

## Work-Life Integration: Challenges and Organizational Responses

P. Monique Valcour and Rosemary Batt

I wish there were more flexibility, especially in our production environment. I've worked all my life around the rotating-work schedule, but this year alone I lost three excellent employees. They had each become single parents for one reason or another, and there's no way you can get child care in off hours and weekends. It just breaks my heart. Traditionally production has been a male-oriented thing, where one partner stays at home with the children and the other one works crazy schedules. . . . the world is changing, but the schedule is not.

—Manufacturing production supervisor  
married to part-time educational  
coordinator and father of two  
children ages 8 and 14

**T**his chapter focuses on organizational responses to the challenges dual-earner couples face in integrating their work and family lives. We examine the effectiveness of various workplace characteristics and organizational initiatives for supporting work-life integration. We then develop a comprehensive model of organizational family responsiveness that incorporates work-life policies, traditional human resource incentives, and work redesign in the context

of a workpl.  
then test so  
est to both  
policies and  
resource inc  
control, and  
couples in  
account the

### The Cha:

Employ  
demands o  
responsible  
cant assista  
ees often t  
Typical of  
“Competen  
company c  
Hochschild  
avoid plac  
hours as a

Employ  
and family  
of interrole  
family don  
from dual-  
experience  
focused or  
growing n  
the context  
uments cro  
life,<sup>8</sup> and  
restructure  
acteristics  
job securit  
and satisf  
*Study* repo  
two career  
our analys  
another's r

of a workplace culture that facilitates the full implementation of these policies. We then test some of the components of this model as predictors of outcomes of interest to both workers and employers. Specifically, we assess the effects of formal policies and supervisor support for flexible work arrangements, traditional human resource incentives, and work-design measures on work-family conflict, perceived control, and turnover intentions. We do this within the context of dual-earner couples in *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study*, which enables us to take into account the characteristics of both spouses' jobs and workplaces.<sup>1</sup>

### The Challenges of Work-Life Integration

Employees have traditionally faced the challenge of meeting the competing demands of work and family life with the assumption that they were solely responsible for managing their own balancing acts and could not expect significant assistance from their employers in this regard.<sup>2</sup> Both employers and employees often treated work and family domains as separate spheres of existence.<sup>3</sup> Typical of this presumption is a statement by an executive in the early 1990s: "Competent workers can handle work-family problems and there is nothing a company can really do to help the incompetent workers."<sup>4</sup> Similarly, in Arlie Hochschild's study of a supposedly family-friendly workplace, female executives avoid placing family photographs in their offices, and the norm of long work hours as a display of organizational commitment is dominant.<sup>5</sup>

Employees tend to experience work-family conflict when demands from work and family are both high and difficult to satisfy. Work-family conflict is a form of interrole conflict in which incompatible demands emanating from work and family domains make it difficult or impossible to satisfy both sets.<sup>6</sup> Employees from dual-earner families (the subjects of our study) are particularly likely to experience conflict between work and family.<sup>7</sup> Whereas most research has focused on individuals and the work-family conflict they personally report, a growing number of studies suggest that work-life issues must be understood in the context of both spouses' employment conditions. One study, for example, documents crossover effects from husbands' and wives' work schedules to family life,<sup>8</sup> and a 1988 study finds that husbands and wives in dual-earner couples restructured their work lives to accommodate family partly based on the job characteristics of their spouses.<sup>9</sup> A 1991 study finds relationships among employees' job security, income, and weekly work hours and their spouses' job involvement and satisfaction.<sup>10</sup> A 1999 study using data from *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study* reports that couples devise joint strategies for managing the demands of two careers, often by scaling back the demands of one spouse's job.<sup>11</sup> Hence, in our analysis, we assess the effects of spouses' employment conditions on one another's reported work-family outcomes.

Evidence for the deleterious effects of work-family conflict on individuals, families, and organizations has been building (see Roehling, Moen, and Batt, chap. 7 in this volume). Research suggests that dual-career couples are very concerned about work-life integration and committed to preserving time with their family.<sup>12</sup> Both quantitative and qualitative research suggests that many workers feel their employers could be—and should be—much more family responsive.<sup>13</sup> Some companies have responded to employee demands for better work-life integration as a critical component of recruitment and retention strategies.<sup>14</sup> A few firms are beginning to link family responsiveness to overall corporate strategy, particularly as a component of work quality and productivity improvements.<sup>15</sup>

Research has begun to document the positive outcomes of corporate work-life initiatives.<sup>16</sup> Through such programs as flexible work arrangements, reduced work time, dependent care, financial benefits, and culture-change initiatives, companies can reduce employees' work-family conflict,<sup>17</sup> improve their job satisfaction,<sup>18</sup> and improve elements of corporate performance including absenteeism<sup>19</sup> and retention.<sup>20</sup> But the research documents more positive outcomes for employees<sup>21</sup> than for employers, for whom findings are more mixed.<sup>22</sup> In our quantitative analysis in this chapter, therefore, we examine outcomes of interest to employees (work-family conflict and employee control over work-family integration) as well as employers (employee-turnover intentions).

### The Dimensions of Organizational Family-Responsiveness

Early studies of work and family focus on programmatic initiatives for dependent care, flexible scheduling, and the like. Over time, researchers have increasingly recognized the limitations of programmatic initiatives for responding to nonwork demands and have focused on a wider range of workplace conditions, including work design and workplace culture. There is, however, no general consensus on what, in fact, constitutes a family-responsive work environment. In this paper, we develop a comprehensive model of organizational strategies for work-life integration. We use the term "family" as shorthand to signify the demands employees face from the nonwork arena. Thus, we recognize that all employees, not only those with spouses and children living at home, experience the demands that result from personal relationships and involvements outside of the workplace. In our view, a family-responsive employer recognizes, legitimates, and responds to the challenges of integrating work and nonwork demands for employees at all stages of their family life cycle. A family-responsive employer provides:

- A broad range of work-life programs that provide employees with control over their working time and support in meeting their family and personal needs

- Adequ
- Work
- A wor
- inform
- life in

With res  
as well as t  
schedules a  
and family.  
schedules a  
include fle:  
compressed  
Employees  
willing to s

The role  
ible schedu  
and schedu  
assignment  
more flexil  
portive sup  
panies mu  
consistent

The sec  
ment and i  
motion opp  
firm. These  
breadwinn  
markets.<sup>28</sup>

growth tha  
security, a  
which em  
demands.  
family-frie  
sizing, out  
a commitn

The th  
designed t  
basis. Flex  
For exam  
ees found

- Adequate pay, benefits, and employment security
- Work designed to provide employees with discretion and control in meeting work and life demands
- A workplace culture, transmitted formally by organizational policies and informally by supervisors and coworkers, that values and supports the work-life integration of all employees

With respect to formal work-life policies, we include dependent-care policies as well as those designed to create greater flexibility in working time. Inflexible schedules and excessive work hours consistently produce conflict between work and family.<sup>23</sup> Working time policies constitute a range of approaches to flexible schedules as well as those designed to reduce total work hours. Specific policies include flextime, family leaves, dependent-care time, time off for volunteering, compressed workweeks, job sharing, part-time work, and telecommuting.<sup>24</sup> Employees from dual-earner families value flexibility highly;<sup>25</sup> some are even willing to switch jobs to have more.<sup>26</sup>

The role of supervisors is particularly important in implementing formal flexible scheduling and work time policies as well as informal working arrangements and schedules. Supervisors are responsible for staffing levels, allocation of work assignments, and unit output. Although supportive supervisors often can allow more flexibility than exists in the written policies of the organization, unsupportive supervisors can subvert employers' family-friendly policies.<sup>27</sup> Thus, companies must train supervisors and create a workplace culture that facilitates consistent policy implementation.

The second dimension of a family-responsive workplace is adequate employment and income security. Historically, employers used pay, benefits, and promotion opportunities to reduce turnover and induce long-term commitment to the firm. These policies, or internal labor-market rules, protected (mostly male) breadwinners (and their families) from the vicissitudes of competitive labor markets.<sup>28</sup> Such policies provided the kind of employment security and income growth that create family stability.<sup>29</sup> Thus, high pay and benefits, employment security, and career development opportunities should create an environment in which employees view their employers as supportive of family needs and demands. Ironically, however, at a time when employers have begun to initiate family-friendly policies, many have simultaneously undertaken policies of downsizing, outsourcing, and contingent staffing in order to reduce pay, benefits, and a commitment to long-term employment relations.

The third dimension of a family-responsive workplace comprises work designed to allow employees to meet their work and nonwork demands on a daily basis. Flexible scheduling policies have proven insufficient to meet these needs. For example, a nationally representative survey of nearly three thousand employees found that working parents experience less work-family conflict when they

individuals,  
n, and Batt,  
are very con-  
ne with their  
any workers  
responsive.<sup>13</sup>  
ork-life inte-  
gies.<sup>14</sup> A few  
rate strategy,  
vements.<sup>15</sup>  
ate work-life  
educated work  
ives, compa-  
job satisfac-  
bsenteeism<sup>19</sup>  
; for employ-  
our quantita-  
f interest to  
-family inte-

es for depen-  
ave increas-  
esponding to  
e conditions,  
general com-  
ment. In this  
ies for work-  
the demands  
ll employees,  
the demands  
ie workplace.  
and responds  
ployees at all  
vides:

with control  
and personal

have jobs with greater autonomy, more schedule control, and fewer demands.<sup>30</sup> By contrast, formal family-friendly policies had no effect on reported levels of work-family conflict for these employees. Autonomous work design not only leads to higher levels of motivation and satisfaction,<sup>31</sup> but also signals to employees that they are trusted to get their work done and manage their time effectively.<sup>32</sup> Employees who report greater control over managing work and family demands also report lower work-family conflict, more job satisfaction, and fewer physiological stress-related symptoms.<sup>33</sup>

Employers often worry, however, that greater individual autonomy simply undermines productivity. Some research by Lotte Bailyn and others, however, suggests otherwise.<sup>34</sup> Bailyn's research group undertook intervention projects at three corporations in the early 1990s. In one case, a team of product-development engineers at Xerox worked in an environment that emphasized long hours and "face time" as a sign of commitment to the employer. Long meetings, documentation requirements, and the interference of supervisors in the day-to-day work of the engineers meant that the real work of product development took place before or after daytime work hours, thereby creating a vicious circle of longer hours, high stress, and low productivity. The intervention team examined time use and redesigned the work so that supervisors were severely restricted in the time they could interact with the engineers. As a result, the engineers increased their autonomy and control over work routines and schedules, substantially increased their productivity, and decreased their total work hours.

The relationship between work-life integration and other dimensions of work design is more ambiguous. For example, firms have increasingly adopted more collaborative or team-based forms of work organization to improve workplace quality, efficiency, and coordination. Although there is considerable support for the idea that team collaboration and coordination improve organizational performance,<sup>35</sup> there is little research on how these forms of work organization affect employees' ability to manage work and family. On the one hand, the ability to collaborate or coordinate work with other colleagues may increase flexibility if coworkers are able to substitute for one another or establish norms of reciprocity in which they agree to help one another meet work and nonwork demands. Some studies have found positive effects of team-based systems on work-life outcomes.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the demands of collaboration and group coordination may increase work hours or the rigidity of work if they lead to time-consuming meetings or heightened peer-group pressure.<sup>37</sup>

The use of information technology is another area of work design that is rapidly changing, and the nature of its impact on work-life integration is also unclear. Portable computers, faxes, voice mail and email allow workers to bring work into the home more easily, but may have effects that are similar to those of telecommuting. Researchers have found very mixed outcomes for telecommuting because, although it increases flexibility, it also allows work to invade or spill over into home

life more. A volume) de ambiguous. Accordingl

Finally, 1 ees' nonwo gerial as w 2000 study ogy firms, increased c employees tions or car

The orga the work-li more work attention. F on parents are single c work.<sup>41</sup> Acc than "work structures : psychologi

### Qualitati Couples

Our fiel in our seve group part visors wen following i face and tl arrange me employer c have you t Third, wha

Our resu involved c tions. Tabl The stater working ti

life more. As Noelle Chesley, Phyllis Moen, and Richard Shore (chap. 14 in this volume) describe, the little research on this aspect of work design has produced ambiguous findings on the effects of technology on the work-life interface.<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, we include a measure of information technology use in our analyses.

Finally, the workplace culture in general must support and legitimate employees' nonwork role demands. This environment shapes the attitudes of managerial as well as nonmanagerial employees. For example, Susan Eaton, in her 2000 study of five hundred technical and professional employees in biotechnology firms, found that formal and informal family-friendly policies and benefits increased organizational commitment and satisfaction only to the extent that employees felt free to use the policies without detriment to their workplace relations or career success.<sup>39</sup>

The organization must also create an environment that recognizes variation in the work-life interface of employees over their life course. Parents experience more work-family conflict than nonparents,<sup>40</sup> and thus need to be given special attention. However, to the extent that employers view work-life policy as focused on parents (particularly women) and privilege them over other employees who are single or whose children are grown, employers risk creating divisiveness at work.<sup>41</sup> Accordingly, in this chapter we frequently use the term "work-life" rather than "work-family" to signify that employees, both male and female, of all family structures and life stages have legitimate demands on their time, energy, and psychological involvement from domains outside of their jobs.

### **Qualitative Evidence from *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study***

Our field research includes a series of focus groups involving 114 employees in our seven participating organizations. The demographic profiles of the focus-group participants mirrors those of the survey respondents. Employees' supervisors were not present at the discussions, which were structured to cover the following three broad open-ended questions. First, what are the challenges you face and the strategies you use in combining work and family? Second, what arrangements (e.g., formal policies or informal arrangements) does your employer offer to help you combine work and family? Also, what arrangements have you used, what have you not used and why, and what has been helpful? Third, what would be ideal for you in terms of combining work and family?

Our results are based on a textual analysis of the focus-group transcripts, which involved coding passages relating to work-life support offered by the organizations. Table 19.1 provides frequencies for the thematic codes we have identified. The statements from the focus groups highlight the importance of flexible working time arrangements. They emphasize the utility of such policies as the

**Table 19.1** Frequency of Themes in Focus Group Transcripts

Themes Related to Work-Life Policy	Frequency
<b>Access to Flexible Working Time</b>	
No company policy on flextime; up to supervisor discretion; varies by department/supervisor	52
My department/supervisor is flexible	46
In my department, flexibility is handled informally (e.g., leave if you need to, make the time up later)	31
My department/supervisor is not flexible	16
Flextime can make it difficult to coordinate work and manage the department	11
Flexibility is difficult because of lack of coworker support	9
Family leave policy helpful	7
Higher-level employees have more flexibility	9
Being able to use vacation time in small chunks for family needs is helpful	5
Lack of flexible work policies signals lack of investment in employees	5
<b>Total Work Hours and Workload</b>	
The company has work-life policies, but the reality is it is hard to use them because of work demands	22
The main problem is that we are asked to do too much work (due to downsizing and being understaffed)	16
Ability to work part-time is a helpful work-life policy	11
Ability to job-share is a helpful work-life policy	6
<b>Wages</b>	
Organization should pay us more; that would be a family-friendly policy	9
Unpaid leave is not helpful because people cannot afford the loss of wages and benefits	4
<b>Dependent Care</b>	
Dependent care time is a helpful policy	3
<b>Culture</b>	
The culture does not support use of work-life policies	17

ability to leave in case of emergencies to attend to family needs, to arrange work schedules to accommodate family demands, and to do part of their work at home. School holidays, children's illnesses, or breakdowns in child-care arrangements are particularly problematic for the dual-career families in this study if neither parent has access to flexible scheduling. The comments also reveal the resentment felt by employees due to unequal access to flexible working time. A second related theme concerns the negative effects of long work hours and overly demanding workloads, which undermine the benefits of flexible work arrangements or other work-life policies. A third thematic area is the need for adequate pay and benefits. In sum, although many employees report being able to make individual flexibility arrangements with their supervisors, a wide range of critical comments from employees indicates dissatisfaction with overall organizational support for work-life integration.

## Access

A dominant formal policies contingencies contingencies is unequal access to flexible scheduling, technology, variability in work schedules. For example, a manager in one department among departments

There's a variation in things like comp time all these things. It's result is that

Other factors sources of variability company philosophy that

To a certain extent on paper, implementation unrealistic. I had a goal but it wasn't people in

Another school-age of it has to always felt hourly wage of things that

These statements higher wages their lower

### Access to Flexible Scheduling

A dominant theme in the focus groups is that the companies either have no formal policies for flexible scheduling or make the implementation of formal policies contingent on supervisor approval and that, as a result, access to such scheduling is unequal, arbitrary, and often insufficient. Unequal access derives from several sources, including variation in departmental tasks, the nature of work and technology, occupational differences, and supervisor attitudes. Interdepartmental variability is a persistent theme running through the focus-group discussions. For example, a professor with two grown children describes the extent of variation among departments at Upstate University:

There's a lot of variation from one area to another. I didn't realize just how much variation until I ended up on a committee last year that was looking at some of the things like flex time. Well, we were informed that there is no flex time. There is no comp time. However, in reality, I've been very fortunate to work for a department all these years that is very flexible and very humane, and kind of just does its own thing. It's sort of a "don't ask, don't tell" kind of thing. And what happens as a result is that people are fiercely loyal and grateful to their supervisor.

Other focus-group participants emphasize technological and occupational sources of variation. One Transco manager explains that he feels caught between company rhetoric emphasizing family supportiveness and manufacturing technology that has to be run on a rigid schedule:

To a certain extent I think it's lip service. These family-friendly policies are nice on paper, but a lot of them are hard to implement. I as a supervisor can't always implement what the company has set up, so I think we are setting people up with unrealistic expectations, and then sometimes we can't follow through on them. Like I had a guy in my group who wanted to do flex time and flex to the second shift, but it would've been very difficult to do. I really made an effort, but we needed two people in the department doing what he did on first shift.

Another Upstate University professor in her mid-forties (the mother of four school-age children, married to a computer programmer) observes, "I think a lot of it has to do with whether you're faculty or staff. As a faculty member, I've always felt a great deal of freedom. But there are a lot of people who are strictly hourly wage people who don't have near the flexibility in trying to do the kinds of things that we can do. So it's really two different worlds in the same office."

These statements are consistent with past research showing that workers with higher wages and occupational status have a wider range of flexible benefits than their lower-wage counterparts.<sup>42</sup>

Frequency

52

46  
31

16

11

9

7

9

5

5

22

16

11

6

9

4

3

17

ange work  
k at home.  
angements  
if neither  
the resent-  
: A second  
and overly  
k arrange-  
r adequate  
le to make  
ge of criti-  
l organiza-



Variation in access, however, can also occur among people in the same department or occupational group, based largely on the arbitrary discretion of supervisors. For example, a forty-year-old female part-time marketing specialist at Utilco with a preschool child reports, "My manager allows me to work part of my time at home, whereas some others don't. My situation hasn't gone through Human Resources and probably shouldn't, because it probably wouldn't get approved."

Although many employees rate their own supervisor favorably, they go on to cite other examples of inequitable treatment. Also, although employees are grateful for the flexibility that they have personally negotiated, informal deals come at a price—employees feel beholden to supervisors, who expect a return for their favors. As one mother of two in her late thirties employed by Lake University states:

We've talked about flexibility, but it's all based on what your supervisor is willing to allow you to do. And that puts you in a mode of groveling, begging, feeling anxious about whether it's going to be okay. You worry about how you might end up paying for it later. At some point down the road somebody is going to say, "you know, we gave you all the breaks." Since it's not a formal policy, it's seen as a privilege rather than as a right, and there's a big difference there.

These informal deals can create hard feelings or resentment from other employees who do not receive such special treatment, leading to divisiveness at work. Informal approaches to flexibility also lack the symbolic stamp of programs developed and supported by the organization. If employees and their supervisors believe that the only way they can accommodate work and family demands is by circumventing employers' rules and regulations, then it is likely that a breakdown of respect and trust will occur between employer and employee. This erosion of trust could, in turn, undermine morale and commitment to the organization. A 48-year-old man working for Utilco as a systems engineer notes, "A real flextime policy would be a part of a covenant in that it would be a formal recognition by management that we are professionals who do our work. When things need to be done, we're here, regardless of the time. Yet all the company has is the paternal system where your boss is the one who decides whether you'll have this flexibility."

All in all, the lack of formal policies for flexible working time not only limits access but leads to the development of informal deal-making between employees and their supervisors and to divisions and perceptions of inequality among employees who do and do not gain access to privileged schedules.

### **Access to Reduced Work Hours and Workloads**

Excessive work demands also make for a family-unfriendly work experience, even when employers have work-life policies on the books. Although flexible

schedules h  
excessive v  
with family  
that empha  
complaints  
Transco pr  
explains, "  
programs a  
istic expect

A collea  
medical tra  
need an en  
forty-eight  
one middle  
time with a  
a regular fi  
just seem t  
are older, I  
then they e  
end up wo

Focus-g  
against the  
alone do r  
staffing lev  
children an  
you were '  
adequate,  
there is so  
think that  
you're not

Past res  
reduce em  
ity.<sup>45</sup> In s  
important  
production  
think the c  
hours a w  
to creep b  
in and put

Other  
options ar  
zations ir  
initiative

schedules help solve work-life integration when total work hours are reasonable, excessive work hours, no matter how flexibly allocated, are likely to interfere with family and personal life.<sup>43</sup> Employees in companies that have downsized or that emphasize “face time” and prioritize work above all else typically have more complaints about workplace inflexibility and heightened work-family conflict. A Transco production planner with a schoolteacher wife and grown daughter explains, “You’ve got the workload of two people, but it’s all on you. All these programs are coming in, but forget the programs, just think about what’s a realistic expectation without causing me to leave this job.”

A colleague from the planning department (a father of three, married to a medical transcriptionist, with a live-in parent) seconds this opinion, “We don’t need an employee assistance program, we need more employees!” Similarly, a forty-eight-year-old Vantech software engineer, married to a CPA and mother to one middle school and one college student, explains that she officially works part-time with a lower salary and reduced benefits so she can, in fact, limit herself to a regular full-time (forty-hour) workweek: “The hours we are expected to work just seem to grow and grow. I’m part-time, 32 hours a week. Now that my kids are older, I would be more ready to go to 40, but once you officially work 40, then they expect you to work 60. So if I say I’m working 32, most of the time I end up working 40, but at least it stops at 40.”

Focus-group participants feel that a family-responsive employer would guard against the tendency for work time to expand without limit. Although employers alone do not determine how much time employees spend at work,<sup>44</sup> they set staffing levels, expectations, and demands. A female engineer with two teenage children and twenty-four years of service to Vantech comments, “It used to be you were working really hard if you worked 50 hours a week. Now this is just adequate, and the new buzz word is to say you work 60 hours a week. I think there is something wrong with that, and businesses should stop promoting it. I think that this company can do something about changing the perception that you’re not a professional unless you work 60 hours a week.”

Past research shows that employers’ efforts to set limits on the workday can reduce employees’ work-family conflict and even improve corporate productivity.<sup>45</sup> In some focus groups, employees identify these types of efforts as important organizational strategies to support work-life integration. A Vantech production supervisor in his late thirties with two school-age children says, “I think the company should step up to the plate and address the issue of how many hours a week people actually work. We should not allow the demands of work to creep beyond 50 to 60 hours—where does it stop? The company needs to step in and put some limits in effect, because otherwise it will continue to creep.”

Other solutions include job-sharing or part-time arrangements, but these options are not widely available to employees at the seven participating organizations in *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study*. Individual employee initiative is the common catalyst for these types of arrangements, and some

professionals are able to reduce hours through negotiations with their supervisors. One Upstate University administrator with two children (ages three and six) explains her situation: "I job share with another professional. It works great, but I had to write up a proposal for it and work it out with my boss. We worked together to go forward on it."

Another Transco planning specialist, a mother of a nine-year-old and four-year-old twins and married for fifteen years to a business administrator, describes her efforts to set up a job-sharing situation and her feeling that she is lucky to have succeeded:

I was lucky to work out a job sharing arrangement because there was another woman in my department who did the same thing as me and was also struggling after she had her second baby. So we went to the human resources person and she was supportive but said the company doesn't have this in place. So we did the research and went to the president of the division and we went through a couple of struggles, but eventually they accepted it. I'm so glad it worked out, because it's been great for me and my family.

However, as in the case of flexible schedules discussed previously, individually negotiated deals to reduce work hours create divisions among employees and perceived inequality at work. Some employees are not successful in their negotiations. For example, a Citizen's Health senior account executive with two children describes her experience: "I had a job-sharing arrangement when my first child was little, but I now have a two-year-old and the company won't allow me to do this. I think that when the company was smaller, they were willing to work with us, but now that we've grown to be a bigger organization, they just don't do that. And they're really strict with the hours. I asked if I could work 8-4:30, but they weren't willing to do that."

Similarly, a forty-five-year-old Vantech information systems manager, married to a lab technician and with two grown children, expresses his frustration with the lack of organizational consistency regarding reduced working time arrangements:

With job sharing and part time, it's not consistent throughout the company. There are some areas where if you say you want to go part time, they'll say either work full-time or you have no job. They don't give you the flexibility even though if you look at the structure of your job and what is required for the position, you could easily do that on a part time basis, or by taking part of the work home if need be.

In sum, focus-group participants highlight the need for reduced work hours as part of an overall flexible working time policy. In the absence of such policies,

workers pu  
ity between

### Beyond Inform

Thus, in  
ing worker  
to advance  
study tend  
ence confi  
Formal  
challenges  
the rest of  
other job f  
also comp  
participant  
life interfa  
married to

I haven't  
but it ha  
falls very  
every ye  
They've  
type me  
because  
your fan

Repeate  
tance of e  
validates a  
activities.  
as in the s  
mentary sc  
to say that  
them, that  
will work  
I don't kn  
thinking."

The ove  
is that forn

workers push for individual exceptions to rules, leading to perceptions of inequality between the haves and have-nots.

### Beyond Work-Life Policies and Informal Supports

Thus, increasing the apparent flexibility of a job or career while still expecting workers to commit boundless time and energy to work does little or nothing to advance the cause of work-life integration.<sup>46</sup> Note that the professionals in our study tend to enjoy job autonomy and control over their work, but also experience conflict between work and nonwork life.

Formal and informal work-life policies alone do not address the full range of challenges that working families face in trying to successfully integrate work and the rest of life. Job security, pay, career-development prospects, benefits, and other job features that are important to employees and their family stability are also components of organizational family responsiveness.<sup>47</sup> Several focus-group participants frame the issue of compensation in terms of its impact on the work-life interface. A forty-six-year-old Utilco engineer, father of two teenagers and married to a nurse, says:

I haven't had a pay raise in three years, and that may appear to be a personal "bitch," but it has a tremendous impact on the family and the strain. I honestly feel that it falls very closely in line with the theme of what we're talking about here. And also, every year for benefits, we get a smorgasbord of options, but they're all reduced. They've gone down for the last five years now. We've been forced into an HMO-type medical benefit, and our cost has increased. That impacts on your family life because it impacts on your budget. And also on the quality of medical care you and your family get.

Repeated comments among focus-group members also emphasize the importance of embedding work-life policies in an overall organizational culture that validates and respects employees' needs to reserve time and energy for nonwork activities. Themes of respect, trust, and employee empowerment were recurrent, as in the statement of a Vantech chemical engineer in her thirties with an elementary school child: "I think there needs to be an environmental shift for people to say that we really do embrace people who have families that are important to them, that they can still be very good workers and excellent contributors, and we will work with them so they can manage well with work and with family. And I don't know how you do that in a policy; it's more of a complete shift in thinking."

The overall conclusion that we draw from our review of the qualitative data is that formal work-life policies alone do not make a family-responsive employer.

The design of human resource practices, the organization of work, and the overall culture regarding the relative importance of employees' work and nonwork lives form the backbone of an integrated approach to work-life balance.

**Quantitative Results from *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study***

We now turn to survey data of a subsample of couples from *The Cornell Couples and Careers Study* and use regression analysis to investigate the predictors of work-family conflict, control over work circumstances, and individuals' intention to leave their present employer. We report results from 264 married or cohabiting opposite-sex couples in which both members are employed. This subsample, approximately one-third of the overall Cornell study, represents participants who were randomly administered the module of survey questions containing the measures of job and workplace characteristics. (For a description of the overall sample, please see app.)

**Measures**

**Dependent Variables** We have three dependent variables: work-family conflict (negative spillover from work to family), employee control over work, and intention to quit one's job. The first two measures capture individuals' day-to-day ability to manage time and commitments to work and family.

**Work-family conflict.** This is a two-item scale of negative spillover from work to family (see Roehling, Moen, and Batt, chap. 7 in this volume, for source and wording of items).

**Employee control over work.** To measure this, we asked employees how much choice they have over their daily work schedule, weekly work schedule, their use of vacation and personal time, their ability to receive personal phone calls and email at work, the amount and timing of work that must be done at home in order to meet work demands, and the place at which they work (home versus regular workplace). The scale ( $\alpha = .76$ ) is adapted from Linda Thomas and Daniel Ganster. Responses are measured on a scale of 1-5.<sup>48</sup>

**Intention to turn over.** This is measured by a scale score comprising five items that ask whether respondents plan to stay with their present employers until retirement, how many more years they expect to stay, whether they have recently talked to colleagues or friends about looking for another job,

whet  
serio

*Indepe*  
traditional  
work-life :

Human

**Salary.**  
your  
and/

**Job se**  
to 10  
100  
in th

**Career**  
type  
care

Forma

**Flexib**  
are ;  
paid  
off  
telec  
abili  
valu

**Super**  
how  
swit  
tene  
fam  
fron

Work-

**Decisi**  
"I d  
able

