

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF WORK/FAMILY BENEFITS:  
AN ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctorate of Philosophy in Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Leslie A. Greising

University of Missouri, St. Louis

December 1, 2004

Michael M. Harris, Ph.D., Chair  
Gary K. Burger, Ph.D.  
Haim Mano, Ph.D.  
Miles L. Patterson, Ph.D.

UMI Number: 3151922

Copyright 2005 by  
Greising, Leslie A.

All rights reserved.

### INFORMATION TO USERS

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 bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send 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.

**UMI**<sup>®</sup>

---

UMI Microform 3151922

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

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

ProQuest Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

As workforce demographics and employee values change, many employees face the challenge of balancing responsibilities of work and family. The stress that results from the imbalance of the competing roles has an impact on employee functioning both at work and home. Organization leaders are beginning to see work/family concerns as legitimate employee issues in which the organization can intervene and assist in order to maximize positive workplace attitudes and behaviors. Employee benefits that address such issues are referred to as work/family benefits. The relatively new field of work and family has gained increased research attention during the last decade, however some fundamental issues remain unresolved.

This study addressed several major weaknesses in the field by evaluating employee perceptions of identified work/family benefits. The first part of this research resulted in a list of benefits that employees believed to address work and family issues as well as appropriate benefit definitions. The work/family benefits and their definitions were then used to evaluate individual differences such as gender, responsibility for dependents and work/family conflict for their effect on employee perceptions of benefit desirability, perceived benefit value, familiarity with benefits and stigma associated with benefit use. Results indicated that female employees, employees with dependent care responsibilities, and employees experiencing work/family conflict desire, value, and feel that work/family benefits are helpful in balancing work and family responsibilities. Overall, employees reported familiarity with work/family benefits and little stigma associated with use of work/family benefits. These perceptions did not differ between different groups of employees. Finally, the assessed dimensionality of employee

perceptions of work/family benefits found that different groups of employees perceived work/family benefits in multiple dimensions. This finding may indicate that employees perceive work/family benefits in a cognitively complex way.

The outcomes of this study have important implications for both research and practice by providing evidence to questions in the field regarding how different employees view and value work/family benefits. The results should be helpful to human resource managers and benefit administrators as they make strategic decisions regarding benefit needs assessment, benefit offering, and communication/marketing of benefit options.



### Acknowledgements

The doctoral process began with the encouragement of Dr. Ken Carson, who believed in me and saw great plans for my future. The dream could not have become a reality without the constant support of my beloved husband, Daryl. He and my family members were there for me throughout the entire process. I am grateful to my daughter, Erin, who for the first four years of her life worked on her “dissertation” along my side. With her I was able to “live” my dissertation as I experienced what it meant to balance my work and family responsibilities. I acknowledge the support of my colleagues and administrators at Bethel College who not only trusted me to teach their students but also provided me with the necessary resources to work on my research. I thank my friends who have been on the journey before me, Diane, Jon, and Kathy; their encouragement kept me going. Patsy Fish made the journey easier with her assistance.

I could not have completed this project without the professional guidance of Dr. Michael Harris who took me under his wing since the beginning of graduate school and held me to the highest standards. I especially thank my committee, Drs. Burger, Mano, and Patterson for sharing their wisdom and providing me precious guidance even though we were separated by hundreds of miles. Finally, I give all glory to God who has blessed me with this opportunity to develop myself and contribute to His world. Without all of these wonderful people, this project would have never happened. I have been truly blessed by each of them and countless others who believed in me and helped me accomplish this task.

Table of Contents

Abstract .....2

Acknowledgements .....4

Table of Contents .....5

List of Tables .....6

Introduction .....9

    Changing Workplace Demographics .....10

    Work/Family Conflict .....11

    Organizational Responses .....16

Literature Review and Hypotheses

    Predictors of Employee Perceptions of Work/Family Benefits .....22

    Perceived Outcomes .....24

        Work/Family Balance .....24

        Perceived Organizational Outcomes .....25

    Perceived Benefit Characteristics .....28

        Desirability .....28

        Stigma .....29

        Familiarity .....30

    Individual Differences .....31

        Gender .....32

        Care-Giving Responsibility .....35

        Work/Family Conflict .....36

Developmental Studies

Developmental Study I:  
 Defining the Work/Family Benefit Construct .....40  
 Method .....40  
 Results .....41

Developmental Study II:  
 Identifying Work/Family Benefits.....42  
 Method.....42  
 Results.....44

Main Study: Employee Perceptions of Work/Family Benefits .....46  
 Method .....46  
 Results .....54  
 Discussion .....66

Follow-Up Study: Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions .....72  
 Method .....77  
 Results .....81  
 Discussion .....91

Summary .....95

References .....97

Tables

1. Developmental Study I (Defining Work/Family Benefits)  
 Demographics .....103

2. Possible Work/Family Benefits and Definitions .....104

3. Developmental Study II (Identifying Work/Family  
 Benefits)Demographics .....105

## WORK/FAMILY BENEFIT PERCEPTIONS 7

4. Scale Means and Reliabilities to Identify Benefits as Work/Family.....	106
5. Final List of Work/Family Benefits and Definitions .....	107
6. Major Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) Demographics ..	108
7. Work/Family Benefits Perceptions and Assessment Items .....	110
8. Work/Family Conflict Scale Items Netermeyer, McMurrian and Boles (1996) .....	111
9. Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables in Major Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) .....	112
10. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Desirability with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) .....	114
11. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Stigma with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) .....	115
12. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Familiarity with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) .....	116
13. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Value with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) .....	117
14. Zero-Order Correlations for Independent and Dependent Variables .....	118
15. Hierarchical Regression Analysis .....	119
16. Hierarchical Regression Analysis .....	120
17. Partial Correlations .....	121
18. Partial Correlations for Gender, Work/Family Conflict and Perceptual Outcomes .....	122
19. Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions) Demographics .....	123
20. Descriptive Statistics for Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions) Measures .....	125

21. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Desirability with Work/Family Benefits in Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions) .....126

22. Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Familiarity with Work/Family Benefits in Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions) .....127

23. Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Gender .....128

24. Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Work/Family Conflict .....129

25. Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by dimension and Care Giving Responsibility .....130

26. Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Desirability .....131

27. Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Familiar with Work/Family Benefits .....132

Appendices

A. Developmental Study I: Survey Instrument .....133

B. Developmental Study II: Survey Instrument .....137

C. Main Study: Survey Instrument .....143

D. Follow Study: Survey Instrument .....149

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF WORK/FAMILY BENEFITS:

AN ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

As the demographics of the workforce continue to change, human resource professionals attempt to attract and retain the most capable employees. In attracting and retaining employees, organizations should consider changes in employees' values and attitudes toward work. For many workers, family values have gained importance to where they make a concerted effort to balance family responsibilities with work expectations. As many employees have taken on important family care giving roles in addition to being employed, they often experience stress in balancing the two roles. To address this shift in workers' attitudes and needs, and to gain the competitive advantage, organizations have developed policies and programs (e.g., flextime, telecommuting, company-sponsored child care) as benefits to assist employees in balancing the demands of work and family. Work/family benefits have become increasingly important with the continuing influx of women in the workforce and the growing proportion of dual earner/dual career families and single parent families (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2001). The prevalence of these family structures creates special needs for the many employees with family responsibilities.

Three critical issues will be presented to discuss the development of this line of research. First, one must understand the impetus of work/family research, the changing demographics of the workforce. Organizations face new employee issues with the increasing number of women in the workforce and the prevalence of non-traditional

family structures. Second, due to the changing demographics, more employees face the challenge of balancing work with family responsibilities. When balance is not achieved, the potential for stress in terms of work/family conflict exists. A number of studies will be reviewed to understand the work/family conflict construct. Third, as organization leaders begin to see that work/family conflict affects work-related outcomes, interventions are created in the form of employee benefits as a means to ameliorate the stress. A number of approaches for addressing this issue will be presented and discussed.

#### Changing Workforce Demographics

The composition of the workforce and the family are rapidly changing. This decade has witnessed the entrance of more women into the workforce as well as the disappearance of the traditional, nuclear family (working father, stay at home mother and children). It is anticipated in 2008 that more than 73 percent of women will be in the civilian workforce, which is an increase from only 30 percent in 1970 (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2000). The labor force participation rate for mothers has increased to where 79 percent of unmarried mothers, 70 percent of married mothers, and 59 percent of unmarried mothers with children under a year old work for pay outside the home (Employment Characteristics of Families, 2000). The percentage of families where the husband is the sole breadwinner is less than 20 percent; whereas families in which both husband and wife are employed is more than 53 percent (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2000). Certainly women's presence in the workforce is increasing.

Many employees face family responsibilities. According to the National Study of the Changing Workforce (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998), 85 percent of employees have immediate, day-to-day family responsibilities off the job. Of those employees, 56

percent are parents with children younger than 18 years who live with them at least part time. Also on the rise is the prevalence of working parents who hold a second job (13% work an average of 13 more hours a week).

With the most prevalent family constellation being the dual-earner family (two employed adults), and with the increasing prevalence of single-parent households (both men and women) (Employment Characteristics of Families, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000; Parasuraman, & Greenhaus, 1997), the roles of family members are changing. No longer does a man solely work to financially support the family nor does a woman stay home to care for dependents and the home; men and women are assuming multiple roles as they both take responsibilities for earning money and caring for their family and home (Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993). The often-conflicting demands for time, attention, and energy can create stress for the individual both at home and at work. As stress affects the worker's health and behavior at work, organizations are beginning to recognize and address the growing needs and desires of employees to balance work with family obligations (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997; Berry & Rao, 1997). Balancing the dual roles of employee and family member has created new challenges for the individual, the family, and the employing organization.

#### Work/Family Conflict

In attracting and retaining employees, employers must consider the changes in employees' values and attitudes toward work. For many workers, family values have gained importance to where there is a concerted effort to balance family responsibilities with work expectations (Losyk, 1997). Performing at a high level at work while managing multiple family responsibilities can place great demands on an individual



(Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1997). When an individual juggles multiple roles such as employee and family member, the potential exists for the roles to conflict. The different responsibilities, expectations, duties, and commitments required by the multiple roles can become difficult to balance, creating pressure and thus resulting in personal stress (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrin, 1996). The difficulty or inability to cope with the competing demands of each role is commonly referred to as work/family conflict while the ability to manage both roles simultaneously is referred to as work/family balance.

The study of balancing work and family has been theoretically grounded in stress and social support literature (Cooke & Rouseau, 1984). These two theoretical approaches provide evidence in understanding how individuals cope with multiple roles such as family caregiver and employee. Stress theory provides insight on the negative outcomes while social support allows an understanding of the positive outcomes of managing multiple roles. Stress literature indicates that interrole conflict rises from tension in one role that leads to stress in another role (Wiley, 1991); for example, work pressure that interferes with family/marital functioning (indicated as  $W \rightarrow F$ ) and family tensions that interfere with work functioning (indicated as  $F \rightarrow W$ ). Role conflict theory states that individuals experience stress when pressures from multiple roles become incompatible (Greenhouse & Betel, 1985; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983). This incompatibility may result from: a) time demands of one role that make it difficult to fulfill the needs of another role (e.g., overtime work precludes parent from attending child's soccer game; the needs of a sick child precludes parent from working overtime), b) strain from participation in one role that affects the functioning in the other role (e.g.,

anxiety from presenting critical sales proposal affects spousal relations; stress of dying parent affects employee's ability to concentrate at work), or c) specific behaviors in one role interfere with the ability to function in the other role (e.g., weekend work eliminates opportunity for family trips; single parent is unable to work night shift). When conflict exists between one's roles in family and work domains, psychological stress and physical strain can result.

In an attempt to integrate the field of work/family conflict, Allen, Herst, Bruck, and Sutton (2000) reviewed multiple studies on the consequences of work/family conflict research. From their review, they found supportive evidence for the "widespread, negative effects ... highlighting the dysfunctional and socially costly effects" of work/family conflict (p. 1). They summarized by stating that work/family conflict results in essentially three different outcomes: work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related. Work-related outcomes include decreased job satisfaction, decreased organization commitment, greater intentions to leave the organization, and lower levels of subjective career success. Nonwork-related outcomes associated with work/family conflict include lower life satisfaction, decreased marital satisfaction/adjustment, and lowered family satisfaction. Stress-related outcomes include increased anxiety, increased life strain, more physical and somatic complaints, depression, substance abuse and job burnout. The human and financial costs of stress to both individuals and their organizations can be great in terms of outcomes.

Evidence from the social support literature, on the other hand, indicates that individuals who have a network of social support are better able to cope with stress of managing multiple roles (Adams, King, & King, 1996; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984). Social

support provided by family members or coworkers can positively influence one's physical and psychological health through emotional (e.g., listening, providing empathy) or instrumental (e.g., problem solving, tangible assistance) support. The dual roles of employee and family member can provide the individual with additional social support sources, which assist the individual in coping with stress.

These two approaches seem contradictory in that on one hand, multiple roles create stress for the individual, yet, provide the individual access to additional social support that is beneficial to coping with stress. Adams and his colleagues (1996) attempted to reconcile this by investigating the role of involvement in one's job and family as a variable important for understanding the relationship between work/family conflict and satisfaction with life and work. They argued that "the level of involvement, or degree of importance, the worker assigns to work and family roles is associated with relationships between work and family" (p. 417) and concluded that the relationship between family and work can be simultaneously characterized by conflict and support.

Spillover theory can help explain the reciprocal relationship between work and family by accounting for both the positive and negative influence of multiple roles (Leiter & Durup, 1996). Spillover refers to the experiences (demands, emotions, responsibilities, resources) of one role "spilling over" or affecting the other role. Spillover can simultaneously involve the experience of both stress and support. When an individual's experienced stress accumulates in one domain and cannot be contained within that domain due to lack of resources, the stress spills over into the other domain and is expressed there as well. For example, spillover from work to family occurs when an employee experiences a difficult, stressful day at the office and comes home to the

family, yelling at one's spouse and children. Stress experienced at the office is then experienced at the home.

Spillover can be experienced the other direction as well when marital conflict and arguments cause an employee to be ill-tempered with coworkers. Spillover generally occurs and stress is experienced when an individual's demands of the roles within either domain exceed the individual's coping mechanisms. Spillover also occurs in the realm of social support. Support from resources in one domain can spill over into the other domain to assist with coping. For example, a very supportive spouse and understanding children will not only provide support when challenges arise within the family but also when challenges are experienced at work. In the same way, if an employee's supervisor is understanding and helpful in the balance of work and family issues at the workplace, not only will stress be reduced at work but at home as well. Support in one domain enhances a person's efficacy across domains (Leiter & Durup, 1996).

The importance of multiple roles to one's self concept was investigated by Sanders, Lengnick-Hall, Lengnick-Hall, and Steele-Clapp (1998). Sanders and her colleagues found that individuals held a preference toward integration of the two domains instead of seeing it as one of trade-offs between the domains of work and family. Their study evaluated the attitudes of new entrants to the workforce (high school graduates) and found that individuals preferred to simultaneously be in the role of employee and family member and sought a balance between the multiple roles. The positive attitudes toward having both a career and a family are characteristic of this more contemporary generation of workers. For this demographic group, one role does not require sacrifice of the other role; rather both contribute to the individual's sense of self.

In sum, employee attitudes of managing multiple roles can be explained by applying two theories. Stress and social support theories focus on the negative and positive effects of one's involvement in work and family (Rothbard, 1999; Frone & Rice, 1987; Adams, King, & King, 1996). Because one's family and work are the two most salient domains in an adult's life and events in one domain have a powerful effect on the other (Frankel, 1998), prudent organizations will evaluate how they can assist employees with effectively balancing the two roles which in turn will positively influence employee attitudes and behaviors.

#### Organizational Responses

Organizations have not always been concerned with employees' family life. In fact, organization leaders have in the past found it difficult to understand home and family issues for several reasons (Hall & Richter, 1988). First, there has been limited precedence and knowledge on which to draw. Work/family programs are in the early stages of development and models of effective responses to such issues have not been fully developed. Second, there has been sensitivity toward employees' privacy. By explicitly discussing family and work issues, management may feel they are intruding on the employees' personal life. Third, there has been a lack of knowledge about home and work dynamics. Understanding the complexity of work and family issues is necessary for managers to facilitate open discussion. Fourth, traditional work attitudes may be threatened by addressing family and work issues. Career advancement has in the past assumed the sacrifice of family life. An employee was expected to pursue a fast-track career path at the expense of the family. In addition, work responsibilities often provided a desired escape from acknowledging and dealing with family needs (e.g., loss of parent,

disabled child, marital conflict). That is, it was easier to ignore the reality of family problems when engrossed in one's work. Finally, family and work issues have primarily been viewed as a woman's problem (e.g., Thompson, Thomas, & Maier, 1992).

Traditionally, childcare and family issues have been seen as the woman's responsibility; that is, in addition to holding a job, the woman was also viewed as primarily responsible for keeping the house, caring for the dependents, and maintaining the family.

These issues and faulty assumptions are beginning to be addressed as family and work integration becomes a prominent social issue (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

This attitude change is occurring for several reasons. First, although women continue to take primary responsibility for the home and family (e.g., Goff, Mount, & Jamison, 1990), men are becoming more actively involved in their children's and families' lives (Berry & Rao, 1997). As men take on more responsibility for household chores, child rearing, and dependent care, they too experience stress from the competing demands of family and work (Berry & Rao, 1997; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Therefore, attitudes are beginning to shift from viewing work and family as a woman's issue to it being an employee issue.

Second, organization leaders are beginning to realize how family issues affect the employee's work (e.g., attitudes, performance) and the organization (e.g., recruitment, retention). As the number of dual-earner and single parent families continues to rise, the importance of addressing such issues increases. The impact of work/family conflict on individual and organizational outcomes has been empirically investigated. Researchers have found evidence of strong correlations between important work outcomes and work/family conflict.

Third, organizations are beginning to discuss family and work issues more openly with employees (Hall & Richter, 1988) and are developing “family friendly” policies and programs to help individuals manage the time pressures of fulfilling family obligations while being employed (Marshall & Barnett, 1994). Such programs include: flexible work schedules, affordable and convenient child and elder care, unpaid or personal leave, maternity and paternity leave, family days at work, family recreation, family-career discussions, and work-at-home arrangements (Marshall & Barnett, 1994; Tetrick, Miles, Marcil, & VanDosen, 1994; Hall & Richter, 1988). By developing work and family programs, organizations are attempting to create a positive, family-friendly work culture for their employees.

With the development of work/family programs and policies, organizations can be categorized in one of two stages (Galinsky, 1991; Galinsky & Stein, 1990). In the first stage, organizations are just beginning to recognize work/family issues as a real organizational concern. This may occur because of a growing awareness of work/family issues due to competition or interested individuals, and the identification of specific individuals’ need such as pregnant employees. Initial program development takes a piece-meal approach in addressing the individuals’ needs. Work/family issues are recognized as a business issue when organizations identify work/family problems that employees are facing and develop work/family initiatives (Galinsky, Hughes, & David, 1990).

More comprehensive and multifaceted programs that assist employees with different concerns (e.g., employee assistance programs, supervisory training, care giving seminars) rather than just care needs (e.g., obtaining child or elder care) characterize the second stage. In this stage of development, work/family issues are seen as an important

business issue and have gained the commitment of top executives. The company's approach to work/family is well integrated and the organization culture is recognized as critical to supporting work/family issues (Galinsky, Hughes, & David, 1990).

Organizations that view work/family benefits as a strategy to gain the competitive advantage incorporate work/family programs into the culture and consider such issues highly important (Goodstein, 1994). This is accomplished by making work/family programs relevant to the organization's mission, gaining the support of top executives, putting someone specifically in charge of the development and maintenance of the programs, and using the benefits as a strategic approach to the recruitment and retention of employees (Galinsky & Stein, 1990).

The approaches organizations use to develop work/family benefit programs can differ. Kossek (2000) has identified three alternative approaches that organizations may take when assisting employees with addressing work/family issues. They have identified these approaches as a) social arbiter, b) whole persons and systems, and c) omniscient organization. In the social arbiter approach, organizations only become involved in an employee's personal life in the case of poor performance. That is, management believes that the employee's personal life is one's own responsibility until it interferes with work responsibilities. When it interferes, the social arbiter organization will assist the employee with separating the competing demands of work and family. Management's approach is hands off until a problem occurs; only then will the employer become involved in the employee's personal life. This reactive approach addresses the interference of employees' family issues by providing relief programs. Sick childcare is



an example of a relief program where the interfering needs of the family are relieved as the employee is assisted with childcare, thus, allowing him/her to focus on work.

The whole persons and systems approach is more sensitive to employees' personal needs and seeks to integrate work/family issues. The focus is on the development of the individual as a valuable commodity to which the organization has a long-term commitment. In this approach, programs are created that treat employees as internal customers by recognizing the importance of the nonwork domain. By addressing the needs of its employees as internal customers, management can enhance the quality of work and influence the culture of the organization to where balancing work and family issues becomes an organizational goal. Such programs under this approach include flexible work time and job sharing.

The final approach, the omniscient organization, takes advantage of technological advances (e.g., computers, cell phones, pagers) that allow for flexible workplace options. Telecommuting is one such program that allows employees to work from home instead of requiring presence at the organization. In addition to workplace flexibility, telecommuting offers scheduling flexibility where the employee can set his/her own work schedule in lieu of set office hours. Telecommuting makes the home the workplace. Other programs developed under this philosophy attempt to make work a home to employees by providing conveniences to them (e.g., dry-cleaning, meals, personal shoppers, internet use) at the organization and allowing family matters to be taken care of during work hours. This flexibility in work place and time and the provision of personal conveniences often leads to a blurring of the boundaries between work and family domains and virtually no separation exists between personal and work life.

Human resource management can be a means of achieving the competitive advantage (Pfeiffer, 1994; Milliken, Martins, & Morgan, 1998) and studies have found that indeed, work/family benefits can clearly impact organizational performance (e.g., Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). The three approaches to work/family benefits and the two stages of development can be critiqued and evaluated as to their strategic nature. The first approach, social arbiter, is clearly reactive in nature. When a problem arises, the organization responds to alleviate the short-term effects. Needs are not anticipated and long-term viability is not considered; therefore, this approach would not be considered strategic. The third approach, omniscient organization, blurs the lines between work and family so that the two domains are no longer separate. Hall and Richter (1988) believe that blurring the lines creates stress for individuals and thus, work/family benefits need to assist the employee with further distinguishing the two roles to alleviate the stress associated with role conflict and overload. Therefore, the omniscient approach would not be strategic in nature as it may accomplish the opposite of the desired outcomes by further blurring the roles, leading to increased conflict and stress. Only the second approach, whole persons and systems, has the possibility of being strategic in nature. This approach considers individuals' needs and plans for the future. Quality of work life is important and the employees are valued as important assets in which the organization is invested.

The two stages of development can also indicate how strategic an organization is in addressing work/family issues. As organizations in the first stage are just beginning to recognize and address employee work/family needs through piece-meal programs and benefits, they have not yet fully realized the strategic potential available. Stage one

organizations would align closely with the social arbiter approach, as they are mainly reactive in nature. As the work/family benefit programs are well-integrated with one another in the whole persons and systems approach, organizations taking this approach would appear to be in the second stage of development. Stage two organizations would be strategic in their approach as they have obtained executive commitment, are highly developed, and have a supportive culture.

In summary, the introduction has provided background information on the development of work/family issues as a legitimate research agenda and as an important contemporary concern to organization leaders as they attempt to address employee issues in the workplace. This study contributes by identifying and defining work/family benefits and by examining individual differences in employee perceptions of such benefits.

#### Predictors of Employee Perceptions of Work/Family Benefits

Theorists and practitioners have recognized the importance of understanding employee attitudes toward human resource management activities and functions (Kinicki & Carson, 1992). A number of studies have empirically evaluated the relationship between employee benefits and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (see Williams & MacDermid, 1994). But even though benefits comprise a large proportion of employees' total compensation, the field of benefits research remains sparse (Williams & MacDermid, 1994; Harris & Fink, 1994). Understanding employee attitudes towards benefits should derive more research attention, as they are a component of organizational effectiveness that needs to be carefully considered when making strategic human resource decisions.

This study simultaneously evaluates employee attitudes and perceptions of multiple work/family benefits. Work/family benefits research has traditionally focused on one or only a few benefits. Because of this, little is known about the underlying structure of employee perceptions of different work/family benefits and how the various perceptions are related. This study evaluates several individual differences (gender, dependent care responsibility, work/family conflict) on perceived benefit characteristics (desirability, familiarity, stigma) and several perceived benefit outcomes (work/family balance, attraction, motivation, retention).

This study addresses four main issues. First, employee perceptions of important individual and work outcomes associated with work/family benefits that have practical as well as theoretical interest and value are evaluated. Specifically, I evaluate employee perceptions of work/family benefits' ability to help a) balance work and family life, b) attract applicants to an organization, c) motivate employees to higher levels of work performance, and d) retain employees. Second, I evaluate employee perceptions of benefit characteristics, including desirability, familiarity, and stigma. Third, I evaluate individual differences and their effect on employee perceptions of the benefits. Specifically I assess whether or not gender, care-giving responsibility, and work/family conflict have any effect on the way employees perceive such benefits. Finally, I evaluate the dimensionality of employee perceptions using multidimensional scaling. That is, I answer in an exploratory manner which employees perceive benefits in a more complex, multidimensional manner.

In the next sections, I will build the rationale for the hypothesized relationships. First, I will discuss appropriate literature and rationale supporting anticipated employee

perceptual outcomes of work/family benefits (ability to balance work and family, ability to attract, retain, and motivate employees). Then I will discuss possible employee perceptions of benefit characteristics (desirability, stigma, familiarity). Finally, I will discuss individual differences including gender, dependent care-giving responsibility, and work/family conflict.

### Perceived Outcomes

Several perceived outcomes associated with work/family benefits are evaluated. An issue of personal employee concern, work/family balance is assessed as well as several human resource/employer concerns including employee attraction, retention, and motivation.

Work/family balance. Organizations have offered work/family benefits as a means to ameliorate the negative effects of stress and to increase work/family balance for employees. Work/family benefits are often referred to as organization interventions because they are designed to intervene and relieve the stress caused by work/family conflict. By providing employees with resources (e.g., tuition assistance, onsite daycare), flexibility (e.g., telecommuting, flextime), or assistance and support with family issues (e.g., employee assistance programs, support groups) individual coping is enhanced.

Evidence from past research indicates that work/family benefits impact individuals' experienced stress. Marshall and Barnett (1994) evaluated several work/family benefits, including parental leave and job flexibility for employees with children. Results indicated a significant relationship between job flexibility and reduced work/family strain. This finding held true for all workers in their sample, regardless of gender and level of parental responsibility. An additional study using a different approach

found a relationship between the use of work/family benefits and reduced work/family strain (Warren & Johnson, 1995). The researchers focused on the number of work/family benefits employees were currently using or had used within the past year. The results indicated that the more work/family benefits employees used (regardless of type), the more adequate they felt in both their work and family roles. These two studies together provide evidence that work/family benefits have the potential to decrease employees' level of experienced stress.

Perceived organizational outcomes. Strategically managed organizations utilize employee benefits as a means to affect the company's functioning through human resource management. Research on work and family has found that when work/family conflict has been reduced, positive attitudes and behaviors such as improved recruitment; increased retention, morale, and commitment; improved job performance and production; as well as lowered training costs, absenteeism, and tardiness result (Raabe, 1990). These outcomes are of interest to human resource managers and have a positive effect on organization's bottom line. This study evaluates employee perceptions of three important organizational concerns employee attraction, motivation, and retention.

As employee benefits comprise a large percentage of payroll costs, it has been important to organization leaders to evaluate the company's benefit of addressing work and family issues. Because work/family benefits are often considered 'fringe' or supplementary, there is a need to justify their costs by identifying outcomes that are of interest to the company. The outcomes research is composed primarily of program evaluation studies and addresses whether or not particular benefits have positive outcomes for the organization.

Studies have provided evidence that when work/family conflict is reduced through work/family benefits, positive work outcomes result. For example, one program evaluation study conducted by Goff, Mount, and Jamison (1990) assessed the outcomes of offering an employer-supported childcare center. This field study was conducted at an on-site childcare center that a company started by converting idle production space. Absenteeism data were collected for employees who used the new facility as well as those who did not. Results indicated when employees had access to quality childcare (regardless of being located on or off site), work/family conflict was reduced and positive work behaviors (reduced absenteeism) resulted. The results of this study indicate that work/family benefits can have a positive effect on employees' behavior by reducing work/family conflict.

The theory of social exchange helps explain the relationship between work/family benefits and positive attitudinal/behavioral outcomes (e.g., Sinclair, Hannigan, & Tetrick, 1995). According to social exchange theory, employees believe that the organization cares about their well-being by providing certain benefits, particularly benefits that are less commonplace and more discretionary. Feeling indebted, employees reciprocate through positive work attitudes and behaviors. With discretionary benefits like work/family benefits, one moves away from an economic exchange where benefits are largely expected as part of the employment relationship (entitlement) to more of a social exchange where employees feel the organization is providing the benefits out of care and concern for their well-being (Sinclair, Hannigan, & Tetrick, 1995).

Social information processing is another theory that provides an explanation for the relationship between work/family benefits and employee attitudes and behaviors.

According to the theory, attitudes are formed from perceptions of people and things. Individuals are influenced by the way they process information that is seen and heard from *others'* experiences. That is, one does not have to personally experience an event to make a judgment about it; instead he/she can evaluate it from others' experiences. Social information processing would indicate that individuals who do not use or even stand to gain from the benefit form opinions about the benefits through perceiving others' direct experiences. Support for this was found in Grover and Crocker's (1995) study. Grover and Crocker evaluated employee attitudes towards organizations and found that employees, regardless of their life situation and the extent to which they could gain from work/family benefits, were more committed to organizations that offered such benefits. They explained that work/family benefits signaled to *all* employees that the organization cared about them. Hence, the organization's positive image, created through work/family benefits, increased employees' organizational commitment, even in those employees who did not need or use such benefits.

In sum, past research has provided evidence that a few specific work/family benefits are related to some positive outcomes for the employee and the organization, including reduced work/family conflict, increased retention, improved morale, job commitment, performance, and production. The relationship between work/family benefits and positive outcomes can be explained by applying theories of social exchange and social information processing. This study specifically evaluates employee perceptions of work/family benefits relationship with an individual outcome (work/family balance) and three organizational outcomes (employee attraction, retention,



motivation). In the next section, I will discuss how employees may perceive benefits in terms of desirability, stigma, and familiarity.

### Perceived Benefit Characteristics

Several perceived benefit characteristics are evaluated regarding employee perceptions of work/family benefits. Work/family benefits are evaluated with regards to employee attitudes of benefit desirability, familiarity with the benefit, and stigma associated with use of benefit.

Desirability. Work/family benefits address the needs of particular groups of individuals. Desirability is determined by the benefit's ability to provide for employees' unfulfilled needs. For a work/family benefit to be desired, a need must first exist. Employees without children, single mothers, and parents of grown children have no need for paid paternal leave and therefore would not desire it as a benefit. In addition, the need not only has to exist, it must also be unfulfilled in order for the benefit to be desired. For example, a father who has satisfactorily arranged quality cost-effective childcare through extended family would not have interest in a company-supported childcare center because his need has been filled. Finally, the benefit must be of satisfactory quality for it to be desired. If the work/family benefit is of poor quality, such as an ineffective employee assistance program, employees may not desire the benefit. The benefit's impact on employee attitudes and behaviors may be minimal, if at all, if the work/family benefit is perceived as undesirable.

The impact of work/family benefit desirability was investigated by Lambert (2000) who found that when benefits assisted employees with their family responsibilities, the employees reciprocated through positive behavior. The more

valuable the benefits were to the employees, the more supportive they viewed their work organization. The desired benefits signaled to the employees that the organization cared about their particular needs so they reciprocated through organizational citizenship behavior.

This study evaluates perceived outcomes associated with employee's value or desirability of work/family benefits.

Hypothesis 1. A positive correlation will exist between employees who desire work/family benefits and favorable ratings of work/family benefits in terms of work and family balance, attraction, motivation, and retention.

Stigma. Even though some employees desire assistance with family issues, they may not utilize the work/family benefits the organization offers because of the stigma attached to its utilization. Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) found that organizations may offer work/family benefits but employees may not utilize them without the existence of a supportive work/family culture. The authors defined work/family culture as the "shared assumptions, beliefs and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees' work and family lives" (p. 394). The role of supervisor appears to be critical in the utilization of work/family benefits and development of work/family culture. In fact Thompson et al (1999) found evidence that "managerial support on a daily basis may be the most critical cultural variable in employees' decisions to use family-friendly benefits and programs" (p. 408). If an employee's supervisor views family issues as detrimental to work, an employee may be reluctant to use work/family benefits the organization offers because of the perceived psychological costs associated with it. In addition, employees may fear

negative career consequences and negative perceptions of their supervisor and coworkers if work/family benefits are utilized in an organization without a supportive work/family culture.

Hypothesis 2. Employees who perceive stigma associated with work/family benefits will less favorably evaluate work/family benefits in terms of desirability, work/family balance, attraction, motivation, and retention.

Familiarity. Familiarity with type and level of benefit coverage provided by the employer varies between employees. In practice, human resource managers have recognized a sometimes wide spread ignorance of employee benefits. In response, human resource management has taken more of a marketing approach, emphasizing the importance of clear, regular communication with employees (Danehower, Celuch, & Lust, 1994). Dreher, Ash, and Bretz (1988) evaluated employee satisfaction with benefit coverage and found significant differences in employee perceptions. Employees who accurately perceived the benefits were better able to assess the quality of the benefit, which affected their level of satisfaction with the benefit.

In addition, it seems plausible that if employees use the benefit, the more familiar they will be with the benefit. Given the empirical evidence, the more the employee knows about the benefit in general, through communication or use, the better equipped he/she should be to evaluate the benefit.

Hypothesis 3a. Employee familiarity with work/family benefits will moderate the relationship between desirability and perceived outcomes (work/family balance, attraction, motivation, retention).

Hypothesis 3b. Employee familiarity with work/family benefits will moderate the relationship between stigma

and perceived outcomes (work/family balance, attraction, motivation, retention).

In sum, several perceived benefit characteristics are considered when assessing employee perceptions of work/family benefits. Desirability, perceived stigma, and familiarity are assessed as employee perceptions of work/family benefits characteristics.

### Individual Differences

Work/family benefits (e.g., tuition assistance, maternity leave) address the needs of particular groups of people (e.g., students, new mothers). For a strategic benefit program to be effective, it should address the specific needs of the organization's employees. Therefore, in developing work/family benefits it is important to understand who would benefit most from such programs so that the plan can be tailored to the employees at the organization rather than indiscriminately offering services that may be unnecessary and costly. Understanding how employee perceptions differ from one another would be beneficial in the development of a strategic benefits plan and provide a more comprehensive theoretical model.

Individual differences in benefits research are critical for evaluation, but are often omitted (Harris & Fink, 1994). Individual differences recognize that work/family benefits differ in salience and importance to different groups of individuals. This study evaluates several individual differences in order to explain variation in employee attitudes and perceptions.

The individual differences evaluated reflect the level of need for work/family benefits. Specifically, individuals who stand to benefit from work/family benefits typically include women, employees with care-giving responsibility, and individuals who

experience work/family conflict. Each of these variables will be reviewed and discussed next.

Gender. Traditionally, care-giving has been the woman's responsibility in the family while earning money has been the man's responsibility. Today, these gender roles are becoming less distinct as more women work to financially support the family and more men take on family care-giving roles (Pleck, 1985). Although the traditional roles (care-giver, wage earner) are more shared between the genders, research has indicated that women continue to take primary responsibility for the family. This remains true even when men and women work comparable number of hours outside the home (Anderson-Kulman & Paludi, 1986).

Understanding the relationship between work and family roles in regards to gender has been an important research topic in the past two decades. Research in the 1980s focused on understanding women's increased role in the workforce and the effect on the individual and family unit. For example, Anderson-Kulman and Paludi (1986) examined how working mothers coped with meeting the demands of multiple roles of mother, wife, and employee. This line of research focused on the changing role of women from being a supportive homemaker to a balanced working wife and mother. Results indicated that strain or work/family conflict was prevalent because of the increasing demands on women in balancing the two roles. In response, organizations developed work/family benefits to assist women in balancing the two often-conflicting roles. In the evaluation of work/family benefits, such as childcare, the focus was on how benefits helped women reduce work/family conflict.

Research in the early 1990s focused on evaluating men's changing roles in regards to work and family due to the increasing number of women working outside of the home (e.g., Higgins & Duxbury, 1992). With the trend toward dual-career families instead of traditional family roles (working father, stay-at-home mother), fathers' roles were changing as well. Research focusing on men has evaluated how these roles have changed with regard to family responsibilities like housework and childcare which have traditionally been the primary and sometimes sole responsibility of the female (Deutsch, Lussier, & Servis, 1993). Research has indicated that men's family roles have changed to where they are more involved in family responsibilities (childcare, housework), however; the change is not proportional to women's involvement in the workforce. That is, when women and men work comparable hours outside the home, men devote proportionally fewer hours on family responsibilities. This is consistent with traditional gender role expectations (Frone & Yardley, 1996).

Research in the later 1990s focused on the couple (husband/wife; father/mother) as the unit of analysis. Assuming the couple functions as a unit, what affects one individual may crossover and affect the other individual. For example, work/family stress experienced by one spouse can create strain for the other (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997). In the same way, resources that support one individual may also provide support for the other. Therefore, if one parent's work provides work/family benefits that are utilized by the family, the positive effects will not only be experienced by that individual but will also crossover to the other parent. Although it makes intuitive sense, empirical evidence for this has not been strong. Limited support was found for crossover effects in

two studies (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997; Hammer, Neal, Brockwood, & Isgrigg, 1999) and differential crossover effects were found for men and women.

In summary, men's involvement with care-giving is increasing and organizations have been challenged to support men in addressing their family issues (Higgins & Duxbury, 1992; Kirchmeyer, 1993). But even though gender roles are evolving, women continue to be the primary caregivers in the family.

Because of women's traditional care-giving role, it is expected that work/family benefits will appeal more to women than men.

Hypothesis 4a. Women will perceive work/family benefits as more helpful in balancing work and family than men.

Hypothesis 4b. Women will perceive work/family benefits as more effective in attracting, motivating, and retaining employees than men.

Hypothesis 4c. Women will report greater desirability of work/family benefits than men.

Hypothesis 4d. Women will be more familiar with work/family benefits than men.

Men involved in family care-giving issues such as securing childcare, leaving work early to care for a sick child, or caring for elderly parents break traditional gender role expectations. When traditional role expectations are broken as evidenced by the use of a work/family benefit, social stigma may be experienced. According to Pleck (1985) there is a "cost" to men using work/family benefits. The cost to men is identified as a) their weakened role and identity as breadwinners, b) others perceiving them as uncommitted to their jobs, or c) appearing unmasculine. Costs reflect the stigma

associated with use of work/family benefits; when costs are high, use is decreased (Pleck, 1993).

Hypothesis 5. Men will report greater stigma with using work/family benefits than women.

Care-giving responsibility. Responsibility for one's family has been an important variable in work/family research and is one measure of the demands of the employee's role as a family member. The measurement of family responsibility in research has taken multiple forms from merely counting the number of children in one's household to reporting the age of the youngest child. The conceptualization and measurement of the family construct has been a messy issue throughout organization research reflecting the complexity and diversity of family structures (Rothausen, 1999). The challenges with this construct and its measurement are discussed in the methodology of this study.

Despite the challenges in conceptualization and operationalization, studies on work/family benefits have found significant effects for family care-giving responsibilities. Generally, studies have found that the greater the responsibility for care-giving, the greater the perceived importance of work/family benefits (e.g., Scandura & Lankau, 1997). The effect of family responsibility differs with regards to the care requirements of employees' dependents. It has been found that the more children an employee has living at home (Maraist, 1999) and the younger the age of the children (Frone & Yardley, 1996), the more care is required, creating a greater potential for work and family to conflict. Parents with younger children devote more time to childcare, domestic work, and errands (Frone & Yardley, 1996). Because of the increased demand on time, there is a greater potential for interference between family responsibilities and daily job activities. When children are present in employees' families, such benefits



become more salient because of the increased need created by work/family conflict

(Maraist, 1999; Scandura & Lankau, 1997).

Hypothesis 6a. Level of dependent care responsibility will be positively correlated with perceived helpfulness of work/family benefits in balancing work and family.

Hypothesis 6b. Level of dependent care responsibility will be positively correlated with perceived effectiveness of work/family benefits in attracting, motivating, and retaining employees.

Hypothesis 6c. Level of dependent care responsibility will be positively correlated with degree of familiarity with work/family benefits.

Hypothesis 6d. Level of dependent care responsibility will be positively correlated with degree of desirability for work/family benefits.

Families are quite diverse. Many times parents do not follow traditional gender roles due to family composition and life circumstances. For instance, a father who is raising his children on his own may be quite maternal in his perceptions and actions because of his children's needs. Another father may take on the primary care-giver role because the parents have chosen to focus on developing and maintaining the mother's career. In both circumstances, traditional gender roles are broken. Therefore, instead of gender influencing employees' perceptions, an employee's level of care-giving responsibility becomes more influential on his/her perceptions.

Hypothesis 6e. When dependent care responsibility is held constant, the effect of gender on perceived outcomes will disappear.

Work/family conflict. As discussed in the literature review, work/family conflict is one reason for organizations to intervene in employees' family lives. Organization leaders hope that through the provision of specific benefits, employees will be equipped

to balance more effectively the multiple responsibilities associated with work and family roles. Since work/family benefits are designed to help alleviate work/family conflict, it is hypothesized that employees who experience such conflict will more positively perceive work/family benefits than those who are not experiencing conflict between work and family.

Hypothesis 7a. Work/family conflict will be positively correlated with employees' perceived helpfulness of work/family benefits in balancing work and family responsibilities.

Hypothesis 7b. Work/family conflict will be positively correlated with employees' perceived effectiveness of work/family benefits in attracting, motivating, and retaining employees.

Hypothesis 7c. Work/family conflict will be positively correlated with employees' degree of familiarity with work/family benefits.

Hypothesis 7d. Work/family conflict will be positively correlated with employees' level of desirability of work/family benefits.

Interest in work and family conflict began as a concern for women's health.

However, as more men take on care-giving roles while continuing employment, work/family conflict has become a man's issue as well. Because both men and women experience work/family conflict (Fallen, 1997), it is anticipated that the effect of gender roles will become meaningless when an employee experiences the stress of work/family conflict. That is, if an employee experiences stress due to the conflicting demands of work and family, their gender will have no effect on how they perceive work/family benefits in terms of benefit outcomes (balance, attraction, retention, motivation). Men

and women experiencing stress due to work and family conflict will equally value and positively perceive work/family benefits.

Hypothesis 7e. When work/family conflict is held constant, the effect of gender differences on perceived outcomes will disappear.

Before the hypotheses could be tested, some developmental work needed to be completed. As the literature lacked an identifiable list of work/family benefits as well as acceptable standardized definitions, these needed to be determined. Therefore, preliminary work was conducted with the main purpose of defining and identifying work/family benefits. The process is presented and discussed next. After the developmental studies are presented, the main study is discussed in detail with regards to each of the specific hypotheses.

#### Developmental Studies:

##### Defining and Identifying Work/Family Benefits

A variety of benefits have been identified in the work/family literature for addressing work/family issues. In this line of research, studies tend to focus on one or few benefits at a time (e.g., flexible work hours, Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Across the studies, there has not been a consistent focus, or grouping of benefits identified as work/family (Warren & Johnson, 1995); instead studies tend to focus on one specific type of benefit (e.g., childcare, flextime). In addition, definitions of such benefits have not been identified. Although proper construct measurement requires precise definition, Harris and Fink (1994) stated that benefit definitions “have been largely neglected” (p.

120). Avoiding the critical step of defining the construct may result in measurement issues of deficiency or contamination (Harris & Fink, 1994). Warren and Johnson (1995) called for research that addresses these deficiencies in the work/family benefit literature. Both theoretically and practically, identification and definition of work/family benefits are needed.

In both practice and research, a variety of benefit programs have been identified as work/family benefits. In practice, organizations have responded to employees' needs to balance work and family through various programs including flextime, dependent care referral services, on-site childcare, paid/unpaid leaves, and family recreation. The programs are diverse and the identification of such programs as work/family benefits meets no specific criteria. Frankel (1998), in fact, stated that detailed operational definitions of work/family benefits (e.g., flextime, flex place, information and referral) are rare in workplace surveys and "practices are based on the flimsiest evidence" (p. 80). Because these programs are in the early stages of development, they do not follow a generally accepted conceptual framework. Not only are definitions lacking in practice, but research efforts also lack appropriate conceptualization of work/family benefits.

Perhaps because of the lack of construct definition, current research continues to focus on individual benefits or miscellaneous benefit groupings, thus continuing the disjointedness of the research. Developmental work was completed to identify and define work/family benefits, resulting in a group of benefits that were utilized to evaluate employee perceptions.

Developmental Study I:

Defining Work/Family Benefits

Method

A list of possible work/family benefits was created utilizing results from a national benefits survey by the Society of Human Resource Management (2001) as compared with a parallel survey conducted locally through the Michiana Society of Human Resource Management (2002). To make the list manageable, the most frequently offered benefits both nationally and locally from the “family friendly” benefits portion were chosen. An additional benefit, employee assistance program, was included as a result of literature review, resulting in a list of 13 benefits. The work/family benefits literature as well as the SHRM surveys do not provide benefit definitions; therefore, definitions were developed for each benefit.

Pilot Studies

Several pilot studies were conducted to evaluate subjects’ comprehension of the definitions. First, human resource managers and benefit administrators were asked to provide verbally their definitions of the 13 benefits. These definitions were compared to my definitions and appropriate modification made. A matching exercise was then created with benefits listed on the left hand column and their scrambled proposed definitions on the right hand column. Next, several employees at various occupational levels (e.g., staff, professional) were asked to talk through the matching exercise as they completed it. Again, areas of confusion were clarified.

### Participants

Adult college students in an organizational management program who were currently or previously employed were recruited to participate in the study. Fifty-nine participants completed the matching exercise. As shown in Table 1, most were female (59%), married (59%), White/Caucasian (67%), and had at least one child (74%). Their ages varied where 41 percent were between the ages of 18 and 34 years, 33 percent were between the ages of 35 and 44 years, and 25 percent were 45 years and older.

---

Insert Table 1.

---

### Procedure

Class instructors were directed on survey administration. During class time, they introduced the study and provided interested students the consent form. After completing the form, participants were provided an instruction sheet, matching exercise, and demographic questions (Appendix A). The matching exercise consisted of 13 benefits and their scrambled definitions. Participants were asked to read the list of benefits that organizations may possibly offer their employees and the list of definitions. They were then instructed to “match the benefit to the definition that best describes it.” They were also provided the opportunity to make comments on the sheet if any definition was unclear or difficult to understand. After completing the matching exercise, they answered six demographic questions. Participation was completely voluntary and no incentive was provided.

### Results

Eighty-two percent of the participants accurately matched all benefits to the proposed definitions. The most frequently confused benefits were compressed work week

(working more than 8 hours a day to allow a whole day or part of a whole day off during the week) and flextime (employee may vary daily work schedule [start & end times, breaks] as long as total hours are worked). The researcher reviewed the definitions with benefit administrators and decided that confusion was due to lack of benefit knowledge rather than unclear definitions. No participant made any comments with regards to definitions being unclear or difficult to understand. Participants were also asked to suggest additional benefits they considered to address work/family issues; none however, were made. Therefore, the definitions were determined to reflect accurately the nature and general understanding of such benefits. The list of possible work/family benefits and their definitions are listed in Table 2.

---

Insert Table 2.

---

#### Developmental Study II:

#### Identifying Work/Family Benefits

#### Method

Additional developmental work was conducted to determine which of the defined benefits employees considered to address work/family issues. Currently in the research literature and human resource management practice, there are a number of benefits that are identified as work/family benefits. The purpose of this developmental study was to identify which benefits employees consider to be work/family benefits. Using the benefits and their definitions from Developmental Study I, participants evaluated which benefits they believed helpful in balancing work responsibilities with family needs. The identified benefits were then used to develop the final survey assessing employee perceptions and attitudes towards such benefits.

### Participants

Participants were recruited from a master's degree graduate program in business administration. Fifty-seven participants completed the survey. One participant reported that she was not currently employed and never had been, so the case was eliminated from the analysis, as she did not meet the criteria for participation. Of the 56 valid surveys, participants were primarily female (71%), White/Caucasian (61%), working full-time (64%), married (59%), and a parent (71%). Ages varied: 52 percent were between the ages of 18 and 34 years, 25 percent were between 35 and 44 years, and 24 percent were 45 years or older. See Table 3 for specific demographic information.

---

Insert Table 3.

---

### Procedure

A survey was constructed using the 13 benefits and definitions from the first developmental study. The survey was pilot tested to ensure comprehension of items and instructions. Packets were made for each participant including an informed consent form, instructions, rating form, and demographic questions (Appendix B). The survey was distributed and collected by professors who were instructed by the researcher on survey administration. Participants completed the surveys during class time.

### Measure

Three items were developed to assess each benefit's ability to address work and family issues. The items were based on literature review and included: a) [benefit] helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities while maintaining family schedule, b) [benefit] helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities, and c) [benefit] helps employees balance the responsibilities of



work with the demands of family and home. For each benefit, participants were asked to respond to each of the three items using a five-point Likert-type scale for which 1 = “not at all” and 5 = “a great extent.”

Scale reliability was evaluated for each benefit. As shown in Table 4, alpha values ranged from .74 to .97, with 12 of the 13 alpha values were in the .80 to .90 range. It was noted that the weakest item was the first, most likely because of the multiple components within the item ([benefit] helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities while maintaining family schedule). Because reliabilities were at an acceptable level, items were averaged for each participant to yield an overall scale score for each evaluated benefit.

---

Insert Table 4.

---

### Results

Scores were averaged across raters. A cut-off score was established a priori. Benefits receiving average scores higher than 3.5 (where 3 was “some” and 4 was “to a good extent”) were retained as work/family benefits and identified as capable of assisting employees with balancing work and family responsibilities. Eight benefits out of 13 met this criteria and were retained for use in the study. These benefits include flextime, telecommuting, childcare referral service, company supported childcare center, subsidized cost of childcare, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, and employee assistance program. The five benefits that did not meet the criteria include compressed work week, job sharing, dependent care flexible spending account, bring child to work in emergency, and adoption assistance.

In summary, the developmental studies provided a concise list of work/family benefits as well as generally accepted definitions, recognized by employees from multiple organizations. The final list of work/family benefits is shown in Table 5 and include flextime, telecommuting, childcare referral service, company supported childcare center, subsidized cost of childcare, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, and employee assistance program.

---

Insert Table 5.

---

Main Study:

Employee Perceptions of Work/Family Benefits

Method

Pilot Study

All data were collected via a written survey. Because several scales had been modified or created for this specific study, the survey's quality in terms of readability, layout, and participants' comprehension of the items were assessed. A pilot study was conducted with several employees representing different types of occupations (professional, administrative support, technical writer). Necessary changes (e.g., placement of scoring guide on top of each page) were made to ensure comprehension.

Participants

For the main study, 245 employed adults (over age 18) participated. Participants were employees of one of five different work organizations in the Midwest (private college [n=195 of 285; return rate of 68%], nonprofit service organization [n=6 of 6; return rate of 100%], staffing agency [n=2 of 5; return rate of 40%], medical office [n=30 of 30; return rate of 100%], production facility [n=12 of 15; return rate of 80%]). The participants were primarily female (60%), White/Caucasian (90%), married (76%), and working in a professional (48%) or administrative support (26%) positions. See Table 6 for specific demographic information.

---

Insert Table 6.

---

### Procedure

In each organization, top management, especially the professional responsible for management of human resources, provided support for conducting the study at his/her worksite. A packet was created for each participant that included the survey, a letter customized to the organization containing consent forms and instructions, and a return envelope. Although the surveys were coded to identify the work organization, all survey responses were anonymous. The surveys were distributed on company premises and most were completed by employees while at work. Participants returned the survey either directly to the researcher with a self-addressed, stamped envelope or to the company representative who then forwarded the surveys to the researcher.

An incentive was provided for participants in two of the organizations. The college was given a lump sum cash donation for employee participation. The medical office was given a shopping mall gift certificate that was awarded to a study participant via a random drawing. Each of these incentives was desired and determined to be appropriate by the organization's management. The other three work organizations did not desire an incentive. At each organization, an employee was designated to be in charge of the distribution and collection of the surveys.

### Survey

The survey included work/family benefits perception questions, family role scales, and demographic measures (Appendix C). The benefits perception questions asked employees to evaluate each of the eight work/family benefits (as identified and defined in the developmental studies) in terms of being able to attract, motivate, and retain employees. In addition, participants evaluated how helpful the benefits are in

balancing work and family, how much stigma is associated with using the benefit, and how much the participant desires the benefits. A final question asked whether or not they believed their current employer offered such benefits. Family role measures included responsibility for dependents and work/family conflict. Employee demographic variables included gender, age, marital status, education, family income, and job classification for self and spouse/significant other. Construct definitions and the items that measured each construct are listed in Table 7.

---

Insert Table 7.

---

### Measures

Dependent care responsibility. Family is an important unit of analysis, especially in work/family research. However, it is a very difficult variable to define and measure as families are becoming more diverse. Household, referred to as one's spouse and number of children living together, is no longer an accurate measure of family. Other frequently used approaches in work/family literature are to identify: a) the number of children, b) ages of one's children, c) age of youngest child, or d) the life cycle stage of the family. These measures also have their limitations.

To address these limitations while acknowledging the importance of this variable, Rothausen (1999) conducted a literature review of family definitions and measures utilized in organizational research. From the review and a survey of family counselors, she identified five critical variables in assessing family in terms of responsibility: number of dependents, the children's ages, the dependent's requirement for supervision, disability, and living arrangement. From this work, Rothausen developed a scale, Responsibility for Dependents, incorporating these variables.

This study used Responsibility for Dependents (RFD) scale with a slight modification to assess the responsibility an individual has for his/her dependents. In the original scale, the number of dependents one has is differently weighted by age (younger children are more heavily weighted), level of care required for disabled child or adult (greater percentage of time required for supervision is more heavily weighted), and living arrangement (living with dependent is more heavily weighted). Responsibility for Dependents score is determined by summing the total number of dependents as weighted by the scale. Higher total scores indicate greater dependent care responsibility.

A critical factor missing in determining an individual's level of responsibility for dependents is the presence or absence of social support. Social support in the form of a spouse or partner provides care-giving assistance and reduces one's responsibility (time, energy, resources) necessary to care for the dependents. Both the presence and the quality of social support need to be considered. For example, a parent with two children under the age of five has a high level of responsibility for the well-being of his/her children according to the scale. This measurement, however, is deficient as consideration needs to be given to the support available and provided by others. Different levels of responsibility occur when a) the caregiver is a single parent without a partner or b) the parent shares responsibility with a spouse/partner. In addition to the presence of social support, the quality of social support also needs to be considered. Is the spouse/partner a stay-at-home parent who provides primary care for the children; or is the spouse/partner one who is physically or emotionally unable to assist with care? Certainly these are very different scenarios that needed to be carefully measured.

The influence of social support on dependent care responsibility was measured by multiplying the weights determined by the RFD scale by the percentage of responsibility the respondent assumes for the dependents' care. That is, the RFD score will be multiplied by 1.0 if the individual is 100 percent responsible for the dependents' care (e.g., a single parent who completely lacks social support). If the individual has a very supportive, active spouse who *equally* shares the responsibility for the dependents' care, the RFD will be multiplied by 0.5, to represent 50 percent responsibility for care. To determine the multiplier, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they are responsible for each dependent's care (0% to 100%). This percentage determines the weight (0 to 1.0) of the RFD value to consider the degree of social support present. In this study, final weighted scores for dependent care responsibility ranged from zero (no responsibility for dependents) to 23.5 (multiple dependents and higher care responsibility) with a mean score of 4.03.

Work/family conflict. Individuals experience work/family conflict when the demands of competing roles (employee and family member) interfere with one another. This interrole conflict exists when roles interfere because of general demands, time, and strain (Netemeyer, McMurrian, & Boles, 1996). Work/family conflict has sometimes been conceptualized as bi-directional. This is evidenced when family role responsibilities interfere with work or work responsibilities interfere with family. Accordingly, conflict may arise in one or both directions. Others have viewed the dichotomy as insignificant, indicating that if work/family conflict exists in either direction, conflict is present. This study conceptualizes work/family conflict as a single construct. That is, if conflict exists in either direction, it is considered to be experienced by the individual.

Work/family conflict was measured by applying two scales developed and validated by Netermeyer, McMurrian, and Boles (1996). Netermeyer et al conceptualized work/family conflict as bi-directional (two distinct constructs) and thus created two scales to measure the conflict in both directions (each scale measures one direction). For the purpose of this study however, the two scales were combined to form an overall measure of work/family conflict. The combined scale contains 10 items, five items measuring each direction. Participants responded to the items with a five-point scale where one represents “strongly disagree” and five represents “strongly agree.” Scale items as developed by Netermeyer et al are presented in Table 8.

---

Insert Table 8.

---

Average coefficient alpha obtained by Netermeyer et al for the scales were .88 and .86. As indicated from the data in Table 9, reliabilities found in this study were .93 and .86, comparable to Netermeyer et al. When the two scales were combined in the current study for a total of 10 items, coefficient alpha was .89. Scores on the work/family conflict scale ranged from one (little/no conflict) to five (much conflict) with a mean score of 2.58, just below midrange.

---

Insert Table 9.

---

Desirability. To measure employees’ desirability of work/family benefits, participants were asked to respond to: “I would use [benefit] if it were made available.” Responses were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree”). Scores ranged from one to five on each benefit with means ranging from 2.78 (childcare referral service) to 4.05 (flexitime). According to the data



listed in Table 9, the most highly desired benefits were flextime ( $M= 4.05$ ), paid leave ( $M= 3.84$ ), telecommuting ( $M =3.48$ ), and employee assistance program ( $M=3.43$ ).

Stigma. Participants were asked to evaluate how co-workers and supervisors perceive employees who use work/family benefits. Stigma, or negative perceptions associated with using the work/family benefits, was measured on a five point Likert-type scale with two items, one measuring stigma from co-workers (co-workers negatively perceived employees who use [benefit]) and the other, stigma from supervisors (supervisors negatively perceive employees who use [benefit]).

The reliability of the two-item scale was assessed for each benefit and varied between .76 for flextime to .96 for employee assistance program and childcare referral service (see Table 9). Six of the eight alphas were in the .90s, indicating that participants believed that co-workers and supervisors similarly perceive employees who use such benefits in terms of stigma. See Table 9 for values.

Because the obtained alphas were at acceptable levels, the two items were combined into a single stigma score by averaging the two values. This score was used in subsequent analyses. Little variation was found in the scores among benefits. According to the data as presented in Table 9, means ranged from 2.32 (childcare referral service) to 2.92 (telecommuting) where two = disagree and three= neutral, indicating that participants in general *disagreed* that co-workers and supervisors negatively perceive employees who use work/family benefits. That is, study participants did not perceive stigma to be highly associated with using work/family benefits.

Familiarity. Participants were asked to indicate how familiar they were with the procedures of work/family benefits. One question was asked for each benefit, "I am

familiar with how [benefit] works” and was rated on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). According to the data in Table 9, little variation was found in the scores among benefits. All mean scores were over the midpoint, ranging from 3.28 (subsidized costs of childcare) to 4.01 (flextime). These scores indicate that participants generally believed they were familiar with such benefits.

Perceived value of work/family benefits. Perceptions of work/family benefit’s ability to attract, motivate, and retain employees were measured. The scale consisted of the following three items as applied to each benefit: 1) I would apply to an organization because [benefit] was offered (measuring attraction), 2) I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if [benefit] were offered (measuring motivation), and 3) I would be less likely to quit a job that allowed [benefit] (measuring retention). Each of the three items, attraction, motivation, and retention were highly correlated with one another (.90, .93, and .92;  $p < .001$ ); therefore, the perceived outcomes were combined into a single scale, perceived value. To assess the quality of the scale, coefficient alpha was calculated for each benefit. Alphas ranged from .88 (flextime) to .96 (company supported childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare). See Table 9 for specifics.

Mean scores were calculated for each benefit’s perceived value and ranged from 2.8 (childcare referral service) to 3.6 (flextime). The most highly valued work/family benefits included flextime, paid leave, and telecommuting. The other five benefits (childcare referral service, company supported childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare, sick/emergency childcare, employee assistance program) clustered around the mean score of 3.0 (neutral).

## Results

### Collapsing Across Benefits

It first needed to be determined whether the eight work/family benefits should be analyzed separately as individual, distinct benefits or collapsed together and analyzed as a group or bundle of benefits. To do so, five reliability coefficients were calculated. Each coefficient alpha measured the correlation between the eight work/family benefits on each of the dependent variables, work/family balance, desirability, stigma, familiarity, and perceived value of work/family benefits. The descriptive statistics of each benefit are presented in Table 9<sup>1</sup>. Each of the benefits was highly correlated with one another in terms of each dependent variable. Because participants similarly perceived the eight benefits with regards to the outcomes, the eight work/family benefits were collapsed into a group of benefits labeled work/family benefits and used in each analysis. In other words, each participant received a score based on his/her average response to the eight work/family benefits for each of the perceptions. For example, with the perception of work/family benefit desirability the participant's scores for desirability on each of the eight benefits were summed and averaged, resulting in one desirability score across all benefits.

---

<sup>1</sup> Factor analysis was conducted on each of the perceptive dependent variables. Benefit familiarity and benefit value both resulted in one factor. Benefit desirability and stigma both resulted in two factors. Loading on the first factor were flextime and telecommuting while childcare referral, company childcare center, subsidized childcare costs, sick childcare, paid family leave and EAP all loaded on the second factor. For both desirability and stigma, the two factors were then correlated with one another. The two factors for desirability correlated significantly at .41 ( $p < .001$ ) and the two factors for stigma correlated significantly at .40 ( $p < .001$ ).

Analysis Strategy

Analysis in the main study took three primary approaches. First, relationships between variables were analyzed using zero-order correlations and evaluated with significance testing. Second, interactions between variables (moderators) were evaluated using hierarchical regression analysis. Significance of the interaction was tested by noting betas and the change in R-square after including the interaction term in the regression equation. Third, the relationship between two variables while controlling for a third (mediation), was evaluated by using partial correlations and testing for significance.

Hypothesis Testing

Correlations between variables were evaluated and presented in Table 14.

---

Insert Table 14.

---

Hypothesis 1: Desirability. The first hypothesis looked at the differences between employees' *desirability* of work/family benefits and perceptions of work/family benefits. Perceptions were evaluated in terms of *work and family balance* and perceived *value* of work/family benefits. To evaluate the relationship, zero order correlations were calculated and presented in Table 14. A correlation value of .91 ( $p < .001$ ) indicated a significant relationship between employees who *desired* work/family benefits and their perception of the benefits' ability to *balance* work and family. A significant relationship ( $r = .89$ ;  $p < .001$ ) was also found between employees' *desirability* and their perceived *value* of work/family benefits. These coefficients provided support for the first hypothesis indicating that employees who desire work/family benefits favorably evaluated the benefits in terms of perceived benefit value and the ability of the benefits to assist the employee with balancing work and family responsibilities. If employees want and need

such benefits, the benefits are perceived as beneficial in terms of reducing work/family conflict and of value.

Hypothesis 2: Stigma. The second hypothesis evaluated the role of perceived stigma in relation to employee perceptions of work/family benefits. Perceived stigma was conceptualized in this study as negative perceptions by co-workers and supervisors. Stigma indicates a belief that others at work see the use of work/family benefits as detrimental to one's career, a way to shirk one's responsibilities, or unfair treatment of those without family responsibilities. This study hypothesized that employees who perceived *stigma* associated with using work/family benefits would less favorably evaluate work/family benefits in terms of work/family *balance* and perceived *value*.

Nonsignificant zero-order correlations were found between stigma and work/family balance ( $r=.07$ ) and benefit value ( $r=.08$ ). This did not provide support for the second hypothesis as no relationship was found to exist between employees' perceived stigma and evaluations of work/family benefits. This means that employees' *value* of work/family benefits and perception of benefit assisting with balancing work and family were not associated with their belief of one's co-workers and supervisors' negative perceptions toward using work/family benefits.

Hypothesis 3: Familiarity. The third set of hypotheses looked at the effect of employee familiarity on perceptions of work/family benefits. First, it was tested whether or not *familiarity* moderated the relationship between benefit *desirability* and work/family *balance* and perceived *value* (attraction, motivation, retention). This relationship was tested utilizing hierarchical regression analysis. The two independent variables (desirability, familiarity) were first entered into the analysis with work/family

balance as the criterion. Adjusted  $R^2$  was .84. At this step, only desirability was significant ( $\beta=.92$ ;  $p<.001$ ), indicating that desirability is the most important factor predicting evaluation of work/family benefits. Then a second level in the hierarchy was created by adding a third variable, an interaction between familiarity and desirability. The nonexistent change in  $R^2$  and the nonsignificant interaction term ( $\beta=.07$ ), indicated that a moderating effect of familiarity was not present in this relationship as expected in hypothesis 3a.

The process was then repeated using work/family benefit value as the criterion. As indicated in Table 15, prior to adding the interaction term (desirability x familiarity) the adjusted  $R^2$  was .80 and only desirability was significant ( $\beta=.90$ ;  $p<.001$ ). After the interaction term was added, no change occurred in  $R^2$ . Additionally, the interaction term was not significant ( $\beta=.13$ ). This evidence indicates that a moderating effect of familiarity was not present.

In both the analyses, multicollinearity between independent variables (desirability, familiarity) was evaluated and not found to be present ( $r=.06$ , *ns*, see Table 14). Hypothesis 3a was not supported, as familiarity did not moderate the relationship between employees' desire of work/family benefits and their perceptions of benefit value and belief in the benefits' ability to help balance work and family issues.

---

Insert Table 15.

---

Next, the influence of familiarity on the relationship between stigma and perceived outcomes was assessed for hypothesis 3b. Specifically, it was evaluated whether or not employee *familiarity* with work/family benefits moderated the relationship between *stigma* and work/family *balance* and perceived *value* of work/family benefits.

That is, will familiarity influence the relationship between stigma and employees perceptions of benefit value?

To evaluate hypothesis 3b, hierarchical regression analysis was used twice again; first, for the outcome of work/family balance and then, for work/family value. Stigma and familiarity were first entered into the analysis and then in the second step, the interaction term (stigma x familiarity) was entered. As shown in Table 16, for the outcome of work/family balance, all three predictors (stigma, familiarity, interaction term) were nonsignificant ( $\beta=.08, .05, .00$ , respectively) and the change in  $R^2$  was zero. For the outcome of value, all three predictors (stigma, familiarity, interaction term) were again nonsignificant ( $\beta=.23, .15, -.16$ , respectively) and the change in  $R^2$  was zero. Therefore, no support was found for hypothesis 3b.

---

Insert Table 16.

---

Interestingly, in post hoc analysis, a significant negative relationship ( $r=-.17; p<.05$ ) was found between perceived stigma and benefit familiarity. This indicates that the more one understands or is familiar with the benefit, the less stigma is associated with the benefit's use. That is, employees who truly understand the benefit are less likely to perceive others as having a negative attitude toward benefit use. On the other hand, employees who are unfamiliar with work/family benefits are more likely to perceive stigma associated with benefit use.

Hypothesis 4: Gender. The fourth hypothesis evaluated the influence of gender on employee perceptions. In the evaluation of gender, four perceptual outcomes (work/family balance, value, desirability, familiarity) were considered. First, the influence of *gender* was evaluated in terms of work/family benefits ability to help

employees *balance* work and family (hypothesis 4a). Specifically, women should perceive work/family benefits as more helpful in balancing work and family than men. This was evaluated using zero-order correlations and indeed a significant relationship was found ( $r=.19$ ;  $p<.01$ ). This supports hypothesis 4a that women find work/family benefits as more helpful than men.

Second, for hypothesis 4b *gender* was evaluated in terms of work/family benefits *value* to employees. Specifically, it was thought that work/family benefits would be perceived as more valuable to female than male employees. Indeed, this was found to be true in this study. Hypothesis 4b was supported with a correlation of  $r=.20$  ( $p<.01$ ). Third, it was believed that women would report greater desirability of work/family benefits than men (hypothesis 4c). Again, this was supported with a correlation of  $r=.18$ , ( $p<.01$ ). In this study, women valued and desired work/family benefits more than men.

Finally, I examined whether women would be more familiar with work/family benefits than men (hypothesis 4d). With a correlation of only .02 (ns), there was no evidence to support this. Overall, participants in this study reported being quite familiar with work/family benefits. On a scale of one (low familiarity) to five (high familiarity), only 13 percent of the respondents indicated that they were not familiar in general with such benefits (mean score less than 3.0).

Hypothesis 5: Gender and Stigma. The fifth hypothesis looked specifically at men's attitudes toward work/family benefits. Thinking that the male "company man" image is still strong today, it was hypothesized that men would perceive greater stigma associated with using work/family benefits than women. Interestingly, hypothesis 5 was



not supported, as the correlation was nonsignificant ( $r=-.06$ ). No relationship between gender and stigma was found.

Post hoc analyses were conducted to further assess stigma and gender. Men with and without children were compared on their attitudes of stigma, but no differences were found with a correlational analysis ( $r= -.17, ns$ ). Also, women with and without children were evaluated in terms of stigma and again no differences emerged when evaluating the correlation ( $r=-.05, ns$ ). In addition, two groups of occupations, professional and office/administrative support, were also compared in terms of stigma perceptions and again, no relationship was found ( $r=-.04, ns$ ).

Descriptive statistics were also evaluated to investigate further this lack of relationship, it was noted that participants in this study saw little stigma associated with work/family benefits in general. On a scale of one (little/no stigma), three (neutral), and five (high stigma), the mean score was 2.6 with a standard deviation of .55, indicating a possible restriction of range.

Hypothesis 6: Dependent Care Responsibility. The sixth hypothesis looked at level of dependent care responsibility in association to various perceptions of work/family benefits. First, it was believed that dependent care responsibility would be positively correlated with perceived helpfulness of work/family benefits in balancing work and family responsibilities (hypothesis 6a). The correlation between *responsibility for dependents* and the belief that benefits would help one *balance* work and family was positive and significant ( $r=.21; p<.01$ ). This indicates that the more responsibilities an employee has for dependents, the more he/she believes the benefits to be helpful in balancing work and family. Therefore, support was found for hypothesis 6a.

Second, it was hypothesized that level of *dependent care responsibility* would be positively correlated with perceived *value* of work/family benefits (hypothesis 6b). That is, the more responsibility one has for care giving, the more he/she would value the benefits. When values on the responsibility for dependents scale were correlated with perceived value of work/family benefits, no significant relationship was found ( $r=.12$ , *ns*). However, when the sample was dichotomized into two groups, one with dependent care responsibilities and the other without such responsibilities, the relationship was significant ( $r=.20$ ;  $p<.01$ ). These results suggest that employees with dependents, regardless of level of care given or required, perceived greater value in work/family benefits than those without dependents.

Thinking that employees with children and other dependents (e.g., aging parent) would be more cognizant of an organization's work/family benefits, it was hypothesized that level of *dependent care* responsibility would be positively correlated with degree of *familiarity* with work/family benefits (hypothesis 6c). Hypothesis 6c however, was not supported ( $r=-.01$ , *ns*) indicating that employees with greater dependent care were not more familiar with work/family benefits than those without. Overall, most participants in this study reported being familiar with such benefits ( $M=3.6$ ,  $SD=.64$ ) indicating a possible restricted range.

Next, it was thought that level of *dependent care responsibility* would be positively correlated with degree of *desirability* for work/family benefits (hypothesis 6d). Indeed, hypothesis 6d was supported ( $r=.15$ ;  $p<.05$ ). This indicates that the greater an employee's family responsibilities, the more work/family benefits are desired.

Finally, I evaluated if the effect of gender on perceived value would disappear when dependent care responsibility was held constant (hypothesis 6e). That is, employees who have greater family responsibilities should value work/family benefits more than employees without family responsibilities regardless of their gender. It would seem that if a man is the primary care giver for his children (e.g., single dad) then he should value work/family benefits just as much as a working mom who provides care for her children. Therefore, gender differences should disappear when level of care is considered. This was statistically evaluated by controlling for the effects of dependent care responsibility on the relationship of gender and value. As indicated in Table 17, partial correlations were calculated and the relationship of gender and perceived value remained significant ( $r=.21$ ;  $p<.01$ ) even when dependent care responsibility was held constant. Therefore, hypothesis 6d was not supported by the data. This means men's and women's perceptions toward work/family benefits do not change when taking into consideration their family responsibilities. Gender differences remain in different family situations. When men and women both have high levels of responsibility for their dependents, women still more favorably evaluate work/family benefits than men. Also, when men and women both have low levels of responsibility for their dependents, women still more favorably evaluate work/family benefits than men.

---

Insert Table 17.

---

Post hoc analyses were conducted to see if all women view the benefits similarly or if women with dependents (children, aged parents) value the benefits more than those without dependents. To do so, a subject's score on responsibility for dependents was transformed from a continuous variable to a dichotomous variable (dependents, no

dependents). A subset of data was created to include only female employees. Then dependent status (dependents vs. no dependents) was correlated with benefit *value* and a significant correlation ( $r=.26; p <.01$ ) was found. Using the same subset of only female employees, it was also found that female employees with dependents *desired* the benefits more ( $r=.23, p<.01$ ). A third post hoc analysis evaluated whether women with dependents felt like the benefits could help them in *balancing* work and family more than women without children. Indeed, this was found ( $r=.28; p<.01$ ).

Hypothesis 7: Work/Family Conflict. The seventh hypothesis looks at the relationship between work/family conflict and employees' perceptions of work/family benefits. Specifically, it was hypothesized that *work/family conflict*, or the presence of stress related to the incompatibility of two simultaneous roles of employee and family member, would be positively correlated with employees' perceived helpfulness of work/family benefits in *balancing* work and family responsibilities (hypothesis 7a). That is, employees who are experiencing stress due to work and family issues should perceive work/family benefits as helpful in balancing the two roles.

This was analyzed by correlating experienced conflict with perceptions of helpfulness of balancing work and family. A correlation of .31 ( $p<.001$ ) was obtained, providing support for hypothesis 7a. The more conflict experienced by the employee, the more helpful the employee perceived the benefits.

It was also evaluated whether employees who experienced *conflict* were more likely to *value* work/family benefits than employees who were not experiencing conflict (hypothesis 7b). Hypothesis 7b was supported with a correlation of .30 ( $p<.001$ ). The

more conflict experienced by employees, the more value they placed on work/family benefits.

It was hypothesized that employees who experienced *work/family conflict* would be more *familiar* with work/family benefits because of their increased needs and perhaps use of such benefits (hypothesis 7c). Because of their need for benefits, employees' awareness should be heightened as they seek resources to assist them with resolving the conflict. Hypothesis 7c was evaluated but support was not found as the correlation between work/family conflict and familiarity was nonsignificant ( $r=.08$ ).

An additional analysis was conducted to evaluate if employees who experience *conflict* are more likely to *desire* work/family benefits (hypothesis 7d). As anticipated, employees with conflict were more likely to desire work/family benefits ( $r=.28$ ;  $p<.001$ ). The more an employee experienced conflict with his/her dual roles of family member and employee, the more work/family benefits were desired. Therefore, hypothesis 7d was supported.

Finally, in terms of work/family conflict, it was anticipated that if *work/family conflict* was controlled, the relationship between *gender* and benefit *value* would disappear (hypothesis 7e). It was thought that employees who experience work/family conflict, regardless of their gender, would more highly value the benefits. This was evaluated by calculating partial correlations. As shown in Table 18, the correlation obtained between gender and value remained significant ( $r=.22$ ;  $p<.01$ ) even when work/family conflict was partialled out. Contrary to what was expected, the significant relationship between gender and benefit value remained, even after work/family conflict

was partialled out. In this study, regardless of experienced conflict, women still perceived work/family benefits as more valuable than men. Hypothesis 7e was not supported.

---

Insert Table 18.

---

In sum, many of the hypotheses were supported through the research however several of them were not. First, it was found that employees who desire work/family benefits perceived the benefits as beneficial in balancing work/family responsibilities and perceived them as valuable. Second, gender differences were found in perceptions. Specifically, it was found that women perceived work/family benefits as more helpful in balancing work and family than men, valued such benefits more than men, and desired them more. Gender differences remained strong in the relationships as work/family conflict and dependent care responsibility did not affect the relationship between gender and perceptions. Third, individuals who have dependent care responsibilities perceived work/family benefits as more helpful in balancing work and family responsibilities, believed such benefits were of value, and desired them more than employees without family responsibility. Fourth, it was found that employees who experienced work/family conflict perceived work/family benefits as helpful in balancing work and family responsibilities, believed them to be of value, and desired them more than employees not experiencing conflict.

The hypotheses that were not supported involved stigma and familiarity. In this study, perceived stigma and familiarity with benefits did not effect employees' perceptions of work/family benefits. It must be noted that with the variables, stigma and familiarity, a possible restriction of range may have masked real relationships. In the study's sample, participants reported perceiving little stigma associated with benefit use

and felt they were generally familiar with such benefits. Other null results involved men not reporting more stigma being associated with work/family benefits than women and women and individuals with care-giving responsibility not being more familiar with work/family benefits than men and those without dependent care responsibility.

### Discussion

The first conclusion that can be drawn, although quite transparent, is that employees who value work/family benefits are those who desire or need such benefits. Employees who desire such benefits are most likely to make work-related decisions because of the presence of work/family benefits. These decisions include applying to a company, increasing his/her productivity, or remaining employed at the organization instead of seeking employment elsewhere. In order to get the best return for work/family benefits, human resource managers should provide work/family benefits to those employees who desire receiving such benefits. This result corresponds with Lambert's (2000) findings that when employees receive a benefit that fulfills a need they have, they reciprocate through positive workplace behaviors.

This study was able to identify which employees desire work/family benefits the most. Specifically, female employees, employees with children, and employees experiencing work/family conflict were identified as groups of individuals who desire such benefits. If an organization's workforce is composed largely of these groups, it would be beneficial to consider offering work/family benefits to meet their needs.

Interestingly, employees in this study did not perceive much stigma (negative perceptions of co-workers and supervisors) associated with use of work/family benefits.

This is contradictory to what previous studies have found. Attitudes of supervisors and employees without families (e.g., family-friendly backlash) sometimes promote a culture that is not family-friendly. Several studies have talked about employees being reluctant to use work/family benefits because of the negative culture at the workplace. Results of this study may indicate a turn of attitudes where family issues are indeed becoming an important organizational issue (Galinsky, 1991). Although previous studies have indicated that work/family initiatives are in their infancy, this study may present evidence of progress with a positive turn in the direction of employees' acceptance and use of work/family benefits.

There seems to be plenty of anecdotal evidence that stigma is strongly associated with the use of work/family benefits. If this is true, there may be several alternative explanations of a null finding with regards to the research method utilized in this study. First, the study was completely survey in nature and attitude-based. If real work behaviors were measured, different results and conclusions may have been made. Second, the results obtained in this study could be sample-specific with limited generalizability to the larger population. Two of the five organizations were private, religious-based organizations and another organization was composed of all female employees. Perhaps these organizations' cultures, management, and co-workers are more tolerant and sensitive to work/family issues than other organizations would typically be. This then indicates a possible statistical problem with range restriction. The limited variability in the stigma construct may hide any real relationship between stigma and perceived outcomes. Third, the scale used to measure stigma was created specifically for this study and consisted of only two items (co-workers negatively perceive employees



who use [benefit]; supervisors negatively perceive employees who use [benefit]). Although the two items were highly correlated, giving acceptable scale reliability, construct validity may have been limited. Future research efforts should focus on more finely developing a scale to measure stigma. For example, additional items could be developed to lengthen the scale such as “employees who use [benefit] do not get promoted as often.” Assessment of scale properties in other work organizations would also be prudent.

Issues also exist with the construct of familiarity. Employees in this study indicated a good deal of familiarity with the benefits. This may be evidence that employees are quite knowledgeable about work/family benefits and procedures or that more organizations are offering such benefits and employees are using them. Additional data were evaluated to further explore familiarity. As part of the survey, participants were asked to indicate which of the eight benefits they believed their employer provided. The manager in charge of benefit administration at the organization was also asked the same question. Participants’ responses were evaluated against benefit administrators for accuracy. The response was considered an accurate perception if the employee said yes and the organization did indeed offer the benefit or the employee said no and the organization did not provide the benefit. However, the response was scored as inaccurate if the participant thought the organization provided the benefit, but did not or if it was thought not to be provided but indeed it was. Participants were also allowed to indicate that they were uncertain whether or not a particular benefit was offered.

Interestingly, only 42 percent of the respondents accurately knew the offering of half or more benefits; 58 percent did not know or were incorrect on at least half of the

benefits evaluated. Although participants in the study indicated they were familiar with work/family benefits, their knowledge on whether or not their organization offered such benefits was lacking. This begs the question whether or not employees really are familiar with such benefits. Some explanations would be that a) employees think they are knowledgeable about benefits when in reality they are not (perceptions not congruent with reality) or b) employees are knowledgeable about benefits, but there is incongruence between “formal” and “informal” benefit policies. Formal and informal policies may differ when the employee handbook policies indicate flextime is not available but individual managers give employees special consideration, allowing them to leave early for appointments.

As with the construct of stigma, range restriction may also have an effect on the outcomes of familiarity. Because most subjects indicated being generally familiar with work/family benefits, variability did not exist within the sample. Thus any true relationship may have been masked. Therefore, the results may be sample-specific and generalizability limited. Special attention should be given in future studies to obtain samples with variability in these constructs. Finally, the measure of familiarity may not have been adequate. Subjects were asked one question “I am familiar with how [benefit] works.” This is a very general question and may be improved by adding additional items or being more specific.

Although it appears that gender has little effect on certain outcomes (both genders view little stigma associated with benefit use, both genders are quite familiar with the benefits), gender effects on other perceptions remain strong. Men and women may see these benefits differently for several reasons. In accordance with gender role theory, these

benefits are more attractive to and have a greater influence on women's perceptions than men. Women see the benefits as more valuable, related to their decisions of where to apply for a job, how much effort they should put into the job, and if they should remain employed at the organization or seek a job elsewhere. Women also view the benefits as being more helpful in balancing the demands of work with family responsibilities. This is probably due to women continuing to be the primary care giver of children and the house, even though both parents/spouses are employed.

There are practical implications of these findings. When human resource/benefit managers evaluate the need for new benefit offerings, the composition of their workforce should be strongly considered. If a significant number of the employees is women and those women have children, it would be beneficial to evaluate employees' need for work/family benefits as the impact could be great. This presents a challenge for human resource managers. Knowing the gender make-up of one's workforce may be simple, but it is not enough. Human resource managers must gain knowledge about an employee's family composition, which can sometimes be difficult. This information will provide a 'snapshot' of the workforce demographics at one point in time. It is important to note that the make-up of the workforce continually changes as employees move in and out of the organization. In addition, employees progress through a 'life cycle' where their needs change as their personal life changes (e.g., marriages, births). Therefore it is important to assess workforce demographics over time, especially when evaluating benefit needs.

Weaknesses of the study must be noted. First, it has already been discussed that the sample may not be representative of the population, although it is questionable how the results may have been affected. Perhaps the organizations surveyed have cultures that

are more acceptable of work/life issues and are more progressive in work/family initiatives. Second, participants were asked “what if” questions. For example, to measure motivation for productivity it was asked, “I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if [benefit] were offered.” This does not measure actual behavior, instead perceptions of intended future behavior. In reality, when time comes to act on perceptions, behavior may differ from what was reported. Finally, this study primarily evaluated relationships between variables. Most of it was correlational in nature and therefore, conclusions of causality cannot be made. Field studies may be helpful in addressing this limitation.

Some interesting conclusions were made based on this data. This opens the door to further exploration of some these issues. Future research may want to utilize interview technique to more fully explore employees’ attitudes and perceptions. It would also be interesting to compare perceptions of work/family benefits in making employment decisions to other job attributes to determine the weight benefit offering has in the decision-making process. For example, do other attributes such as salary, work location, work hours more heavily weigh on an employee’s decision-making process than the offering of work/family benefits? Future studies may be able to look more carefully at this issue by comparing benefit offerings to other attributes of the job or other benefit types.

This study contributes to the industrial/organizational psychology field by providing practical guidelines to benefit administrators. The results of this study should assist human resource managers in making decisions about offering work/family benefits. It provides insight as to which employees would most likely benefit from such offerings.

It also provides evidence as to which groups of employees highly value such benefits, leading to a good return on investment. The study also contributes to the scientific literature. It is the only study that has evaluated multiple work/family benefits simultaneously. In addition, it has provided a better understanding of employees' perceptions of important, contemporary workplace benefits. The study enhances the work/family field by providing a greater understanding of the employees' perceptions of work/family benefits' value.

#### Follow-up Study:

##### Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions

The first study focused on identifying employee perceptions of work/family benefits in terms of benefit characteristics and outcomes. Each of the eight identified work/family benefits was highly correlated with another in terms of the employee perceptions (e.g., desirability, familiarity, ability to reduce work/family conflict). This indicated that participants similarly perceived the eight different benefits in terms of the specified criteria and therefore could be analyzed together as a group of benefits identified as "work/family benefits."

This approach was appropriate for the data and methodology, and it answered each hypothesis. However, further investigation was desired to discover employees' perceptual structure of work/family benefits. Therefore, further investigation utilized a different statistical analysis with a different data collection technique in an attempt to uncover differences between groups of individuals that were not found using the

methodology and analysis of the main study. This would allow perceptual structures to possibly be identified for various groups of employees.

Dimensions of subjects' perceptions could be determined with data from the first study using correlations and cluster analysis. However, both statistical approaches require a dependent variable on which the benefits are judged or perceived (e.g., desirability). Therefore, the basis for perceiving is determined a priori by the researcher and forced onto the participant. This approach is limited because the researcher determines what evaluative criteria are important. A different approach would allow subjects to communicate benefits perceptions without using a dependent variables or predetermined criteria. Instead, a participant would be utilizing the criteria important to him or her. Multidimensional scaling is the statistical approach that allows this analysis to be conducted and was utilized in this follow-up study.

This study asked employees to compare multiple work/family benefits (same eight as identified in the developmental study and used in the main study) to determine the connections among employee attitudes and perceptions. This allowed an underlying structure of employee perceptions and attitudes towards work/family benefits to be identified without forcing them onto the subjects. This approach has not been taken with work/family benefits but has been successful in evaluating employee assistance programs and other alcohol-help sources (Harris & Fennell, 1988).

In an exploratory manner, this study evaluated perceptual profiles for different groups of employees based on gender, level of care giving responsibility, work/family conflict, and desirability of and familiarity with work/family benefits. These individual

differences were evaluated because it was thought that the needs of such groups would influence the way in which individuals perceived such benefits.

Cognitive Complexity. Cognitive complexity has been used to discuss why different dimensional structures emerge for various groups (e.g., Carraher & Buckley, 1996). Cognitive complexity refers to how individuals construe their social world where constructs are used to classify information such as people and objects. The number of constructs, or dimensions, used in evaluation differs between individuals, as some persons are more cognitively complex than others. That is, they are able to perceive objects in more dimensions than others low in complexity. Levels of cognitive complexity vary because of differing levels of intelligence, knowledge, familiarity and interest (Carraher & Buckley, 1996).

Cognitive complexity can be used to understand employee perceptions of work/family benefits as employees usually differ in terms of their knowledge of workplace benefits, familiarity, and interest in such benefits. This is due to many factors such as personal need for particular benefits, prior use of such benefits, as well as marketing and communication efforts of the benefits department. This follow-up study looked particularly at individual differences that may indicate a need for or familiarity with work/family benefits. It was expected that individuals who need work/family benefits and are familiar with such benefits would view them in a more complex manner. That is, employees who have the need for the benefits should more finely distinguish between the benefits and perceive specific unique qualities that others may overlook. For example, an employee without children may broadly group childcare benefits together, while an employee with children and specific childcare issues may carefully distinguish

between such benefits, identifying perhaps subtle differences others do not perceive (e.g., locality of childcare, quality of childcare).

The results would have practical implications by assisting human resource managers and benefits administrators with defining how to communicate different benefit offerings to various groups of employees. That is, if employee groups could be identified as cognitively complex regarding work/family benefits, then detailed information should be provided to communicate various aspects of the benefits. On the other hand, groups of employees with low cognitive complexity would probably desire more general information about the benefits, as details would be overwhelming and unnecessary.

Analysis Strategy. Multidimensional scaling is an appropriate and unique tool for identifying the connections between perceptions as well as the underlying dimensions on which the perceptions fall. By using multidimensional scaling, the dimensionality of employee perceptions can be determined and individual differences evaluated. Multidimensional scaling was used in this study to identify the underlying perceptual dimensions of work/family benefits.

Multidimensional scaling (MDS) analyzes the dimensionality of work/family benefits by graphically mapping the perceptual distances between evaluated objects (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). In this study, participants evaluated benefits as the objects in terms of similarity to one another. With MDS, the researcher does not specify the criteria on which the participants rate their perceptions (objective dimensions), but rather allows the subjects to rate the objects using their own criteria (subjective dimensions). The advantage to this approach is that the experimenter does not force participants to use rating criteria that are deficient or irrelevant to the participants.



The challenge of this approach is that the researcher must identify and interpret the meaning of dimensions after they emerge from the analysis.

Using the participants' similarity ratings, MDS graphically maps the objects onto a 'perceptual' space where objects that are most similar are placed in close proximity and those that are most dissimilar are graphically separated. Multiple dimensions emerge that reflect the subjects' perceived dimensions or criteria used for evaluation. To evaluate individual differences, separate matrices were created for the different groups analyzed. For example, with gender one matrix was created for males while another was created for females. By creating profiles for each gender, gender differences in structures could be analyzed. In their study, Harris and Fennell (1988) found very different perceptual structures for men than women when evaluating alcohol help sources. Other individual differences are analyzed using the same approach, first dichotomizing the groups based on individual differences and then creating a matrix for each group.

MDS results in a number of dimensions that fit the data. This is accomplished by clustering the various work/family benefits onto different dimensions that reflect the various attitudes/perceptions important to the employees making the judgments. The group for which more dimensions emerge will be interpreted as viewing the benefits in a more complex manner.

Hypotheses. The follow-up study examined in an exploratory manner whether certain groups of individuals perceived work/family benefits in a more complex manner. These individual differences were chosen because it was believed that such employees would have greater interest, knowledge, or experience with such work/family benefits

and therefore be more cognitively complex regarding work/family benefits. Specifically the hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1. Female employees perceive work/family benefits in more dimensions than men.

Hypothesis 2. Employees experiencing work/family conflict perceive work/family benefits in more dimensions than employees without work/family conflict.

Hypothesis 3. Employees with care-giving responsibility perceive work/family benefits in more dimensions than employees without such responsibilities.

Hypothesis 4. Employees who desire work/family benefits perceive work/family benefits in more dimensions than employees without need.

Hypothesis 5. Employees who are familiar with work/family benefits perceive work/family benefits in a more dimensions than employees who are not familiar with such benefits.

## Method

### Participants

Seventy-eight subjects participated in the study. All subjects were adult students in either a masters or undergraduate program at a local college and were employed at various work organizations. As indicated in Table 19, most participants were female (57%), married (55%), and White/Caucasian (70%). Their ages varied where 41% were 18 to 34 years old, 30% were 35-44 years old, and 23% were 45 years and older.

---

Insert Table 19.

---

### Procedure

All data were collected via a written survey. A packet was made for each participant and included an informed consent, instructions, and survey. The survey contained the comparisons between all pairs of benefits, perceptual scales, work/family conflict scale, responsibility for dependents measure, and demographic information (Appendix D).

Surveys were distributed and collected by class instructors who were trained on survey administration. Surveys were completed during class time or immediately after class dismissal. No incentives were provided for participation in the study.

### Measures

Benefit comparisons. The eight work/family benefits and their definitions from the previous developmental studies were used to create twenty-eight unique paired benefit comparisons. Each participant was asked to determine the degree of similarity between each of the paired benefits. Benefit pairs were evaluated on degree of similarity with a 10-point Likert-type scale for which zero = “not at all similar” and nine = “extremely similar.” Because MDS analyzes dissimilarity data, individual responses were reverse scored before submitting for analysis.

Gender. Participants indicated their gender which was coded as one (male) and two (female).

Work/family conflict. Work and family conflict was measured using Netermeyer, McMurrian, & Boles (1996) scale. Please see the previous study for an explanation of the scale. As with the previous study, the 10 items were combined to create a scale measuring work/family conflict. Responses were measured on a five-point Likert-type

scale with one “strongly disagree” (no conflict) and five “strongly agree” (high conflict). As shown in Table 20, the alpha obtained for the scale was .88, comparable to Netermeyer et al (.88, .86) and the previous study (.89). Scores on the scale ranged from one (no conflict) to 4.8 (high conflict) with a mean of 2.79 (SD= .83).

To analyze the second hypothesis, two groups needed to be created, those who were experiencing work/family conflict and those who were not. The group that lacked work/family conflict included individuals whose scale score was below 3.0, the midpoint or neutral on the work/family conflict scale. This group consisted of 42 individuals. The second group, those who reported the presence of work/family conflict in their lives, had a scale score of over 3.0, the midpoint or neutral on the work/family conflict scale. This group consisted of 29 individuals. Six individuals scored 3.0 (neutral) on the work/family conflict scale and were not included in the analysis as their scores represented neither the presence nor absence of work/family conflict.

---

Insert Table 20.

---

Dependent care responsibility. As in the previous study, the responsibility for dependents scale was utilized. With this scale, participants were asked to indicate the number of dependents for which they cared, their ages, living arrangement, disability status, and percentage of care for which they were responsible. See previous study for a discussion of the Responsibility For Dependents scale. Thirty-three percent of the participants indicated having no responsibility for dependents, while 67 percent indicated having some responsibility for a family member. As shown in Table 20, scores ranged from zero to 35 with a mean of 6.04 (SD = 7). Participants were dichotomized on the basis of dependent care. The first group included those who reported no responsibility

(n=26) while the second group included those who indicated at least some responsibility (n=52).

Desirability. As in the previous study, participants' need or desire for such benefits was measured with one question, "I would use [benefit] if it were available." Mean scores for each benefit ranged from one "strongly disagree" (not at all desired) to five "strongly agree" (highly desired) except for paid family leave, which ranged from three "neutral" to five "strongly agree" (highly desired). Of the eight benefits the most highly desired benefits were paid family leave (M= 4.6, SD=.59) and flextime (M= 4.5, SD= .83). Please see Table 20. The least desired was childcare referral services (M=3.35, SD= 1.2). Overall, the participants generally perceived the benefits as desirable.

For the purpose of this study, participants needed to be divided into two groups, those that desired work/family benefits and those who did not. This would allow a comparison between perceptual structures of the two groups. Desirability presented a challenge for the analysis. If the eight evaluations were averaged into a scale (M=4.06, SD=.58) the resulting scale had relatively poor internal reliability ( $\alpha=.65$ ). An alternative approach was to sum the evaluative scores. This however, did not provide a clear cut-score to dichotomize the group for comparisons. An appropriate cut score was much easier to identify with the averaged scale score. Participants who had a mean score for desirability of all benefits under 4.0 (indicated they did not agree that they would use the benefit if it were offered) made the group of individuals who did not desire work/family benefits *in general* (n=34). The other group whose mean score was 4.0 or greater was identified as individuals who desired work/family benefits *in general* (n=43). Therefore,

the averaged score was used to determine the cut score for dichotomizing the group and weaknesses of this approach were noted.

Familiarity. As in the previous study, participants' familiarity with each benefit was assessed with one question for each benefit "I am familiar with [benefit]." Responses were based on a 5-point Likert type scale where 1 is "strongly disagree" (not familiar) and 5 is "strongly agree" (very familiar). As shown in Table 22, the participants' familiarity with the benefits were highly correlated where 23 of the 28 correlations were significant at  $p < .05$ . The ratings were therefore combined to create a scale consisting of 8 familiarity ratings. Alpha for the scale was .84. A scale score was calculated for each participant by averaging the eight item scores. Scores ranged from 1.88 to 5.0 with a mean of 3.76 (SD= .81). For the MDS analysis, participants were dichotomized into a "not familiar" group with scores of 3.0 or less (n=19) and a "familiar" group with scores greater than 3.0 (n=58).

---

Insert Table 22.

---

### Results

Each of the hypotheses was evaluated by using non-metric multidimensional scaling, Alscal. Critical to the analysis is determining the number of dimensions that best fit the data. Several criteria were used to make this decision. First, two fit statistics were evaluated, R square and the stress index. Higher values of  $R^2$  and lower values for stress index (ideally less than .20) are desired. From the statistical output, several models are offered as potential solutions (e.g., 1, 2, or 3 dimensions). The researcher must evaluate the  $R^2$  with the stress index for each solution to determine which 'model' best fits the data. Second, a scatter plot of linear fit is created from the data for each potential

solution. For each model, the scatter plot graphs the disparities (perceived differences between variables) against the distances (physical space). The better (tighter) the linear fit, the better the solution. Taken together, the  $R^2$ , stress index, and scatter plot of linear fit provide evidence as to which is the best fitting model.

After the model is chosen as best fitting for the data, the researcher must interpret the dimensions for each group of individuals. In this study, most of the data resulted in a three dimensional solution for each group of individuals evaluated. Analyses were run for one, two, and three dimensions and the resulting R-square and stress indices reported for each solution. A four dimensional solution was unable to be calculated as the number of parameters to be estimated (32) exceeded the number of data values (28). Therefore, to determine if the number of dimensions was appropriately determined, the three dimensional solution values were compared to published studies that used MDS analysis. For example, R-square values determined to be acceptable by Harris and Fennell (1988) was .78, by McKirnan (1980) was .73, and by Ferguson, Kerrin, and Patterson (1997) was .85. All of the R-squares obtained in this study (ranged from .87 to .92) exceeded those values. In addition, stress index values determined to be acceptable by Harris and Fennell (1988) was .16 and Robinson and Bennett (1995) was .27. The stress indices obtained in this study varied from .14 to .16 and were therefore determined to be appropriate.

Although Alscal provides a graph of the data points (each variable's location on each dimension), three dimensions were too difficult to see visually. Therefore, the dimensions were interpreted separately by noting each variable's location on the dimension. Variables located on the end points or extremes of each dimension weighed

the heaviest in identifying the dimension. In some cases individuals who were members of a particular demographic group (e.g., male) were consulted in the interpretation.

Gender. The first hypothesis stated that females would be more cognitively complex in their perceptual structure of work/family benefits. This was evaluated by creating a matrix of averaged comparison scores for male participants and one for female participants. As shown in Table 23, the resulting MDS structure indicated that a three dimensional structure was the best fit for the data for both women and men. Specifically, the female three-dimensional configuration resulted in an R square of .86 and a stress index of .14. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .71 and stress of .27; one dimension .64 and .49 respectively. The male three-dimensional configuration resulted in an R-square of .92 and a stress index of .14. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .78 and stress of .27; one dimension .64 and .44 respectively. Therefore, the first hypothesis was not supported as both men and women viewed work/family benefits in the same number of dimensions.

---

Insert Table 23.

---

Further assessment of the profiles for each gender provides information as to the meaning of each dimension. For both genders, the dimensions appear to be addressing the same issues. The first dimension seems to address the family-relatedness of the benefit. That is, benefits at one extreme (flextime and telecommuting) are appealing to employees regardless of having a family as they address flexibility in work-schedules. Benefits at the other extreme are appealing to employees specifically with family issues (emergency/sick childcare, childcare referral, company childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare, paid family leave, employee assistance programs). The second dimension



for women is similar to the third dimension for men. This dimension seems to address the type of family issue addressed by the benefit. At one end of the benefits address everyday issues or normal functioning (company childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare, childcare referral, telecommuting) while at the other end benefits help employees solve family problems or crisis situations (employee assistance program, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, flextime). Women's third dimension is similar to men's second dimension. This dimension the benefits are perceived in terms of type of assistance provided. Informative resources are provided through employee assistance programs and childcare referral, whereas, tangible concrete help is provided by the other benefits and include: sick childcare, subsidized costs of childcare, company childcare center and paid family leave.

Work/Family Conflict. The second hypothesis stated that employees experiencing work/family conflict would view work/family benefits in more dimensions than those without conflict; that is, their perceptions would be more cognitively complex. For the analysis, participants were divided into two groups, those with work/family conflict and those without. MDS analysis resulted in a three dimensional configuration as the best fitting model for both groups. Specifically, the configuration for subjects with work/family conflict resulted in an R square of .91 and stress index of .14. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .81 and stress of .27; one dimension .80 and .45 respectively. The group without work/family conflict had an R square of .89 and stress index of .16 (see table 24). Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .80 and stress of .26; one dimension .62 and .46 respectively. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported as

individuals with and without work/family conflict viewed work/family benefits in three dimensions.

---

Insert Table 24.

---

The three dimensions appear to be the best fit for the data for both groups of employees, those who experience work/family conflict and those who do not experience work/family conflict. Interpretation of the dimensions also indicates some similarity between the groups, specifically the first and second dimensions. For the first dimension, employees perceived the benefits as appealing to employees with family issues (subsidized costs of childcare, company childcare center, childcare referral, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, and employee assistance program) or appealing to employees without family needs (flextime, telecommuting). With the second dimension both groups of employees viewed the benefits in terms of type of assistance provided. Specifically, employee assistance program and childcare referral are seen as providing assistance or support in working through problems, while other benefits are seen as providing direct intervention or help with family issues (emergency/sick childcare, company supported childcare center, flextime, paid family leave, and telecommuting).

Differences between the groups arose with the third dimension. Those who experience work/family conflict viewed the third dimension in terms of ability to separate work and family. Benefits that allow separation of work and family issues include paid family leave, flextime, and employee assistance program. These benefit programs take family issues out of the workplace to be addressed. Benefits that lean more towards integrating work and family include: company childcare center, subsidized costs of

childcare, telecommuting, sick/emergency childcare, and childcare referral. These are benefits that allow the workplace to intervene into the family realm in order to provide assistance.

The third dimension perceived by employees without work/family conflict is interpreted as the type of issue the benefit addresses. Specifically, daily issues confronted in normal functioning are addressed by childcare referral services, telecommuting, company supported childcare center, and subsidized costs. While problems or crisis situations are addressed by paid family leave, employee assistance programs, emergency/sick childcare, and flextime.

Dependent Care Responsibility. The third hypothesis stated that employees who have dependent care responsibility (e.g., children, aged parents) would more finely distinguish between various work/family benefits than those without family care responsibilities, resulting in a more complex attitudinal structure. To analyze, two matrices were created with averaged evaluation scores, one for participants who had no care giving responsibility and another for participants with some responsibility. Both resulted in a three dimensional configuration as the best fitting. Specifically, the solution for participants with care responsibility resulted in an R-square of .89 and stress index of .15. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .78 and stress of .27; one dimension .64 and .49 respectively. The three dimensional solution for participants without any care responsibility resulted in an R-square of .90 and stress index of .16 (see Table 25). Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .83 and stress of .16; one dimension .63 and .45 respectively. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported as both groups of individuals perceived the benefits in three dimensions.

---

Insert Table 25.

---

The three dimensions were interpreted to determine whether or not employees with care giving responsibilities perceived the benefits differently than those employees without such responsibilities. It appears that the three dimensions are similarly perceived for both employee groups. The first dimension clearly indicates the type of employee the benefit assists (family vs. no family). Those benefits appealing to employees with families include: subsidized costs of childcare, childcare referral, company childcare center, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, and employee assistance program while flextime and telecommuting appeal to employees with or without families as they provide work-scheduling flexibility. The second dimension appears to indicate the type of assistance the benefits provide. Benefits providing informational, indirect support include childcare referral and employee assistance program. The other benefits provide direct, tangible assistance and include: emergency/sick childcare services, subsidized costs of childcare, company supported childcare center, and paid family leave. Flextime and telecommuting did not seem to fit well on this dimension and differed for the two employee groups. Finally the third dimension appeared to address the type of issues the benefits addresses. Childcare referral services, company supported childcare center, telecommuting and subsidized costs of childcare appear to assist the employee with maintaining daily functioning. On the other hand, crisis intervention appears to be the goal of paid family leave, employee assistance programs, flextime, and emergency/sick childcare benefits.

Desirability. The fourth hypothesis stated that employees who desired work/family benefits would perceive such benefits in more dimensions than employees

without need. Again, two matrices of averaged comparison scores were created, one for individuals who desired work/family benefits and a second for those who did not. MDS analysis resulted in a three dimensional solution for both groups. As shown in Table 26, the three-dimension configuration for participants who desired work/family benefits had an R-square of .92 and stress index of .15. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .83 and stress of .24; one dimension .67 and .49 respectively. The group of participants who did not desire work/family benefits had an R-square of .88 and a stress index of .16 for the three-dimensional solution. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .71 and stress of .30; one dimension .54 and .45 respectively. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported as the data indicated a three-dimensional structure for both groups of employees. Employees who desired work/family benefits did not perceive such benefits in a more complex manner.

---

Insert Table 26.

---

Interpretation of the three dimensions indicates that the two groups of employees, those who desire work/family benefits and those who do not, similarly perceive the benefits in types of dimensions as well. The first dimension indicates a difference between benefits that address scheduling issues (telecommuting and flextime) that may be of interest to all employees regardless of family status and benefits that address issues pertinent primarily to employees with families (childcare referral, company childcare center, subsidized cost of childcare, emergency/sick childcare, paid family leave, employee assistance program). The second dimension groups benefits into those that provide direct tangible assistance (emergency/sick childcare, company childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare, paid family leave) and those that are more informative or

supportive in nature (employee assistance program, childcare referral services).

Telecommuting and flextime did not clearly fall into either group but were positioned graphically between the groups, indicating a lack of identification with either grouping.

The third dimension indicates the type of work/family issues the benefit addresses. Either the benefit addresses every day, normal functioning issues (childcare referral services, telecommuting, company supported childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare) or crisis management when something goes wrong or out of the ordinary (paid leave, emergency/sick childcare, employee assistance program, flextime).

Familiarity. The fifth hypothesis expected that employees who were more familiar with work/family benefits to perceive the benefits in a more complex manner than those who were not familiar with the benefits. MDS analysis again resulted in a three dimensional structure. As shown in Table 27, the three-dimensional configuration for employees familiar with work/family benefits was best fitting as it resulted in an R-square of .92 and stress index of .15. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .82 and stress of .27; one dimension .63 and .46 respectively. The three dimensional model was best fitting for the group of employees who were not familiar with such benefits as it resulted in an R-square of .87 and a stress index of .16. Two dimensions resulted in R-square of .72 and stress of .30; one dimension .62 and .52 respectively. Therefore, the fifth and final hypothesis was not supported either as both groups of employees, those familiar and those not familiar with work/family benefits, perceived the benefits in three dimensions. There was not evidence of cognitive complexity present.

---

Insert Table 27.

---

Both groups similarly viewed the benefits in number of dimensions but when the dimensions were interpreted, two of the three differed from one another. The first dimension was similar for both groups, those familiar with and those not familiar with work/family benefits. The first dimension represented a grouping of work/family benefits addressing work-scheduling issues (flextime, telecommuting), which may be of interest to employees without families. The other benefits seem to address specific family issues and include: childcare referral, subsidized costs of childcare, emergency/sick childcare, company supported childcare center, paid family leave and employee assistance program.

The group of participants who were familiar with work/family benefits perceived the benefits in a similar fashion as previous groups. Specifically their second dimension indicated the type of assistance the benefit provided the employee. Benefits that provide information and indirect assistance included: employee assistance program and childcare referral services. Benefits that provide a more direct, tangible type of assistance include emergency/sick childcare, subsidized costs of childcare, company childcare center, and paid family leave. Telecommuting and flextime again appeared graphically in the middle of those two groups, indicating a lack of strong identification with either grouping. The third dimension as with other employee groups represented the type of issue the benefit addressed. Specifically, some benefits assist employees with normal, everyday functioning (childcare referral services, telecommuting, company childcare center, subsidized costs of childcare) while other address more of a response to a crisis situation (paid leave, employee assistance program, flextime, emergency/sick childcare).

Employees who indicated not being familiar with work/family benefits also perceived the benefits in three dimensions. The first dimension was similar to all other

groups and has already been discussed, but the second and third dimensions were impossible to interpret. The second dimension grouped employee assistance program and paid leave together and telecommuting, flextime, emergency/sick childcare, childcare referral, subsidized costs of childcare and company childcare center together. A coherent rationale behind such grouping was difficult to identify. It was the same with the third dimension. The third dimension was anchored by childcare referral and emergency/sick childcare. Grouped together were childcare referral, employee assistance program, telecommuting, subsidized costs of childcare. On the other end of the dimension were emergency/sick childcare, flextime, paid family leave, and company childcare center. Again the groupings were too difficult to interpret.

#### Discussion

It was anticipated that different groups of employees would differently perceive the work/family benefits. I thought that due to certain individual differences, employees would have specific needs or interest in work/family benefits and thus be able to more finely distinguish between the benefits. In terms of cognitive complexity, their increased knowledge, familiarity, and interest in the benefits would cause them to see the benefits in more dimensions than individuals who had no need or interest. Specifically, it was thought that women, employees with dependent care responsibility, employees experiencing stress due to work/family conflict, and employees familiar with such benefits would have greater cognitive complexity with regards to work/family benefits than other employees.



None of the hypotheses was supported as each hypothesized group of employees viewed the benefits in the same number of dimensions. Therefore cognitive complexity was not found to be present as anticipated. However in further analysis, the interpretation of the dimensions that resulted from multidimensional scaling revealed a few differences between the groups. Differences did not exist in the interpretation of the dimensions for gender, care giving responsibility, and desire for work/family benefits. Specifically, men and women, those with and without dependents, and those who desired and did not desire work/family benefits all similarly perceived the benefits in three dimensions. These dimensions are identified as: a) family-relatedness (work-scheduling/family-focused), b) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible), and c) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis management). In addition, employees not experiencing work/family conflict and employees familiar with such benefits also perceived the benefits in the same manner as just stated.

Differences between dimensions were found with employees who experienced stress due to work/family conflict. This group of employees perceived the benefits in the third dimension in terms of their ability to separate work and family domains instead of type of issue addressed by the benefit. The other group of employees that differed in their perceptions included individuals who were unfamiliar with work/family benefits. This group of individuals also perceived the benefits in three dimensions but it was too difficult to interpret the meaning of each dimension. Apparently, employees who do not understand work/family benefits have a difficult time finding commonalities between benefits.

The results of this follow-up study provide empirical evidence for an issue discussed by Kossek (2000). In her writings on work and family, Kossek advocated for the need to evaluate human resource bundles (groups of benefits) rather than individual human resource benefits. She defines bundles as “a group of complementary, highly related and, in some cases, overlapping human resource policies that may help employees manage nonwork role” (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000, p. 1107).

Kossek (2000) suggested that four main types of employer supports exist to assist the employee with work/family issues. These four are closely in line with the three identified by Perry-Smith and Blum (2000). First, flexibility in terms of place and time, allows employees to work at different locations such as home or with different schedules such as different starting and ending times. Such programs include: part time work, emergency leave, compressed workweek, job sharing, work at home and telecommuting. Second, resource and referral programs provide employees with important information. These programs assist employees with identifying community resources such as dependent-care giving options, financial planning and support groups. Third, organizations also provide work/family assistance through financial means by offering benefits such as flexible spending accounts, childcare vouchers, and tuition reimbursement. Finally, through direct support, organizations provide employees assistance through programs such as company-sponsored daycare, employee assistance programs, and lactation programs for nursing mothers.

Kossek’s bundling approach has not been empirically tested. But, the results of this study add some validity to her suggestions. In this follow-up study, the first dimension identified by all groups of employees included benefits that provided

flexibility in work-scheduling (telecommuting, flextime) which is very similar to Kossek's flexibility bundle. Participants in this study similarly perceived benefits that provide supportive, informational help such as employee assistance programs and childcare referral services. This is similar to the second bundle identified by Kossek, resource and referral. The study also identified benefits that provided employees with tangible help (e.g., company childcare center, emergency/sick childcare, subsidized costs of childcare). Again, this was similar to the third bundle that Kossek presented, direct support. Therefore, this study contributes to the scientific literature by providing support for several of the work/family benefit bundles proposed by Kossek.

The study has some interesting practical implications and contributions to make as well. It is interesting to note that employees in general similarly perceive work/family benefits. Employees do not lump all such benefits together but do indeed distinguish between the sometimes-subtle differences. Human resource managers and benefit specialists should understand that employees perceive the benefits in terms of the type of assistance they provide as well as the type of issues they address.

For employees experiencing stress due to work and family conflict, it should be noted that these employees know what benefits will help separate the domains of work and family. According to Hall and Richter (1988) workplace interventions that address work/family conflict must separate the domains rather than further blur the lines. Because separation will relieve the stress, effective benefits for this group would be those that do not allow work to intrude into family issues and vice versa.

Finally, for employees who are not familiar with work/family benefits, clear communication and education need to occur. Although this group did perceive the

benefits in multiple dimensions, the groupings of the benefits were indistinguishable. This is an indication that they lack knowledge and awareness. If some of these employees need work/family benefits, clear benefit communication would be beneficial.

In sum, this follow-up study provides insight as to how employees perceive work/family benefits. Multidimensional scaling allowed participants to use criteria important to them instead of the researcher forcing a predetermined set of factors for evaluation. Understanding employee perceptions will better equip human resource managers and benefit administrators in making strategic decisions regarding benefit offerings and provide a basis for future research.

#### Summary

The four studies conducted in this research project will contribute to the field of industrial/organizational psychology by providing a better understanding of how individuals differ in their perceptions of work/family benefits. Specifically, human resource managers and benefit administrators can tailor an organization's benefit offerings to specific groups of individuals who value and desire such benefits. By customizing benefit packages, organizations can use such offerings as a strategic approach in attracting, motivating, and retaining their employees.

The scientific literature was strengthened by the development of a list of benefits that employees consider to address work/family issues as well as acceptable definitions. The follow-up study provided evidence for perceptual grouping of work/family benefits, closely in line with what Kossek (2000) proposed.

The study attempted to address how employees' perceived stigma of work/family benefit use as well employees' level of familiarity with work/family benefits affected their perceptions of the benefits. Limitations of this study with regards to those variables were discussed. Additional research is necessary to further define and measure these variables.

## References

- Adams, G. A., King, L.A., & King, D.W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, *81*, 411-420.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, *5*, 278-308.
- Anderson-Kulman, R., & Paludi, M.A. (1986). Working mothers and the family context: Predicting positive coping. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *28*, 241-253.
- Berry, J.O., & Rao, J.M. (1997). Balancing employment and fatherhood: A systems perspective. Journal of Family Issues, *18*, 386-402.
- Bond, J.T., Galinsky, E., & Swanberg, J.E. (1998). The 1997 national study of the changing workforce (Families and Work Institutes). New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2001).
- Carraher, S.M., & Buckley, M.R. (1996). Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, *81*, 102-109.
- Cooke, R.A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1984). Stress and strain from family roles and work-role expectations. Journal of Applied Psychology, *69*, 252-260.
- Danehower, C., Celuck, K., & Lust, J.A. (1994). Benefits management and communication: A marketing orientation. Human Resource Management Review, *4*, 177-195.
- Deutsch, F. M., Lussier, J. B., & Servis, L. J. (1993). Husbands at home: Predictors of paternal participation in childcare and housework. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *65*, 1154-1166.
- Dreher, G. F., Ash, R.A., & Bretz, R.D. (1988). Benefit coverage and employee cost: Critical factors in explaining compensation satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, *41*, 237-254.
- Employment Characteristics of Families (2000). <http://stats.bls.gov/newsrels.htm>.
- Fergusson, E., Lerrin, M., & Patterson, F. (1997). The use of multi-dimensional scaling: A cognitive mapping technique in occupational settings. Journal of Managerial Psychology, *12*, 204-214.

Frankel, M. (1998). Creating the family friendly workplace: Barriers and solutions. 79-100. In S. Klarreich (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational health psychology: Programs to make the workplace healthier* (pp. 79-100), Madison, CT: Psychosocial Press/International Universities Press.

Frone, M.R. & Rice, R.W. (1987). Work-family conflict: The effect of job and family involvement. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 8, 45-53.

Frone, M.R., & Yardley, J.K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 69, 351-366.

Galinsky, E. (1991). Stages in the development of work/family programs. In *The corporate reference guide to work-family programs* (pp.9-19). New York: Families and Work Institute.

Galinsky, E., Hughes, D., & David, J. (1990). Trends in corporate family-supportive policies. In *Corporations, businesses, and families* edited by Roma S. Hanks, Marvin B. Sussman. (pp. 75-94). New York: Haworth Press.

Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11, 368-377.

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.

Goodstein, J.D. (1994). Institutional pressures and strategic responsiveness: Employer involvement in work-family issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 350-382.

Greenhouse, J.H., & Beutell, J.J. (1985) Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.

Greenhaus, J.H., & Parasuraman, S. (1997). The integration of work and family life: Barriers and solutions. In Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J.H. (Eds.), *Integrating work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 232-240). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Grover, S. L., & Crocker, K.J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 271-288.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, D.T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? The Academy of Management Executive, 11, 213-223.

Hammer, L.B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T.D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual earner couples: within individual and crossover effects of work and family. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50, 185-203.

Hammer, L. B., Neal, M. B., Brockwood, K. J. Colton, C., & Isgrigg, J. L. The effects of use of family-friendly policies on organizational outcomes. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA, in May, 1999.

Harris, M.M. & Fennel, M.L. (1988). Perceptions of an employee assistance program and employees' willingness to participate. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 24, 423-438.

Harris, M.M., & Fink, L.S. (1994). Employee benefit programs and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes: A preliminary model. Human Resource Management Review, 4, 117-129.

Higgins, C.A., & Duxbury, L.E. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional-career men. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13, 389-411.

Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). Organizational stress. New York: Wiley.

Kinicki, A.J., & Carson, K.P. (1992). Relationship between an organization's actual human resource efforts and employee attitudes. Group & Organization Management, 17, 135-152.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1993). Nonwork-to-work spillover: a more balanced view of the experiences and coping of professional women and men. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 28, 531-552.

Kopelman, R.E., Greenhaus, J.H., & Connolly, T.F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32, 198-215.

Kossek, E.E. (2000). Support of work/life integration: cultural issues facing the employer. In Kossek & Block (Eds.), Managing human resources in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: from core concepts to strategic choice. (pp. 11.3-11.22). Cincinnati, OH: South-western College Publishing.

Lambert, S.J. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 801-815.



Leiter, M.P., & Durup, M.J. (1996). Work, home, and in-between: A longitudinal study of spillover. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32, 29-47.

Losyk, B. (1997). Generation X: What they think & what they plan to do. Public Management, 79, 4-10.

Maraist, C.C. (1999, May). Will the "True" Predictors of Work-Family Conflict Please Stand Up?. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Marshall, N.L., & Barnett, R.C. (1994). Family-friendly workplaces, work-family interface, and worker health. In G.P. Keita & J.J. Hurrell (Eds.), Job stress in a changing workforce: investigating gender, diversity, and family issues (pp. 253-264). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Michiana Society of Human Resource Management (2002). Michiana SHRM 2001 family-friendly benefits survey.

McKirnan, D.J. (1980). Community differences in conceptions of deviant behavior: An exploratory study of attitudes toward alcohol-related help sources. American Journal of Community Psychology, 8, 637-656.

Milliken, F.J., Martins, L.L., & Morgan, H. (1998). Explaining organizational responsiveness to work-family issues: the role of human resource executives as issue interpreters. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 580-592.

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 400-410.

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J.H. (1997). The changing world of work and family. In Parasuraman, & Greenhaus (Eds.), Integrating work and family: challenges and choices for a changing world (p.3-13). Westport, CT: Quorum.

Perry-Smith, J.E., & Blum, T.C. (2000). Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 1107-1117.

Pfeiffer, J. (1994). Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the workforce. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pleck, J.H. (1993). Are "family-supportive" employer policies relevant to men? In Hood, J. C. (Ed.) Men, Work, and Family. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Raabe, P.H. (1990). The organizational effects of workplace family policies. Journal of Family Issues, 11, 477-486.

- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 555.
- Rothausen, T.J. (1999). 'Family' in organizational research: A review and comparison of definitions and measures. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 817-836.
- Rothbard, N.P. (1999, May). Enriching or Depleting? The Dynamics of Engagement in Work and Family. Paper presented at the meeting of the meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Sanders, M.M., Lengnick-Hall, M., Lengnick-Hall, C., & Steele-Clapp, L. (1998). Love and work: Career-family attitudes of new entrants into the labor force. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, 603-619.
- Scandura, T.A. & Lankau, M.J. (1997). Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organization commitment and job satisfaction. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18, 377-391.
- Sinclair, R.R., Hannigan, M.A., & Tetrick, L.E. (1995). Benefit coverage and employee attitudes: A social exchange perspective. In Tetrick, L.E. & Barling, J. (Eds.). Changing employment relations: behavioral and social perspectives. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Society of Human Resource Management. (2001). SHRM 2001 benefits survey.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States (2000). U.S. Census Bureau. The national data book: Population.
- Tetrick, L. E., Miles, R. L., Marcil, L., & Van Dosen, C.H. (1994). Child-care difficulties and the impact on concentration, stress, and productivity among single and nonsingle mothers and fathers. In Keita & Hurrell (Eds.) Job stress in a changing workforce. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L.L., Lyness, K.S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54, 392-415.
- Thompson, C.A., Thomas, C.C., & Maier, M. (1992). Work-family conflict: Reassessing corporate policies and initiatives. pp. 59-84.
- Thompson, P. (1983). Some missing data patterns for multidimensional scaling. Applied Psychological Measurement, 7, 45-55.

Warren, J.A., & Johnson, P.J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. Family Relations, 44, 163-169.

Wiley, M.G. (1991). Gender, work, and stress: The potential impact of role-identity salience and commitment. The Sociological Quarterly, 32, 495-510.

Williams, M.L., & MacDermid, S.M. (1994). Linkages between employee benefits and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes: A research review and agenda. Human Resource Management Review, 4, 131-160.

Table 1.  
Developmental Study I (Defining Work/Family Benefits) Demographics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>	n	%
Gender	1 = Male	24	41
	2 = Female	35	59
		N= 59	
Age	1 = 18-24 years	4	7
	2 = 25-34 years	20	33
	3 = 35-44 years	20	33
	4 = 45-54 years	14	23
	5 = 55 and above	1	2
	N= 59		
Race	1 = African American/Black	14	23
	2 = American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0
	3 = Asian American/Asian	0	0
	4 = Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano	3	5
	5 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0
	6 = White/Caucasian	41	67
	7 = Other	1	2
	N= 59		
Employment Status	1 = Full time	46	75
	2 = Part time	8	13
	3 = Not currently, but past employment	5	8
	4 = Not currently, never been employed	0	0
	N= 59		
Marital Status	1 = Single	12	20
	2 = Married	36	59
	3 = Separated	0	0
	4 = Divorced	8	13
	5 = Widowed	0	0
	7 = Not married, living with partner	2	3
	8 = Other	0	0
		N= 58	
Children	1 = No	14	23
	2 = Yes	45	74
	N= 59		

Table 2.  
Possible Work/Family Benefits and Definitions

<i>Benefit</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Compressed Work Week	Working more than 8 hours a day to allow a whole day or part of a whole day off during the week
Flextime	Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times, breaks) as long as total hours are worked
Job Sharing	Individuals share full time job responsibilities so that each works only part time
Telecommuting	Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office
Dependent Care Flexible Spending Account	Money deducted from paycheck before taxes to save in an account specifically for childcare expenses
Subsidized Cost of Childcare	Financial assistance provided to ease the costs of childcare services
Paid Family Leave	Paid time off for taking care of family
Adoption Assistance	Financial and other support resources provided for the adoption process
Childcare Referral Service	Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources
Bring Child to Work in Emergency	Child is allowed to be at work with the employee when other care arrangements are not available
Company Supported Childcare Center	Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office
Emergency/Sick Child Care	Company services provided for the care of a sick child
Employee Assistance Program	Counseling and support services for family and personal issues

Table 3.  
Developmental Study II (Identifying Work/Family Benefits) Demographics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>	n	%
Gender	1 = Male	16	29
	2 = Female	40	71
		N= 56	
Age	1 = 18-24 years	5	9
	2 = 25-34 years	24	43
	3 = 35-44 years	14	25
	4 = 45-54 years	11	20
	5 = 55 and above	2	4
	N= 56		
Race	1 = African American/Black	16	29
	2 = American Indian/Alaska Native	1	2
	3 = Asian American/Asian	0	0
	4 = Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano	3	5
	5 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0
	6 = White/Caucasian	34	61
	7 = Other	1	2
	N= 55		
Employment Status	1 = Full time	36	64
	2 = Part time	12	21
	3 = Not currently, but past employment	8	14
	4 = Not currently, never been employed	0	0
	N= 56		
Marital Status	1 = Single	17	30
	2 = Married	33	59
	3 = Separated	1	2
	4 = Divorced	3	5
	5 = Widowed	0	0
	6 = Not married, living with partner	1	2
	7 = Other	1	2
	N= 56		
Children	1 = No	16	29
	2 = Yes	40	71
	N= 56		

Table 4.  
Scale Means and Reliabilities to Identify Benefits as Work/Family

<i>Benefit</i>	M	$\alpha$
Compressed Work Week	3.49	.90
Flextime*	3.86	.90
Job Sharing	3.46	.90
Telecommuting*	3.96	.88
Dependent Care Flexible Spending Account	2.95	.91
Subsidized Cost of Childcare*	4.02	.86
Paid Family Leave*	4.32	.74
Adoption Assistance	3.11	.97
Childcare Referral Service*	3.51	.92
Bring Child to Work in Emergency	3.22	.88
Company Supported Childcare Center*	4.44	.93
Emergency/Sick Child Care*	3.95	.93
Employee Assistance Program*	4.06	.85

*\*Indicates benefit meeting criteria of mean greater than 3.5 (set a priori) and thus identified as work/family benefit.*

Table 5.  
Final List of Work/Family Benefits and Definitions

<i>Benefit</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Flextime	Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times, breaks) as long as total hours are worked
Telecommuting	Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office
Childcare Referral Service	Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources
Company Supported Childcare Center	Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office
Subsidized Cost of Childcare	Financial assistance provided to ease the costs of childcare services
Emergency/Sick Child Care	Company services provided for the care of a sick child
Paid Family Leave	Paid time off for taking care of family
Employee Assistance Program	Counseling and support services for family and personal issues



Table 6.  
Major Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions) Demographics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>	n	%
Gender	1 = Male	95	39
	2 = Female	148	60
		N= 243	
Age	1 = 18-24 years	13	5
	2 = 25-34 years	39	16
	3 = 35-44 years	58	24
	4 = 45-54 years	86	35
	5 = 55 and above	46	19
	N= 242		
Race	1 = African American/Black	6	2
	2 = American Indian/Alaska Native	1	0.5
	3 = Asian American/Asian	3	1
	4 = Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano	4	2
	5 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	1
	6 = White/Caucasian	221	90
	7 = Other	3	
	N= 240		
Marital Status	1 = Single	36	15
	2 = Married	187	76
	3 = Separated	2	1
	4 = Divorced	14	6
	5 = Widowed	1	0.5
	6 = Not married, living with partner	2	1
	7 = Other	1	0.5
	N= 243		
Education Level	1 = Some High School	1	0.5
	2 = High School	27	11
	3 = Some College	34	14
	4 = Associates Degree	18	7
	5 = Bachelors Degree	45	18
	6 = Some Graduate School	17	7
	7 = Masters Degree	54	22
	8 = Doctorate or Professional Degree	37	15
	9 = Other	10	4
	N= 243		

WORK/FAMILY BENEFIT PERCEPTIONS 109

Household Income	1 = under 30,000	42	17
	2 = 30,001 – 40,000	42	17
	3 = 40,001 – 50,000	35	14
	4 = 50,001 – 60,000	34	14
	5 = 60,001 – 70,000	20	8
	6 = 70,001 – 80,000	18	7
	7 = 80,001 – 90,000	14	6
	8 = 90,001 and greater	24	10
	N=	229	
Profession	1 = Not currently working for pay	0	0
	2 = Operator, fabricator, laborer	2	1
	3 = Precision, production, craft, repair	4	2
	4 = Service	15	6
	5 = Sales	0	0
	6 = Office & administrative support	60	26
	7 = Technical specialist	6	3
	8 = Professional	112	48
	9 = Managerial	21	9
	10 = Other	15	6
	N=	235	

Table 7.  
Work/Family Benefits Perceptions and Assessment Items

<i>Attitude/Behavioral Outcome Perception</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Item</i>
Work/Family Balance	How helpful the benefit is in balancing work and family life	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if [benefit] were offered.
Benefit Value	How much the employee values the benefit	Combined attract, motivate, retain
Attract	How helpful the benefit is in attracting applicants to an organization	I would apply to an organization because [benefit] was offered.
Motivate	How helpful the benefit is in motivating employees to higher levels of work performance	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if [benefit] were offered.
Retain	How helpful the benefit is in retaining employees	I would be less likely to quit a job that allowed [benefit].
Stigma	How much stigma (cost to career, negative perceptions) is associated with use of this benefit	Combined coworker and supervisor stigma
Coworker Stigma		Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use [benefit].
Supervisor Stigma		Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use [benefit].
Familiarity	How familiar employee is with the benefit	I am familiar with how [benefit] works.
Desirability	How much employees would like to use the benefit	I would use [benefit] if it were made available.

Table 8.  
Work/family Conflict Scale Items  
Netermeyer, McMurrian and Boles (1996)

1. The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.
2. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.
3. Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.
4. My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.
5. Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.
6. The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with my work-related activities.
7. I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.
8. Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.
9. My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.
10. Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.

Table 9.  
Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables in Major Study  
(Work/Family Benefit Perceptions).

<i>Measure</i>	M	SD	Range	$\alpha$
Dependent Care Responsibility	4.03	5.34	0 – 23.5	
Work/Family Conflict	2.58	.73	1 – 5	.89
<b>Benefit Desirability</b>				
Flextime	4.05	.97	1 – 5	
Telecommute	3.48	1.05	1 – 5	
Childcare Referral	2.78	1.04	1 – 5	
Company Childcare Center	2.93	1.10	1 – 5	
Subsidized Childcare costs	3.06	1.15	1 – 5	
Sick Childcare	3.12	1.11	1 – 5	
Paid Leave	3.84	.93	1 – 5	
EAP	3.43	.95	1 – 5	
All benefits	3.33	.73	1 – 5	
<b>Benefit Use Stigma</b>				
Flextime	2.91	.85	1 – 4.5	.76
Telecommute	2.92	.74	1 – 5	.87
Childcare Referral	2.32	.78	1 – 4	.96
Company Childcare Center	2.38	.75	1 – 4	.94
Subsidized Childcare costs	2.59	.77	1 – 5	.91
Sick Childcare	2.54	.79	1 – 5	.93
Paid Leave	2.56	.87	1 – 5	.92
EAP	2.67	.87	1 – 5	.96
All benefits	2.60	.55	1 – 4.19	
<b>Familiarity with Benefit</b>				
Flextime	4.01	.87	1 – 5	
Telecommute	3.78	.89	1 – 5	
Childcare Referral	3.35	.88	1 – 5	
Company Childcare Center	3.51	.85	1 – 5	
Subsidized Childcare costs	3.28	.92	1 – 5	
Sick Childcare	3.36	.93	1 – 5	
Paid Leave	3.67	.92	1 – 5	
EAP	3.71	.94	1 – 5	
All benefits	3.60	.64	1.63 – 5	

WORK/FAMILY BENEFIT PERCEPTIONS 113

Perceived Benefit Value				
Flextime	3.63	1.0	1 – 5	.88
Telecommute	3.26	1.10	1 – 5	.94
Childcare Referral	2.81	1.00	1 – 5	.95
Company Childcare Center	2.98	1.09	1 – 5	.96
Subsidized Childcare costs	2.96	1.10	1 – 5	.96
Sick Childcare	3.04	1.06	1 – 5	.95
Paid Leave	3.48	1.02	1 – 5	.92
EAP	3.12	.99	1 – 5	.94
All Benefits	3.17	.82	1 – 5	.91

Table 10.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Desirability with Work/Family Benefits in  
Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flextime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.46**	.29**	.31**	.33**	.37**	.35**	.32**
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		.23**	.24**	.23**	.28**	.29**	.15*
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.84**	.69**	.66**	.33**	.34**
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.74**	.70**	.36**	.36**
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.72**	.47**	.43**
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.42**	.42**
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.42**
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 11.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Stigma with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flexitime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.56**	.05	.20**	.18**	.25**	.38**	.30**
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		.19**	.31**	.23**	.31**	.41**	.38**
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.70**	.54**	.56**	.30**	.22**
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.59**	.65**	.44**	.35
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.60**	.48**	.38**
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.51**	.42**
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.41**
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .



Table 12.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Familiarity with Work/Family Benefits in  
Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flexitime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.49**	.35**	.36**	.35**	.28**	.34**	.28**
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		.34**	.45**	.41**	.34**	.43**	.43**
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.66**	.60**	.50**	.43**	.46**
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.67**	.59**	.44**	.47**
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.48**	.53**	.48**
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.56**	.47**
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.48**
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 13.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Value with Work/Family Benefits in Main Study (Work/Family Benefit Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flextime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.65**	.42**	.49**	.48**	.48**	.62**	.49**
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		.38**	.40**	.42**	.43**	.53**	.42**
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.81**	.75**	.70**	.50**	.47**
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.83**	.77**	.55**	.49**
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.81**	.58**	.49**
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.59**	.54**
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.66**
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 14.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Independent and Dependent Variables.

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>1</sub>	Y <sub>2</sub>	Y <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>4</sub>	Y <sub>5</sub>
Gender (X <sub>1</sub> )	-.09	-.03	.19**	.18**	-.06	.02	.20**
Dependent Care (X <sub>2</sub> )		.16*	.14*	.15*	-.10	-.01	.12
Work/Family Conflict (X <sub>3</sub> )			.31**	.28**	.00	.08	.30**
Work/Family Balance (Y <sub>1</sub> )				.91**	.07	.05	.94**
Benefit Desirability (Y <sub>2</sub> )					.02	.06	.89**
Benefit Stigma (Y <sub>3</sub> )						-.17*	.08
Benefit Familiarity (Y <sub>4</sub> )							.05
Benefit Value (Y <sub>5</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 15.  
Hypothesis 3: Hierarchical Regression Analysis

	<i>Work/family Balance</i>				<i>Value Work/family Benefits</i>			
	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>		<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>	
	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>
Desirability	.92 <sup>***</sup>	.03	.87 <sup>***</sup>	.15	.90 <sup>***</sup>	.03	.79 <sup>***</sup>	.17
Familiarity	-.00	.04	-.04	.13	.00	.04	-.07	.14
Desirability x Familiarity			.07	.04			.13	.04
R <sup>2</sup> adj	.84		.84		.80		.80	
R <sup>2</sup> change			.00				.00	

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Table 16.  
Hypothesis 3: Hierarchical Regression Analysis

	<i>Work/family Balance</i>				<i>Value Work/family Benefits</i>			
	<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>		<i>Model 1</i>		<i>Model 2</i>	
	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>SE</i>
Stigma	.08	.10	.08	.54	.09	.10	.23	.55
Familiarity	.05	.09	.05	.34	.05	.09	.15	.34
Stigma x Familiarity			-.00	.14			-.16	.14
R <sup>2</sup> adj	-.00		-.01		.00		-.00	
R <sup>2</sup> change			.00				.00	

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

Table 17.  
Hypothesis 6: Partial Correlations

	<u>WF Balance</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Desirability</u>	<u>Familiar</u>	<u>Stigma</u>
Zero Order Gender	.18*	.19**	.17*	.02	-.09
Controlled Dependent Care Gender	.20**	.21**	.19**	.02	-.10

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 18.  
Hypothesis 7: Partial Correlations for Gender, Work/family Conflict and Perceptual Outcomes.

---

	WF Balance	Value	Desirability	Familiarity
Zero Order Gender	.19**	.20**	.18**	.02
Controlled Work/family Conflict	.22**	.22**	.19**	.02

---

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 19.  
Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions) Demographics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>	N	%
Gender	1 = Male	31	37
	2 = Female	47	57
		N= 78	
Age	1 = 18-24 years	5	6
	2 = 25-34 years	29	35
	3 = 35-44 years	25	30
	4 = 45-54 years	14	17
	5 = 55 and above	5	6
	N= 78		
Race	1 = African American/Black	11	13
	2 = American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0
	3 = Asian American/Asian	1	1
	4 = Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano	6	7
	5 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	1
	6 = White/Caucasian	58	70
	7 = Other	1	1
	N= 78		
Marital Status	1 = Single	17	21
	2 = Married	46	55
	3 = Separated	2	2
	4 = Divorced	10	12
	5 = Widowed	1	1
	6 = Not married, living with partner	2	2
	7 = Other	0	0
	N= 78		
Education Level	1 = Some High School	0	0
	2 = High School	0	0
	3 = Some College	26	31
	4 = Associates Degree	29	35
	5 = Bachelors Degree	10	12
	6 = Some Graduate School	9	11
	7 = Masters Degree	2	2
	8 = Doctorate or Professional Degree	1	1
	9 = Other	0	0
	N= 77		



WORK/FAMILY BENEFIT PERCEPTIONS 124

Profession	1 = Not currently working for pay	8	9
	2 = Operator, fabricator, laborer	3	4
	3 = Precision, production, craft, repair	1	1
	4 = Service	5	6
	5 = Sales	3	4
	6 = Office & administrative support	13	16
	7 = Technical specialist	6	7
	8 = Professional	15	18
	9 = Managerial	14	17
	10 = Other	8	10
		N= 76	

Table 20.  
Descriptive Statistics for Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions)  
Measures

<i>Measure</i>	M	SD	Range	$\alpha$
Dependent Care Responsibility	6.04	7	0-35	
Work/Family Conflict	2.79	.83	1 – 4.8	.88
<b>Benefit Desirability</b>				
Flextime	4.53	.83	1 – 5	
Telecommute	4.00	1.23	1 – 5	
Childcare Referral	3.35	1.22	1 – 5	
Company Childcare Center	3.84	1.13	1 – 5	
Subsidized Childcare costs	3.96	1.13	1 – 5	
Sick Childcare	4.05	1.18	1 – 5	
Paid Leave	4.59	.59	3 – 5	
EAP	4.12	1.02	1 – 5	
All benefits	4.06	.58	2.63 – 5	.66
<b>Familiarity with Benefit</b>				
Flextime	4.33	.98	2 – 5	
Telecommute	3.92	1.26	1 – 5	
Childcare Referral	3.54	1.14	1 – 5	
Company Childcare Center	3.47	1.27	1 – 5	
Subsidized Childcare costs	3.58	1.19	1 – 5	
Sick Childcare	3.41	1.27	1 – 5	
Paid Leave	3.97	1.14	1 – 5	
EAP	3.95	1.10	1 – 5	
All benefits	3.76	.81	1.88 – 5	.88

Table 21.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Desirability with Work/Family Benefits in  
Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flextime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.27*	.03	.17	-.06	-.04	.29*	.02
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		-.10	-.09	-.01	.06	.14	.27*
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.67**	.53**	.38**	.00	.16
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.67*	.50**	.12	.14
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.52**	.13	.20
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.11	.11
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.25*
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 22.  
Zero-Order Correlations for Perceptions of Familiarity with Work/Family Benefits in  
Follow-Up Study (Dimensionality of Employee Perceptions)

	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>
Flextime (X <sub>1</sub> )	.41**	.25*	.25*	.24*	.20	.15	.20
Telecommuting (X <sub>2</sub> )		.28*	.37**	.22	.27*	.41**	.39**
Childcare Referral (X <sub>3</sub> )			.57**	.73**	.61**	.26*	.20
Childcare Center (X <sub>4</sub> )				.72**	.72**	.41**	.42**
Subsidized Childcare Cost (X <sub>5</sub> )					.77**	.40**	.31**
Sick Childcare (X <sub>6</sub> )						.49**	.24*
Paid Leave (X <sub>7</sub> )							.54**
EAP (X <sub>8</sub> )							

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 23.  
Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Gender.

Work/Family Benefit	<i>Dimensions</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Female<sup>a</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.14	-.20	.64
Telecommuting	2.07	.16	-.89
Childcare Referral	-.83	.75	-1.39
Company Childcare Center	-.78	1.15	.36
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-.89	.97	.51
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.93	-.63	.08
Paid Family Leave	-.15	-.61	1.30
Employee Assistance Program	-.63	-1.58	-.60
R Square	.86		
Stress Index	.14		
<i>Male<sup>b</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.15	.18	.59
Telecommuting	2.05	-.01	-.96
Childcare Referral	-1.05	1.02	-1.09
Company Childcare Center	-.87	-.71	-.56
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.06	-.77	-.48
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.68	-.80	.64
Paid Family Leave	.02	-.64	1.10
Employee Assistance Program	-.56	1.73	.77
R Square	.92		
Stress Index	.14		

<sup>a</sup> The attitude clusters for female employees are the following: (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis), (3) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible)

<sup>b</sup> The attitude clusters for male employees are the following (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible), (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

Table 24.  
Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Work/Family Conflict.

Work/Family Benefit	<i>Dimensions</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Some Work/Family Conflict<sup>a</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.17	-.59	.78
Telecommuting	2.20	.73	-.60
Childcare Referral	-.82	1.49	-.19
Company Childcare Center	-.65	-.29	-.93
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-.95	-.29	-.78
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.80	-.83	-.44
Paid Family Leave	-.35	-1.07	.79
Employee Assistance Program	-.81	.84	1.37
R Square	.91		
Stress Index	.14		
<i>No Work/Family Conflict<sup>b</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.01	-.48	-.21
Telecommuting	1.94	-.04	.94
Childcare Referral	-.98	.80	1.32
Company Childcare Center	-1.10	-.72	.45
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.25	-.49	.16
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.79	-.76	-.66
Paid Family Leave	.08	-.30	-1.33
Employee Assistance Program	.10	1.99	-.67
R Square	.89		
Stress Index	.16		

<sup>a</sup> The attitude clusters for employees experiencing work/family conflict are the following: (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible) (3) separation of work and family domains.

<sup>b</sup> The attitude clusters for employees without work/family conflict are the following (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible), (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

Table 25.  
Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Care Giving Responsibility.

Work/Family Benefit	<i>Dimensions</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Some Care Giving Responsibility<sup>a</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.15	-.49	.35
Telecommuting	2.07	.54	-.64
Childcare Referral	-.82	1.39	-.86
Company Childcare Center	-.84	-.62	-.83
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.07	-.64	-.57
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.89	-.90	.11
Paid Family Leave	-.07	-.59	1.26
Employee Assistance Program	-.53	1.33	1.19
	R Square	.89	
	Stress Index	.15	
<i>No Care Giving Responsibility<sup>b</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.11	-.11	-.57
Telecommuting	1.99	.53	.91
Childcare Referral	-1.16	-.35	1.20
Company Childcare Center	-1.00	.80	.35
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.05	.63	.36
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.58	.53	-.85
Paid Family Leave	-.24	.13	-1.35
Employee Assistance Program	-.09	-2.14	-.05
	R Square	.90	
	Stress Index	.16	

<sup>a</sup> The attitude clusters for employees with care giving responsibility are the following: (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible) (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

<sup>b</sup> The attitude clusters for employees without care giving responsibility are the following (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible), (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

Table 26.  
Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Desirability.

Work/Family Benefit	<i>Dimensions</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Desire Work/Family Benefits<sup>a</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.12	-.46	.48
Telecommuting	2.21	.28	-.73
Childcare Referral	-.80	.81	-1.30
Company Childcare Center	-.95	-.69	-.48
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.20	-.52	-.11
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.89	-.97	.10
Paid Family Leave	-.10	-.19	1.33
Employee Assistance Program	-.39	1.73	.72
R Square	.92		
Stress Index	.15		
<i>Do Not Desire Work/Family Benefits<sup>b</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.14	-.19	-.65
Telecommuting	1.81	.22	1.15
Childcare Referral	-1.17	-.83	1.17
Company Childcare Center	-.87	.94	.48
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-.93	.81	.44
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.57	.52	-.88
Paid Family Leave	-.08	.47	-1.31
Employee Assistance Program	-.34	-1.93	-.39
R Square	.88		
Stress Index	.16		

<sup>a</sup> The attitude clusters for employees who desired work/family benefits are the following: (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible) (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

<sup>b</sup> The attitude clusters for employees who did not desire work/family benefits are the following (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible), (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).



Table 27.  
Weighting for Each Work/Family Benefit by Dimension and Familiar with Work/Family Benefits.

Work/Family Benefit	<i>Dimensions</i>		
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Familiar with Work/Family Benefits<sup>a</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.13	-.09	.63
Telecommuting	2.03	.08	-.95
Childcare Referral	-1.03	1.06	-1.08
Company Childcare Center	-.91	-.76	-.63
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.03	-.75	-.37
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.76	-.83	.44
Paid Family Leave	-.03	-.49	1.21
Employee Assistance Program	-.41	1.79	.75
	R Square	.92	
	Stress Index	.15	
<i>Not Familiar with Work/Family Benefits<sup>b</sup></i>			
Flextime	2.05	.06	.98
Telecommuting	2.12	.04	-.77
Childcare Referral	-.59	.82	-1.29
Company Childcare Center	-.82	.95	.25
Subsidized Costs of Childcare	-1.07	.85	-.05
Emergency/Sick Childcare	-.85	.13	1.05
Paid Family Leave	-.43	-1.28	.73
Employee Assistance Program	-.42	-1.56	-.90
	R Square	.87	
	Stress Index	.16	

<sup>a</sup> The attitude clusters for employees who are familiar with work/family benefits are the following: (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) type of assistance provided (informative/tangible) (3) type of issue addressed by benefit (daily functioning/crisis).

<sup>b</sup> The attitude clusters for employees who are not familiar with work/family benefits are the following (1) family-relatedness (work-scheduling /family-focused), (2) not interpretable, (3) not interpretable.

Appendix A

Developmental Study I

Survey Instrument

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**On the following page is a list of benefits that organizations may possibly offer their employees. There is also a list of definitions. Please match the benefit to the definition that best describes it. Write the letter of the definition on the blank to the left of each benefit. If any definition is unclear or difficult to understand, please note your comments on the page. Your feedback is greatly appreciated.**

Thank you for your participation.

WORK/FAMILY BENEFIT PERCEPTIONS 135

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Definitions</b>
_____ Compressed work week	A. Information provided regarding available childcare services & resources
_____ Flextime	B. Money deducted from paycheck before taxes to save in an account specifically for childcare expenses
_____ Job Sharing	C. Working more than 8 hours a day to allow a whole day or part of a whole day off during the week
_____ Telecommuting	D. Individuals share full time job responsibilities so that each works only part time
_____ Dependent care flexible spending account	E. Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office
_____ Child care referral service	F. Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times, breaks) as long as total hours are worked
_____ Company supported child care center	G. Financial assistance provided to ease the costs of childcare services
_____ Subsidized cost of childcare	H. Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office
_____ Bring child to work in emergency	I. Financial and other support resources provided for the adoption process
_____ Emergency/sick child care	J. Child is allowed to be at work with the employee when other care arrangements are not available
_____ Paid family leave	K. Company services provided for the care of a sick child
_____ Adoption assistance	L. Counseling and support services for family and personal issues
_____ Employee Assistance Program	M. Paid time off for taking care of family

**Background Information**

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age in years?

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55 and above

3. How would you describe your racial background?

- African American/Black*
- American Indian/Alaska Native*
- Asian American/Asian*
- Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/ Chicano*
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*
- White/Caucasian*
- other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Are you currently employed?

- Full time
- Part time
- Not currently employed, but have been in the past
- Not currently employed, and have never been employed

5. How would you describe your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Not married, living with a partner
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you have any children?

- No
- Yes

If yes, please list the ages of your children

\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B

Developmental Study II

Survey Instrument

**INSTRUCTIONS**

On the following page is a list of possible benefits and their definitions that organizations may offer their employees. Please evaluate each benefit by answering the questions on the extent to which you believe it is or could be helpful to an employee in balancing work and family responsibilities.

Thank you for your participation.

**Employee Benefit**

		Not at all	Not much	Some	To a good extent	To a great extent
<b>1. Compressed work week</b> Working more than 8 hours a day to allow time off during the week	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2. Flextime</b> Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3. Job Sharing</b> Individuals share fulltime job responsibilities so that each works only part time	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>4. Telecommuting</b> Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5



		Not at all	Not much	Some	To a good extent	To a great extent
<b>5. Dependent care flexible spending account</b> Money deducted from paycheck before taxes to save in an account specifically for childcare expenses	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>6. Child care referral service</b> Information provided regarding available childcare services & resources	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>7. Company supported child care center</b> Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8. Subsidized cost of childcare</b> Financial assistance provided to ease the costs of childcare services	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5

		Not at all	Not much	Some	To a good extent	To a great extent
<b>9. Bring child to work in emergency</b> Child is allowed to be at work with the employee when other care arrangements are not available	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>10. Emergency/sick childcare</b> Services provided for the care of a sick child	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>11. Paid family leave</b> Paid time off for taking care of family	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>12. Adoption assistance</b> Financial and other support resources provided for the adoption process	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>13. Employee Assistance Program</b> Counseling and support services for family and personal issues	Helps employees get to work on time, accomplish daily work tasks, and focus on work related activities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees fulfill family and home responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
	Helps employees balance the responsibilities of work with the demands of family and home.	1	2	3	4	5

**Background Information**

1. What is your gender?
  - Male
  - Female
  
2. What is your age in years?
  - 24 and under
  - 25-34
  - 35-44
  - 45-54
  - 55 and above
  
3. How would you describe your racial background?
  - African American/Black*
  - American Indian/Alaska Native*
  - Asian American/Asian*
  - Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/ Chicano*
  - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*
  - White/Caucasian*
  - other \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. Are you currently employed?
  - Full time
  - Part time
  - Not currently employed, but have been in the past
  - Not currently employed, and have never been employed
  
5. How would you describe your marital status?
  - Single
  - Married
  - Separated
  - Divorced
  - Widowed
  - Not married, living with a partner
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  
6. Do you have any children?
  - No
  - Yes

If yes, please list the ages of your children

\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix C

Main Study

Survey Instrument

# Employee Survey

## Workplace Benefits

I. Employee Benefits: Please answer the following questions about each benefit by circling your response.

SD - Strongly disagree D - Disagree N - Neutral A - Agree SA - Strongly agree

1. Flextime	Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week				
a. I would be better able to balance my work and family life if flextime were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b. I would apply to an organization because flextime was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c. I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if flextime were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d. I would be less likely to quit a job that allowed flextime.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e. Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use flextime.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f. Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use flextime.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g. I would use flextime if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h. I am familiar with how flextime works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i. I currently use flextime.	Yes		No		
j. I have used flextime in the past.	Yes		No		
k. My current employer offers flextime as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

2. Telecommuting	Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office				
a. I would be better able to balance my work and family life if telecommuting were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b. I would apply to an organization because telecommuting was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c. I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if telecommuting were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d. I would be less likely to quit a job that allowed telecommuting.	SD	D	N	A	SA

SD - Strongly disagree D - Disagree N - Neutral A - Agree SA - Strongly agree

e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who telecommute.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who telecommute.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would telecommute if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how telecommuting works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently telecommute.	Yes		No		
j.	I have telecommuted in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers telecommuting as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

**3. Childcare referral service** Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources

a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if a childcare referral service were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because a childcare referral service was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if a childcare referral service were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d.	I would be less likely to quit a job that offered a childcare referral service.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use a childcare referral service.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use a childcare referral service.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would use a childcare referral service if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how a childcare referral service works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently use a childcare referral service.	Yes		No		
j.	I have used a childcare referral service in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers a childcare referral service as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

SD - Strongly disagree D - Disagree N - Neutral A - Agree SA - Strongly agree

**4. Company supported childcare center** Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office

a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if a company supported childcare center were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because a company supported childcare center was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if a company supported childcare center were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d.	I would be less likely to quit a job that offered a company supported childcare center.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use a company supported childcare center.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use a company supported childcare center.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would use a company supported childcare center if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how a company supported childcare center works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently use a company supported childcare center.	Yes		No		
j.	I have used a company supported childcare center in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers a company supported childcare center as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

**5. Subsidized cost of childcare** Financial assistance provided to ease the costs of childcare services

a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if childcare costs were subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because childcare costs were subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if childcare costs were subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA



**SD - Strongly disagree D - Disagree N - Neutral A - Agree SA - Strongly agree**

d.	I would be less likely to quit a job where childcare costs were subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who have their childcare costs subsidized by their employer.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who have their childcare costs subsidized by their employer.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would have my childcare costs subsidized if available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how childcare costs are subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently have my childcare costs subsidized by my employer.	Yes		No		
j.	In the past, my costs of childcare have been subsidized by my employer.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer subsidizes the cost of childcare as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

6. Emergency/sick childcare		Company services provided for the care of a sick child				
a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if emergency/sick childcare were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because emergency/sick childcare was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if emergency/sick childcare were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d.	I would be less likely to quit a job that provided emergency/sick childcare.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use emergency/sick childcare.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use emergency/sick childcare.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would use emergency/sick childcare if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA

**SD - Strongly disagree D - Disagree N - Neutral A - Agree SA - Strongly agree**

h.	I am familiar with how emergency/sick childcare works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently use emergency/sick childcare.	Yes		No		
j.	I have used emergency/sick childcare in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers emergency/sick childcare as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

7. Paid family leave		Paid time off for taking care of family				
a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if paid family leave were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because paid family leave was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if paid family leave were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d.	I would be less likely to quit a job that provided paid family leave.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use paid family leave.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use paid family leave.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would use paid family leave if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how paid family leave works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently use paid family leave.	Yes		No		
j.	I have used paid family leave in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers paid family leave as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

8. Employee Assistance Program		Counseling and support services for family and personal issues				
a.	I would be better able to balance my work and family life if an employee assistance program were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
b.	I would apply to an organization because an employee assistance program was offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA

**SD - Strongly disagree   D - Disagree   N - Neutral   A - Agree   SA - Strongly agree**

c.	I would be motivated to higher levels of work performance if an employee assistance program were offered.	SD	D	N	A	SA
d.	I would be less likely to quit a job that provided an employee assistance program.	SD	D	N	A	SA
e.	Coworkers negatively perceive employees who use an employee assistance program.	SD	D	N	A	SA
f.	Supervisors negatively perceive employees who use an employee assistance program.	SD	D	N	A	SA
g.	I would use an employee assistance program if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
h.	I am familiar with how an employee assistance program works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
i.	I currently use an employee assistance program.	Yes		No		
j.	I have used an employee assistance program in the past.	Yes		No		
k.	My current employer offers an employee assistance program as an employee benefit.	Yes	No	Unsure		

**II. Attitudes toward work: Circle to what extent you agree with each of the following statements.**

**SD - Strongly disagree   D - Disagree   N - Neutral   A - Agree   SA - Strongly agree**

1.	The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.	SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6.	The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with my work related activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7.	I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8.	Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.	SD	D	N	A	SA
9.	My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.	SD	D	N	A	SA
10.	Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.	SD	D	N	A	SA



**III. Family responsibilities: Please describe your dependents (children and others which you are responsible for their care) using the following grid. List each dependent separately and answer the questions accordingly.**

What is the age of each of your dependents?	Does the dependent live with you?	What percent of the dependent's care are you responsible for? (0 - 100%)	Is the dependent disabled?	If dependent is disabled, how much supervision is required?
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %

**IV. Background information: Please answer the following questions about yourself.**

- What is your gender?  Male  Female
- I work  part time  full time
- What is your age in years?
  - 18 - 24  45 - 54
  - 25 - 34  55 and above
  - 35 - 44
- How would you describe your marital status?
  - Single  Widowed
  - Married  Not married but living with a partner
  - Separated  Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Divorced
- How would you describe your racial background?
  - African American/Black  Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
  - American Indian/Alaska Native  White/Caucasian
  - Asian American/Asian  Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano
- What is the highest level of education you have attained?
  - Some high school  Some graduate school
  - High school  Masters degree
  - Some college  Doctorate of Professional degree
  - Associates degree  Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Bachelors degree
- What is your annual gross family income?
  - Under \$30,000  \$60,001 - \$70,000
  - \$30,001 - \$40,000  \$70,001 - \$80,000
  - \$40,001 - \$50,000  \$80,001 - \$90,000
  - \$50,001 - \$60,000  \$90,001 and above
- Below is a list of job categories. Please choose the one that best describes your current job and the job of your spouse/partner (if applicable).
 

Self	Spouse/ Partner	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not currently working for pay
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operator, fabricator, laborer
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Precision, production, craft and repair
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sales
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office & administrative support
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical specialist
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Professional
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Managerial
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____

Appendix D

Follow Up  
Study

Survey Instrument

**I. Benefit Evaluation:** Please evaluate the degree of similarity between the following workplace benefits. Circle one response per pair.

				Not at all Similar								Extremely Similar	
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office										
2.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Childcare referral service</b> - Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources										
3.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> - Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office										
4.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> - Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services										
5.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> - Company services provided for the care of a sick child										
6.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> - Paid time off for taking care of family										
7.	<b>Flextime</b> - Employee may vary daily work schedule (start & end times; breaks) as long as total hours are worked in a week	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> - Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
8.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Childcare referral service</b> - Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources										
9.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> - Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office										
10.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> - Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services										
11.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> - Company services provided for the care of a sick child										
12.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> - Paid time off for taking care of family										
13.	<b>Telecommuting</b> - Working from home or a location other than the workplace/office	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> - Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
14.	<b>Childcare referral service</b> - Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources	vs	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> - Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office										
15.	<b>Childcare referral service</b> - Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources	vs	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> - Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services										
16.	<b>Childcare referral service</b> - Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources	vs	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> - Company services provided for the care of a sick child										

			Not at all Similar									Extreme Similar	
		vs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
17.	<b>Childcare referral service</b> – Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> – Paid time off for taking care of family										
18.	<b>Childcare referral service</b> – Information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> – Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
19.	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> – Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office	vs	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> – Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services										
20.	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> – Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office	vs	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> – Company services provided for the care of a sick child										
21.	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> – Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> – Paid time off for taking care of family										
22.	<b>Company supported childcare center</b> – Employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> – Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
23.	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> – Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services	vs	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> – Company services provided for the care of a sick child										
24.	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> – Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> – Paid time off for taking care of family										
25.	<b>Subsidized cost of childcare</b> – Financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> – Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
26.	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> – Company services provided for the care of a sick child	vs	<b>Paid family leave</b> – Paid time off for taking care of family										
27.	<b>Emergency/sick children</b> – Company services provided for the care of a sick child	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> – Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										
28.	<b>Paid family leave</b> – Paid time off for taking care of family	vs	<b>Employee Assistance Program</b> – Counseling and support services for family and personal issues										

**II. Circle to what extent you agree with each of the following statements.**

**SD - Strongly disagree    D - Disagree    N - Neutral    A - Agree    SA - Strongly agree**

1.	I would use flextime (employee may vary daily work schedule [start & end times; breaks] as long as total hours are worked in a week) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
2.	I am familiar with how flextime (employee may vary daily work schedule [start & end times; breaks] as long as total hours are worked in a week) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	I would telecommute (working from home or a location other than the workplace/office) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	I am familiar with how telecommuting (working from home or a location other than the workplace/office) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
5.	I would use a childcare (information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources) referral service if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6.	I am familiar with how a childcare (information company provides regarding available community childcare services & resources) referral service works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7.	I would use a company supported childcare center (employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8.	I am familiar with how a company supported childcare center (employer provides childcare services on or near the worksite/office) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
9.	I would have my childcare costs (financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services) subsidized if available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
10.	I am familiar with how childcare costs (financial assistance provided to ease the cost of childcare services) are subsidized.	SD	D	N	A	SA
11.	I would use emergency/sick childcare (company services provided for the care of a sick child) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
12.	I am familiar with how emergency/sick childcare (company services provided for the care of a sick child) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA

13.	I would use paid family leave (paid time off for taking care of family ) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
14.	I am familiar with how paid family leave (paid time off for taking care of family ) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
15.	I would use an employee assistance program (counseling and support services for family and personal issues) if it were made available.	SD	D	N	A	SA
16.	I am familiar with how an employee assistance program (counseling and support services for family and personal issues) works.	SD	D	N	A	SA
17.	The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.	SD	D	N	A	SA
18.	The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
19.	Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.	SD	D	N	A	SA
20.	My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.	SD	D	N	A	SA
21.	Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
22.	The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with my work related activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA
23.	I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.	SD	D	N	A	SA
24.	Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.	SD	D	N	A	SA
25.	My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.	SD	D	N	A	SA
26.	Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.	SD	D	N	A	SA

**III. Background Information:**

1. Please describe your dependents (children and others which you are responsible for their care) using the following grid. List each dependent separately and answer the questions accordingly.

What is the age of each of your dependents?	Does the dependent live with you?	What percent of the dependent's care are you responsible for? (0 - 100%)	Is the dependent disabled?	If dependent is disabled, how much supervision is required?
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %
___ years	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____ %	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> some help required, but largely self-sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 64 % <input type="checkbox"/> 65 - 100 %

2. What is your gender?
  - Male       Female
3. What is your age in years?
  - 18 - 24       45 - 54
  - 25 - 34       55 and above
  - 35 - 44
4. How would you describe your marital status?
  - Single       Widowed
  - Married       Not married but living with a partner
  - Separated       Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Divorced
5. How would you describe your racial background?
  - African American/Black       Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
  - American Indian/Alaska Native       White/Caucasian
  - Asian American/Asian       Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Mexican/Hispanic/Latino/Chicano
6. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
  - Some high school       Some graduate school
  - High school       Masters degree
  - Some college       Doctorate of Professional degree
  - Associates degree       Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Bachelors degree
7. Below is a list of job categories. Please choose the one that best describes your current job.
  - Not currently working for pay
  - Operator, fabricator, laborer
  - Precision, production, craft and repair
  - Service
  - Sales
  - Office & administrative support
  - Technical specialist
  - Professional
  - Managerial
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_