1996

Assessing incoming workers' desire and expectation for a family supportive workplace

Peri Fleisher
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Fleisher, Peri, "Assessing incoming workers' desire and expectation for a family supportive workplace" (1996). *Master's Theses*. 1223.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.48zu-y8nu>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1223

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**ASSESSING INCOMING WORKERS' DESIRE AND EXPECTATION FOR A
FAMILY SUPPORTIVE WORKPLACE**

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Peri Fleisher

May 1996

UMI Number: 1379338

**Copyright 1996 by
Fleisher, Peri Frances**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 1379338
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

©

Peri Fleisher

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Lori Bartels, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Jane Boyd, M.A.
Committee Member

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

ASSESSING INCOMING WORKERS' DESIRE AND EXPECTATION FOR A FAMILY SUPPORTIVE WORKPLACE

by Peri Fleisher

Because of the dramatic shifts in the demographics of the U.S. laborforce and the family structure, it is important for U.S. businesses to examine how effectively they are supporting employees in managing the competing demands of work and family roles. This study assesses incoming workers' anticipated commitment to occupational and family roles and their expectations and desires for their prospective employers to provide specific benefits that may mitigate work/family conflict.

Data were collected from 52 female and 50 male undergraduate college students. Subjects responded to a three-part, 73 item questionnaire. Data were analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and T-tests. Males and females did not respond to questions in significantly different ways. Overall, subjects indicated that they intend to commit high levels of time and energy to both roles, and that they are more likely to want than expect their work environment to be family supportive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the faculty of Industrial/Organizational Psychology program for sharing their expertise so graciously - Dr. Howard Tokunaga for his help on the analyses, and Dr. Lori Bartels, for the tremendous amount of time and energy she extended to me and for her unfailing attention to detail. My thanks and appreciation also go to my friend and fellow student, Meri-Sue Nuzum, for her guidance in navigating the administrative maze and for helping me stay on track. Finally, I would like to thank my son (the inspiration for this study), David Miller, for being such a pleasure to parent in my own work/family balancing act.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	3
Work-Family Conflict.....	3
Working Mothers.....	6
Working Fathers.....	8
Work-Family Initiatives.....	9
Current Study.....	15
METHOD.....	17
Research Participants.....	17
Materials.....	17
Procedure.....	19
RESULTS.....	20
DISCUSSION.....	26
Implications.....	28
Limitations.....	29
Future Research.....	31
Conclusions.....	32
REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDICES.....	40

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Coefficient Alphas for Multiple-Item Scales	21
2. Sample Demographics by Levels of Commitment to Family and Work	22
3. Desire and Expectation for W/F Benefits by Level of Commitment to Family and Work	24

Assessing Incoming Workers' Desire and Expectation
for a Family-Supportive Workplace

Peri Fleisher

San Jose State University

Running Head: FAMILY-SUPPORTIVE WORKPLACE

Footnotes

Requests for reprints should be sent to Peri Fleisher, Department of Psychology,
San Jose State University, San Jose, CA, 95192

Abstract

Because of the dramatic shifts in the demographics of the U.S. laborforce and the family structure, it is important for U.S. businesses to examine how effectively they are supporting employees in managing the competing demands of work and family roles. This study assesses incoming workers' anticipated commitment to occupational and family roles and their expectations and desires for their prospective employers to provide specific benefits that may mitigate work/family conflict.

Data were collected from 52 female and 50 male undergraduate college students. Subjects responded to a three-part, 73 item questionnaire. Data were analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and T-tests. Males and females did not respond to questions in significantly different ways. Overall, subjects indicated that they intend to commit high levels of time and energy to both roles, and that they are more likely to want than expect their work environment to be family supportive.

The composition of the United States labor force has changed significantly in the last 40 years. In the 1950's, married males whose wives stayed home to care for their children represented the majority of employed Americans. Today, two-earner families, single-parent families and unmarried couples living together constitute more than 90% of the U.S. work force (Googins, 1991). Between 1950 and 1985, the number of women entering the labor market increased by 178%. Today, 70% of all women with children between the ages of six and 17 work outside the home (Vanderkolk, 1991). The U.S. Department of Labor projects that by 2005, women will make up 47.7% of the labor force, 90% of whom will become pregnant during their working lives (Googins, 1991). The growing participation of mothers in the labor force indicates that increasing numbers of workers - both males and females - have concurrent commitments to work and family. Managing the competing demands of these two essential roles creates conflict for many (Duxbury et al., 1994; Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Googins, 1991; Levander, 1994; Raabe, 1990; Rafferty, 1995).

Work-family conflict

In the United States today, work and family are still very much treated as separate, distinct domains with their own sets of functions, territories, norms, responsibilities and roles (Googins, 1991; Kanter, 1977). Work-family conflict develops when the pressures of the work role make it more difficult to participate in the family role and vice versa

(Goff et al., 1990; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflict may be strain-based, behavior-based or time-based (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Strain-based conflict. Strain-based conflict occurs when the tensions between work and family roles negatively impact an individual's psychological and/or physical well-being (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Within the family, husband-wife disagreements about greater work involvement and the allocation of household chores may weaken mutual support systems resulting in strain-based conflict. Unstable and/or low quality dependent care arrangements may also cause strain. Jobs contribute to strain-based conflict when workers have little autonomy, are paid poorly, have no job security, unsupportive co-workers and/or supervisors and when tasks are physically or mentally demanding (Friedman, 1991; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Behavior-based conflict. Behavior-based conflict occurs when an individual exhibits behaviors suitable for family interactions, such as being nurturing and sympathetic, while on the job and behaviors appropriate for work, such as steadfastness and interrogative at home (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). For example, a manager who is as lenient with her staff as she is with her children and excuses the decreased productivity of an employee experiencing personal problems, may jeopardize the performance of the whole department. Whereas, a lawyer arguing with his spouse as if he were in the courtroom, may probe so

rigorously and/or defend his position so zealously that he hampers the chances for an amicable resolution of their differences.

Time-based conflict. Time-based conflict is produced when the time required to fulfill one role makes it difficult to fulfill the requirements of the other. Family composition, such as marital status, and number and ages of children contribute to time-based conflict (Duxbury et al., 1994; Friedman, 1991). Studies have found that parents with large families and young children have more time demands than those with smaller families and older children. Additionally, spouses of highly career-involved men and women participate more heavily in family activities which in turn may conflict with their own work responsibilities (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Jobs contribute to time-based conflict when employees work long hours, have little control over job scheduling, have lengthy commutes, work overtime and week-ends, have travel demands or do shift work (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Friedman, 1991; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). And, Americans today work more hours than ever before. One survey indicates that the average non-exempt worker spends 47 hours a week in work related activities, and salaried professionals report working 62 hours a week (Googins, 1991). It is estimated that Americans work the equivalent of one month more each year than they did 20 years ago (Schor, 1991). As companies downsize, fewer workers are expected to do more work. Johnson & Johnson employees report that because

of cutbacks in the workforce, they now have additional responsibilities making their jobs more demanding and time consuming than they were two years before (Families & Work Institute, 1993).

Working mothers

Working mothers, with jobs in the workplace and at home, work longer hours than everyone else - about 50% more than working fathers or people without children (Scarr, Phillips, & McCartney, 1989). Mothers assume primary responsibility for dependent care and housework (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1991; Galinsky, Bond & Freidman, 1993; Hall, 1990; Hochschild, 1989; Solomon, 1991) and experience more role overload than fathers and childless women (Duxbury et al., 1994). Several studies have found that working mothers with young children, those in professional positions and those whose wages are so low that they need two jobs, work between 70 to 80 hours/week performing paid and household work. They describe themselves as being "ragged," "bone-weary," "sinking in quicksand," "busy every waking hour," and having little time and energy for their children and husbands (Schor, 1991).

As women's parental responsibilities increase, their wages decline (O'Neill, 1994), while men tend to benefit economically from the accumulation of family roles (Witowski & Leicht, 1995). Earnings of childless women between the ages of 27 and 33 are 98% of men's in that same age group, whereas women in general earn 76% of what men do

(Crittenden, 1995). Many employers believe that family responsibilities detract women from their careers and are reluctant to promote them (Lobel, 1991). Employers assume that a woman's commitment to work declines as her commitment to family grows (Families & Work Institute, 1995). This is supported by research which suggests that female managers' career progressions lag behind males'. Women earn lower salaries and progress less than men who are comparably educated, career-oriented and working at similar jobs (Brett, Stroh, & Reilly 1992). Though most mothers work because their earnings are a necessary part of their family income (Families & Work Institute, 1995), they are viewed by employers as digressive members of the labor force, interested in low-wage jobs that can be easily entered and exited so that they can primarily focus on child rearing (Spalter-Roth & Harmann, 1991). This puts single mothers who support their families on their incomes alone in the most vulnerable position. And, given that approximately two-thirds of all mothers can expect to be single parents at some point in their lives (Spalter-Roth & Harmann, 1991), the effects are widespread.

For many professional women, the challenge of combining family and career is extremely complex as role conflicts are magnified. The prevailing career path leading to an executive position typically includes sacrificing an involved home life, since organizational commitment and loyalty are measured by time spent at work rather than on results produced (Rogers, 1992). Like most mothers, professional women assume primary

responsibility for their children and may feel negligent and guilty about having so little time to spend with them (Morrison, White & Van Velsor, 1987; Swiss & Walker, 1993; Walsh, 1995). Elsa Walsh, in her book , Divided Lives, investigates the lives of three successful women. Initial interviews with one, Meredith Vierra, a broadcast journalist, were conducted when she had just had her first child and was a correspondent on *60 Minutes* (a coveted position in her field). Though the program's producer had agreed to allow Vierra to do some of her work at home so that she could be with her infant, and "he had assured her in their negotiations that he did not care where she worked, it was clear her absences disturbed him. If she was to have any chance of succeeding, she realized she needed to be in the office, a presence" (Walsh, 1995, p. 48). Meredith Vierra eventually left her job on *60 Minutes*. She found it impossible to parent responsibly and schedule her work as her boss had *actually* wanted.

Working fathers

Fathers, too, are increasingly torn between work and family roles (Saltzman, 1991) and like mothers, experience work/family stress (Pleck, 1993). Men today want to parent differently than their fathers (Saltzman, 1991) who primarily contributed to their families by providing income (Googins, 1991). In a recent study, 21% of men reported that if their earnings were not necessary, they would rather stay home to care for their dependents than work (Families & Work Institute, 1995). Additionally, the number of single

custodial fathers is growing - from 393,000 in 1970 to 1,351,000 in 1990 (Grief, DeMaris, & Hood, 1993) - as is the number of divorced fathers with joint custody arrangements who solely care for their children half-time. These men experience significant problems balancing the demands of work and parenting (Grief, DeMaris & Hood, 1993).

Though men, generally, spend only about one-third as much time caring for their children as women (Catalyst, 1988), many fathers modify their work roles to meet their family needs (Pleck, 1991). They do so, however, in non-visible, non-public ways. To protect a committed careerist image, they may turn down job assignments that require travel in order to spend more time at home but give another reason for their refusal (Hall, 1990). Or, they may take a few days off after the birth of a child and call it vacation time instead of paternity leave (Hall, 1990; Meihner, 1993). Like women, men who make accommodations at work to meet family obligations risk being perceived as uncommitted employees. Unlike women who are seen as more feminine when they put family first, men are seen as less masculine which creates additional stress (Pleck, 1993).

Work-family initiatives

Research suggests that workplace productivity may be affected when workers struggle to balance work and family responsibilities (Friedman, 1991). Recruitment and retention efforts may suffer, attendance and tardiness may increase, workers may refuse to work overtime, travel or relocate. Management experts, like Peter Senge, recognize

that in order for workers to be committed and creative in their jobs, employing organizations must develop work environments that support work/family balance and circumvent work/family conflict (Paton, 1995; Rogers, 1992). They understand that as companies reengineer and fewer workers have more responsibilities, it is as important to invest in programs that ease employee stress as it is to invest in new equipment and marketing strategies (Elmer, 1995).

Some employing organizations, like Dupont, Nations Bank, IBM, Johnson & Johnson (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992), acknowledge that their continued success hinges on the productivity of working parents. They understand that it is crucial to legitimize this issue and ensure that accommodations are made for families. In response, they offer work-family benefits. Work-family benefits may be visible, i.e., an individual's supervisor and co-workers know that he/she is using them. They may include: a) flexible work policies such as flextime, compressed work weeks, job sharing, part-time work, and work at home/telecommuting, b) parental leaves, and c) in-house life skills seminars. Other work/family benefits are non-visible, i.e., supervisors and co-workers do not know if an individual employee is using them. They may include: a) information services, such as resource and referral services and off-site life skills seminars, b) direct services, such as employer-supported child care, and c) financial assistance, such as voucher programs, dependent care spending accounts, tax-exempt care programs, dependent care

reimbursement and flexible benefit plans (Fernandez, 1990; Friedman & Galinsky, 1992; Vanderkolk & Young, 1991).

Very few organizations measure the success of their work-family initiatives (Kraut, 1992), and the literature, which consists mainly of anecdotal accounts, is mixed on how effectively they support employees balance work and family responsibilities and in improving worker productivity. Some studies suggest that the processes that link work and family have not been sufficiently identified and that solutions have been developed before the problems have been thoroughly understood (Lambert, 1990). Others propose that these benefits fall short in really helping families because they only support employees adapt to employers' demands (Schor, 1993) and are designed to be convenient for the organization (Brett, Stroh & Reilly, 1992; Googin, 1991). However, workers with dependent care responsibilities seem to want and ask for work-family benefits (Galinsky, Bond & Friedman, 1993; Woolsey, 1992).

Of all work-family initiatives, most employees consider flexibility in work hours to be most useful (Friedman, 1991; Friedman & Galinsky, 1992; Martinez, 1993). Workers are more satisfied and committed to doing their jobs well when they have more job autonomy and control over their work schedules (Galinsky, Bond & Friedman, 1993). Flextime, which allows full-time workers to choose their start and stop times, and compressed work weeks, where employees work longer hours on fewer days, can help employees reduce

their child care costs, allow them more time with their children and avoid stressful commute times. Flextime has been found to ease tardiness and absenteeism and improve employee morale (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992). Part-time work and job sharing (where two workers share the responsibilities of one full-time position) benefit employees who prefer to work fewer hours. Though reduced work hours provide employees with more time to attend to other things, most employers do not offer other benefits (i.e., medical, vacation or sick time) to employees who work part-time, and employees' salaries are reduced.

It is difficult for a significant number of employed parents to find and retain affordable, quality child care (Fernandez, 1986; Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Googins, 1991). Some companies have responded by providing direct services, such on-site child care centers, consortiums, after school programs and summer camps. They are, however, expensive to build, subsidize and maintain, benefit only a small segment of the workforce (Martinez, 1993) and seem to have little impact on improving morale, loyalty and reducing absenteeism. They do, however, support recruitment and retention efforts (Shellenbarger, 1993). Information services, like resource and referral programs, assist employees in finding suitable child care and elder care for their dependents. Critics feel these services offer little support, as they only help locate care which may be expensive and not high quality (Googins, 1991).

Paying for child care poses a problem for many working parents. Families with small children spend between 10-25% of their incomes on child care (Galinsky & Stein, 1990). Voucher programs, like the one developed at Polaroid, subsidize the cost of child care, with the amount of the subsidy varying according to family size and income (Fernandez, 1990; Freidman & Galinsky, 1992). Very few companies, however, have voucher programs or any other type of direct financial assistance for dependent care (Parker & Hall, 1993). The Dependent Care Assistance Plan (DCAP) (along with information services) is offered by more employers than any other work-family benefit (Parker & Hall, 1993). The DCAP, provided within a flexible benefit plan, allows all employees, regardless of income, to use pretax earnings to pay for child care (Fernandez, 1990; Friedman & Galinsky, 1992; Parker & Hall, 1993).

Researchers recognize that a supportive corporate culture is key to the success of any program (Freidman & Johnson 1991; Galinsky & Stein, 1990; Googins, 1991; Hall, 1990; Solomon, 1991). To date, however, only a handful of companies have seriously begun to examine and change their fundamental attitudes toward work and family (Saltzman, 1991). Only a few cutting edge corporations, such as Lost Arrow, have corporate philosophies that, "see workers as parents first" (San Jose Mercury New, July 25, 1993, 2PC). The greater number feel that if benefit programs are in place, the problems involved with balancing work/family roles are solved (Solomon, 1991). For men, especially, this is not

so. Research suggests that the culture of the workplace determines whether or not men will use formal work/family programs (Pleck, 1993). Men employed in organizations with work/family benefit programs but "family-unfriendly" workplace cultures who take advantage of alternative work schedules or parental leaves are usually thought of as eccentrics or some sort of "funny guy" (Hall, 1990). They accommodate their family commitments in non-public, non-visible ways (Pleck, 1993) such as utilizing resource and referral services and the DCAP, but not alternative work scheduling.

Most U.S. businesses have not begun to directly address the needs of working parents at all (Parker & Hall, 1993). The majority continue to operate within an outmoded system designed to support the needs of traditional families in which men participate in the workforce and women maintain the home, care for the children and support their husbands' career advancement. Yet, despite the minimal response by employers, continuous reports appear in the popular news media touting the changes some businesses have made to support working families, implying that they are prevalent (Freidman & Galinsky, 1992; Kingston, 1990; Raabe, 1990; Saltzman, 1991). Accounts in the academic press also give the impression to readers (many of whom are students and future workers) that corporate work/family programs are common (Kingston, 1990).

One explanation for the nominal response by employing organizations is that most corporate decision makers are not in tune with what employees need, want and expect

businesses to offer to help those with dependent care responsibilities manage multiple roles (Mirvis, 1993). Corporate officers are typically white males whose wives stay/stayed home to care for their families (Allen, 1993; Friedman & Galinsky, 1992). They and their wives have not experienced the daily struggle involved in trying to successfully manage the competing demands of work and family responsibilities and do not realize how taxing it is. Work/family needs assessments are almost exclusively conducted in and utilized by organizations with family-responsive work cultures. Additional research to assess the changing needs of both men and women in the labor force at large is necessary so that a greater number of employers may become cognizant of the concerns of a more comprehensive employee population.

Current study

Because of the dramatic shifts in the demographics of the U.S. labor force and the family structure, it is important for U.S. businesses to examine how effectively they are supporting working parents in managing dual roles. As companies restructure and more work is performed by fewer employees who have commitments to family roles as well, the consequences of disregarding their needs may prove to be significant. Trends and labor force projections indicate that increasing numbers of both men and women will have concurrent commitments to work and family, but very little is known about how men and women respond to different corporate work-family programs (Friedman, 1991). Work-

family programs, though designed for working parents, are for the most targeted at working mothers (Catalyst, 1988). And though men seem to use them, male use as compared to female use is rarely monitored and analyzed (Pleck, 1993). As more fathers take greater responsibility for family obligations, empirical evidence to determine what policies and programs men want and expect compared to what women want and expect is needed. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to assess incoming workers' commitment to multiple roles and to examine what family supportive policies male and female future work force participants expect and want their prospective employers to provide. Three hypotheses are addressed:

1. Individuals anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles will be more likely to expect and to want their work environment to be family supportive than individuals anticipating low commitment to family roles.
2. Females anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles will be more likely to expect and to want their work environment to be family supportive than males anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles.
3. Males anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles will be more likely to expect and to want their employers to offer non-visible work/family benefit options than visible work/family benefit options.

Method

Subjects

Data for this study were collected from 52 female and 50 male undergraduate college students. Approximately 70% of the respondents were recruited from psychology classes at large public urban university and 30% from a public community college. Subjects covered a representative sample of races. Forty-five subjects (44%) were freshmen; 26 (25%) were sophomores; 20 (20%) were juniors and 11 (11%) were seniors. Subjects' ages ranged from 14 through 44. The mean age of the sample was 21. Most respondents were single (82%), but 97% anticipated being married or in a marriage-like relationship in the future. Most subjects did not have children (85%), but a majority (97%) plan to be parents. Thirty-four percent of the subjects had some full-time work experience. All expect to work full-time after graduation.

Materials

Demographic characteristics. Demographic data were collected using sixteen items developed by McKeen and Beatty (1992) (see Appendix B).

Work and family role expectations. Two instruments were used to assess work and family role expectations. The first, the Life Role Salience Scales, developed by Amatea, Gross, Clark and Bobby (1986), is a 40-item, Likert-type attitude scale with 5 possible response choices: (1) disagree, (2) somewhat disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree,

(4) somewhat agree, (5) agree (see Appendix D). It is designed to assess men's and women's personal expectations concerning occupational, marital, parental and homecare roles. It is applicable to both men and women and to individuals anticipating participation in these roles as well as individuals currently engaged in them. Two aspects of personal role expectations were assessed using these scales: (1) the personal importance or value attributed to participation in a particular role was measured using such items as, "I expect my job/career to give me more real satisfaction than anything else I do," and "My life would be empty if I never had children," and (2) the intended level of commitment of personal time and energy resources to enactment of a role were measured using items such as, "I expect to devote whatever time and energy it takes to move up in my job/career field," and "I expect to devote a significant amount of my time and energy to the rearing of my own children."

Twenty-one, single-item measures developed by McKeen and Beatty (1992) and used by Burke (1994) in a similar study were also used to assess respondents work and family role expectations (see Appendix C). Typical items are: "In 5 years, I will most likely be working: a) Full Time b) Part Time c) Not Working for Pay," and "Will you and your partner share child care duties equally? a) Yes b) No, I will do more c) No, my partner will do more d) will have a caregiver (such as a nanny or grandparent)."

Family-supportive workplaces. A questionnaire concerning work/family benefit programs was designed to evaluate respondents expectations and desires for specific work/family options (see Appendix E). The scale lists 10 benefit options that are characterized as visible, e.g, compressed work week and 10 benefit options characterized as non-visible, e.g, flexible spending account for dependent care expenses. The item format is a five-point Likert-type rating scale. Respondents were asked to indicate how well each statement described their expectations and desires for a particular benefit that may mitigate work/family conflict. Ratings for measure 1, which assesses desire, range from (1) definitely do not want to (5) definitely want and ratings for measure 2, which assesses expectation, range from (1) definitely do not expect to (5) definitely expect.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered to subjects during several classroom sessions all proctored by the researcher. Participation was voluntary. Before filling out the survey, respondents read and signed a consent form informing them of their rights as participants and received both verbal and written instructions (see Appendix A). The questionnaire, completed individually and anonymously, was 9 pages long and required 20 minutes to finish. Six percent of the respondents did not complete the questionnaire and were eliminated from the sample.

Results

Coefficient alphas, listed in Table 1, were calculated to estimate the internal consistency of all multiple-item scales used in the study. The family commitment scale had coefficient alphas similar to those reported by Burke, but the work commitment scale had coefficient alphas which were lower (Burke, 1994). All scales did have reliabilities over .50, indicating acceptable values.

Four groups were created by dichotomizing subjects by their scores on the commitment to work and family scales. Individuals with scores above the median for each scale (commitment to family >4.067 ; commitment to work >3.800) were considered to have high commitment to those roles. Those with scores below the median were deemed to have low commitment. Table 2 shows demographic characteristics of the sample by group. There were some notable differences within and between the groups related to gender. The number of females anticipating high commitments to both roles ($n = 14$) was much greater than the number of males ($n = 5$). The number of females anticipating high commitment to family ($n = 33$) was greater than the number of males ($n = 16$). The mean age, number of children and marital status were comparable across all groups.

The means and standard deviations of the scales measuring desire and expectation for family supportive benefits by level of commitment to work and family roles are displayed in Table 3. Overall, subjects seemed more likely to want than expect their prospective

Table 1

Coefficient Alphas for Multiple-Item Scales

<u>Scale</u>	<u># of Items</u>	<u>Coefficient Alphas</u>
Expectation for W/F Benefits	20	.83
Expectations for Invisible W/F Benefits	10	.82
Expectations for Visible W/F Benefits	10	.59
Desire for W/F Benefits	20	.78
Desire for Invisible W/F Benefits	10	.80
Desire for Visible W/F Benefits	10	.60
Commitment to Work	10	.65
Commitment to Family	30	.78

Table 2

Sample Demographics by Levels of Commitment to Family and Work

	<u>High Family/ High Work</u>		<u>High Family/ Low Work</u>		<u>Low Family/ High Work</u>		<u>Low Family/ Low Work</u>	
Gender	Male 5 (26%)	Female 14 (73.7%)	Male 11 (36.7%)	Female 19 (63.3%)	Male 16 (66.7%)	Female 8 (33.3%)	Male 18 (62.1%)	Female 11 (37.9%)
Children	Yes 2 (10.5%)	No 17 (89.5%)	Yes 5 (16.7%)	No 25 (83.3%)	Yes 7 (29.2%)	No 17 (70.8%)	Yes 1 (3.4%)	No 28 (96.5%)
Age	<u>M</u> 20.6	<u>S.D.</u> (5.86)	<u>M</u> 22.1	<u>S.D.</u> (5.55)	<u>M</u> 22.7	<u>S.D.</u> (5.75)	<u>M</u> 21.1	<u>S.D.</u> (5.46)
Marital Status	Single 17 (89.5%)	Married 2 (10.5%)	Single 25 (83.3%)	Married 5 (12.7%)	Single 19 (79.2%)	Married 5 (20.8%)	Single 26 (89.6%)	Married 3 (10.3%)

employers to provide family supportive benefits. Surprisingly, males who anticipated low commitment to both roles (want work/family benefits, $\underline{M} = 3.92$; expect work/family benefits, $\underline{M} = 3.06$), and males who anticipated high commitment to both roles (want work/family benefits, $\underline{M} = 3.93$; expect work/family benefits, $\underline{M} = 3.09$), responded similarly on both scales. As predicted, all subjects who anticipated high commitment to family roles appeared more likely to *want* their work environments to be family supportive ($\underline{M} = 4.09$, $\underline{M} = 3.90$) than those anticipating low commitment to family roles ($\underline{M} = 3.78$, $\underline{M} = 3.78$). But, not as expected, individuals who anticipated a low commitment to family and a high commitment to work appeared more likely to *expect* their employers to offer work/family benefits ($\underline{M} = 3.42$) than individuals anticipating high commitment to family roles ($\underline{M} = 3.26$ and $\underline{M} = 3.28$) as well as individuals anticipating low commitment to both roles ($\underline{M} = 3.12$).

The first hypothesis predicted that individuals anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles would be more likely to expect and to want their work environment to be family supportive than individuals anticipating low commitment to family roles. To test this hypothesis, data analysis was performed examining the response differences between those subjects who anticipated a high commitment to work and either a high commitment to family or a low commitment to family on the work/family benefit scales. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used with one independent variable

Table 3

Desire and Expectation for W/F Benefits by Level of Commitment to Family and Work

	<u>Want W/F Benefits</u>			<u>Expect W/F Benefits</u>		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
High family/high work						
All subjects	4.09	(.41)	19	3.26	(.53)	19
Females	4.15	(.33)	14	3.32	(.59)	14
Males	3.93	(.59)	5	3.09	(.27)	5
High family/low work						
All subjects	3.90	(.55)	30	3.28	(.70)	30
Females	4.00	(.59)	19	3.22	(.59)	19
Males	3.75	(.44)	11	3.38	(.68)	11
Low family/high work						
All subjects	3.78	(.44)	24	3.42	(.45)	24
Females	3.74	(.39)	8	3.33	(.40)	8
Males	3.80	(.47)	16	3.47	(.47)	16
Low family/low work						
All subjects	3.78	(.42)	29	3.12	(.40)	29
Females	3.55	(.27)	11	3.21	(.54)	11
Males	3.92	(.45)	18	3.06	(.45)	18

(commitment to family) and two dependent variables (want work/family benefits and expect work/family benefits) with only subjects anticipating high commitment to work selected. The hypothesis that individuals anticipating high commitment to both roles ($M = 4.09$) would be more likely to *want* their work environment to be family supportive than individuals anticipating low commitment to family roles ($M = 3.78$) was supported [$F(1,42) = 5.57, p < .05$]. The hypothesis that individuals anticipating high commitment to both roles would be more likely to *expect* their work environment to be family supportive than individuals anticipating low commitment to family roles did not yield significant results [$F(1,42) = 1.29, p > .05$].

In order to test hypothesis 2, that females anticipating high commitment to work and family roles would be more likely to expect and to want their work environment to be family supportive than males anticipating high commitment to both roles, a MANOVA was performed comparing the work/family benefit scale scores of males anticipating high commitment to work and family roles and the work/family benefit scale scores of females anticipating high commitment to work and family roles. Subjects with high commitment to both roles were selected and one independent variable (sex) and two dependent variables (want work/family benefits, expect work/family benefits) were used. The hypothesis that females anticipating high commitment to both roles would be more likely to *want* their work environments to be family supportive than males anticipating high commitment to

both roles was not supported [$F(1,18) = 1.10, p > .05$]. The hypothesis that females anticipating high commitment to both roles would be more likely to *expect* their work environment to be family-supportive than males anticipating high commitment to both roles also did not yield a significant result [$F(1,18) = .677, p > .05$].

Hypothesis 3 stated that males anticipating high commitment to both roles would be more likely to expect and to want their employers to offer non-visible work/family benefit options than visible work/family benefit options. To test this hypothesis, paired sample T-tests were performed comparing how males anticipating high commitment to both roles responded to questions concerning their desire and expectation for non-visible work/family benefit options and visible work/family benefit options. Statistically significant differences were not found. The analysis did not indicate that males anticipating high commitment to both work and family roles were more likely to *want* their employers to offer non-visible benefit options ($M = 4.10$) than visible benefit options ($M = 3.76$) [$t(4) = 1.49, p > .05$], or that men anticipating high commitment to both work and roles were more likely to *expect* their employers to offer non-visible benefit options ($M = 3.22$) than visible benefit options ($M = 2.97$) [$t(4) = 2.49, p > .05$].

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess the next generation of workers' anticipated commitment to work and family roles and to examine what work/family benefit options

male and female incoming workers want and expect their prospective employers to provide to help mitigate work-family conflict. The first hypothesis that individuals anticipating high commitment to both roles would be more likely to want and to expect their work environment to be family supportive than those anticipating low commitment to family roles was partially supported. Respondents *wanted* work/family benefits, but did not *expect* their employers to provide them. A possible explanation of why respondents did not *expect* their prospective employers to provide work/family benefits is that among all subjects, regardless of their anticipated commitment to both roles, only 36.25% ($n = 37$) plan to work in large organizations. Most employing organizations that offer formal work/family benefits tend to be large businesses (Aldous, 1990; Lawler, Cohen, & Chang, 1993). Perhaps subjects had realistic expectations about what benefits their future employers will and will not provide.

A primary objective of this study was to see if males and females responded differently to corporate work/family programs. It was hypothesized that females anticipating high commitment to both roles were more likely to want and to expect their work environment to be family-supportive than males anticipating high commitment to both roles. Statistically significant differences were not found. However, though not hypothesized, these results do support a premise of this study and are consistent with findings of other researchers (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992), that working men are

becoming more responsible for the care of their dependents and may want employer support to do so.

Results for hypothesis 3, that males anticipating high commitment to both roles will be more likely to expect and to want their prospective employers to offer non-visible work/family benefit options than visible benefit options was not supported. Though the mean scores for both wanting and expecting non-visible benefits were higher than the mean scores for wanting and expecting visible benefits, significant results were not found. A possible reason the analysis did not yield significant results is that distinguishing between the two benefit types is difficult without the direct experience of working in a "family-unfriendly" work environment while needing employer support to manage work and family roles. Because all the male subjects included in the analysis ($n = 5$) were single (100%), had no children (100%) and had no full-time work experience (100%), it is understandable that they did not report differences in their desire and expectation for these two types of work/family benefits.

Implications

Findings from this study have implications for employing organizations that will be recruiting new workers. Consistent with broader projections of future workforce composition, the students in this study plan to commit a large percentage of time and energy to their family roles. In five years, all but 2.4% of these subjects expect to be

married, all but 4.5% expect to have children, and 91% intend to be working full-time. The majority reported that they intend to commit more time and energy to family than to work. It is important for more employers to recognize this shift in employee priorities and understand that “loyal and committed” workers no longer are (nor will be) individuals with few non-work responsibilities to distract them from long hours on the job. Current and future workers not only have (and will have) job responsibilities but personal responsibilities as well. And, as a recent study conducted at Dupont indicates, today’s employee’s commitment to a company’s success increases when the employer supports its workers balance work and family (Mallet, 1996).

Findings from this study also suggest that males, as well as females, with high commitment to family and work roles want their work environment to be family supportive. A common characteristic of organizations that currently offer work/family benefits is that they are in the service sector (health care, banking, communications) and employ a large portion of females of child bearing age (Aldous, 1990; Auerbach, 1990; Lawler, Cohen & Chang, 1993). Businesses in male-dominated industries have barely begun to address employees’ work/family concerns. These results imply there is a need for them to do so.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the sample size was very small. Only 43

subjects were included in the data analysis for hypothesis 1; 19 subjects were used to test hypothesis 2, and just 5 subjects could be considered when testing hypothesis 3. Had the sample size been larger, it is possible that statistically significant differences may have been found for hypothesis 3. Additionally, because the sample size was so small, groups could not be formed that accurately represented the four levels of commitment. Groups characterizing respondents as having high or low commitment to work and family roles were created by dichotomizing subjects by whether they scored above or below the median on the family commitment and work commitment scales. The ratings for the family commitment and work commitment scales range from 1 (low) -5 (high). The majority of subjects responded with 4 and 5 on both scales - 87% (n = 89) on the family commitment scale and 71% (n=72) on the work commitment scale. No subject responded with 1 on either scale; three subjects answered with a 2 on the family commitment scale and four responded with a 2 on the work commitment scale. A neutral response was given by all other subjects on both scales. Had there been more subjects, the opportunity to form low commitment groups with subjects who responded with 1 and 2 would have increased.

A second limitation of the research is the relatively young age of most subjects. Questions concerning elder care were purposely omitted from the survey because it is typically a concern of individuals in or approaching middle-age (Rogers, 1992). Since the

need for elder care is growing substantially for employed Americans, this is a serious omission.

A third limitation of the study is that all participants were enrolled in college and intended to find professional positions after graduation. Since most new entrants into the labor force will not be professionals, the results of this study are not broadly generalizable. Research suggests that exempt and non-exempt workers respond differently to corporate benefit programs because they experience different kinds of work-family conflict (Googins, 1991; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Exempt workers may work long hours, travel frequently and be expected to relocate. Non-exempt employees may be required to do shift work, have little control over their schedules and have low job autonomy. A fourth limitation is the relatively low Cronbach alphas for some of the measures. More reliable scales are needed for future research.

Future Research

Despite the methodological limitations discussed above, findings from this study invite continued investigation of the hypotheses it addressed. Future research might include examining how workers who intend to commit a large portion of time to family roles but do not expect their work environment to be family supportive plan to successfully manage the competing demands of family and work responsibilities. Studies investigating both male and female workers' desire for non-visible versus visible benefits would be valuable,

as both men's and women's careers may be stymied when they publicly take advantage of work/family benefits. It would also be beneficial to look at the desire for work/family benefits among males who intend to work (or are working) in male-dominated industries.

Conclusion

Historically, females have been predominantly responsible for child care and for maintaining their households. Only within the last 40 years have large numbers of women also worked outside of the home. As more women entered the workforce, most men did not, in turn, assume additional responsibility for home and family. Consequently, the problems associated with balancing work and family roles became a women's issue. And as a women's issue, work/family concerns became a "soft issue" and garnered little attention and few resources from businesses. Now, as more corporate decision makers who typically do not (and did not) struggle with managing work and child care struggle with managing work and elder care (frail parents and/or spouses), they are becoming aware of how stressful it can be to successfully handle both roles. Hopefully, this new-found awareness and continued research in the work/family field will translate into more workplaces becoming family-supportive.

References

- Aldous, J. (1990). Specification and speculation concerning the politics of workplace family policies. Journal of Family Issues, 11 (4), 355-367.
- Allen, F.E. (1993, June 21). What problem? The Wall Street Journal, p. R7.
- Amatea, E.S., Cross, E.G., Clark, J.E. & Bobby, C.L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-oriented men and women: The Life Role Salience Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 831-838.
- An evaluation of Johnson & Johnson's work-family initiative (1993, April). New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Auerbach, J.D. (1990). Employer-supported child care as a women-responsive policy. Journal of Family Issues, 11 (4), 384-400.
- Bohen, H.H., & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). Balancing jobs and family life. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Brett, J.M., Stroh, L.K., & Reilly, A.H. (1992). What is it like being a dual-career manager in the 1990s? In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, Families and Organizations (pp. 138 - 167). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, R.J. (1994). Career and life values and expectations of university business students. Psychological Reports, 75, 147-160.

- Catalyst. (1988). Workplace policies: new options for fathers. In P. Bronstein & C.P. Cowan (Eds.), Fatherhood today: Men's changing role in the family (pp. 323-340). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Child care seen as way to keep workers on the job. (1993, July, 25). San Jose Mercury News. p. 2 PC.
- Crittenden, D. (1995, August, 22). Yes, motherhood lowers pay. New York Times. p. A11.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C. & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict. A comparison by gender, family type and perceived control. Journal of Family Issues, 15 (3), 449-466.
- Elmer, V. (1995, July, 16). Balancing work, family becoming universal issue. The San Jose Mercury News, pp. 1 PC-2PC.
- Fernandez, J.P. (1990). The politics and reality of family care in corporate America. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Friedman, D.E. (1991). Linking work-family issues to the bottom line. New York: The Conference Board.
- Friedman, D.E. (1990). Corporation responses to family needs. In D.G. Unger & M.B. Sussman (Eds.), Families in community settings: interdisciplinary perspectives (pp. 77-98). New York: Hawthorn Press.
-

- Friedman, D.E., & Johnson, A.A. (1991). Strategies for promoting a work-family agenda. New York: The Conference Board.
- Friedman, D.E., & Galinsky, E. (1992). Work and family issues: A legitimate business concern. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, Families, and Organizations (pp. 168-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J.T., & Friedman, D.E. (1993). The changing workforce: highlights of the national study. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Galinsky, E., & Stein, P.J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees. Journal of Family Issues, 11 (4), 368-383.
- Goff, S.J., Mount, M.K. & Jamison, R.L. (1990). Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: A field study. Personnel Psychology, 43, 793-809.
- Googins, B.K. (1991). Work/family conflicts: Private lives - public responses. New York: Auburn House.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10 (1), 76-88.
- Greif, G.L., DeMaris, A. & Hood, J.C. (1993). Balancing work and single fatherhood. In J.C. Hood (Ed.), Men, Work, and Family (pp. 179-194). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

- Hall, D.T. (1990). Promoting work/family balance: An organization-change approach. Organizational Dynamics, 18, 5-18.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). The second shift. New York: Viking Press.
- Kanter, R.M. (1987). Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research policy. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kingston, P. W. (1990). Illusions and ignorance about the family- responsive workplace. Journal of Family Issues, 11(4), 438-454.
- Kraut, A.I. (1992). Organizational research on work and family issues. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, Families, and Organizations (pp. 208-235). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, S.J. (1990). Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. Human Relations, 43(3), 239-257.
- Lawler, E.E., Cohen, S.G. & Chang, L. (1993). Strategic human resource management. In P.H. Mirvis (Ed.), Building the Competitive Workforce (pp. 31-59). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Levander, M. (1994, August 29). The parent trap. San Jose Mercury News. pp. 1F-2F.
- Lobel, S.A. (1991). Allocation of investment in work and family roles: Alternative theories and implications for research. Academy of Management Review, 16(3), 507-521.

Mallet, E. (1996, January 21). Flexibility makes for loyal workers. San Jose Mercury News, p.2C.

Martinez, M.N. (1993, January). Family support makes business sense. HR Magazine, pp. 38-43.

McKeen, C.A., & Beatty, C.A. (1992). Survey of graduates career and life expectations. Kingston, Ontario: Queens University, School of Business.

Mieher, S. (1993, June 21). Men at war. The Wall Street Journal, p. R8.

Mirvis, P.H. (1993). A competitive workforce: The issues and the study. In P.H. Mirvis (Ed.), Building the Competitive Workforce. (pp. 1-29). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Morrison, A.M., White, R.P. & Van Velsor, E. (1987). Breaking the glass ceiling. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

O'Neill, J. (1994, September 22). The causes and significance of the declining gender gap. Paper presented at Bard College, New York.

Parker, V.A., & Hall, D.T. (1993). Workplace flexibility: Faddish or fundamental? In P.H. Mirvis (Ed.), Building the Competitive Workforce (pp. 122-155). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Paton, S.M. (1995, March). The new gurus. Quality Digest, pp. 28-39.

- Pleck, J.H. (1993). Are "family-supportive" employer policies relevant to men? In J.C. Hood (Ed.), Men, Work, and Family (pp. 217-237). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Raabe, P.H. (1990). The organizational effects of workplace family policies: Past weaknesses and recent progress toward improved research. Journal of Family Issues, 11(4), 477-491.
- Rafferty, C. (1995, May 9). Care worn. The San Jose Mercury News. pp. 1C, 5C.
- Rogers, F.S. (1992, Autumn). When the business case is common sense: Coming to terms with America's family challenge. ACA Journal, 1, 84-93.
- Saltzman, Amy (1991). Downshifting. New York: HarperCollins.
- Scarr, S., Phillips, D., & McCartney, K. (1989). Working mothers and their families. American Psychologist. 44(11), 1402-1409.
- Schor, J.B. (1991). The overworked American. New York: Basic Books.
- Shellenbarger, S. (1993, June 21). Data gap. The Wall Street Journal, p. R6.
- Solomom, C. M. (1991, August). 24-hour employees. Personnel Journal, pp. 56-63.
- Spalter-Roth, R.M. & Hartmann, H.I. (1991, November). Increasing working mothers' earnings. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Swiss, D.J. & Walker, J.P. (1993). Women and the work/family dilemma. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Thomas, L.T. & Ganster, D.C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80 (1), 6-15.
- Vanderkolk, B.S., & Young, A.A. (1991). The work and family revolution. New York: Facts On File.
- Walsh, E. (1995). Divided lives. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Witkowski, K.M. & Leicht, K.T. (1995). The effects of gender segregation, labor force participation, and family roles on the earnings of young adult workers. Work and Occupations, 22 (1), 48-72.
- Women: The new providers. (1995, May). New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Woolsey, C. (1992, September 14). Continued growth seen in work-family benefits. Business Insurance, pp. 13, 16.
-

Appendix A

Instructions

Thank you for participating in this study. Your time and input are very much appreciated.

In order for your answers to be most helpful to us, it is important that you be as **accurate** as you can. We would like you to read each question carefully and provide **all** the information asked for. Please answer **all** questions which apply to you. It is important to have a **complete** questionnaire from each participant. This is an anonymous survey. Please **do not** write your name or any other identifying mark on the questionnaire.

If you have any questions while answering this survey, please refer back to this sheet, or raise your hand for assistance from the researcher.

To answer Parts A & B, you will either be asked to **check** the appropriate box:

For example: ☐ Yes ☐ No

or **fill in the blank** with the appropriate response:

For example: _____

To answer Parts C-D, please **circle** the appropriate number in response to **each** statement.

For example: 1 2 3 4 5

Thank-you

Please begin the questionnaire.

PART A: PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

These questions deal with demographic information which will help to identify trends in the data. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.

1. Please indicate your current program of study:

- ☐ Psychology ☐ Other _____

2. Please indicate your grade level:

- ☐ Freshperson ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior
☐ Senior ☐ Other _____

3. After graduation, do you expect to work for pay full-time without interruption until you retire?

- ☐ Yes - go to question 6
☐ No or ☐ Not Sure - go to questions 4 & 5

4. If no/not sure do you expect to work part-time at some point?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure

5. What would be your most likely reasons for a career interruption or part-time work?
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ To have/care for children ☐ Spousal commitments ☐ Travel
☐ Furthering education ☐ Exploring alternative career options

6. Are you:

- ☐ Female? ☐ Male?

7. How old are you? _____ Years of age.

8. Have you had full time work experience (not summer or part time work)?

- ☐ Yes *If yes, for how long? _____ years _____ months*
☐ No

9. Are you currently employed?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. What is your current marital status?

- ☐ Single (never married) - go to question 11
- ☐ Single (separated, divorced or widowed) - go to question 11
- ☐ Married or living in a marriage-like relationship - go to question 12

11. Do you expect to be married or in a marriage like relationship in the future?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Most likely
- ☐ Not Sure

12. Do you have any children? ☐ Yes - go to question 13 ☐ No - go to question 14

13. Please specify the number of children in each group:

0-5 years How many? _____

6-13 How many? _____

14-17 How many? _____

14. Do you expect to have a child(ren)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Most likely
- ☐ Not sure

**IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY MARRIED OR IN A MARRIAGE-LIKE RELATIONSHIP,
ANSWER QUESTIONS 15 AND 16 BEFORE PROCEEDING TO PART B.**

15. Do you and your spouse/partner generally share household duties equally?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I generally do more
- ☐ No, my partner generally does more

16. If you have children, do you and your spouse/partner generally share child care duties equally?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, I generally do more
- ☐ No, my partner generally does more

Appendix C

PART C: Using the 5-point scale below, please respond to each of the following with the choice that best describes your present views. Please circle the appropriate response.

-
1	2	3	4	5	Having work/a career that is interesting and exciting to me is my most important life goal.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect my job/career to give me more real satisfaction than anything else I do.
1	2	3	4	5	Building a name and reputation for myself through work/a career is not one of my life goals.
1	2	3	4	5	It is important to me that I have a job/career in which I can achieve something of importance.
1	2	3	4	5	It is important to me to feel successful in my work/career.
1	2	3	4	5	I want to work, but I do not want to have a demanding career.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect to make as many sacrifices as are necessary in order to advance in my work/career.
1	2	3	4	5	I value being involved in a career and expect to devote the time and effort needed to develop it.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect to devote a significant amount of my time to building my career and developing the skills necessary to advance in my career.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect to devote whatever time and energy it takes to move up in my job/career field.
1	2	3	4	5	Although parenthood requires many sacrifices, the love and enjoyment of children of one's own are worth it all.
1	2	3	4	5	If I chose not to have children, I would regret it.
1	2	3	4	5	It is important to me to feel I am (will be) an effective parent.
1	2	3	4	5	The whole idea of having children and raising them is not attractive to me.
1	2	3	4	5	My life would be empty if I never had children.
1	2	3	4	5	It is important to me to have some time for myself and my own development rather than have children and be responsible for their care.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect to devote a significant amount of my time and energy to the rearing of children of my own.
1	2	3	4	5	I expect to be very involved in the day-to-day details of rearing children of my own.
-

- 1 2 3 4 5 Becoming involved in the day-to-day details of raising children involves costs in other areas of my life which I am unwilling to make.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I do not expect to be very involved in childrearing.
- 1 2 3 4 5 My life would seem empty if I never married.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Having a successful marriage is the most important thing in my life.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect marriage to give me more real personal satisfaction than anything else in which I am involved.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Being married to a person I love is more important to me than anything else.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect the major satisfactions in my life to come from my marriage relationship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to commit whatever time is necessary to making my marriage partner feel loved, supported and cared for.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Devoting a significant amount of my time to being with or doing things with a marriage partner is not something I expect to do.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to put a lot of time and effort into building and maintaining a marital relationship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Really involving myself in a marriage relationship involves costs in other areas of my life which I am unwilling to accept.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to work hard to build a good marriage even if it means limiting my opportunities to pursue other personal goals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 It is important to me to have a home of which I can be proud.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Having a comfortable and attractive home is of great importance to me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 To have a well run home is one of my life goals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Having a nice home is something to which I am very committed.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I want a place to live, but I do not really care how it looks.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to leave most of the day-to-day details of running a home to someone else.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to devote the necessary time and attention to having a neat and attractive home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to be very much involved in caring for a home and making it attractive.
- 1 2 3 4 5 I expect to assume the responsibility for seeing that my home is well kept and well run.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Devoting a significant amount of my time to managing and caring for a home is not something I expect to do.

PART B: YOUR FUTURE CAREER AND LIFE DECISIONS

Try and imagine yourself 5 years after graduation. What will your life be like? Please answer the following questions for that time period.

1. I will most likely be working:

- ☐ Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐ I will not be working for pay

2. I would most like to be working:

- ☐ Full Time ☐ Part Time ☐ I will not be working for pay

3. I would most like to be: (choose one)

- ☐ Working for a large organization ☐ Working for a small organization
☐ Running my own company (entrepreneur) ☐ Self-employed & working alone (i.e., consultant, professional)
☐ Not working for pay ☐ Other _____

4. Money will likely be: (choose one)

- ☐ Plentiful ☐ Adequate
☐ In somewhat tight supply ☐ In very tight supply

5. Life will most likely be: (choose one)

- ☐ Hard work, long hours, not much time for friends and family
☐ Regular workload, reasonable hours, normal amount of time for friends and family
☐ Easy work, not long hours, lots of time for friends and family

6. How many hours of work per week would you consider a reasonable work week for you?

_____ hours

7. How many hours per week do you expect to actually work?

_____ hours

8. Suppose that you have 100 waking hours per week. Please indicate how you imagine you will apportion these hours among paid work, household responsibilities and leisure.

Paid Work _____ hours per week

Household
Responsibilities _____ hours per week

Leisure _____ hours per week

Total _____ **100** hours per week

9. Given the way the world is, do you think balancing and managing your career and family will be.....

☐ easy ☐ mostly easy with some difficulties ☐ often difficult ☐ very difficult

IMAGINE YOURSELF IN THE FUTURE IN A MARRIAGE OR MARRIAGE-LIKE RELATIONSHIP. FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS PLEASE INDICATE WHAT YOU WANT TO HAPPEN AS WELL AS WHAT YOU EXPECT WILL HAPPEN.

If you are currently in a marriage or marriage-like relationship, please think about what it will be like in the future. If you never intend to be in this sort of a relationship, please skip to Part C.

Sample question: Will you and your partner always eat breakfast together?

	I want	I expect
Yes, always	☒	☐
No, not always	☐	☒
Never	☐	☐

The choices indicate that you want you and your partner to always eat breakfast together but actually expect that you may not always do so.

10. How will you and your partner share household duties? (choose one from each column)

	I want	I expect
Equally	☐	☐
I will do more	☐	☐
My partner will do more	☐	☐

11. How will you and your partner share child care duties? (choose one from each column) (If you do not intend to have children, skip to question 12)

	I want	I expect
Equally	☐	☐
I will do more	☐	☐
My partner will do more	☐	☐
We will have a care giver (such as a nanny or grandparent	☐	☐

12. Will your partner be working for pay?

	I want	I expect
Yes, full time	☐	☐
Yes, part time	☐	☐
No	☐	☐
Not sure	☐	☐

13. Will your partner have earnings :

	I want	I expect
Greater than yours?	☐	☐
Less than yours?	☐	☐
About the same as yours?	☐	☐
Will not be working for pay	☐	☐

14. Will your partner have a paid job that is:

	I want	I expect
More demanding or prestigious than yours?	☐	☐
Less demanding or prestigious than yours?	☐	☐
About the same as yours?	☐	☐
No paid job?	☐	☐

Appendix E

48

Part D: Imagine yourself considering job offers after graduation. Using both 5-point scales, indicate which benefit options you WANT your future employer to provide and which you EXPECT will be offered. For each benefit described, circle 1 appropriate number from the WANT column and 1 appropriate number from the EXPECT column.

1. Definitely do not want
2. Do not want
3. Neither want nor do not want
4. Want
5. Definitely want

1. Definitely do not expect
2. Do not expect
3. Neither expect nor do not expect
4. Expect
5. Definitely expect

<u>WANT</u>					<u>EXPECT</u>					
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Unpaid Parental Leave - Allows employees to take an <u>unpaid</u> leave for the birth or adoption of a child or to take care of an ill family member; employee returns to the same or equivalent job.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Paid Parental Leave - Full or partial <u>paid</u> leave for the birth or adoption of a child or to take care of an ill family member; employee returns to the same or equivalent job.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Maternity (Disability) Leave - Disability leave for mother relating to the birth of a child; mother returns to the same or equivalent job.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Flexible Scheduling - Permits employees to either vary the specific hours worked or vary arrival and departure times.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Job Sharing - Permits two or more employees to share one full-time position.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Voluntary Reduced Work Time - Permits employees to work fewer hours per week for a defined period of time.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Compressed Work Week - Permits employees to work the same number of hours in a shorter period of time (e.g., four/ten hour days vs. five/eight hour days).
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Work at Home - Permits employees to perform part of their work at home on a regular basis.
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Dependent Care Resource & Referral - Provides information to help employees select dependent care programs and services.

1. Definitely do not want
2. Do not want
3. Neither want nor do not want
4. Want
5. Definitely want

1. Definitely do not expect
2. Do not expect
3. Neither expect nor do not expect
4. Expect
5. Definitely expect

<u>WANT</u>	<u>EXPECT</u>	
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Family Sick Days - Permits employees to stay home to care for sick dependents.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	On Site Seminars - Seminars or group sessions on work and family issues held at the work site during lunch or after work.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Off Site Seminars - Seminars or group sessions on work and family issues held at locations other than work site; employees are reimbursed for the cost.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Child Care Center - On or near-site child care solely or primarily for employees' children.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Child Care Center Consortium - On or near-site child care for employees' children and children of other employers participating in the consortium.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Emergency Child Care Center - Care for employees' children when regular care is not available (e.g., caregiver is ill).
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Sick Child Care - Care for employees' children when they are mildly ill.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Before/After School Child Care or Vacation Program - Care for school-age children at a community center, sports or recreation program or summer camp.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Flexible Spending Account for Dependent Care - An account that accepts employee pre-tax dollars to pay for dependent care expenses.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Child Care Vouchers - Partial subsidy for the cost of child care to help employees purchase such services.
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Full Flexible Benefit or Cafeteria Plan - Offers employees a choice of benefits from a wide variety of options rather than one standard benefit package.

Office of the Academic Vice President • Associate Academic Vice President • Graduate Studies and Research
One Washington Square • San José, California 95192-0025 • 408/924-2480

TO: Peri Fleisher
P.O. Box 922
Capitola, CA 95010

FROM: Serena W. Stanford
AAVP, Graduate Studies & Research

DATE: October 30, 1995

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Family Supportive Workplace: Expected/Wanted Benefit
of the Future Work Participant"

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to any and all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Serena Stanford, Ph.D., immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that each subject needs to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.