, de Bruin, Kgaladi, & de Bruin, 2012). In addition to the racial division, Apartheid South Africa was deeply patriarchal, even though Black African families were known for having matriarchs run the household (Bak, 2008). Women who pursue a career over family are often still viewed unfavourably, especially in traditional Black African households. However, Gaganakis (2003) has noted a shift in the gender expectations of young Black African women, which Bosch et al. (2012) confirmed in their more recent study. Acknowledgement of South Africa’s history provides a contextual background for understanding how female students from different backgrounds may have different experiences of AWFC in the present study.

Anticipated work-family conflict is relevant to all emerging young adults. Arnett (2000) defined emerging adulthood between the ages of 18 and 25, which signifies a transitional period in a young adult’s life. The focus of many AWFC studies, however, has been on students as the main sample of interest (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003; Campbell, Campbell, & Watkins Jr, 2015; Cinamon, 2006; Coyle et al., 2015; Savela & O’Brien, 2016). The majority of these researchers have examined the AWFC of students not only because of convenient sampling but because young adults who pursue tertiary education do so with the intention of pursuing career occupations as opposed to earner occupations (Higgins, Duxbury, & Johnson, 2000). Career occupations refer to more prestige related occupations. Jobs in these categories are generally associated with higher education levels, status, earning potential and greater responsibility (Rojewski, 2005). These jobs tend to be demanding and often result in time being taken away from one’s home life in order to meet work demands. Earner occupations, on the other hand, refer to jobs which allow people to meet their
economic needs with little opportunity for career aspirations and growth (Higgins et al., 2000). Choosing a career- or earner-occupation is not necessarily a choice. For many, the latter is as a result of a lack of resources and opportunities which is a reality for many South Africans (Bosch et al., 2012). Despite these barriers, students who are in a position to attend tertiary education institutions are potentially at risk for higher levels of AWFC because of their intentions to enter more stressful and demanding jobs.

The family and work landscape is continuously changing. The entry of “Millennials” (Strauss & Howe, 2000) into the workforce is one of the key drivers of this change. The Millennial Generation describes those who were born approximately between 1980 and 1994 (Buonocore, Russo, & Ferrara, 2015; Lyons & Kuron, 2014); however the exact end date of this generation is still being debated (Stewart, Oliver, Cravens, & Oishi, 2017). Research concerning the Millennial Generation has been of considerable interest because the theory of generations suggests that individuals who belong to the same group tend to view the world through a similar lens due to the shared experiences and historical events that took place in their formative years of life (Buonocore et al., 2015; Kuron, Lyons, Schweitzer, & Ng, 2015). The outcome of these shared experiences influences the way in which each generation views their identities, life values, personal experiences and, most relevant to the present study, their work expectations (Buonocore et al., 2015). The major influencing factors on the Millennial Generation were the rise of the internet and other technological advances which had a considerable impact on both the workplace and the home (Beutell, 2013).

In both popular and academic literature alike, Millennials have been viewed in a negative light with terms such as “neediness, indifference, lack of etiquette, arrogance, abrasiveness, impatience, self-absorption, and entitlement” (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 50) being used to describe their generation. Despite this negative view, Millennials are also seen as being more “optimistic, team-oriented and committed to balancing personal and work life” (Myers & Sadaghiiani, 2010, p. 234). The higher value that Millennials place on their non-work life compared to the generations before them is a defining feature of this generation. This suggests that one would expect Millennials to experience higher levels of work-to-family conflict should their work interfere with their family life and lower levels of family-to-work conflict should their family interfere with their work life (Bennett, Beehr, & Ivanitskaya, 2017).
Researchers studying the work-family interface have predominantly focused on the influence of maternal employment on various outcomes because a mother’s career tends to be more affected when a child is born, in comparison to a father’s career (Lombardi & Coley, 2014). Paternal employment is often neglected in the literature due to the continued prevalence of fathers being the primary breadwinner (Lombardi & Coley, 2014; Ruhm, 2008). This study was interested in exploring the role of both parents in shaping female students’ AWFC. Examining both maternal and paternal role modelling provided an opportunity to examine the social learning theory proposition that mothers, rather than fathers, have a stronger influence on their daughters’ expectations regarding the work-family interface.

Women in leadership and senior management roles are underrepresented in South Africa (Grant Thornton, 2017; Motaung, Bussin, & Joseph, 2017). If this gap is to be closed, female students need to be encouraged and supported to persevere with challenging and demanding career paths, while still being able to raise a family. Anticipated work-family conflict may discourage female students from pursuing such career paths if it has the potential to add strain on one’s work and family life (Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015; Weer et al., 2006). This highlights the importance of building on the limited empirical research on the antecedents of AWFC. This information can assist vocational counsellors and university support staff to identify the types of students who are more susceptible to AWFC. Counsellors and support staff will be in a better position to best guide and support these students as they transition into the next phase of their lives. Many organisations are placing an emphasis on the need for women in leadership roles (PwC, 2017). Supporting and enabling female students during this transitional phase of their lives will play an important role in setting future female leaders up for success in the workplace (Baker, 2014; Fitzsimmons, Callan, & Paulsen, 2014; Kakabadse et al., 2015).

Aims of the Research

The limited body of knowledge regarding female students’ anticipated work-family conflict (AWFC) requires further development. The aim of this study was to examine the influence of three forms of parental role modelling (i.e. parental employment, perceived work-family coping of parents and parental role sharing) on female students’ AWFC. Both maternal and paternal influences were examined in order to explore the social learning theory, which suggests that maternal influences would be a stronger predictor of female
students’ AWFC than paternal influences. In addition, the relative contribution of each form of parental role modelling in explaining AWFC was examined. This study also explored the moderating effect of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict between maternal employment and AWFC. The study utilised a sample of female business students from a tertiary education institution in South Africa as this cohort is expected to move into demanding career occupations.

**Research Question**

In order to meet the aims of this research, the research question is: How does parental role modelling influence female students’ anticipated work-family conflict? More specifically, to what extent do parental employment, perceived work-family coping of parents and parental role sharing predict female business students’ anticipated work-family conflict? In addition, does self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict moderate the relationship between maternal employment and anticipated work-family conflict?

**Structure of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is divided into several sections. The previous section provides the context and rationale for the study. This is followed by the literature review which provides a detailed and critical evaluation of research conducted on the topic to date. This includes the theoretical framework that underlies AWFC as well as explanations of the variables under study. The literature review concludes with the research propositions put forward for examination. The section that follows details the method that was undertaken to conduct this study, the demographic characteristics of the sample and the measures utilised in the study. This is followed by the results section which describes the various analyses which were used in order to assess the suitability of the measures as well as to examine the propositions in question. The discussion follows, where the findings of the study are reviewed in light of existing literature and the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are presented. The dissertation ends with a concluding section which summarises the key contributions of the study.
THE INFLUENCE OF PARENTAL ROLE MODELLING ON ANTICIPATED WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

Literature Review

The following section introduces the theoretical background and empirical research around anticipated work-family conflict (AWFC). Anticipated work-family conflict is a relatively underdeveloped construct with limited empirical research. Anticipated work-family conflict is a form of the broader work-family conflict construct; therefore the plethora of research around work-family conflict was used as the groundwork for understanding AWFC. The section begins by firstly describing work-family conflict and its theoretical underpinnings. This is followed by a section on anticipated work-family conflict. The career development theories that provide a framework for AWFC are described in detail. Lastly, the three forms of parental role modelling are discussed.

Literature Search Procedure

Several electronic databases were used to conduct journal article searches. These databases included PsychINFO, Academic Source Premier, Jstor, Emerald, Elsevier and Science Direct. Research into the anticipated work-family (AWFC) interface is still a relatively new area of study. Therefore, a number of searches were conducted using a broad range of search terms to source articles which examined anticipated work-family conflict and related constructs. These search terms included “anticipated”, “work”, “family”, “conflict”, “career”, “marriage”, “expected”, “future”, “self-efficacy”, “role sharing”, “students”, “university”, “college”, “parental influence”, “expectations”, “positive affectivity”, “traditional”, “egalitarian”, “commerce”, “business”, “interface”, “maternal employment” and “paternal employment”. A number of searches were conducted using multiple combinations of the search terms. The initial searches were kept broad and no date restriction was set. This was to ascertain how many AWFC journal articles have been published to date. Follow up searches were conducted restricting the period to the past five years to view the most recent studies. The main literature search took place from February 2017 until September 2017. Searching was an on-going and regular exercise which continued until February 2018 to ensure that all relevant articles were included.

Searches yielded a number of journal articles on AWFC and related constructs; however, a very limited number have researched AWFC in the context of the other variables under study (i.e. parental role modelling). The broader domain of work-family conflict is a
well-researched area of study and additional searches were conducted using “work-family conflict” as the key search term. Understanding work-family conflict was therefore used as a reference point to better understand the theoretical underpinnings of AWFC.

**Work-Family Conflict**

Work-family conflict amongst adults is a well-researched construct (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008; Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011; Li, Bagger, & Cropanzano, 2017; Nohe, Meier, Sonntag, & Michel, 2015; Premeaux, Adkins, & Mossholder, 2007; Zhang & Liu, 2010). Work-family conflict refers to the inter-role conflict individuals face when there are incompatible pressures between meeting the expectations of multiple work and family roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). When demands in one role domain prevent an individual from meeting the demands in another role domain, work-family conflict is experienced. Interest in this field began with the intention to better understand the interdependencies and crossover effects between the work and family domains.

**Theoretical approaches to work-family conflict**

Several theories, including boundary theory (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000), conservation of resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1989) and role strain theory (Goode, 1960) emerge in the work-family conflict literature to explain such phenomena. These theories provide a theoretical grounding for understanding the foundations of AWFC. A lack of personal resources and continuous transitioning between a student’s university and family/social life are underlying dynamics at play when female students think about and experience AWFC.

**Role strain theory**

Role strain theory suggests that people participate in different role relationships (e.g. mother, wife, daughter and employee) which require different responsibilities and duties (Goode, 1960). Fulfilling duties in one role relationship can detract from fulfilling the duties in other role relationships due to limited resources. When too much time is spent in one role, less time is available to fulfil the duties of other roles. The inability to meet multiple incompatible demands results in individuals experiencing work-family conflict.
Boundary theory

Boundary theory has been used to better understand the transitions that take place between work and family domains and provides a framework for the different ways that people create, maintain or change boundaries in order to make sense of the complex world around them (Ashforth et al., 2000). A key component is the transitioning that takes place between work and family roles. For some individuals the boundary is thick, where there are clear distinctions between work and family and these are kept separate. Others have thin boundaries where the distinctions between work and family are less clear and often overlap (Allen, Cho, & Meier, 2014).

Conservation of resources theory

Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) posits the importance of resources in managing stress. Extending to the current context, individuals see time as a finite resource with which to divide between their different roles. Failure to divide time equitably between multiple roles is seen as a threat to individuals. This threat or loss of resources results in the experience of stress. Relevant to the current context, this stress is the experience of AWFC (Hobfoll, 1989).

Individuals who partake in both work and family roles often find themselves in situations where they experience role overload (Goode, 1960). Role overload can occur in either the work or family domain. When this occurs, individuals have a tendency to reallocate resources from the accommodating role to the overloaded role due to the limited resources available (Hobfoll, 1989; Matthews, Winkel, & Wayne, 2014). Such an example is when an employee has to work late for several nights due to a deadline at work. This work role overload results in resources (e.g. time and attention) from the accommodating family role being reallocated to the overloaded work role (Matthews et al., 2014). This example highlights the permeability of work and family boundaries.

Directionality of work-family conflict

Early researchers viewed work-family conflict as a unidimensional construct (Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983). However, as research in this domain gained further interest, researchers began to understand the complexity of work-family conflict and that work-to-family conflict and family-to-work are two distinct but related constructs, each with their own antecedents and consequences (Byron, 2005; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991;
Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Researchers have further conceptualised work-family conflict as being six-dimensional, however, results have been mixed (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Work-to-family conflict occurs when work-related matters interfere with family life (e.g. spending long hours at work instead of spending this time with family). Antecedents related to work-to-family conflict include role conflict, time demands and lack of supervisor support in the workplace (Michel et al., 2011). Likewise, family-to-work conflict occurs when family-related matters interfere with work life (e.g. looking after a sick child instead of coming into work). These antecedents include family stressors, role overload and parental demands (Michel et al., 2011). Negative cross-over effects have also been shown to occur between the two domains (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). Much research has been done in the work-family conflict domain exploring both the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Byron, 2005; Premeaux et al., 2007). Work-family conflict is associated with many negative consequences at both an individual and organisational level. A meta-analysis by Byron (2005) supported the negative impact work-family conflict can have on both work and family life such as decreased job satisfaction (work-related), decreased marital satisfaction (non-work related) and burnout (stress-related). This research reiterates the importance of finding ways to help individuals better manage work-family conflict.

In line with boundary theory, individuals transition between work and family roles. These inter-domain transitions refer to the frequency with which individuals shift their available resources to another domain through specific actions (Matthews et al., 2014). The problem arises when individuals feel that the resources available to them are not sufficient to successfully fulfil both work and family roles. This is in line with the conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989). These inter-domain transitions enhance one’s understanding of the bidirectionality of work-family conflict. This transitioning of family-to-work resources can be viewed as work interfering with family and work-to-family conflict is experienced (Matthews et al., 2014). Likewise, the transitioning of work-to-family resources is often viewed as family interfering with work and family-to-work conflict is experienced. Matthews, Barnes-Farrell and Bulger (2010) findings supported the notion that individuals who experience more inter-domain transitions feel like they have much thinner boundaries between work and family. Their findings also suggested that individuals who experienced
more work-to-family transitions experienced higher levels of family-to-work conflict. The same can be applied to family-to-work transitions, with individuals experiencing higher levels of work-to-family conflict (Matthews et al., 2010).

**Anticipated Work-Family Conflict**

Anticipated work-family conflict expands on work-family conflict by viewing work-family conflict from a future anticipatory perspective. The experience of AWFC is most relevant to emerging adults who are going through a transitionary phase in their lives from late adolescence into early adulthood. In line with the work-family conflict definition by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), AWFC refers to the perception of the conflict young adults expect to experience between their future work and family roles (Weer et al., 2006). Anticipated work-family conflict involves emerging adults thinking about their future and the potential stressors that might make balancing work and family roles challenging. Some of these thoughts include the following:

> How will I “do it all” as a career person, parent, and spouse? Will I feel a lot of conflict if I continue my career and have a child? How will my spouse and I divide home and family responsibilities? (Campbell et al., 2015, p. 370)

These thoughts can influence the decisions individuals make about if and what they decide to study (Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015), whether to delay getting married and having children (Barnett et al., 2003; Fernández-Cornejo et al., 2016; Weer et al., 2006) and the career trajectory they envision for themselves (Bass, 2015; Fulcher et al., 2015).

Several researchers have shown interest in further understanding anticipated work-family conflict (AWFC), especially amongst students and emerging adults (e.g. Cinamon, 2010; Cinamon & Rich, 2014; Coyle et al., 2015; Weer et al., 2006). Table 1 provides a summary of the researchers who have examined AWFC (and related constructs) and the constructs relevant to the present study. Anticipated work-family conflict appears to be the common terminology utilised to examine the construct under study (e.g. Campbell et al., 2015; Cinamon, 2010; Cinamon, Most, & Michael, 2008; Cinamon & Rich, 2014; Gaffey & Rottinghaus, 2009; Johnson, Oesterle, & Mortimer, 2001; Michael et al., 2011; Savela & O’Brien, 2016). Other studies have utilised the term expected work-family conflict (Weer et al., 2006) and anticipated career-marriage conflict (Barnett et al., 2003; Bush, Mentzer, Grisaffi, & Richter, 2011). Anticipated career-marriage conflict refers to a similar yet more limited construct of AWFC.
### Table 1

**Summary Table of Studies Examining Anticipated Work-Family Conflict and the Relevant Constructs under Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevant Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnett et al. (2003)</td>
<td>CMC, Maternal employment</td>
<td>Students whose mothers worked during their childhood years expressed less CMC. Mothers’ early work history was a stronger predictor of future CMC than mothers’ later work history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagraim &amp; Harrison (2013)</td>
<td>AWFC, Maternal employment, Paternal employment, PA, SEFWFC</td>
<td>AWFC is unidimensional. PA and SEFWFC predicted AWFC. Female students whose mothers worked full time experienced lower levels of AWFC. Paternal employment did not predict students’ AWFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Career-family conflict, Career-marriage conflict</td>
<td>The majority of female students did not anticipate that they would experience career-family conflict or career-marriage conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al. (2015)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>There is support for the validity of multiple forms of AWFC measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon et al. (2008)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>No significant difference between the experience of AW→FC and AF→WC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon &amp; Rich (2014)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>AWFC is unidimensional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon (2006)</td>
<td>AWFC, SEFWFC, Parental role sharing (childcare and housework)</td>
<td>AWFC is bidirectional. Students experienced higher levels of AF→WC than AW→FC. Students raised in an egalitarian household of sharing childcare responsibilities experienced lower levels of AW→FC. No correlation was found between parental role sharing of housework and AWFC. SEFWFC was negatively correlated with both forms of AWFC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* CMC = career-marriage conflict; AWFC = anticipated work-family conflict; PA = positive affectivity; SEFWFC = self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict; AW→FC = anticipated work-to-family conflict; AF→WC = anticipated family-to-work conflict.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevant Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon (2010)</td>
<td>AWFC, SEFWFC</td>
<td>SEFWFC was significantly negatively related to both AW→FC and AF→WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyle et al. (2015)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>Women experienced higher levels of AF→WC than AW→FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffey &amp; Rottinghaus (2009)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>Students differentiated between time-; strain- and behavioural-based conflict. Students could only differentiate between the two directions of time-based conflict. Female students experienced higher levels of AF→WC than AW→FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston et al. (1996)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>Women experienced significantly lower levels of AWFC than men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael et al. (2011)</td>
<td>SEFWFC, AWFC</td>
<td>SEFWFC is a bidirectional construct (SEFW→FC; SEFF→WC). Young adults experience higher levels of SEFW→FC than SEFF→WC. Higher SEFWFC is related to lower levels of AWFC (in two of the three groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savela &amp; O’Brien (2016)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>AWFC is a multi-dimensional construct (time, strain, behaviour) with two directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne &amp; Casper (2016)</td>
<td>AWFC</td>
<td>Only anticipated work-to-family conflict was examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weer et al. (2006)</td>
<td>EWFC, Maternal employment</td>
<td>Maternal employment did not predict female students’ EWFC. Women expected relatively high levels of EWFC regardless of the extensiveness of maternal employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westring &amp; Ryan (2011)</td>
<td>AWFC, Self-efficacy for work-family decision making</td>
<td>AWFC can be represented by the same six dimensional factor structure as WFC. Students' self-efficacy for work-family decision-making was the most robust predictor of AWFC. Greater self-efficacy for making work-family decisions correlated with lower levels of AWFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. AWFC = anticipated work-family conflict; AW→FC = anticipated work-to-family conflict; AF→WC = anticipated family-to-work conflict; SEFWFC = self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict; SEFW→FC = self-efficacy to manage future work-to-family conflict; SEFF→WC = self-efficacy to manage future family-to-work conflict; EWFC = expected work-family conflict.
Theoretical approaches to anticipated work-family conflict

The following section discusses different social cognitive theories and career development theories that are used as a framework in the anticipated work-family conflict literature.

Social learning theory

Socialisation into the work-family interface is not an isolated phenomenon. It begins from early childhood and continues beyond the adolescent years (Levine & Hoffner, 2006; Wiese & Freund, 2011). Socialisation takes place through several sources; however parents are considered the primary and most influential learning source for children (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Jodl, Michael, Malanchuk, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2001; Levine & Hoffner, 2006). This concept is grounded in social learning theory which posits that vicarious learning, which involves observations of others’ behaviour, is a key element to learning through role modelling (Bandura, 1977). Role modelling is further enhanced when the observer (e.g. a daughter) and model (e.g. mother) are similar in some way (e.g. same gender) (Bandura, 1977). The theory suggests that children observe their parents’ behaviours in both the work and family domains, internalise these observations and, in turn, act out appropriate behaviour themselves.

Social learning theory suggests that socialisation is not a static process. Learning is a continuous self-regulatory process which can change through positive and negative reinforcement of behaviour. A son, for example, will observe his father’s (i.e. role model) participation in housework. If the outcome of participating in these chores results in the son’s mother being happier that responsibilities are shared then the child will observe this as a positive outcome. In turn, the son is more likely to imitate these behaviours himself. On the other hand, if a daughter observes her mother working and if this creates tension with her father, leading to arguments, this is a negative outcome. In turn, a daughter will be less likely to imitate her mother’s working behaviour or even her desire to marry. Social learning theory acknowledges that outcomes can change in different situations and reiterates that learning is a continuous and self-regulatory process (Bandura, 1971, 1977). Several studies have explored the influence of parents on young adult’s decision making about the work-family interface using social learning theory as a framework (e.g. Basuil & Casper, 2012; O'Shea & Kirrane, 2008; Wiese & Freund, 2011). The majority of studies have kept their samples to undergraduate students (Basuil & Casper, 2012; O'Shea & Kirrane, 2008) and a smaller
number have utilised high school students for their samples (Wiese & Freund, 2011). Many students have not yet directly experienced work-family conflict themselves and therefore use their observations of their parents’ behaviour to form their own expectations (Barnett et al., 2003).

**Social cognitive career theory**

Social cognitive career theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) has proven to be a popular theory amongst researchers from a career development perspective (e.g. Cinamon, 2006; Thompson & Dahling, 2012; Tokar, Thompson, Plaufcan, & Williams, 2007; Westring & Ryan, 2011). Social cognitive career theory posits that individual-specific factors (e.g. gender, race, personality) and background contextual factors (e.g. social economic status) influence an individual’s learning experiences. These learning experiences result from observation, modelling and reinforcement of certain behaviours; and in turn, impact an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs. The theory further posits that an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs and learning experiences influence specific outcome expectations. Individuals will pursue and remain committed to a career which they believe they have the capabilities to do well in (i.e. self-efficacy) and achieve the expected outcomes associated with that career (e.g. prestige, salary; Lent et al., 1994).

Applying the social cognitive career theory framework to the current context, work-family conflict can be viewed as an outcome expectation. Pursuing a specific career path which an individual may perceive will lead them to experience greater levels of work-family conflict, might act as a deterrent to pursuing that career path. Furthermore, because outcome expectations are influenced by self-efficacy, this highlights the importance of students’ self-efficacy beliefs to manage work-family conflict when pursuing a career path of their choice. The association between self-efficacy and outcome expectations is why the social cognitive career theory has been popular in career development and vocational behaviour literature, especially amongst female students pursuing tertiary education in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematical (STEM) fields which are predominantly more male-dominated (e.g. Scheuermann, Tokar, & Hall, 2014; Tokar et al., 2007).

Social cognitive career theory highlights the influence of individual-specific factors and background factors on various outcomes. One such example is that women have a tendency to expect more barriers to their career trajectory than men (Watts, Frame, Moffett,
Van Hein, & Hein, 2015). Such an example is evidence to suggest that women may have a tendency to experience greater levels of work-family conflict because of contextual and person-specific factors, simply because of their gender (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014; Cinamon, 2006).

**Super’s life-span, life-space theory**

Super’s (1980) life-span, life-space theory posits that individuals can experience nine primary roles in their lives: child, student, worker, partner, parent, citizen, homemaker, leisurite and pensioner. A person occupies only a single role at some stages in their lives (e.g. child in the early stages of one’s life) and multiple roles at other stages (e.g. partner, worker, parent and homemaker at the prime of one’s life). These life roles tend to be played out in a particular theatre (e.g. home, school, work or community). Since the development of Super’s theory in 1980, technological advances and the contemporary world of work have resulted in an overlap in the theatres in which certain roles tend to be played (e.g. a worker replying to work emails in a coffee shop). The blurring of these boundaries between work and family and the theatres in which these various roles play out can, for some individuals, result in increased experiences of work-family conflict.

Viewing anticipated work-family conflict through the lens of Super’s life-span, life-space theory (1980), one can understand that up until the emerging adult phase in one’s life, an individual has mainly held a dual role of child and student. When students transition from late childhood to early adulthood, they start to anticipate the multiple roles they will begin to step into such as partner, parent, worker and homemaker. The anticipation of moving from fulfilling mainly a dual role to now fulfilling multiple roles can evoke concerns amongst young adults when thinking about their future. These feelings and concerns are understood as AWFC. Super’s (1980) life-span, life-space theory offers another perspective through which to view AWFC as it highlights the multiple roles that a person fulfils in their lifetime and the transitioning that takes place between them.

**Directionality of anticipated work-family conflict**

Anticipated work-family conflict has been measured as a unidimensional construct (Barnett et al., 2003; Livingston, Burley, & Springer, 1996; Weer et al., 2006) and a bidirectional construct (Cinamon, 2006, 2010; Coyle et al., 2015). The unidimensional view of AWFC is based upon the notion that students are not familiar enough with the distinctions
between both family and work and instead group them as one overall construct (Bu & McKeen, 2000; Weer et al., 2006). Some researchers have suggested that students do experience conflict already, albeit in a slightly different way with university being viewed as students’ work-life and their life outside of the university as their home-life (Cinamon, 2006). Biggs and Brough (2005) examined the bidirectionality of university-family conflict amongst a sample of university students. This construct examined the students’ current experience of the interference between university and family domains with the intention of establishing whether formal tertiary study could be interchangeable with paid work. Their findings supported the notion that formal tertiary study is relevant to the work-family conflict interface and that students were able to differentiate between university-to-family conflict and family-to-university conflict (Biggs & Brough, 2005). This further supports the idea that university-family conflict can be seen as a sufficient proxy for students to use on which to base their assumptions of AWFC.

Several researchers have examined whether there were any differences between the experience of anticipated work-to-family conflict (AW→FC) and anticipated family-to-work conflict (AF→WC) amongst female students (Cinamon, 2006; Coyle et al., 2015; Gaffey & Rottinghaus, 2009). Cinamon (2006) found that female students experienced higher levels of AF→WC than AW→FC. Both Gaffey and Rottinghaus (2009) and Coyle et al. (2015) supported these findings. These findings are in line with the original work-family conflict work by Pleck (1977) which suggested that because home responsibilities are considered to be predominantly a woman’s duty; women will experience greater family interfering with work conflict than work interfering with family conflict. This could suggest that despite the perception of a shift in changing gender expectations, women still anticipate that the family duties are their primary responsibility (Askari et al., 2010).

Table 2 outlines a summary of the various studies on anticipated work-family conflict, displaying the sample characteristics, the country where the study took place, the directionality of AWFC and the AWFC measure used in the study. The sample demographic information is relevant because an older sample could suggest a greater level of understanding between the work and family interface due to the maturity of older students compared to a younger sample. Studies where AWFC has been measured as a bidirectional construct have been conducted by the same primary researcher (Cinamon, 2006, 2010; Cinamon et al., 2008). In all three studies, Cinamon used an Israeli sample of students where
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Table 2
Summary of Samples and Measures Utilised in Anticipated Work-Family Conflict Studies to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Directionality</th>
<th>Measure of AWFC</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnett et al.</td>
<td>325 college seniors (secondary data) attending a private university</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>A; E; H; M&amp;S; SS; O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CMC: four-item measure developed for the study based on an earlier study by Barnett (1971)</td>
<td>$M = 22.99; SD = 0.97$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagraim &amp; Harrison (2013)</td>
<td>645 university students</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>AWFC: Adapted version of Gutek, Searle and Klepa’s (1991) eight item measure of WFC.</td>
<td>$M = 20.5; SD = 1.75$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush et al. (2011)</td>
<td>131 undergraduate students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Bus; H; M&amp;S; N; SS; O</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>CFC: an instrument modified by Sennet (2006) to measure post-college graduation plans of students</td>
<td>More than 95% aged Between 20 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell et al. (2015)</td>
<td>120 undergraduate college students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Various measures of AWFC: Spontaneous report measures; AWFC single-item measure; multi-item FDS created by Gilbert, Dancer, Rossman and Thorn (1991); adapted version of Gutek, Searle and Klepa’s (1991) WFC measure</td>
<td>$M = 20.33; SD = 1.77$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon et al. (2008)</td>
<td>101 unmarried young adults (19 hard of hearing; 16 deaf and 66 with normal hearing)</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cinamon’s (2006) 14-item questionnaire</td>
<td>$M = 25; SD = 2.88$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon &amp; Rich (2014)</td>
<td>353 at-risk Grade 10 and 12 adolescents</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>An eight item adapted version of Cinamon’s (2006) AWFC measure</td>
<td>$M = 17.1; SD = 0.91$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. US = United States; CMC = career-marriage conflict; A = Arts; E = English; H = History; M&S = Maths & Science; SS = Social Sciences; O = Other; U = unidimensional; $M$ = mean; $SD$ = standard deviation; SA = South Africa; Bus = Business; AWFC = anticipated work-family conflict; WFC = work-family conflict; N = Nursing; CFC = career-family conflict; Psy = Psychology; B = bidirectional; FDS = Future Difficulties Scale; IS = Israel; N/A = not applicable
### Table 2

**Summary of Samples and Measures Utilised in Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict Studies to Date (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Directionality</th>
<th>Measure of AWFC</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon (2006)</td>
<td>358 students from two universities</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>Hum; Sci</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Adapted version of Gutek, Searle &amp; Klepa’s (1991) WFC questionnaire (14 items)</td>
<td>$M = 26.5; SD = 2.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinamon (2010)</td>
<td>387 unmarried students from two universities</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>Hum; Sci</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Adapted version of Gutek, Searle &amp; Klepa’s (1991) WFC questionnaire (14 items)</td>
<td>$M = 26.4; SD = 2.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyle et al. (2015)</td>
<td>121 undergraduate students from two colleges</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>An eight-item adapted version of Carlson et al. (2000) WFC scale</td>
<td>$M = 19.83; SD = 1.22$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaffey &amp; Rottinghaus (2009)</td>
<td>295 university students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18-item adapted version of the WFCMS (Carlson et al., 2000)</td>
<td>$M = 22.84; SD = 5.26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston et al. (1996)</td>
<td>256 university students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Adapted version of Kopelman et al.’s (1983) four-item Inter-role Conflict Scale</td>
<td>67.2% under 20 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael et al. (2011)</td>
<td>101 unmarried young adults (35 hearing impaired, 66 with normal hearing)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male; Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cinamon’s (2006) 14-item questionnaire</td>
<td>$M = 25; SD = 2.88$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** US = United States; Hum = Humanities faculty; Sci = Science Faculty; Psy = Psychology; U = unidimensional; $M$ = mean; $SD$ = standard deviation; WFC = work-family conflict; B = bidirectional; IS = Israel; N/A = not applicable; WFCMS = Work-family Conflict Multidimensional Scale.
Table 2

*Summary of Samples and Measures Utilised in Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict Studies to Date (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Directionality</th>
<th>Measure of AWFC</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savela &amp; O’Brien (2016)</td>
<td>177 undergraduate students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18-item AWFC measure (Westring &amp; Ryan, 2011)</td>
<td>M = 19.64; SD = 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne &amp; Casper (2016)</td>
<td>195 undergraduate students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>U *</td>
<td>Five-item adapted WFC scale by Netemeyer et al. (1996)</td>
<td>M = 19.8; SD = .98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westring &amp; Ryan (2011)</td>
<td>437 university students</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18-item adapted version of Carlson et al.’s (2000) six dimensional WFC measure</td>
<td>73% were under 26 years of age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* *This study only examined anticipated work-to-family conflict; US = United States; U = unidimensional; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Bus = Business; AWFC = anticipated work-family conflict; WFC = work-family conflict; Psy = Psychology; Med = Medicine; B = bidirectional.*
the majority was comprised of Jewish students. Israeli Jewish students normally attend university about two to three years later than the average American student, as there is mandatory military service in Israel. Table 2 highlights the average higher age of Cinamon’s (2006, 2008, 2010) samples compared to the other samples in AWFC studies. The only study where Cinamon examined AWFC as a unidimensional construct was in Cinamon and Rich’s (2014) study where the average age of the sample was much younger at 17.1 years of age. Further research is required to examine whether the supported bidirectionality of work-family conflict also applies to AWFC.

Researchers who have examined AWFC amongst students have utilised samples across various different faculties. Based on Weer et al.’s (2006) study, the present study focused specifically on business students as the sample of interest because business students tend to move into demanding corporate careers, managerial positions or become entrepreneurs. In line with the study by Savela and O’Brien (2016), only female students were included in the study. This is because female students may be more susceptible to AWFC as a result of the societal pressure placed on women to balance both work and family roles (Askari et al., 2010).

Forms of Parental Role modelling and Anticipated Work-Family Conflict

Studies have examined a range of different antecedents of AWFC including maternal employment (e.g. Weer et al., 2006), gender (e.g. Cinamon, 2006), natal family size (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003), religious affiliation (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003), instrumentality (e.g. Savela & O’Brien, 2016), parental education (e.g. Bagraim & Harrison, 2013) and role salience (e.g. Cinamon, 2010). No study to date has focused specifically on how parental role modelling shapes female students’ AWFC. Parents play a pivotal role in shaping their children’s views around the work-family interface. Socialisation begins from early childhood and continues beyond the adolescent years, with parents being viewed as the primary learning source for children (Jodl et al., 2001; Levine & Hoffner, 2006; Wiese & Freund, 2011). Based on these insights, this study focused specifically on the influence of parental role modelling on AWFC to examine which influences were predictors of AWFC.
Parental role modelling

The following section discusses each form of parental role modelling, namely parental employment, perceived work-family coping of parents and parental role sharing.

Parental employment

Parental employment patterns refer to whether parents worked full-time, part-time or were not employed at various stages of their careers. Employment patterns could be influenced by factors out of one’s control (e.g. retrenchments or company restructuring) or by choice (e.g. sabbatical, the birth of a child or stay-at-home parent). Researchers are interested in parental employment due to the impact that being at work can have on a young child (Goldberg, Prause, Lucas-Thompson, & Himsel, 2008). This interest has resulted in a large body of research around parental employment, especially focusing on the impact of maternal employment during a child’s early developmental years (e.g. Brooks-Gunn, Han, & Waldfogel, 2010; Ermisch & Francesconi, 2013; Harvey, 1999; Lightbody & Williamson, 2017). Studies have examined the potential effects of working parents on various aspects of their child’s functioning. These potential effects include educational attainment (Ermisch & Francesconi, 2013) and development (Lightbody & Williamson, 2017) in a child’s early years and also the potential effect of working parents on their children’s delinquent behaviours during their adolescent years (Mendolia, 2016; Milkie, Nomaguchi, & Denny, 2015). Despite the overwhelming interest in parental employment studies, results have been inconclusive (Hsin & Felfe, 2014; Milkie et al., 2015). Further research is required to enhance researchers’ understanding of the dynamics at play between parental employment and the potential impact on children.

Mothers used to be the primary caregiver looking after the home and children. With mothers now being active participants in the workforce, researchers have shown increased interest in studying the possible impact of maternal employment on children (e.g. Brooks-Gunn et al., 2010; Ermisch & Francesconi, 2013; Harvey, 1999; Lightbody & Williamson, 2017). Additional factors contributing to the interest in maternal employment is that a mother’s career tends to be more affected when a child is born in comparison to a father’s and the sex-typing of the traditional caregiver role onto mothers (Barnett et al., 2003; Bernal, 2008; Ruhm, 2008; Weer et al., 2006). In the past, traditional gender roles dictated that women would take a setback in their careers to look after their children. Often, women would not work at all. The increase in women into the workforce has resulted in a shift of childcare
responsibilities and has resulted in children going into daycare from an early age or being looked after by other family members (Belsky et al., 2007). This has led to an increased area of research on the impact of maternal employment on children. Several researchers have examined whether maternal employment benefits or hinders a child’s development and whether having a working mother influences a child’s view of the work-family interface (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003; Cooksey, Joshi, & Verropoulou, 2009; Hsin & Felfe, 2014; Lightbody & Williamson, 2017; Lombardi & Coley, 2014; Weer et al., 2006). Results, however, have been mixed and further research is required to build on this body of literature.

The influence of maternal employment on students’ experience of AWFC has been examined in only a handful of studies (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013; Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006). It has been proposed that maternal employment can influence the way in which socialisation into the work-family interface takes place. Because a child’s early years of life are so crucial for development, understanding how maternal employment might influence development at different stages of a child’s life would provide valuable insights. Very few studies have attempted to examine the potential impact of maternal employment at the different life stages of a child’s development. Barnett et al. (2003) and Weer et al. (2006) made an attempt to explore this but summed the data to ascertain a range of maternal employment from not employed at all to extensive maternal employment during the participants’ childhood to late adolescent years.

Barnett et al. (2003) examined the relationship between maternal employment and participants’ anticipated career-marriage conflict, a related but more limited construct to anticipated work-family conflict. In line with social learning theory, their study revealed that students whose mothers were employed during their childhood experienced lower levels of anticipated career-marriage conflict compared to students' whose mothers did not work. Barnett et al. (2003) posited that the rationale behind these findings is that students who observed their mothers work while growing up view working mothers as being familiar to them. In turn, they too would expect to be working mothers themselves or intend to be married to a woman who will work. The notion of familiarity versus the unexpected is what plays a key role here (Barnett et al., 2003). Contrary to this, Weer et al.’s (2006) study revealed that female’s AWFC was not related to their mothers’ employment history and that female students expected high levels of AWFC regardless of whether their mother worked or not.
Paternal employment is no recent phenomenon. Men have long been viewed as the primary breadwinner in the family. Paternal employment has received little attention as an area of study because tradition has dictated that it be the norm for a father to continuously work throughout his child’s childhood and adolescent years. In line with social learning theory, paternal employment was included in this study to examine whether maternal employment has more of an influence on female students than paternal employment.

**Perceived work-family coping of parents**

Children observe their parents’ work-family behaviour while growing up. They observe not only whether their parents participated in both work and family roles, but also whether their parents were successfully able to manage these multiple roles. Perceived work-family coping of parents refers to whether young adults perceived their parents to have successfully coped with competing work-family demands. This is based on an individual’s recollection of the experience.

As discussed previously, Weer et al. (2006) hypothesised that students whose mothers were employed during their childhood would expect to experience lower levels of AWFC than female students whose mothers were not employed. This was based on social learning theory which suggests that female students with working mothers would view a working mother as familiar to them as they have seen how the work and family domain can be combined (Barnett et al., 2003). An unexpected finding in Weer et al.’s (2006) study which showed that female students’ AWFC was not related to their mothers’ employment history prompted them to suggest that it might not simply be whether their mother was employed or not, but rather influenced by whether their mother was able to successfully manage both family and work roles. Interestingly, Barnett et al. (2003) suggested that AWFC would not depend on whether parents were actually able to successfully manage multiple roles in the work and family domain, but simply if children were exposed to this arrangement. Weer et al. (2006) recommended that future research should examine whether a daughter’s perception of her mother’s success in coping with both work and family responsibilities influences her levels of AWFC. Based on this recommendation, both the perceived work-family coping of one’s mother and father were examined in this study.

Basuil and Casper (2012) examined a similar variable in their study on work-family planning attitudes among emerging adults. They examined the perceived work-to-family
conflict of mothers and fathers. Basuil and Casper (2012) hypothesised that because students do not yet have families of their own nor have they yet experienced working life, students will draw assumptions and expectations around work and family based on observing their parents’ behaviour. Their findings supported their hypothesis that perceived work-to-family conflict of parents is associated with work-family role planning. Basuil and Casper (2012) suggest that when children are exposed to certain behaviours by their parents (i.e. work-to-family conflict), the behaviour becomes familiar to them through observation. It is the familiarity with a behaviour that can influence how children use this information to make more informed decisions about their own future work and family lives. In addition, Basuil and Casper (2012) found that the relationship was stronger between a mother and daughter; and a father and son. This is based on the psychoanalytic perspective that children model same-gender parents (Riggio & Desrochers, 2006). Although Basuil and Casper’s (2012) study examined a different parental role modelling related variable, their findings highlight how the perception one has of one’s parents’ behaviour has an important role to play in the work-family interface. Based on these findings, it is reasonable to expect that perceived work-family coping of parents would predict anticipated work-family conflict and that perceived maternal work-family coping would be a stronger predictor than perceived paternal work-family coping on female students.

**Parental role sharing**

Parental role sharing models are categorised into two main groups: traditional and egalitarian. A traditional household is one where the father is the primary breadwinner and the mother is the primary caregiver. A mother can still work in a traditional model; however, her working role is viewed as being secondary to a father’s role. A mother’s working role is normally the supplementary income as opposed to fulfilling the primary breadwinner role. Egalitarian models describe a role sharing model where neither partner spends more than 60% or less than 40% on housework or childcare (Ferree, 1991). Dual-earner couples from a traditional model can result in more responsibilities being placed on women. Added responsibilities can, in turn, make the balancing of work and family responsibilities more of a challenge. When women are unable to balance these various roles, work-family conflict is experienced.

In line with social learning theory, one would suggest that children plan to follow the same role sharing model as their parents as this is what they observed and is familiar to them.
Interestingly, studies on role sharing models revealed that although both men and women desire to be in an egalitarian relationship, women still expected that they would be doing more of the family responsibilities (Askari et al., 2010; Fulcher et al., 2015). These findings suggest that although the 21st Century has resulted in a shift in gender-based norms dictating the roles of men and women (O'Shea & Kirrane, 2008), in reality, men and women tend to fall back into their traditional roles. Fulcher et al. (2015) found that when it came to the division of childcare responsibilities, although some men did envision being more involved in childcare, both men and women still expected childcare to be primarily the women’s task. Of the 20 childcare tasks asked in the study, men envisioned to only be responsible for five (Fulcher et al., 2015). Women envisioned men to only be responsible for one. Furthermore, the latter responsibility was discipline which is already viewed as a more masculine duty.

Traditional role sharing models have several implications for women. Despite the increase in dual-earner couples, men are still generally seen as the primary earner and women as the supplementary earner. Likewise, men are only expected to help out at home whereas housework and childcare are seen as women’s primary responsibility. The increase in dual-earner couples has created opportunities for women to pursue non-traditional career paths (Ericksen, 2013). However, women who are career-driven and aspire to be in demanding careers are often viewed negatively for choosing work over family. The gender role framework further suggests that men’s contribution to the family domain is indirect through their provider role (Bernard, 1981). Men are expected to spend most of their time at work as opposed to being with their families because it is through their income that they are supporting their family (Gutek et al., 1991). Women, on the other hand, are expected to spend more time in day-to-day family activities. Women who are in demanding careers and spend more of their time in paid-work may feel that they are placing their family second and neglecting their primary responsibilities (Bernard, 1981). These insights provide further context to work-family conflict in the 21st Century where, for many, traditional gender role expectations are still prevalent, despite women being less likely to endorse the traditional gender ideology (Katz-Wise, Priess, & Hyde, 2010). This implies that women can be expected to experience higher levels of work-family conflict than men. If young female students anticipate high levels of work-family conflict, they might be inclined to follow or change their chosen study or career path towards one with less demanding responsibilities.
Cinamon’s (2006) study examined the relationship between parental role sharing and anticipated work-family conflict. Cinamon’s measure of parental role sharing comprised of a question pertaining to parents’ sharing of housework responsibilities and a question pertaining to parents’ sharing of childcare responsibilities. Measuring parental role sharing using separate items for housework and childcare allowed for differences to be examined based on the different responsibilities associated with each task. Housework is viewed differently to childcare as it is more tedious and less rewarding (Mannino & Deutsch, 2007). Participants could select that their mother did the majority of the work, their father did the majority of the work or the work was shared equitably between both parents. Based on the notion of women being the primary caregiver, it was to be expected that in dual-earner households, participants did not select that their father did the majority of the work. This resulted in two role sharing models being identified: traditional and egalitarian. The study revealed that students who grew up in an egalitarian model where childcare was shared between a mother and father reported significantly lower levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict. This finding highlights the influential role that a father can play by participating in caregiver duties and the impact that equal sharing of responsibilities can have on female students’ perception of the work-family interface. Interestingly, there were no significant differences between the experience of AWFC and traditional or egalitarian models of housework. Cinamon (2006) suggested a reason this could be that the students’ parents were able to afford domestic help to take care of housework. Domestic help was not examined in the study; therefore Cinamon (2006) recommended that future research should include domestic help as response item in a survey.

Croft, Schmader, Block and Baron (2014) highlighted an interesting observation in their study on young children that even if working mothers are role models to their children and influence their perception of working women; children spend their time mainly directly observing the work that their parents do at home. Even if women are involved in paid work, if they still do the majority of housework, children observe this and the traditional gender role model continues. Their study revealed that even if both a mother and father are working, unless the division of labour at home is equally shared, daughters still anticipated a more traditional-gendered household (Croft et al., 2014). These findings emphasise the importance of understanding the role that parental role sharing models have on their children’s AWFC because there is evidence to support that students who come from egalitarian households tend to experience lower levels of AWFC (Cinamon, 2006).
Personal Characteristics and Anticipated Work-Family Conflict

Several researchers have examined the role that personal characteristics play in students’ experience of AWFC (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013; Cinamon, 2006, 2010; Michael et al., 2011; Westring & Ryan, 2011). This study focused on the personal characteristics of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict (SEFWFC) and positive affectivity (PA) in relation to AWFC. These are discussed in turn.

Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict

Self-efficacy is a key component of social cognitive theories. Self-efficacy refers to “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). The strong link between self-efficacy beliefs and personal agency is what makes self-efficacy a construct of interest in career development research (Lent et al., 1994). An individual’s self-efficacy beliefs are a key driver of the effort, tenacity and emotional reaction one displays when faced with difficulties (Lent et al., 1994). Lent et al. (1994) explain how through the lens of social cognitive theories, self-efficacy is viewed as “not a passive, static trait, but rather is seen as a dynamic set of self-beliefs that are specific to particular performance domains and that interact complexly with other individual, behaviour, and contextual factors.” (p. 83).

Researchers have examined self-efficacy at both a general and task-specific level. General self-efficacy refers to an individual’s perception of one’s own abilities to perform across a variety of different situations (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001; Luszczynska, Gutiérrez-Doña, & Schwarzer, 2005). Situational self-efficacy, on the other hand, refers to an individual’s perception of their own abilities to perform a specific task or within a specific domain (Davidson, Feldman, & Margalit, 2012). Situational self-efficacy has been a popular area of research in the educational and vocational literature (e.g. Brown & Cinamon, 2015; Butz & Usher, 2015; Hsieh & Huang, 2014; Lent, Ezeofor, Morrison, Penn, & Ireland, 2016; Scheuermann et al., 2014). Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict (SEFWFC) is a form of situational self-efficacy. It refers to an individual’s belief that one will be able to successfully manage both future work and family responsibilities.

Anticipated work-family conflict is not a static experience. With the right support and resources, female students can experience lower levels of AWFC. This is in line with the conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) which posits that “people strive to retain,
protect, and build resources and that what is threatening to them is the potential or actual loss of these valued resources” (Hobfoll, 1989, p. 513). Anticipated work-family conflict is a form of stress experienced when young adults anticipate that they will have a lack of resources, such as time and family support, to meet the demands of their future work and family roles. Hobfoll (1989) identified self-efficacy as a resource individuals use to manage their stress. The threat to self-efficacy or loss of self-efficacy can influence one’s ability to successfully manage AWFC. Self-efficacy equips individuals with the beliefs that they can successfully complete a task. This suggests that female students’ self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict plays an important role in the level of AWFC they believe they will experience.

Hennessy and Lent (2008) developed and validated an English version of the Self-Efficacy for Work-Family Conflict Management Scale (SE-WFC), which was originally developed in Hebrew. The scale has been shown to have high internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Hennessy & Lent, 2008). Hennessy and Lent's (2008) factor analysis supported the bidirectional properties of the scale, indicating that self-efficacy to manage work-to-family conflict and self-efficacy to manage family-to-work conflict are two distinct constructs. Adapted versions of the 10-item SE-WFC Scale have been used in several AWFC studies where the items have been adapted to the future tense (Bagaim & Harrison, 2013; Cinamon, 2006; Michael et al., 2011).

Researchers have shown that in adult samples there is a negative relationship between self-efficacy and the experience of work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2012; Cinamon, Weisel, & Tzuk, 2007; Karatepe & Karadas, 2014). Several studies which examined the relationship between SEFWFC and AWFC supported a negative correlation (Bagaim & Harrison, 2013; Cinamon, 2006; Michael et al., 2011). Cinamon (2006) and Michael et al. (2011) examined SEFWFC as a bidirectional construct, with self-efficacy to manage future work-to-family conflict (SEFW→FC) and self-efficacy to manage future family-to-work conflict (SEFF→WC) being distinct but related constructs. Michael et al. (2011) examined the relationship between both directions of SEFWFC and AWFC with a sample comprising of participants who were from three groups: hearing, hard of hearing or deaf. Their study revealed that participants with higher levels of SEFW→FC from the hearing and hard of hearing groups experienced lower levels of AW→FC. Only participants with higher levels of SEFF→WC from the hearing group experienced lower levels of AF→WC. The findings that
SEFWFC is negatively associated with AWFC were consistent with other studies (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013; Cinamon, 2006). This is in line with social cognitive theories, which suggest that individuals higher in self-efficacy have a tendency to engage with tasks instead of avoiding them and have a higher level of persistence when faced with obstacles (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Based on these findings, it is reasonable to expect that female students with higher levels of SEFWFC will experience lower levels of AWFC. Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict was therefore used as a control variable in the present study.

Self-efficacy as a moderating variable has been documented in the work-family literature amongst adult samples (Cho & Ryu, 2016; Glaser & Hecht, 2013; Jex & Bliese, 1999; Lu, Chang, & Lai, 2011; Rauf, 2013; Thakur & Kumar, 2015; Zellars, Hochwarter, Perrewe, Miles, & Kiewitz, 2001). Self-efficacy has been examined in the form of situational self-efficacy (e.g. Rauf, 2013) and general self-efficacy (e.g. Glaser & Hecht, 2013). To date, no study has examined SEFWFC as a moderating factor between any form of parental role modelling and the experience of AWFC amongst a student sample. Weer et al. (2006) recommended that self-efficacy be examined in future studies in relation to maternal employment and AWFC. Based on this recommendation and that self-efficacy has been shown to act as a resource to manage stress (Hobfoll, 1989), it is reasonable to expect that SEFWFC may act as a resource and moderate the relationship between maternal employment and AWFC. This relationship was examined as exploratory research in the present study.

Positive affectivity

Positive affectivity (PA) is a dispositional trait which “reflects the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active, and alert” (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p. 1063). Individuals can experience PA on a continuum with those high in PA being described as “active, elated, enthusiastic and strong” (Eby, Maher, & Butts, 2010, p. 6) and those low in PA as “drowsy, dull, sleeping and sluggish” (Eby et al., 2010, p. 6). Trait-based variables play an influential role in how individuals interpret and respond to their work and family life and remain relatively stable over time and place (Bowling, Beehr, & Lepisto, 2006; Watson et al., 1988).

There is empirical research to suggest that positive affectivity is related to work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2012; Bruck & Allen, 2003; Karatepe & Uludag, 2008; Tement & Korunka, 2013). Allen et al. (2012) conducted the first meta-analysis on the relationship
between dispositional factors and work-family conflict and their findings supported a
negative relationship between PA and work-family conflict. The authors went on to suggest
that positive trait based variables like PA act as a resource for individuals which help protect
individuals from the negative effects of work-family conflict (Allen et al., 2012). Individuals
high in PA will have a tendency to be more energetic, optimistic and have an overall more
positive outlook. They may view work and family as positively influencing each other and
therefore view the work-family interface with less anxiety (Tement & Korunka, 2013). In line
with the present study, it is reasonable to expect that female students with higher levels of PA
will view their future more positively and may be excited about having a family and a career.
They may view balancing career and family as an enriching and rewarding experience. This
is in contrast to female students low in PA who might be more anxious about the prospect of
balancing future work and family roles (Allen et al., 2012).

Drawing from findings from the work-family conflict literature, it is reasonable to
expect that individuals high in PA would also experience lower levels of AWFC (Allen et al.,
2012). Positive affectivity was therefore used as a control variable in the present study
considering that dispositional traits remain relatively stable over time (Watson et al., 1988).

The literature review gives rise to the following research propositions:

**Research Propositions**

**Proposition 1:** Anticipated work-family conflict is a bidirectional construct

**Proposition 2:** Parental employment significantly explains the variance in anticipated
work-family conflict

**Proposition 3:** Perceived work-family coping of parents significantly explains the
variance in anticipated work-family conflict

**Proposition 4:** Parental role sharing significantly explains the variance in anticipated
work-family conflict

**Proposition 5:** Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict moderates the
relationship between maternal employment and anticipated work-family conflict
Final notes

The literature review has provided a theoretical and empirical context to the influence of parental role modelling on female business students’ anticipated work-family conflict. Anticipated work-family conflict is still theoretically underdeveloped. The propositions put forward have been based on both the limited research that has empirically examined the relationships between the different forms of parental role modelling and anticipated work-family conflict, as well as existing literature which has examined related constructs.

Method

The following section describes the method followed to conduct the study. The study utilised secondary data. This is in line with Barnett et al.’s (2003) study which examined career-marriage conflict, a similar construct to anticipated work-family conflict. The framework outlined by Smith et al. (2011) was used as a guideline in conducting secondary data analysis. Technological advances have resulted in secondary data analysis becoming more prevalent as large amounts of data can easily be archived and accessed when required (Johnston, 2017). Secondary data analysis is still subjected to the scientific and systematic method more commonly associated with primary data. Secondary data analysis is a viable method of data analysis and is particularly advantageous when time and resources are limited (Johnston, 2017; Smith et al., 2011).

Research design

This study utilised a quantitative research approach using a cross-sectional design. This design allows for comparisons between different groups and relationships between variables to be examined at one-point in time (Salkind, 2009). The study utilised secondary data which had been collected via self-report questionnaires. The dataset was eight years old; however, it was still considered appropriate for further analysis. The research design was selected in order to meet the requirements of the study.

Participants

The sample comprised of 265 participants. The selection was based on the following criteria: Commerce students; female; had both a mother and father figure present from 0 to 18 years of age; not currently working full-time; currently single but intended to marry and have children. Arnett’s (2000) classification of emerging adults being between the ages of 18 and
25 was used to delimit the age range. The selection criteria were chosen to limit the influence of additional factors impacting the results. It is assumed that students who do not intend to marry nor have children may not experience the same levels of AWFC because they do not intend on having these additional role responsibilities in their lives. This may influence the experience of AWFC and therefore influence results.

Among the participants, the mean age was 20.50 years ($SD = 1.62$). Of the sample, 231 (87.2%) respondents’ mothers worked and 259 (97.7%) respondents’ fathers worked while growing up. Of the respondents, 35.5% ($n = 94$) reported having a domestic worker who took care of the housework and only 3.4% ($n = 9$) reported to have a childminder who took care of the childcare responsibilities. The majority of housework (53.2%, $n = 141$) and childcare (60.0%, $n = 159$) responsibilities were managed by a mother figure. Of the sample, 14 (5.3%) reported to have had less than enough while growing up, 165 (62.3%) had enough and 86 (32.5%) reported to have had more than enough. This data provided information on the social economic status of the students. Of the sample, 132 (49.8%) respondents were living in a digs or residence at the time of the study; 90 (34.0%) were living with their parents, 38 (14.3%) were living in their own flat or apartment, and 3 (1.1%) were living with other family members. The mean age at which students wanted their first child was 28.07 years of age ($SD = 2.22$). More than half of the sample (59.2%) expressed that over the past few years they had been concerned about how they will balance competing work and family demands in the future. Table 3 represents the distribution of other characteristics of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$N = 265$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education level</td>
<td>Did not complete Grade 12</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Grade 12</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. % = percentage; $n = sample subset; N = sample.
Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Degree or Diploma</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's education level</td>
<td>Did not complete Grade 12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Grade 12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Degree or Diploma</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children wanted</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than four</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental role sharing of</td>
<td>Mother figure</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father figure</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equally by both parents</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic worker</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental role sharing of</td>
<td>Mother figure</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father figure</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equally by both parents</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A childminder</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to enter the world</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 2010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. % = percentage; n = sample subset.

**Procedure**

Non-probability and purposive sampling techniques were used in this study. The data was extracted from a larger database based on the selection criteria. The dataset was provided in SPSS format. The dataset did not include any identifying information and the responses could not be traced back to the original participants.
Measures

This section discusses the measures utilised in this study. Responses from six measures were extracted from a larger database. Responses to additional demographic items were extracted and are also discussed. The full measures can be found in Appendix A.

Anticipated work-family conflict

Anticipated work-family conflict was measured using an adapted version of Gutek, Searles and Klepa’s (1991) measure of work-family conflict. The questions were rephrased to the future tense as students were expected to think about their anticipated conflict of balancing future work and family demands. The measure consisted of eight items. Half the items reflected anticipated work-to-family conflict and the other half reflected anticipated family-to-work conflict. Gutek et al. (1991) conducted two separate studies in their research paper and the reported Cronbach alphas were 0.81 and 0.83 for the work-to-family conflict items and 0.79 and 0.83 for the family-to-work conflict. Cinamon (2006) used an adapted version of Gutek et al.’s (1991) measure and reported Cronbach’s alpha of .78 and .80 for anticipated work-to-family conflict and anticipated family-to-work conflict respectively. These values indicate a high level of internal consistency (DeVellis, 2003). A five-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) was used, where high scores indicated high levels of AWFC and low scores indicated low levels of AWFC. A sample item of anticipated work-to-family conflict is “After work, I will come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do”. A sample item of anticipated family-to-work conflict is “I will be too tired at work because of the things I will have to do at home.”

Parental employment

Parental employment was assessed using Weer et al.’s (2006) measure. Students were asked whether their parents had been employed full-time, part-time or never during each of the five stages of childhood. These stages included 0 to 1 years old (infant); 1 to 3 years old (toddler); 3 to 6 years old (pre-school); 6 to 12 years old (primary school) and 12 to 18 years old (late primary school and high school). In line with Weer et al.’s (2006) study, differential weighting was applied to each life stage in order to measure the extensiveness of each parent’s employment during the participant’s childhood years. Full-time employment was weighted with a 2; part-time employment was weighted with a 1 and a 0 was allocated if a parent did not work at all. The number of years in each life stage was multiplied by the
relevant weighting. The scores for the five life stages were summed to produce a score which represented the extensiveness of each parent’s employment during the participant’s childhood years. The scores could range from 0 (did not work at all) to 36 (worked full-time for 18 years), with higher scores representing more extensive employment. Participants who responded with “no mother/father figure” or “don’t know” at any of the five life stages were removed from the analysis because including them would distort the calculations. The same process was followed for both maternal and paternal employment.

**Perceived work-family coping of parents**

Perceived work-family coping of parents was assessed based on participants’ recollection of whether their parents were successfully able to cope with competing work-family demands. Participants responded to three different life stages namely: 0 to 6 years old; 6 to 12 years old and 12 to 18 years old using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). This measure was developed for the original research project (Harrison, 2009). The data were summed and averaged to produce a score which represented the extensiveness to which participants’ recalled their parents to have successfully coped with competing work-family demands. High scores indicated that participants recalled that their parents coped well with work-family demands; low scores indicated that participants recalled that their parents did not cope well with work-family demands.

**Parental role sharing**

Parental role sharing was measured using two items adapted from Cinamon’s (2006) study. The first item related to parents’ sharing of housework and the second item to parents’ sharing of childcare. Participants were asked in separate items about who was responsible for the majority of housework and childcare duties. Participants could choose from five responses. An additional two responses were added to the original three responses to account for different possible scenarios (Cinamon, 2006). Participants could select from (1) my mother figure; (2) my father figure; (3) equally by both my parents; (4) other family members and (5) domestic worker/childminder. The my mother figure option refers to the traditional role sharing model and equally by both my parents refers to an egalitarian model of role sharing. Very few participants selected my father figure, other family members and childminder as responses and these were removed from future analysis due to the very small group sizes (Pallant, 2010). The remaining responses were recoded into three separate binary variables for role sharing of housework (my mother figure = 1, else = 0; equally by both
parents = 1, else = 0; domestic worker = 1, else = 0) and one binary variable for childcare (my mother figure = 1, equally by both parents = 0).

**Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict**

An adapted version of the Self-Efficacy for Work-Family Conflict Management Scale developed by Hennessy and Lent (2008) was used to measure this construct. Six items from the original 10 item measure were used. The six items were selected based on the three highest loadings for Factor 1 (self-efficacy for managing work-to-family conflict) and for Factor 2 (self-efficacy for managing family-to-work conflict) respectively. Hennessy and Lent (2008) reported high Cronbach’s alpha of .90 and .89 for self-efficacy for managing work-to-family conflict and self-efficacy for managing family-to-work conflict respectively. The items were rephrased to the future tense to measure self-efficacy to manage future work-to-family conflict (SEFW→FC) and self-efficacy to manage future family-to-work conflict (SEFF→WC). The items were responded to on a nine-point Likert scale (1 = complete lack of confidence to 9 = totally confident). An example item of SEFW→FC is “How confident are you that you could manage incidents in which work-life interferes with family life?”. An example item of SEFF→WC is “How confident are you that you could focus on and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive?”. Cinamon (2006) utilised a similar adapted version of the measure and reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 in both directions.

**Positive affectivity**

Positive affectivity was measured using the ten PA items from Watson et al.’s (1988) PANA Schedule. Participants’ responses were based on their experience of positive affectivity over the previous week at the time of completing the questionnaire and were responded to on a five-point Likert scale (1 = very slightly to 5 = extremely). Watson et al. (1988) showed high Cronbach’s alpha of .88 for positive affectivity over the time period of the “past few days”. The scale showed consistent Cronbach’s alpha over a time period from the current moment up until one year (Watson et al., 1988).

**Demographic Characteristics**

Demographic variables were measured using single items. These variables included age, gender (male or female), race (Indian, White, Black African, Coloured, other or prefer not to answer), number of expected children (options ranged from 0 to more than 7), current living situation (with my parents; with family members other than my parents; in a
digs/university res; in my own apartment/flat/house or other) and social economic status while growing up (less than enough; enough; more than enough). Marital status was measured by providing 12 possible responses. Respondents who selected “Single, but I intend to marry and have children” were retained in the study.

**Statistical Procedures**

The data was analysed using the Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted using principal axis factoring and oblique rotation (Direct Oblimin) when required. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s test were conducted to ensure the data met the criteria for EFA. Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient to measure the internal consistency of the items (Pallant, 2010). ANOVA were conducted to determine between-group differences. Descriptive statistics were calculated to determine the characteristics of the sample group. Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted in order to examine which variables were predictors of AWFC, even after controlling for certain personal factors. Lastly, the PROCESS module written by Hayes (2012) (http://www.afhayes.com) was used to examine the moderating effect of SEFWFC on the relationship between maternal employment and AWFC.

**Data Cleaning**

The data was examined prior to conducting any statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were run to ensure that no unrealistic data values were included in the analysis. This process also allowed for confirmation that only female Commerce students between the ages of 18 and 25 were included in the study and that any participants who did not have a mother or father figure throughout all life stages of their childhood were also excluded.

**Results**

The following section summarises the results of the data analysis. The section begins by examining the suitability of the measures in the study. This is followed by the results of the statistical analyses, which were used to examine the propositions. The statistical analyses included correlation analysis, ANOVA, multiple hierarchical regression and moderation analysis using PROCESS (Hayes, 2012). Reporting was done according to the guidelines and format outlined by Field (2014) and Pallant (2010).
Initial psychometric analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using principal axis factoring was conducted on each set of the AWFC, SEFWFC and PA items to analyse the underlying dimensions of the constructs (Burns & Burns, 2008). Prior to each analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were used to determine the sampling adequacy and inter-item correlations respectively (Burns & Burns, 2008). Data was considered suitable if the KMO was greater than .50 and if Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant at \( p < .05 \) (Field, 2014). Factors were retained based on Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson’s (2010) guidelines for a minimum loading of greater than .30. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .70 was considered an indicator of the reliability of the scales (Nunnally, 1978). Hair et al.’s (2010) suggestion that a Cronbach’s alpha of .60 is acceptable for exploratory research was also noted. The results will be discussed in turn.

Factor analysis

The preliminary analysis revealed that the set of items in the AWFC, SEFWFC and PA measures were appropriate for factor analysis. The KMO values were all above .50 and Bartlett’s tests of sphericity were all significant \( (p < .001) \).

Based on prior research, two AWFC factors were expected to emerge from the analysis and correlate with one another (Cinamon et al., 2008; Coyle et al., 2015; Michael et al., 2011; Westring & Ryan, 2011). Rotations are recommended when factors correlate (Field, 2014). Direct Oblimin was selected for this analysis. Two factors emerged, each with three distinct items loading on each factor; and two items loading on both factors. Item three (“my family/friends will dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home”) and item five (“I will often be too tired at work because of the things I will have to do at home”) loaded on both factors. The difference in the factor loadings for each factor was less than .20 which is considered grounds on which to remove an item and rerun the analysis (Gu, Cavanagh, Baer, & Strauss, 2017). After the analysis was rerun, two distinctive factor loadings emerged. All six items had loadings above .40 and were thus retained (Hair et al., 2010). Factor 1 reflected anticipated work-to-family conflict (AW→FC) and Factor 2 reflected anticipated family-to-work conflict (AF→WC). The factor correlation, which indicates the strength of the relationship between the two factors, was .36. This supports the selection of Direct Oblimin, an oblique rotation of the factors (Pallant, 2010).
In line with Field’s (2014) recommendation, the results from the pattern matrix were used to interpret the factor loadings. The pattern matrix provides information on the unique contribution the variable makes to a factor (Field, 2014). Table 4 displays the results. The two-component solution explained 40.53% of the variance. Component 1 (AW→FC) contributed 27.45% and Component 2 (AF→WC) contributed 13.08%. The eigenvalues were 1.44 and 1.30 respectively. The results support proposition 1 that AWFC is a bidirectional construct. All further analyses used each direction of AWFC as a separate scale: Anticipated work-to-family conflict (AW→FC) and anticipated family-to-work conflict (AF→WC).

Table 4
Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation of Anticipated Work-Family Conflict Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AW→FC</th>
<th>AF→WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWFC1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWFC2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWFC4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFWC2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFWC3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFWC4</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual total variance (%)</td>
<td>27.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total variance (%)</td>
<td>40.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 265 after listwise deletion; factor loadings > .40 are in bold, AWFC = anticipated work-family conflict; AW→FC = anticipated work-to-family conflict, AF→WC = anticipated family-to-work conflict.

A paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference between female students’ experience of AW→FC and AF→WC (t_{264} = 20.05, p < .001, n = 265). Female students
experienced significantly higher levels of \( AW \rightarrow FC \) \( (M = 3.14, SD = .78) \) than \( AF \rightarrow WC \) \( (M = 2.08, SD = .61) \).

The factor analysis conducted on the SEFWFC items showed one factor with an eigenvalue of 3.02 that explained 50.34% of the variance. Examination of the scree plot confirmed the unidimensionality of SEFWFC. Table B1 in Appendix B presents the factor structure of SEFWFC. For PA, one factor emerged with an eigenvalue of 4.08. The emerging factor explained 47.98% of the variance. Table B2 in Appendix B presents the factor structure of PA.

**Reliability analysis**

Reliability analysis was conducted on the \( AW \rightarrow FC \), \( AF \rightarrow WC \), PA and SEFWFC scales and the Cronbach alpha coefficients are reported on the diagonal in Table 5. Cronbach’s alpha values for \( AW \rightarrow FC \) and \( AF \rightarrow WC \) were .65 and .62 respectively which is acceptable for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2010). Further analysis to determine whether removing any items would increase reliability showed that the removal of item \( AW \rightarrow FC4 \) would have resulted in only a marginal increase in the Cronbach’s alpha to .67. The item was therefore retained. The SEFWFC (Cronbach \( \alpha = .86 \)) and PA (Cronbach \( \alpha = .90 \)) scales were reliable (Nunnally, 1978).

**Descriptive statistics**

Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics. The table reflects the means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis of the data.

The mean scores indicate that female students experience higher levels of \( AW \rightarrow FC \) \( (M = 3.14, SD = .78) \) than \( AF \rightarrow WC \) \( (M = 2.08, SD = .61) \). Female students are also fairly confident that they will be able to manage future competing work-family demands \( (M = 6.20, SD = 1.11) \). Participants reported moderate levels of PA \( (M = 3.26, SD = .86) \), which suggests that the sample has a general optimistic and positive outlook. Female students reported that both their mothers \( (M = 4.45, SD = .75) \) and fathers \( (M = 4.03, SD = 1.01) \) coped well with work-family issues. These results suggest that participants recall their mothers and fathers coping well with competing work-family demands. Female students reported that their fathers worked \( (M = 34.42, SD = 5.60) \) more intensively than their mothers \( (M = 24.01, SD = 12.63) \) did.
Table 5
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis of Variables under Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AW→FC</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AF→WC</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>(.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SEFWFC</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PA</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ME</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PE</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PWFCM</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PWFCF</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Age</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MChild</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MHouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EHouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. DHouse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations include Pearson, phi and point-biserial coefficients. Ns range from 218 to 265; Cronbach’s alpha reflected along the diagonal; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; AW→FC = anticipated work-to-family conflict; AF→WC = anticipated family-to-work conflict; PA = positive affectivity; ME = maternal employment; PE = paternal employment; PWFCM = perceived work-family coping of mother; PWFCF = perceived work-family coping of father; MChild = mother did majority of childcare; MHouse = mother did majority of housework; EHouse = majority egalitarian role sharing of housework; DHouse = domestic did majority of housework. Dummy-coded variables are as follows: MChild (1 = mother did majority of childcare, 0 = egalitarian role sharing of childcare); MHouse (1 = mother did majority of housework, 0 = else); EHouse (1 = egalitarian role sharing of housework, 0 = else); DHouse (1 = domestic worker did majority of housework, 0 = else).
The skewness and kurtosis of the continuous variables were examined. Skewness looks at the symmetry of the distribution; the extent to which the distribution is skewed to have either too many low scores or too many high scores in a distribution (Burns & Burns, 2008; Field, 2014). Kurtosis looks at the width and height of the distribution (Field, 2014). The further away the kurtosis and skewness values are from zero, the greater the likelihood that the data is not normally distributed (Field, 2014). Although many statistical analyses are based on the assumption of normal distribution of data, it is acknowledged that this assumption is not often met in social sciences research. Furthermore, many of the parametric analyses in SPSS are robust and can still be used when this assumption is not strictly met (Egboro, 2015). Anticipated work-to-family conflict, SEFWFC and PA measures were all negatively skewed, indicating relatively higher scores in the distribution (Field, 2014). Anticipated family-to-work conflict was positively skewed, indicating relatively lower scores in the distribution.

**Correlation analysis**

Correlation analysis was conducted using Pearson product moment correlation, point biserial correlation and phi correlation depending on the type of variable analysed. Table 5 displays the correlation coefficients. Cohen’s (1988) suggestion for interpreting the strength of the correlation coefficients was used as a guide in this study: correlations close to 0.1 are to be interpreted as being small (weak), 0.3 as medium (moderate) and 0.5 as large (strong).

A significant, moderate, correlation was found between AW→FC and AF→WC (r = .27, p < .001, n = 265) which is consistent with prior research (Cinamon, 2006). The overlap between AW→FC and AF→WC is small, with a shared variance of only 7.3%.

A weak negative relationship was found between maternal employment and AW→FC (r = -.16, p = .020, n = 218). No relationship was found between maternal employment and AF→WC. No relationship was found between paternal employment and either direction of AWFC. Proposition 2 was therefore supported only in the case of maternal employment and AW→FC. No relationship was found between either maternal or paternal perceived work-family coping and either direction of AWFC. Proposition 3 was therefore not supported. Egalitarian role sharing of housework negatively correlated with AW→FC (r = -.15, p = .016, n = 260). Proposition 4 was therefore supported only in the case of egalitarian role sharing and AW→FC. Given that of the different forms of parental role sharing, only maternal
employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework correlated with AW→FC, only these variables were used in further analysis.

A significant, yet weak, negative relationship was found between SEFWFC and both AW→FC and AF→WC. The strength, direction and significance of the relationship was the same for both directions of conflict (r = -.18, p = .003, n = 265). Positive affectivity significantly correlated to AW→FC (r = -.25, p < .001, n = 265). Unexpectedly, no relationship was found between PA and AF→WC (r = -.08, p = .220, n = 265). A moderate positive relationship was found between perceived work-family coping of mother and maternal employment (r = .32, p < .001, n = 218). Similarly, female students with fathers who worked extensively tended to recall that their fathers were able to successfully manage both work and family responsibilities (r = .22, p = .001, n = 252).

A moderate positive relationship was found between participants who perceived that their mother coped well with work-family responsibilities and female students who perceived that their father coped well with work-family responsibilities (r = .41, p < .001, n = 265). A significant yet weak relationship was found between age and AW→FC (r = .13, p = .036, n = 265). Interestingly, a moderate negative correlation was found between a household where the mother did the majority of the childcare and the participant’s perception that her father coped with work and family while growing up (r = -.42, p < .001, n = 243).

ANOVA

ANOVAs were conducted to determine group differences. The Levene’s test was applied to confirm homogeneity of variances. When the homogeneity of variance assumption was not met, Welch’s test was performed and interpreted (Field, 2014).

Parental role sharing and anticipated work-family conflict

Three responses for parental role sharing of housework were retained in the analysis: my mother figure; equally by both parents and domestic worker. Two responses for parental role sharing of childcare were retained in the analysis: my mother figure and equally by both parents. This was done because the responses to the remaining categories (my father figure; other family members; childminder) were small and not a sufficient size to be included in the ANOVA (Pallant, 2010). Results indicated no group differences for either direction of AWFC across the different parental role sharing scenarios.
Maternal employment at different life stages

Maternal employment was measured at five different life stages of the participant’s childhood. Following Weer et al.’s (2006) study, the maternal employment responses were recoded into a binary categorical variable, 1 = mother worked full time; 0 = mother did not work full time. Five ANOVA analyses were conducted to examine whether having a working mother or not having a working mother at different life stages influenced a female student’s AWFC. The analysis was conducted on both directions of AWFC.

The analysis revealed statistically significant differences between female students’ AW→FC and the employment status of their mothers at life stages 0 to 1 ($F[1, 219] = 4.36, p = .038$), 1 to 3 ($Welch's F[1, 230.88] = 4.50, p = .035$) and 12 to 18 ($Welch's F[1, 240.71] = 7.45, p = .007$). At these three life stages, female students with mothers who worked experienced significantly lower levels of AW→FC than those students with mothers who did not work at all. Further detail can be found in Table 6. No statistically significant differences were found across the different life stages for AF→WC.

Table 6
One-Way ANOVA Results of Maternal Employment Analysis with Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother worked</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stage 0 -1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stage 1 -3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stage 3 - 6</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stage 6 -12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stage 12 -18</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ANOVA = Analysis of variance. ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$. 
Demographic variables and anticipated work-family conflict

No significant differences were found across race ($F[3, 247] = 1.68, p = .179, n = 251$), current living circumstances ($F[1, 261] = .11, p = .740, n = 263$), maternal education ($Welch’s F[1, 235.18] = 1.26, p = .726, n = 259$), paternal education ($Welch’s F[1, 145.32] = 3.44, p = .066, n = 255$) and social economic status ($Welch’s F[2, 37.34] = .71, p = .50, n = 265$) for AW$\rightarrow$FC.

No significant differences were found across race ($F[3, 247] = .78, p = .505, n = 251$), current living circumstances ($Welch’s F[1, 227.32] = 1.19, p = .277, n = 263$), maternal education ($F[1, 257] = .13, p = .722, n = 259$), paternal education ($F[1, 253] = .06, p = .812, n = 255$) and social economic status ($F[2, 262] = 1.09, p = .337, n = 265$) for AF$\rightarrow$WC.

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was conducted to examine how maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework predicted AW$\rightarrow$FC and to control for the influence of PA, SEFWFC and age on the relationship.

Several assumptions need to be met in order for data to be appropriate for multiple regression analysis. The first assumption concerns the sample size. Pallant (2010) proposed that Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2007) recommended formula be used as a benchmark to determine the adequacy of the sample size: $N > 50 + 8m$ (where $m =$ the number of independent variables). The regression analyses in this study had a maximum of five independent variables which would require a minimum sample size of 90 respondents. Pallant (2010) also suggested that if the dependent variable is skewed, more cases are required, which is the case with the present study. There were 265 respondents in this study; therefore, this assumption has been met. Second, the Tolerance values were examined to check for multicollinearity. Tolerance values were all above the minimum benchmark of .10 (smallest value was .95). Outliers were examined using Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2007) definition which describes outliers as a dataset which has standardised residual values above 3.3 or less than -3.3. The standardised residuals were all within the accepted range. The minimum standardised residual value was -3.2 and the maximum was 2.50. Normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were examined by checking the Normal Probability Plot (P-P) plot of the regression standardised residual. All assumptions were met and the data was appropriate for multiple regression analysis.
Maternal employment and anticipated work-to-family conflict

Hierarchical multiple regression was performed between AW→FC as the outcome variable and maternal employment as the predictor variable, after controlling for the influence of age, PA and SEFWFC. See Table 7 for further details. Age, PA and SEFWFC were entered into the analysis in Step 1, explaining 12.2% ($R = .350$, $R^2 = .122$, adjusted $R^2 = .110$, $p < .001$) of the variance in AW→FC. After the entry of maternal employment in Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 14.4%, $F(4, 213) = 8.95, p < .001$. The addition of maternal employment to the model only explained an additional 2.1% of the variance in AW→FC and was significant ($R = .379$, $R^2 = .144$, adjusted $R^2 = .128$, $p = .022$). After Step 2, age ($\beta = .129$, $p = .044$), PA ($\beta = -.198$, $p = .003$), SEFWFC ($\beta = -.207$, $p = .002$), and maternal employment ($\beta = -.147$, $p = .022$), were significant predictors of AW→FC. Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict was the strongest predictor of AW→FC.

Egalitarian role sharing of housework and anticipated work-to-family conflict

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of egalitarian role sharing of housework to predict AW→FC, after controlling for age, PA and SEFWFC. In Step 1 of the regression model, the control variables accounted for 8.7% ($R = .296$, $R^2 = .087$, adjusted $R^2 = .077$, $p < .001$) of the variance in AW→FC. Egalitarian role sharing of housework was entered into the model in Step 2 and explained an additional 2.4% ($R = .334$, $R^2 = .111$, adjusted $R^2 = .097$, $p = .009$) of the variance in AW→FC, after controlling for age, PA and SEFWFC. $F(1, 255) = 6.911, p = .009$. In the final model, only PA ($\beta = -.225$, $p < .001$), SEFWFC ($\beta = -.122$, $p = .043$), and egalitarian role sharing of housework ($\beta = -.156$, $p = .009$) were statically significant. See Table 8 for additional information.

Maternal employment, egalitarian role sharing of housework and anticipated work-to-family conflict

A standard multiple regression was performed between AW→FC as the outcome variable and maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework as the predictor variables. The overall model was significant, $F(2, 210) = 6.50, p = .002$. Together, maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework explained 5.8% of the variance in AW→FC ($R = .242$, $R^2 = .058$, adjusted $R^2 = .049$, $p = .002$). Egalitarian role sharing of housework ($\beta = -.185$, $p = .006$) was a stronger predictor of AW→FC than maternal employment ($\beta = -.154$, $p = .022$). Full results are displayed in Appendix C.
### Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for Maternal Employment Predicting Female Students’ Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affectivity</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>9.949***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.337*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. $N = 218$ after listwise deletion of missing data. ***$p < .001$. **$p < .01$. *$p < .05$. 
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Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework to predict AW→FC, after controlling for age, PA and SEFWFC. See Table 9 for further details. The control variables were entered into the model in Step 1 and accounted for 11.3% (R = .336, R² = .113, adjusted R² = .100, p < .001) of the variance in AW→FC, F(3, 209) = 8.864, p < .001. Maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were entered into the model at Step 2 and accounted for an additional 5.4% (R = .408, R² = .167, adjusted R² = .147, p = .002) of the variance, F(2, 207) = 6.696, p = .002. The model as a whole explained 16.7% of the variance in AW→FC, F(5, 207) = 8.287, p < .001. After Step 2, age (β = .131, p = .003), PA (β = -.193, p = .003), SEFWFC (β = -.191, p = .004), maternal employment (β = -.147, p = .022) and egalitarian role sharing of housework (β = -.179, p = .005) were statically significant.

**Moderation Analysis**

Field (2014) recommends the use of the PROCESS tool for running moderation analysis (Hayes, 2012, http://www.afhayes.com). PROCESS script was added to SPSS in order to run the analysis.

**Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict as a moderator between maternal employment and anticipated work-to-family conflict**

A moderation analysis was conducted in order to examine whether SEFWFC moderates the relationship between maternal employment and both directions of AWFC. The analysis was run at a 95% level of confidence, 1000 bootstrap samples were used to estimate the indirect effect, and maternal employment and SEFWFC were mean centred prior to analysis. The results indicated that there was no moderating effect of SEFWFC on the relationship between maternal employment and AW→FC, b = -.003, 95% CI [-.012, .005], t = -.64, p = .52. The same procedure was applied to AF→WC and the results also indicated no moderating effect of SEFWFC on the relationship between maternal employment and AF→WC, b = -.002, 95% CI [-.009, .006], t = -.42, p = .68.
Table 8
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for Egalitarian Role Sharing of Housework Predicting Female Students’ Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affectivity</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian role sharing of housework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for change in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. $N = 260$ after listwise deletion of missing data. ***$p < .001$. **$p < .01$ *$p < .05$.  

## Table 9
### Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for Maternal Employment and Egalitarian Role Sharing of Housework Predicting Female Students’ Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict</td>
<td>- .141</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>- .197**</td>
<td>- .137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian role sharing of housework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>8.864**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.696*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. $N = 213$ after listwise deletion of missing data. ***$p < .001$. **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.**
Final Notes

The findings of this study supported that AWFC is a bidirectional construct. Of the forms of parental role modelling, only maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were significant predictors of AW→FC. Egalitarian role sharing of housework was found to be a stronger predictor of AW→FC than maternal employment, even after controlling for age, SEFWFC and PA. Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict predicted both directions of AWFC. Positive affectivity was only related to AW→FC. Contrary to expectations, SEFWFC was not found to moderate the relationship between maternal employment and either direction of AWFC. Table 10 provides a summary of the proposition findings.

Table 10
Summary of Propositions and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 1:</strong> Anticipated work-family conflict is a bidirectional construct</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 2:</strong> Parental employment significantly explains the variance in AWFC</td>
<td>Support for maternal employment and AW→FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 3:</strong> Perceived work-family coping of parents significantly explains the variance in AWFC</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 4:</strong> Parental role sharing significantly explains the variance in AWFC</td>
<td>Support for egalitarian role sharing of housework and AW→FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 5:</strong> Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict moderates the relationship between maternal employment and AWFC</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. AWFC = Anticipated work-family conflict; AW→FC = Anticipated work-to-family conflict; AF→WC = anticipated family-to-work conflict.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to expand on the limited research of anticipated work-family conflict by focusing on the role parents play in shaping female students’ anticipated work-family conflict. Specifically, three forms of parental role modelling were examined,
namely parental employment, perceived work-family coping of parents and parental role sharing. Findings indicated that only maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were significant predictors of anticipated work-to-family conflict. When examined together, an especially interesting finding was that egalitarian role sharing of housework was a stronger predictor of anticipated work-to-family conflict than maternal employment, which highlights the influential role a father can have on female students’ experience of the work-family interface. No forms of parental role modelling predicted anticipated family-to-work conflict. Contrary to expectations, self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict did not moderate the relationship between maternal employment and either direction of anticipated work-family conflict. The study also showed that self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and positive affectivity are important variables to consider when examining the work-family interface. Implications for practice and suggestions for future research are discussed.

**Contributions of the Present Study**

This study is the first to consider three specific forms of parental role modelling in shaping female students’ experience of anticipated work-family conflict and contributed to this limited research area in several ways. First, the bidirectional nature of anticipated work-family conflict was supported, indicating that the female business students in the sample could distinguish between anticipated work-to-family conflict and anticipated family-to-work conflict. Second, the findings indicate that anticipated work-family conflict is a global experience and not restricted to developed countries. Third, this study showed that only maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were found to predict anticipated work-to-family conflict. These findings question the commonly accepted views from sociology that parents play a strong role in influencing their children’s views of the work-family interface.

**Directionality of Anticipated Work-Family Conflict**

The bidirectional nature of work-family conflict is well established with empirical research showing support for both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Byron, 2005; Premeaux et al., 2007). Research around the bidirectionality of anticipated work-family conflict, however, has yielded mixed findings with some studies supporting a unidimensional construct (Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006) and others supporting a bidirectional construct (Cinamon, 2006, 2010; Coyle et al., 2015; Savela &
O’Brien, 2016). The exploratory factor analysis supported the bidirectional nature of anticipated work-family conflict which suggests that female students in the sample could distinguish between anticipated work-to-family conflict and anticipated family-to-work conflict as two distinct but related constructs. These findings are in support of recent studies (Coyle et al., 2015; Savela & O’Brien, 2016; Wayne & Casper, 2016).

Researchers who examined anticipated work-family conflict as a unidimensional construct have done so based on the notion that students are not familiar enough with the distinctions between work and family domains to be able to distinguish between the two separate constructs (Bu & McKeen, 2000). This argument might apply to a younger sample that is still living at home with their parents. One such example where a one-factor structure was supported is Cinamon and Rich’s (2014) study which utilised a sample of adolescent students ranging from ages 15 to 19 with a mean age of 17.10 years ($SD = .91$). The mean age of the present study was 20.50 ($SD = 1.62$) which indicates a slightly older and more mature sample. Several studies which supported the bidirectional nature of anticipated work-family conflict also utilised samples where the mean age was above 20 years of age (e.g. Campbell et al., 2015; Cinamon, 2010). However, several studies which supported the unidimensional nature of anticipated work-family conflict also utilised samples with a mean age of above 20 years of age (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003; Bush et al., 2011). Interestingly, Barnett et al. (2003) and Bush et al. (2011) measured career-marriage conflict and career-family conflict respectively, which are similar but narrower constructs of anticipated work-family conflict. Campbell et al. (2015) noted that there is no consistent measure of anticipated work-family conflict in the literature. This lack of consistency could suggest why there is no consensus on the directionality of anticipated work-family conflict.

Biggs and Brough’s (2005) study on university-family conflict provides further support for why the sample was able to distinguish between the two directions of anticipated work-family conflict. Their study found that students were able to distinguish between university-to-family conflict and family-to-university conflict. Bu and McKeen (2000) do not acknowledge how living away from one’s family might influence how students distinguish between work and family roles. In the present study, more than half of the participants (64.1%) were living away from their parents and only 35.1% were living with their parents or family members. Students who live away from their parents have already partially transitioned into their adult roles because over and above university work, these students will
also have to cook, clean and may even work part-time. These students have direct experience in balancing work and university responsibilities and therefore may be able to make a clearer distinction between work and family domains. The finding that anticipated work-family conflict is bidirectional may, therefore, be an artifact of the sample composition.

Contrary to previous studies (Coyle et al., 2015; Gaffey & Rottinghaus, 2009), the findings of the paired samples t-test supported the view that female students experience greater anticipated work-to-family conflict than anticipated family-to-work conflict. This is in line with the findings in the broader work-family conflict literature that women experience more work-to-family conflict than family-to-work conflict (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; McElwain, Korabik, & Rosin, 2005).

The participants in the present study form part of the Millennial Generation which has been categorised as a generation that is committed to balancing both their personal and work lives (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Bennett et al. (2017) have therefore argued that one would expect Millennials to experience higher levels of work-to-family conflict should they anticipate that their future work will impact their family life. Furthermore, Millennials are aware that prior generations have a negative view of their work ethic (Stewart et al., 2017). Although the view is not necessarily warranted, Millennials entering the workforce are aware of the extra pressure and focus placed on them to prove their worth and that they will have to place a lot of their time, energy and attention (i.e. resources) on their work role to gain the respect of their colleagues (Stewart et al., 2017). This added pressure placed on their work role, together with the desire to have a balanced work and family life, can explain why female students in the present study experienced higher levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict than anticipated family-to-work conflict.

Technological advances have had a major influence on the Millennial Generation (Beutell, 2013). Smartphones and tablets have enabled people to be online and connected to their work at all times. Likewise, while at work, people are able to be online and connected to their families at all times too. For many, the boundaries between work and family have become highly permeable as employees are continuously transitioning between their multiple work and family roles (Allen et al., 2014). Millennials are aware of how technology has made these boundaries thin and that they can expect regular transitioning between their future work and family roles. Knowing that their future bosses will be able to contact them during their
valued family time, may be another reason why greater anticipated work-to-family conflict was experienced.

Some might argue that they would expect female students to experience higher levels of anticipated family-to-work conflict because of women’s commitment to their family role (Coyle et al., 2015). The low cost of hired domestic help in South Africa makes it affordable for many individuals to pay for this service (Fourie, 2014). The participants in the present study are all business students. One can assume that many of these female students will enter into careers where they will be able to afford domestic help to assist them with their housework responsibilities. Knowing that they will likely have support in their own home may be a reason why female students did not anticipate higher levels of anticipated family-to-work conflict.

A reason for why female students anticipated lower levels of anticipated family-to-work conflict may be an artifact of the sample composition. The mean age at which female students wanted their first child was 28.07 years of age ($SD = 2.22$). The mean age of the sample itself was 20.50 years of age ($SD = 1.62$). These descriptive results indicate that on average, the participants expected to have their first child in eight years’ time. Almost a quarter of the sample (24.5%) planned to enter the working world the following year. These results suggest that there were female students in the sample thinking about the imminent working world as opposed to building their families which they anticipate will only happen at a later stage in their lives. Although female students learn about the work-family interface by observing their parents and make their own assumptions based on their parents’ behaviour, assumptions and reality can be very different. Female students may be underestimating how their future families might impact their work life; and as a result, anticipate lower levels of anticipated family-to-work conflict while they are students.

**Personal Factors, Demographics Variables and Anticipated Work-Family Conflict**

Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and positive affectivity were two personal factors examined in this study. Age, race, parental education levels, social economic status and current living circumstances were demographic variables included in this study.
Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and anticipated work-family conflict

Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict has been measured in only a handful of anticipated work-family conflict studies and there is support for a two-factor structure, with self-efficacy to manage future work-to-family conflict and self-efficacy to manage future family-to-work conflict being two distinct, but related constructs (Cinamon, 2006, 2010; Michael et al., 2011). One could argue that if individuals can distinguish between both directions of anticipated work-family conflict, the same individuals should be able to distinguish between whether they have the self-efficacy beliefs to manage both directions of future work-family conflict. Unexpectedly, although the participants in the present study were able to distinguish between both directions of anticipated work-family conflict, they did not distinguish between both directions of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict. The findings from the exploratory factor analysis in the present study revealed that self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict is a unidimensional construct.

A possible reason for this finding could be the nature of the scales used. Although an adapted version of Hennessey and Lent’s (2008) Self-Efficacy for Work-Family Conflict Management Scale was used in all the studies to measure the construct, the versions varied and this may influence the outcome of the results. The present study utilised a six-item adapted version of the Self-Efficacy for Work-Family Conflict Management Scale whereas the previous studies utilised an eight-item adapted version of the measure. The mixed findings suggest that the version of measure used may have influenced the factor structure of the construct.

Another possible explanation could be as a result of the samples used. Cinamon’s (2006, 2010) studies utilised a sample of male and female Israeli students whereas the present study utilised a multi-racial group of South African female students. All Israeli Jewish young adults at the age of 18 have to enter into two to three years of mandatory military service which results in the average age of Israeli university students being above average when compared to other countries. The average age difference in the samples and the focus of the present study being only on female students may result in a difference in the way self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict is experienced and understood.
In line with existing literature, self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict negatively correlated with both directions of anticipated work-family conflict (Cinamon, 2006, 2010). Social cognitive theories support the relationship that those higher in self-efficacy are more likely to persevere when faced with difficulties (Bandura, 1986; Lent et al., 1994). Self-efficacy is not a static trait (Lent et al., 1994). These findings therefore highlight the importance of building female students’ self-efficacy if one is to see reduced levels of anticipated work-family conflict and in turn, a decrease in the need for female students to change their primary career choice, utilise career-altering or family-altering strategies (Alexander et al., 2011; Coyle et al., 2015; Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015; Weer et al., 2006).

Positive affectivity and anticipated work-family conflict

The correlation analysis supported a negative, moderate correlation between positive affectivity and anticipated work-to-family conflict. Unexpectedly, no significant correlation was found between positive affectivity and anticipated family-to-work conflict. The present sample reported a moderately strong mean for positive affectivity ($M = 3.26; SD = .86$). This was to be expected because the Millennial Generation is viewed as being optimistic with a more positive outlook of the future (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Positive affectivity acts as a resource which individuals use to buffer the potential negative effects of anticipated work-family conflict (Hobfoll, 1989). It is, therefore, reasonable to have expected that positive affectivity would have negatively related to both directions of anticipated work-family conflict. Female students who are soon to enter the workforce might be thinking more about their imminent careers than their future family. The imminent task of entering the working world as opposed to starting a family could suggest why positive affectivity is correlated to anticipated work-to-family conflict and not anticipated family-to-work conflict. Positive affectivity is a dispositional trait which remains relatively stable over time (Watson et al., 1988). Although this suggests that interventions targeted at improving female students’ positive affectivity may not yield the desired results, the findings highlight the relevance of examining dispositional traits in the anticipated work-family conflict literature.

Demographic variables and anticipated work-family conflict

Several demographic variables were examined in the present study: Age, race, parental education levels, social economic status and current living circumstances. No differences in either direction of anticipated work-family conflict were found for race, parental education levels, social economic status or current living circumstances. Very few
studies have examined these demographic variables in relation to anticipated work-family conflict. Barnett et al. (2003) also found no differences between students’ experiences of anticipated career-marriage conflict and maternal education. The sample in the present study were all business students at a tertiary education institution and the majority had mothers (59.6%) and fathers (69%) who were tertiary educated. In line with social learning theory, one would expect that female students’ would follow the same educational paths as their parents, especially their mothers. Interestingly, it was not the level of education that influenced participants’ anticipated work-family conflict, but rather the extensiveness of maternal employment. A possible reason for this could be that tertiary education is often a minimum requirement for many career occupations (Higgins et al., 2000). Career occupations are often viewed as being demanding and require continuous full-time employment if one is to progress in one’s career. Tertiary education may enable women to seek career occupations which are employment intensive. Therefore, it may be through an indirect effect of maternal education on maternal employment that in turn, predicted anticipated work-to-family conflict. Maternal employment will be discussed in more detail later.

Considering South Africa’s history, one would have expected group differences across race and social economic status. Unlike many of the studies conducted in America which had samples of majority White participants, (e.g. Barnett et al., 2003; Coyle et al., 2015; Savela & O’Brien, 2016; Westring & Ryan, 2011), the present study had a larger non-White sample of 63.5% and a smaller White sample of 31.3%. Although race is often used as a proxy for social economic status in South Africa, only a small percentage of participants (5.3%) felt that they had less than enough while growing up. There are many barriers to entry to tertiary education institutions which could reflect why there were few students who came from lower social economic backgrounds (Stander & Herman, 2017). The results, however, do reflect that anticipated work-family conflict is an experience common to many female students and not limited to only those from developed countries.

The correlation analysis supported a significant, but weak, positive relationship between age and anticipated work-to-family conflict. The finding suggests that as female students transition from the early stages of emerging adulthood at 18 years of age to the later stages of emerging adulthood at 25 years of age, they expect higher levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict. This is to be expected because the closer one gets to graduation and entering the working world; the more one thinks about the impending future and this may
generate increased anxiety amongst female students. No correlation was found between age and anticipated family-to-work conflict. As discussed previously, the mean age at which the participants wanted their first child was 28.07 years of age (SD = 2.22) which could suggest that only after the age of 25 years are female students really thinking about how their family may start to impact on their work life.

Differences between the experiences of anticipated work-family conflict amongst female students living in different circumstances were expected to emerge from the analysis. Interestingly, no differences were found. Of the sample, 64.1% were living away from their parents or immediate family members. Living away from one’s family and taking care of oneself is one of the first transitions into early adulthood (Arnett, 2000). It is plausible to believe that female students living away from their family will have to start taking on more adult responsibilities such as cooking and cleaning, and in turn, become familiar with such tasks. The familiarity gained by completing these tasks may provide young adults with the self-efficacy beliefs that they will be able to successfully manage these work and family tasks once fully transitioned into their adult roles. The findings, however, were contrary to this line of reasoning and suggested that living circumstances did not influence anticipated work-family conflict. The questionnaire did not distinguish between whether respondents were living in a digs or a residence at the time of the study and perhaps more students were living in a residence where some of these responsibilities are taken care of by the residence staff.

Parental Role Modelling and Anticipated Work-Family Conflict

The regression analysis indicated that only maternal employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were predictors of anticipated work-to-family conflict, even after controlling for age, self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and positive affectivity. The discussion on this finding is divided into three sub-sections: Parental employment and anticipated work-family conflict; perceived work-family coping of parents and anticipated work-family conflict; and parental role sharing and anticipated work-family conflict.

Parental employment and anticipated work-family conflict

The multiple hierarchical regression analysis supported that maternal employment was a predictor of anticipated work-to-family conflict, even after controlling for age, self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and positive affectivity. Only two studies to
date have examined the role of maternal employment on students’ anticipated work-family conflict and the results have been mixed (Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006). In both these studies, anticipated work-family conflict was examined as a unidimensional construct. No study has examined the influence of maternal employment on both directions of anticipated work-family conflict. The findings of the present study are in line with Barnett et al.’s (2003) study which supported that students who had mothers who worked extensively during their childhood years expressed lower levels of anticipated career-marriage conflict, compared to their peers whose mothers worked less or not at all. Interestingly, Weer et al., (2006), on the other hand, found that female students experienced high levels of anticipated work-family conflict regardless of their mothers’ employment history. The present study found no significant relationship between maternal employment and anticipated family-to-work conflict.

The findings that maternal employment predicts anticipated work-to-family conflict can be explained by social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Barnett et al., 2003). Female students who observe their mothers working grow up viewing working mothers as being familiar to them. This familiarity creates an expectation that they too will one day be working mothers themselves. Of the sample, 87.2% participants reported that their mothers worked while they grew up, therefore the majority of the sample have observed and been exposed to the role of a working mother. In addition, 59.6% of the sample had mothers who held tertiary qualifications. It cannot be known for certain, but one can make an assumption that the mothers who were tertiary educated did so with the intention of pursuing career occupations (Rojewski, 2005). The female students in the present study are all business students and most likely have similar aspirations. Learning through role modelling is further enhanced when the observer (i.e. educated daughter) and model (i.e. educated mother) are similar in some way (i.e. same gender and education level) (Bandura, 1977). The results support that female students who observed their mothers working, believe that they too will be able to do the same, thus lowering the expectations of anticipated work-to-family conflict.

Interestingly, no relationship was found between maternal employment and anticipated family-to-work conflict. Cinamon (2006) suggested that participants who came from a dual-earner family might have been in a position to afford hired household help and this would alleviate some stress of household responsibilities. The low cost of domestic work in South Africa may result in female students anticipating that they will hire someone to
assist with their housework responsibilities (Fourie, 2014). This could explain why no relationship was found between maternal employment and anticipated family-to-work conflict.

Barnett et al. (2003) examined whether a mother’s early work history had more of an influence than a mother’s later work history on students’ career-marriage conflict. Their findings strongly supported this notion. The results from the ANOVA analysis in the present study partially supported Barnett et al.’s (2003) findings. Significant anticipated work-to-family conflict differences were found at three life stages between female students with mothers who worked full time and those with mothers who did not work. Two key differences between the present study and Barnett et al.’s (2003) study was the way in which life stages were categorised. Barnett et al. (2003) disaggregated maternal work history into two life stages, 0 to 11 years old and from 12 to 16 years old, and a significant difference was found between these two life stages. The present study disaggregated maternal work history into five life stages. Although the ANOVAs revealed significant differences in mothers’ early work history at life stages 0 to 1 \( (p = .038) \) and 1 to 3 \( (p = .035) \), the most significant difference was found at life stage 12 to 18 \( (p = .007) \) which falls under a student’s late junior school and high school years. These findings contribute to the maternal employment literature by suggesting that, when it comes to anticipated work-to-family conflict, a mother’s early work history can actually have a positive impact on a child. In addition, these results suggest that mothers who work while their daughters are in high school have the strongest benefit on female students’ anticipated work-to-family conflict. Children generally start to think about their future and their careers when they reach high school. This is particularly relevant to grade nine students in South Africa who are required to select their targeted academic subjects for their remaining three years at high school. These choices can impact the career a student takes. Having a working mother while in high school may create an opportunity for mothers to share their own experiences and knowledge with their daughters. In turn, female students can talk to their mothers about their own career aspirations. This may be more of a challenge for mothers who are not working as they do not have the direct experience themselves.

The finding that early maternal employment can have a significant positive effect on female students offers a different perspective with which to view maternal employment. There is a large body of research around maternal employment with a particular focus on the
impact of maternal employment during a child’s early developmental years (Ermisch & Francesconi, 2013; Lightbody & Williamson, 2017; Lombardi & Coley, 2014). There has been support for the negative impact early maternal employment can have on children in terms of their development and cognitive outcomes (Brooks-Gunn et al., 2010; Lightbody & Williamson, 2017). It has been argued that because women were traditionally the primary caregivers, they looked after their own children and spent more direct contact time with them (Ruhm, 2008). Maternal employment has resulted in mothers spending less time with their children in enriching home environments and instead, mothers are placing their children into childcare facilities from an early age (Belsky et al., 2007). The reduced time spent between mother and child is what has been argued to be a cause of concern on a child’s development (Belsky et al., 2007; Goldberg et al., 2008; Ruhm, 2008). The results from the present study suggest that early maternal employment can have a positive impact on female students’ views on the work-family interface. The results suggest a need for more longitudinal studies to examine the impact of maternal employment not only on early childhood development but on adolescents and emerging adults too. These findings contribute to the literature that early maternal employment can have a positive impact on children.

No relationship was found between paternal employment and either direction of anticipated work-family conflict. Although it was expected that based on social learning theory, maternal employment would be a stronger predictor of anticipated work-family conflict than paternal employment, some form of relationship was proposed. Paternal employment has been the norm in the traditional breadwinner-caregiver model. Paternal employment is, therefore, no new phenomenon and may be a reason why paternal employment did not influence female students’ experience of anticipated work-family conflict.

**Perceived work-family coping of parents and anticipated work-family conflict**

In line with future research recommendations by Weer et al. (2006), perceived work-family coping of parents was included in this study from an exploratory perspective. Weer et al. (2006) proposed that maternal employment might not simply be enough to influence a daughter’s anticipated work-family conflict. What may be more important is whether a mother was able to work and manage family responsibilities successfully. For example, a child might observe her mother working; however, a mother’s employment might place a strain on the parents’ relationship. This strain could result in negative consequences such as
fighting between parents. In this scenario, female students might be discouraged to become working mothers themselves if there is a potential for negative consequences. Unexpectedly, there was no influence between perceived work-family coping of either parent on either direction of anticipated work-family conflict. These findings support Barnett et al.’s (2003) original claims that the social role theory plays a pivotal role whereby simply being exposed to a working mother is sufficient and not whether a mother was actually able to successfully manage both roles (Eagly, 1987). Exposure is enough whereby children can make informed decisions about their own futures based on observing their parents.

The results may also be an artifact of the sample composition. The female students reported high levels of perceived work-family coping of their mothers ($M = 4.45$, $SD = .75$) and fathers ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.01$). This suggests that female students recalled that their parents coped very well with competing work-family demands. This measure was based on the perception that participants had of their parents, while growing up. Participants might not have accurate recollections of what actually happened. Alternatively, parents may have hidden certain behaviours or work-family challenges from their children in order to protect them. These could suggest why perceived work-family coping values were high.

Perceived work-family coping of parents has not been examined in previous studies in relation to anticipated work-family conflict. The measure was developed for the original research project (Harrison, 2009); however, it was not utilised. The measure created was an index measure. Research into the perceived work-family coping of parents may benefit from developing improved measures of perceived work-family coping of parents. A measure with no proven reliability and validity may account for such discrepancies.

**Parental role sharing and anticipated work-family conflict**

Egalitarian role sharing of housework was the only parental role sharing variable found to predict anticipated work-to-family conflict, even after controlling for age, positive affectivity and self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict. Cinamon (2006) is the only researcher to date to have examined parental role sharing in relation to anticipated work-family conflict. The findings of the present study are inconsistent with Cinamon’s (2006) results, which supported that students raised in an egalitarian role sharing of childcare model experienced lower levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict; whereas an egalitarian role sharing of housework model showed no influence.
The finding that only egalitarian role sharing of housework predicts anticipated work-to-family conflict suggests that when responsibilities were shared between a mother and father, role sharing did have an influence on female students’ views of the work-family interface. It was interesting that only parental role sharing of housework predicted anticipated work-to-family conflict and not parental role sharing of childcare. Housework is viewed differently to childcare because it is viewed as a more tedious and less rewarding task (Mannino & Deutsch, 2007). Daughters who view their fathers being actively involved in such tasks will observe a tangible shift in traditional gender roles, and in turn expect that their husbands will also assist them with housework (Katz-Wise et al., 2010). This finding is similar to the role of spousal support in the work-family conflict literature which has been shown to be related to lower levels of work-family conflict (see meta-analytic review by Michel et al., 2011).

Interestingly, the findings that female students raised in homes with egalitarian role sharing of housework had lower levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict, highlights the influential role a father can play in shaping female students’ anticipated work-family conflict. Despite the increase in dual-earner families, many women still feel that taking care of their family and household is their primary responsibility (Askari et al., 2010; Goldin, 2014). This is particularly relevant in South Africa where Black South African females are often expected to run the household at the expense of pursuing their own careers (Bak, 2008; Holborn & Eddy, 2011). The results do suggest the importance of seeing a more tangible shift in gender role expectations if female students are to experience lower levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict.

The majority of the sample was raised in traditional households where the mother did the majority of housework (53.2%) and childcare (60.0%). It was proposed that female students who were raised in a traditional household would expect to do the majority of housework and childcare responsibilities too, resulting in higher levels of anticipated work-family conflict. There was no significant correlation between traditional role sharing models and either direction of anticipated work-family conflict. A possible explanation for these findings could be an artifact of the sample composition. The present sample of female students falls part of the Millennial Generation. Technological advances have made social media an entrenched part of this generation’s daily lives (Bolton et al., 2013; Vaterlaus, Patten, Roche, & Young, 2015). Social media has opened up many more platforms through
which individuals can observe other people’s behaviour and source information (Shao, 2009). Powerful women have become prevalent on social media platforms such as Michelle Obama and Sheryl Sandberg who continue to inspire and uplift women and young girls towards an equal society (Howard, 2017). These women show that it is possible to have a meaningful career and a family. Female students may view these women as role models and they too may believe that they will be able to have both a career and a family, even if their own mothers did not. The potential influential role that social media has on the Millennial Generation might suggest a shift in the role of parents as primary role models towards social media playing a pivotal role in influencing children and young adults. Alternatively, social media could have a more influential role on students than their parents once they reach late adolescence and emerging adulthood (Levine & Hoffner, 2006).

**Self-efficacy to Mange Future Work-Family Conflict as a Moderator between Maternal Employment and Anticipated Work-Family Conflict**

The moderating effect of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict on the relationship between maternal employment and both directions of anticipated work-family conflict was examined as exploratory research. Previous research has supported a relationship between maternal employment and anticipated work-family conflict (Barnett et al., 2003). Based on Hobfoll’s (1989) conservation of resources theory, it was posited that self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict would act as a resource that buffers the relationship between maternal employment and anticipated work-family conflict. It is viewed that self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict acts as a personal resource that will help alleviate the stress that female students experience when thinking about their future work and family roles. Female students with higher levels of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and with mothers who worked extensively would experience lower levels of anticipated work-family conflict. Alternatively, female students with lower levels of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict and with mothers who worked extensively would in turn, experience higher levels of anticipated work-family conflict as a result of their low self-efficacy beliefs. The moderation analysis, however, did not support this proposed relationship. The results suggest that self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict does not moderate the relationship between maternal employment and either direction of anticipated work-family conflict.
A possible explanation for no moderation effect could be an artifact of the sample composition. The female students in the sample had high self-efficacy beliefs that they would be able to manage future competing work-family demands ($M = 6.20$, $SD = 1.11$). The negatively skewed data might have influenced these results. Self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict is a form of situational self-efficacy. Situational self-efficacy beliefs are more strongly formed through direct experiences as opposed to through vicarious learning (Riggio & Desrochers, 2006). Only participants who indicated that they were unmarried and without children were included in the study, therefore the female students in the present sample have not yet directly experienced work-family conflict themselves. They instead form their assumptions from watching their parents and other influential role models. Riggio and Desrochers (2006) suggested that examining a more general form of self-efficacy may be more suitable when examining the self-efficacy of young adults. The selected measure may have resulted in the data being negatively skewed as the female students made assumptions based on vicarious learning and not through the direct experience themselves. Often the reality of balancing work and family is much harder than individuals initially anticipate.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

The aim of this study was to examine the influence of three forms of parental role modelling on female business students’ anticipated work-family conflict. Anticipated work-family conflict is still a theoretically underdeveloped construct and this study intended to contribute to this growing area of research. The following section outlines suggestions for future research based on the limitations identified in this study.

This study utilised secondary data and there are several limitations associated with this type of data source. The original data was not collected with the intention of answering the current research question (Johnston, 2017; Smith et al., 2011). Based on the data provided, one has to assume that the data was collected accurately and is void of any intentional manipulation (Tripathy, 2013). Because the data has already been collected through the distribution of surveys, there was no control over the data collection process. If any questions were misinterpreted or not fully completed, no changes could be made. Completion of the survey was not compulsory. This can result in sample selection bias as individuals self-select to voluntarily participate. One cannot determine whether there is a difference between those who responded and those who elected not to. Using surveys as a method for collecting data does place it at risk for social desirability bias and various other
forms of response bias. Due to the questionnaire being completed online and anonymously, one can assume that this would account for some response bias concerns (Tripathy, 2013).

Several limitations of the use of secondary data gave rise to recommendations for future research. Asking additional demographic questions would have added value to this research paper. The tertiary education institution from which the sample was drawn accommodates students not only from South Africa but globally too (IAPO, 2018). A question pertaining to the students’ nationality would have allowed the researcher to determine which students were from South Africa and which were international students. South Africa is marked by a history of inequality and power struggles and these contextual factors can influence the way in which children were raised (Booysen, 2007). Additional questions about the marital status of the students’ parents would have assisted in determining the family structure. The present study utilised a sample of female students who had both a mother and father figure throughout their childhood and late adolescence; however, it cannot be determined whether the students’ parents were living in the same household. Social learning theory is based on the notion that children learn by observing their parents’ behaviour. Having parents live separately could influence results. Future research should consider including these questions in their surveys. In addition, researchers could also consider examining the role of parents of not only dual-households but single families too. Divorce rates and single parenting are highly prevalent in South Africa (Madhavan, Schatz, Clark, & Collinson, 2012; Marteleto, Cavanagh, Prickett, & Clark, 2016). The inclusion of not only dual-earner parents but also other family structures could provide additional insights into female students’ experience of anticipated work-family conflict.

This study utilised a cross-sectional design, which presents certain limitations. This type of design cannot establish cause-and-effect relationships, only associations (Sedgwick, 2014). It is recommended that future researchers look into longitudinal studies in order to examine possible cause and effect (Burns & Burns, 2008; Field, 2014). Research into the work-family interface could benefit from a qualitative approach whereby more detailed and in-depth topics are explored. Qualitative research is adding value to the work-family interface field amongst adult samples by providing a more in-depth understanding to a quantitatively well-researched domain (e.g. Beigi, Wang, & Arthur, 2017; Maher, 2013; Schilling, 2015).
This study examined only female students’ experience of anticipated work-family conflict. The majority of previous studies have included both male and female students with mixed findings (Cinamon, 2006; Weer et al., 2006). The mixed findings between the directionality and experience of anticipated work-family conflict and self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict may indicate a need to establish measures targeted separately at male and female students. Society has placed added pressure on women to balance both work and family roles, in comparison to men, and this may influence the way in which items in a measure are interpreted (Fulcher et al., 2015).

Most researchers examining anticipated work-family conflict have utilised university students as their sample of interest (Coyle et al., 2015; Savela & O’Brien, 2016; Wayne & Casper, 2016). By the time students have reached university, they have already made decisions about their careers and what they intend to study. An insight by Mueller, Hall and Miro (2015) from their study on a sample of self-selected high school students highlights the problem that a self-selected sample can create. The sample in the present study was a group of female business students who had already self-selected into this field. Future researchers should explore the experience of anticipated work-family conflict amongst high school students and whether anticipated work-family conflict at this level influences the study path they intend to take. Interventions targeted at high school level might encourage more female students to pursue non-traditional careers, instead of only having interventions targeted at university level after students have self-selected their study path.

Positive affectivity was one type of dispositional trait examined in this study. Watson et al. (1988) described how positive affectivity and negative affectivity are two separate, but related traits. A number of studies have already examined the influence of negative affectivity in the work-family conflict literature and have found a negative relationship between negative affectivity and work-family conflict (Bruck & Allen, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Karatepe & Uludag, 2008; Stoeva, Chiu, & Greenhaus, 2002). Only one study to date has examined negative affectivity in the context of anticipated work-family conflict and found no correlation between negative affectivity and concerns about career-marriage conflict (Barnett et al., 2003). As indicated previously, career-marriage conflict is a more limited construct in comparison to anticipated work-family conflict; therefore, future research could benefit by examining the roles of both positive affectivity and negative affectivity in anticipated work-family conflict studies.
Based on research by Amatea, Cross, Clark and Bobby (1986) on life role salience, research on anticipated work-family conflict could benefit by examining students’ life role salience profiles. A handful of studies have explored the influence of life role salience on anticipated work-family conflict but further research is required on more diverse samples (Cinamon, 2010; Cinamon et al., 2008; Cinamon & Rich, 2002). Life role salience refers to the value and level of commitment an individual places on occupational, marital, parental and housework roles (Amatea et al., 1986). Cinamon (2010) found that students who placed the highest value and commitment on the work role experienced the highest levels of anticipated work-family conflict compared to those who were more family-oriented. These findings suggest a need for further research in understanding how life role salience can influence students’ anticipated work-family conflict and how best to counsel and support students depending on their identified profile (Cinamon, 2010).

The descriptive statistics of the sample indicated that the large majority of the sample perceived that both their mothers ($M = 4.45$, $SD = .75$) and fathers ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.01$) coped well with competing work-family demands. The lack of variability in this data might have influenced results. The present study utilised an index tool to measure perceived work-family coping of parents. Future research should focus on developing a valid and reliable scale to measure perceived work-family coping of parents. Alternatively, future research could expand on Basuil and Casper’s (2012) study where they measured perceived work-to-family conflict of parents. The researchers utilised an adapted scale by Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996) to measure the perceived work-to-family conflict of both mothers and fathers. The reliability analyses revealed high Cronbach’s alpha of .95 for both mothers’ and fathers’ work-to-family conflict. Utilising an existing measure with high reliability instead of an index measure could yield more meaningful findings.

The anticipated work-family conflict field could benefit from studies examining the influential role of social media on students’ expectations of their future work and family roles. Levine and Hoffner (2006) began examining the influence of mass media on adolescents’ views of the work-family interface over a decade ago. Although their study focused exclusively on the influential role of television and movies, their findings did reveal that adolescents learnt about work and family through other sources besides their parents, peers and teachers (Levine & Hoffner, 2006). Social media is prevalent in modern society with access to information becoming easily accessible to many, even in developing countries.
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like South Africa (Duffett & Wakeham, 2016). Further research into better understanding the effects of social media on young adults’ expectations of the work-family interface will offer a new direction for research.

Implications of the Present Study

This study has contributed to the anticipated work-family conflict literature by supporting previous research that anticipated work-family conflict is a bidirectional construct. The findings provide empirical evidence that female students are able to differentiate between both anticipated work-to-family conflict and anticipated family to-work conflict and experience higher levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict. This suggests that female students are concerned with how they will successfully manage competing work and family demands and especially how their work may impact their family life. Female students may be discouraged to pursue demanding career paths if they anticipate that they will not be able to successfully manage both their work and family responsibilities (Fulcher et al., 2015; Savela & O’Brien, 2016; Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015).

Organisations can benefit from the insights of this study by offering family-friendly workplace policies and driving family-supportive company cultures. Family-friendly policies create some level of flexibility with which employees can structure their workdays, such as flexi-time, and a family-supportive culture is one where usage of these policies is actually supported and encouraged (Wayne & Casper, 2016). Although many organisations do offer family-friendly policies, there appears to be a belief that utilising such benefits is not socially accepted, and consequently, are not utilised as frequently as intended (Mandeville, Halbesleben, & Whitman, 2016; Radcliffe & Cassell, 2015; Wayne & Casper, 2016). Usage of such policies has been found to be negatively linked to work-family conflict (Mandeville et al., 2016). Knowing that female students anticipate conflict between their future work and family roles is a clear indicator to organisations of the importance of offering such policies as a talent attraction tool to entry-level graduates. If female students are aware that companies offer these benefits, it might alleviate some of the anxiety that they experience and in turn, reduce their anticipated work-family conflict.

Wayne and Casper (2016) provided empirical support that undergraduate students were more attracted to companies that offered a supportive work-family culture and that this was stronger for female students. The “war for talent” (Chambers, Foulon, Handfield-Jones,
Hankin, & Michaels, 1998, p. 44) has become a popular term amongst many human resource professionals and corporate recruiters (Festing & Schäfer, 2014; Sharma, Sharma, & Tiwari, 2015; Ulrich, 2015). The term is used to describe the competitive nature of seeking and retaining talented employees in the workplace. The present study showed that female business students attending one of the top universities in South Africa experience anticipated work-family conflict. These students are sought after by organisations and the top students may even receive multiple job offers. Many female students pursue business degrees with the intention of moving into demanding corporate careers and managerial positions. Organisations can benefit by offering a supportive work-family culture as an attraction tool (Wayne & Casper, 2016). Companies offering such a culture will have a competitive advantage when attracting top talented female students into their organisations. Supporting women in the workplace will attempt to address the shortage of females in leadership positions, especially in South Africa where it is reported that only 28% of senior management roles are held by women (Grant Thornton, 2017).

This study examined anticipated work-family conflict in the South African context where there is currently limited research on this topic (Bagraim & Harrison, 2013). Other anticipated work-family conflict studies have highlighted the difficulty of having a heterogeneous sample comprised of students from different racial categories. Most studies have had majority White participants (e.g. Barnett, 1971; Barnett et al., 2003; Campbell et al., 2015; Weer et al., 2006; Westring & Ryan, 2011). Using South African’s Employment Equity Act (Act No. 55 of 1998) definitions of Black referring to African, Indian and Coloured individuals and non-Black referring to White individuals as a guideline, this study had a larger percentage of Black participants (63.5%) when compared to White participants (31.3%). The heterogeneous sample attempts to address the concerns raised by past researchers that the samples in many anticipated work-family conflict studies have been too homogenous (e.g. Campbell et al., 2015; Weer et al., 2006; Westring & Ryan, 2011).

The findings from the present study can be used by vocational counsellors and university support staff to identify the type of female student who may be more susceptible to anticipated work-family conflict. Female students who were not raised in homes with egalitarian role sharing of housework and who had mothers who did not work may be at a higher risk of anticipated work-family conflict. Counsellors can use these insights to have meaningful discussions with female students’ about their upbringing and explore how their
learning experiences and role models may have influenced their perception of the work-family interface.

Self-efficacy beliefs are dynamic and can change over time (Lent et al., 1994; Lent et al., 2016). In line with Hobfoll’s (1989) conservation of resources theory, self-efficacy acts as a resource individuals use to manage their stress. The findings highlight the importance of self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict for female students in managing their anticipated work-family conflict. Because self-efficacy beliefs can improve over time, vocational counsellors can implement targeted interventions and career programmes aimed at improving female students’ self-efficacy beliefs (Cinamon, 2010). Some examples could include arranging internships over vacations as this will provide female students with exposure to the working world. Because most female students have not yet had direct experience in managing both work and family roles, exposure to the workplace and creating familiarity with what is to come can help reduce some concerns. Other examples include having successful businesswomen with families come and speak to female students about how they have been able to succeed in both domains. In line with the social learning theory, listening to success stories from role models who young females aspire to be might improve their own self-efficacy beliefs that they, too, will be able to do the same.

Conclusion

The transition from late childhood to early adulthood is a challenging time for many young adults as they think about their future work and family lives and South African female business students are no exception. The collapse of the traditional breadwinner-caregiver model has created opportunities for women to pursue non-traditional career paths, including careers in business (Bieri Buschor, Kappler, Keck Frei, & Berweger, 2014; Fischlmayr & Puchmüller, 2016). This study extended on the limited research on anticipated work-family conflict by considering the influence of three specific forms of parental role modelling on female business students’ anticipated work-family conflict in South Africa. There is very limited research on anticipated work-family conflict in South Africa and the results from this study have extended support for anticipated work-family conflict being a global phenomenon and not isolated to developed countries.

The findings of this study suggest that parental role modelling may not be as strong of a predictor of anticipated work-family conflict as initially expected. Only maternal
employment and egalitarian role sharing of housework were found to predict anticipated work-to-family conflict, although the effect sizes were small. Positive affectivity and self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict were stronger predictors of anticipated work-to-family conflict than any of the forms of parental role modelling. This finding highlights the importance of personal characteristics in managing anticipated work-to-family conflict. Although positive affectivity is a dispositional trait which remains relatively stable over time and interventions to improve positive affectivity might therefore not be effective, self-efficacy beliefs are dynamic and targeted interventions at improving female students’ self-efficacy to manage future work-family conflict may result in decreased anticipated work-family conflict.

Competition amongst organisations to attract highly skilled women is on the rise (PwC, 2017). Organisations can use the insight from this study that female business students experience high levels of anticipated work-to-family conflict when developing their talent attraction strategies for entry-level graduates into the workforce. Talent attraction strategies that promote a supportive work-family culture have been shown to be an attraction tool to female students (Wayne & Casper, 2016). Organisations which offer such benefits may have a competitive advantage when seeking out talented students from top universities.

This study suggests that the commonly accepted views from sociology that parents are strong influences on their children’s work-family views may no longer be as accurate as initially thought. With anticipated work-family conflict being a global phenomenon, it is therefore important for future research to examine other potential influencing factors if counsellors and university support staff are to be able to target interventions accurately. Researchers have shown possible consequences of anticipated work-family conflict, such as influencing students’ decisions about if and what they decide to study, whether to delay getting married and have children and the career trajectory they envision for themselves (Barnett et al., 2003; Bass, 2015; Tan-Wilson & Stamp, 2015). These considerations are important because they suggest a need to equip female students with the right tools and resources to make informed decisions about their future work and family lives. This is important if future generations of young female students are to aspire to successfully manage a family and a fulfilling career path, despite the many obstacles women face simply because of their gender.
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APPENDIX A

Measures utilised in the study

**Anticipated Work-Family Conflict Scale**

In the future, when I am working, I anticipate that:

**Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict Scale**

1. After work, I will come home too tired to do some of the things I’d like to do.
2. On the job, I will have so much work to do that it will take away from my personal interests.
3. My family and friends will dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.
4. My work will take up time that I’d like to spend with family/friends.

**Anticipated Family-to-Work Conflict Scale**

1. I will often be too tired at work because of the things I will have to do at home.
2. My personal demands will be so great that it will take away from my work.
3. My superiors and peers will dislike how often I am preoccupied with my personal life while at work.
4. My personal life will take up time that I’d like to spend at work.

**Self-efficacy to Manage Future Work-Family Conflict Scale**

When I have established a career and family:

1. How confident are you that you could manage incidents in which work life interferes with family life?
2. How confident are you that you could fulfil your family responsibilities despite going through a trying and demanding period in your work?
3. How confident are you that you could fulfil your family role effectively after a long and demanding day at work?
4. How confident are you that you could invest in your job even when under heavy pressure due to family responsibilities?
5. How confident are you that you could succeed in your role at work although there are many difficulties in your family?
6. How confident are you that you could focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive?

Parental Employment

If your mother (father) worked, was she (he) employed full-time or part-time whilst you were the following ages:

1. 0 to 1 years old
2. 1 to 3 years old
3. 3 to 6 years old
4. 6 to 12 years old
5. 12 to 18 years old

Parental Education level

What is your mother’s (father’s) highest level of education?

1. First level (did not complete Grade 12)
2. Second level (completed Grade 12)
3. Third level (university degree or diploma)
4. Postgraduate level (postgraduate degree)
5. Unknown

Perceived Work-Family Coping of Parents

To the best of my knowledge, my mother (father) successfully coped with competing work-family demands when I was:

1. 0 to 6 years old
2. 6 to 12 years old
3. 12 to 18 years old
Parental role sharing responsibilities

Whilst I was growing up:

The majority of the house chores were conducted by:
1. My mother figure
2. My father figure
3. Equally both my parents
4. Other family members
5. Domestic workers

The majority of the child-rearing responsibilities were taken care of by:

1. My mother figure
2. My father figure
3. Equally both my parents
4. Other family members
5. Child-minder

Positive Affectivity

Indicate to what extent over the past week you have felt the following:
1. Interested
2. Alert
3. Excited
4. Inspired
5. Strong
6. Determined
7. Attentive
8. Enthusiastic
9. Active
10. Proud
APPENDIX B

Factor Analysis Results

Table B1
Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Self-Efficacy to Manage Future Work-Family Conflict Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEFWFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SEFWCF1</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could manage incidents in which work life interferes with family life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SEFWCF2</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could fulfil your family responsibilities despite going through a trying and demanding period in your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SEFWCF3</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could fulfil your family role effectively after a long and demanding day at work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SEFFCW1</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could invest in your job even when under heavy pressure due to family responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SEFFCW2</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could succeed in your role at work although there are many difficulties in your family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SEFFCW3</td>
<td>How confident are you that you could focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>50.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 522. Factor loadings > .40 are in bold, SEFWFC = Self-Efficacy to Manage Future Work-Family Conflict.
Table B2

*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Positive Affectivity Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA4</td>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA5</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA6</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA7</td>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA8</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA9</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA10</td>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>47.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 522. Factor loadings > .40 are in bold, PA = Positive Affectivity*
APPENDIX C

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for Maternal Employment and Egalitarian Role Sharing of Housework Predicting Female Students’ Anticipated Work-to-Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal employment</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian role sharing of housework</td>
<td>-.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>6.504**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. $N = 213$ after listwise deletion of missing data.; **$p < .01$ *$p < .05$. 