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Abstract

Work and family embody two of the most fundamental areas of adult life. The increased participation in the labour force of working women with children has had a major impact on the work and family interface. Theories of work and family have been incorporated to analyse potential relationships of conflict with undesirable work outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction and burnout. The study investigates whether work-family conflict ultimately leads to working women with children’s experiences of burnout and lower job satisfaction. The research study also explores the effects of the mother-role identity on the manifestation of family and work conflict in working women with children and posits that working women with children experience role salience differently from other working women without children.

The study employed a quantitative research design using electronic self-administered questionnaires. Using the data from 545 employees in a fast-moving consumer goods industry showed that working women with children who identified closer with the mother-role identity, experienced greater work-family conflict. The mother-role identity forms a greater part of working women with children’s self than that of the employee-role identity and the results infer that role identity plays a significant role when conflict is experienced. In working women with children, strong relationships were found between family-work conflict and burnout, and moderate inverse relationships between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. Work-family conflict may ultimately lead working women with children to experience higher burnout and lower job satisfaction owing to their preoccupation with family-related responsibilities.

The concept of role identity is introduced as a significant variable to consider into the work and family conflict investigation, as well as in the development of burnout and job satisfaction for working women with children. The current research also assists in understanding the work and family role integration of working women with children and provides a consolidated overview of the current work and family theories within a conceptual and unifying model. This
research offers an explanatory model that outlines the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, by investigating the mechanisms by virtue of which such relationships exist.

*Key words:* work-family conflict, family-work conflict, job satisfaction, burnout, role identity, spillover.
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Para Cocos e Gina

“A palavra impossível so existe no dicionario dos malucos”
“The word impossible only exists in the dictionary of fools”

- Napoleon Bonaparte -
Chapter 1: The Problem and its Background

1.1 Introduction

Difficulties in the work and family relationship are not new experiences, as much of the work-family literature indicates. Individuals have always been accountable for managing their family responsibilities in conjunction with maintaining employment. Challenges arising between the work and family domains were documented in earlier times and are recognised in social science disciplines (Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek, & Sweet, 2006). Changes in family structure and the composition of the workforce, and the demographic characteristics of society further elevated the level of the discourse regarding work and family. Towards the end of the 20th century, the increased representation of dual-earning families and households headed by single parents became prominent (Marks, 2006). As the number of women entering the labour force increased, the conformity to the traditional family structure, of husband as primary breadwinner and wife as homemaker, decreased.

Organisational and technological changes have further transformed the ways in which individuals carry out their jobs (Valcour & Hunter, 2005). Structural changes within organisations have contributed to the erosion of boundaries between work and family roles. The stability of organisations is largely dependent on the global competitive demands of the economic landscape. Global competitive pressures have compelled organisations to downsize their workforce and streamline organisational operations. Competitive pressures have obliged organisations to provide customers with high-quality service levels. The need to deliver superior customer service and satisfaction has generated additional work role pressures for employees, and the reduction in the number of jobs has contributed to the increasing workload of those who are still employed (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). A large proportion of an individual’s time is now spent at work, contributing to role overload and conflict between work and family roles (Duxbury & Higgins, 2003; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Role overload contributes to the conflict
created in managing work and family roles; therefore it becomes increasingly important that organisations understand the impact that social and economic changes have upon work and family interaction (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004).

Work and family form two distinct parts of an adult’s life, and each aspect provides a unique point from which to examine important qualities of human behaviour (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Work and family were previously believed to be separate entities, a belief that Kanter (1977) refers to as the myth of separate worlds. According to this belief, work and family operated by their own set of rules, and thus could be examined separately. The argument of separate worlds has, however, recently been supplanted by new thinking, in which the work and family relationships are regarded as interactive and reciprocal in nature (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004). For example, issues arising from the work domain influence the family domain, and family matters also have strong influences on work life (Huang, Hammer, Neal, & Perrin, 2004). A topic of particular interest to researchers is work-family conflict. Work and family research has indicated that work-family conflict has an unfavourable effect on an individual’s work life, family life and general well-being (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). Work-family conflict is the product of numerous tasks and time requirements faced by individuals as they attempt to manage family and work responsibilities (Ciabattari, 2007). While this conflict may occur in both directions, in other words from work-to-family and from family-to-work, the main focus in organisational research has primarily been on work-to-family conflict (Boles, Howard, & Donofrio, 2001).

Men and women experience work-family conflict in different ways. One cannot assume that men and women have adopted an egalitarian perspective on work and family, as the roles that men and women occupy are deeply gendered (Toth, 2005). Differences in gender are further reinforced by the cultural assumptions that organisations make about men and women. Organisations stereotype women as being emotional, loving and nurturing, while men are characterised as logical and industrious (Santos & Cabral-Cardoso, 2008). However, the numbers of dual-earner families are continually
increasing and more modern gender-role norms are beginning to prevail, in which both men and women are finding it important to take part in and contribute to work and family life (Ten Brummelhuis, Van der Lippe, Kluwer, & Flap, 2008).

1.2 Definitions of Constructs

1.2.1 Work-family conflict.

Much of the literature in organisational behaviour and industrial and organisational psychology uses the constructs “work-family” and “work-life” interchangeably to characterise the interface of individuals’ personal, or family, lives and their professional, working lives (Hamilton, Gordon, & Whelan-Berry, 2006). Earlier conceptualisations of work-family conflict did not differentiate between the directions of conflict. In other words, no distinction was made between conflict caused by a work role interfering with family, and conflict caused by a family role interfering with work.

One of the consequences of an individual’s inability to manage the demands of work and family is the increasing level of conflict that the individual experiences. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) define work-family conflict as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (p. 77). Examination of the literature brings to light three forms of work and family conflict: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict and behaviour-based conflict. Time-based conflict refers to the numerous roles that compete for an individual’s time. Strain-based conflict refers to strain produced by a particular role, and behaviour-based conflict refers to specific patterns of role behaviour incompatibility (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) incorporated the two forms of work and family conflict (time-based and strain-based conflict) offered by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) in their conceptual definition of work-family conflict. Netemeyer et al. (1996) define work-family conflict as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the general
demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities” (p. 401).

The cumulative demands of participation in various roles result in two types of strain: role overload and role interference. Role overload occurs when the demands of different roles on an individual’s time and energy exceed the individual’s ability to perform either role proficiently. Role interference occurs when the demands from numerous roles conflict to such a degree that the requirements of none of them can be fully achieved (Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994). Role interference is recognised as bi-directional, and can be conceptualised as having two components: family interference with work, and work interference with family (Duxbury et al., 1994; Eagle, Icenogle, Maes, & Miles, 1998). Family interference with work arises when responsibilities of participation in the family role impede an individual’s performance at work; for example when a sick child prevents a parent’s work attendance. Work interference with family occurs when activities at work hinder the performance of family duties and responsibilities; for example when an individual is working long hours and not spending enough time with the family. Family interference with work and work interference with family are separate, although interconnected, components of work-family conflict (Gutek, Searle, & Kelpa, 1991; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992).

The conceptual definition of work-family conflict used in the context of this study is based on the definition by Netemeyer et al. (1996). The researcher of the current study adapted the definition to include the third form of work and family conflict (behaviour-based conflict) offered by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Therefore, the definition of work-family conflict used to guide the definition construction in this study is “a form of inter-role conflict in which the general demands of time devoted to, strain created by, and behaviour required for the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities” (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77).
Family-work conflict is also regarded as a type of inter-role conflict in which family and work responsibilities are mutually incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Limited definitions of family-work conflict are found in the work and family literature, as a large number of studies have focused exclusively on work-to-family effects (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). Regardless of the conceptual distinction between work-family conflict and family-work conflict, most researchers have focused entirely on the impact of work outcomes on family life (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Frone, Russell and Cooper, (1992) found that family boundaries are more permeable than work boundaries; that is, demands from work roles interfere more easily with family roles. This may explain why limited research on the construct of family-work conflict is presented in the work and family literature.

According to Frone et al. (1992), family-work conflict is more likely to wield its negative influences in the family domain, thus contributing to lower life satisfaction and increased conflict within the family. Family-work conflict, like work-family conflict, is also associated with individuals' attitudes towards their jobs (Netemeyer et al., 1996). The study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge regarding family-work conflict and to understand the interrelations between constructs: work-family and family-work conflict. The conceptual definition of family-work conflict used in this study is also based on that of Netemeyer et al. (1996). This definition, like work-family conflict, has also been adapted to include the third form of work and family conflict (behaviour-based conflict) offered by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Therefore, family-work conflict is defined in this study as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, strain created by, and behaviour required by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities” (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77).
Based on the definitions of work-family and family-work conflict, the interface between work and family may be regarded as an interactional activity in which an individual’s functioning in a specific domain is affected by the negative or positive load effects that have accumulated in another domain (Demerouti, 2004). If an individual is unable to function according to the requirements of various roles in work and family domains, there is a high likelihood that the individual will experience conflict between these roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflict and family-work conflict are separate, but conceptually associated forms of inter-role conflict. Both forms of conflict are essentially a consequence of an individual’s effort to satisfy a plethora of pressures originating from both the family and work domains (Boles et al., 2001).

1.2.3 Role identity and social identity.

The concept of identity is applicable in both the social and behavioural sciences (Ng & Feldman, 2007). As a result, various theoretical disciplines have investigated the concept, resulting in numerous conceptualisations of the term (Burke, 2003). Identity theory helps to explain the role-related behaviour of individuals and focuses on the individual’s sense of self as constituting the basis of his or her role identity (Burke, 2003). Social identity theory, on the other hand, seeks to explain processes that occur within groups and in inter-group relations (Veer, Becirovic, & Martin, 2010). Social identity theory presumes that an individual’s identity is related to the social group to which he or she is affiliated (Burke, 2003).

Role identities act as a framework which individuals utilise to translate an assortment of social situations; thus they affect role-related behaviour by conforming to behavioural expectations (Burke & Tully, 1977; Thoits, 1991). Role identities are self-formations and self-referent insights that individuals assign to themselves as a result of the structural role positions that they occupy as members of specific social groups (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). Essentially, role identities can be defined as the meanings that individuals
ascribe to themselves within specific situations. These meanings enclose a set of intentions that determine applicable behaviour within a particular role-related position.

### 1.2.4 Work and family.

There has been much debate over the definition of work, especially the issue of whether work is restricted to tasks associated with paid employment or includes task-related activities that are not related to financial gain, such as housework (Eby et al., 2005; Zedeck, 1992). Work is usually associated with employment, and is identified by activities that are prescribed for individuals to perform on a contractual basis for remuneration. Work characteristically involves membership in an employing organisation or market that remunerates the individual for his or her contributions (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Work is defined as the converse of rest and encompasses the original goal of engaging in activities to obtain goods and services essential for survival (Parker & Smith, 1976, as cited in Drenth, 1991, p. 125). Because part of the focus of this study is on the interface between paid employment and family activities, the definition of work will be restricted to “full-time paid employment”. In other words, work is any activity that involves a relationship of exchange of effort, knowledge, or other contributions for financial rewards (Eby et al., 2005).

Family can be understood as a universal social unit, which consists of people who are directly linked by “kin” relationship or connection, where members are accountable for childcare responsibility; a social group characterised by shared residence, economic co-operation and reproduction (Duncan, 2001). Like work, family implies membership within a social organisation to which an individual contributes (Zedeck, 1992, as cited in Edwards & Rothbard, 2000, p. 179). However, such contributions are not planned to receive goods and services, but rather to uphold and improve the well-being of the family (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For the purposes of this study, family is defined as two or more individuals (who may include dependent children) who reside
together or apart and are related by birth, marriage or adoption. However, committed but unmarried partners who may (or may not) have children together will also form part of the definition used in this study.

1.2.5 Working women with children.

In this study, the term “working women” refers to women who are part of the labour force and who receive remuneration for the work that they perform. Women who have children and are engaged in permanent formal employment (Lupri, 1983) are included in this definition. In the context of this study, working women with children are women who are engaged in formal employment and who have children (biological, adopted or inherited, and conceived in or out of wedlock) who are dependent on them emotionally or financially.

1.2.6 Job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is probably one of the most researched constructs in management literature, and has attracted a substantial amount of research. By 1990 more than 12 000 job satisfaction studies had been published and since then hundreds more have been made available (Ghazzawi & Smith, 2009). Understanding the construct of job satisfaction is of fundamental significance in understanding and predicting the behaviour of individuals at work (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992).

Job satisfaction is related to how adequately individuals feel their wants and needs are being met at work (Sellgren, Ekvall, & Tomson, 2008). Research has shown that there are individual differences in people’s vocational needs with respect to the resources that are accessible for the satisfaction of needs (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). For the purposes of this study, job satisfaction is defined as the attitudes that an individual has towards several aspects of work and the work environment (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999).
1.2.7 Burnout.

According to Winstanley and Whittington (2002), burnout is a dynamic process, associated with stress and deriving from a combination of low coping mechanisms and a high workload. Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001) postulate that burnout is caused by the heavy workload that has resulted from modern lifestyles and demands from work-related pressures. Burnout has been conceptualised as consisting of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and feelings of reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Emotional exhaustion constitutes the stress dimension related to burnout and typically leaves the individual feeling drained of energy (Maslach et al., 2001). Depersonalisation affects the interpersonal situation, and refers to a negative approach towards other people and a tendency to treat them as objects (Maslach et al., 2001). Reduced personal accomplishment represents the component of self-evaluation and denotes low levels of sufficiency in relation to individual job performance (Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & De Clermont, 2003).

The most influential definition of burnout has been offered by Maslach (1982, p. 20), who characterises burnout as “a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity”, bearing in mind that burnout is defined as a state of mind that is related to work characteristics. Therefore, burnout is defined in this study as a three-dimensional condition of emotional exhaustion, cynicism and low professional efficacy, with the possibility of these resulting in a combination of continued stress at work and ineffectual ways of coping (Ahola, Honkonen, Virtanen, Aromaa, & Lönnqvist, 2008).
1.3 The Research Problem

Consideration of gender is fundamental to the study of work and family because work and family roles within society are largely based on gender expectations (Rothausen, 2009). Gender stereotyping takes place within the family and work context, where the social ideals of femininity are what reflect a “good mother” or “ideal employee”, and the social ideals for masculinity are what constitute a “good father” or “ideal employee” (Fletcher & Bailyn, 2005). However, the rise of dual-career couples and households headed by single parents, and the changes in the traditional structures of single-breadwinner families signify that accountabilities for work, domestic duties, and childcare are no longer restricted to conventional gender roles. More and more, individuals are struggling to cope with the challenging demands of combining work and family roles (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

According to Eagly and Carli (2007), the masculine roles of the family provider and the ideal employee are interdependent and complementary for men. In contrast, the feminine roles of the family nurturer and the ideal employee are independent and conflicting for women. Based on Eagly and Carli’s (2007) proposition, one can assume that men and women therefore assign different meaning to their work and family roles. Simon (1995) contends that work and family responsibilities are far more interdependent for men than they are for women. It is likely that the more roles a woman occupies, the greater the amount of pressure she will experience on her time, energy and other resources. As a result, the cumulative pressures of participation in various roles may result in role interference (work interference with family conflict or family interference with work conflict). The psychological cost of multiple-role occupancy is most often evaluated in terms of organisational outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction and burnout. Burnout and decreased job satisfaction may both be dependent on the importance an individual places on a particular role identity. In other words, if a working woman with children regards her family role of being a mother as more salient than her work role as an employee, she is more likely to experience conflict in the form of work
interfering with family. This is consistent with Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) postulation that over-engagement in the family domain may adversely affect the work domain. It is likely that the increase in interference from work-to-family ultimately leading to work-family conflict may affect burnout and job satisfaction levels among working women with children. In a study conducted by Pitt-Catsouphes et al. (2006), women who participated in various roles, especially women with children who took on the additional role of employee, were frequently exhausted, greatly vulnerable to stress-related issues and not capable of managing the various demands of their work and family lives.

Yet individuals participate in a number of social roles within work and family. Participation in roles provides meaning and purpose in their lives. The salience of a particular role identity has certain implications for an individual’s engagement in a role. These implications become apparent when individuals have a limited amount of time and energy to invest in a particular role identity that they occupy. The investment of time and energy in various family or work roles may be due to the desire that individuals have to maintain and reinforce their self-identities to provide meaning and purpose. This proposition is deeply rooted in the scarcity theory, which posits that individuals have finite amounts of time, energy or resources at their disposal (Marks, 1977). This proposition is represented in Figure 1, which was developed from the literature by the researcher of the current study, and is discussed in detail in Chapter 3. The researchers’ intention is not to test the proposition; but the figure is rather used to clarify and illustrate the conceptual thinking that formed a framework of potential relationships that may exist between the work-family conflict as the independent variable and other dependent variables (burnout, job satisfaction and role identity).
Figure 1. Conceptual framework, linking role identity, conflict, burnout and job satisfaction

Figure 1 shows that, depending on the role identity that is regarded as significantly salient to an individual, participation in that role identity is accompanied by various role stressors. For instance, if the employee role is regarded as salient, individuals will be exposed to various work role stressors such as inflexible working schedules, long working hours and little or no support from their managers. Taken together, such stressors that are inherent to a specific domain (work domain stressors or family domain stressors) intensify because of the limited amount of time and energy an individual has at his or her disposal, and eventually causes interference between roles.
Role interference, regardless of direction (from work to family or from family to work), is further exacerbated when role characteristics affect the time dedicated to, strain created by and the behaviour required for participation in a particular role. This eventually leads to conflict between two roles: work role or family role. Individuals create boundaries around work and family domains; these boundaries are most frequently defined in terms of their permeability (Clark, 2000), which refers to the extent to which a role or domain interferes with another role or domain. According to Pleck (1977), men are more likely to allow the work domain to interfere with the family domain; in contrast, women are more likely to allow the family domain to interfere with the work domain.

In summary, in this research study (and as shown in Figure 1) it is argued that burnout and decreased job satisfaction result from the conflict experienced when too much time and energy is invested in one particular role (family). Individuals need to determine their own levels of engagement in a variety of different roles depending on the salience of the particular roles. Role pressures are intensified when the work and family roles are salient or fundamental to the individual's self-concept and when strong negative sanctions for nonconformity with role demands are present. The incompatibility of the work and family roles due to the different norms and responsibilities that each role represents causes interference and spillover from one role into another (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). That is, involvement in one role (work or family) is made more complicated by virtue of involvement in another role (work or family) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), which causes an individual to experience conflict. Empirical research has indicated that increased transitions from one role to another lead to an increase in conflict between those roles (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005; Matthews & Barnes-Ferrell, 2006).

An overarching premise of this study is that work and family should not be seen as separate worlds, but that both domains compete for scarce resources such as an individual’s time and energy (Marks, 1977). A number of
researchers agree that work-family conflict and family-work conflict should be seen as distinct but interrelated forms of inter-role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Khan, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Work interference with family and family interference with work are also regarded as separate, albeit interrelated, forms of work-family conflict (Gutek et al., 1991; O’Driscoll et al., 1992).

1.4 Research Objectives and Research Questions

The research objectives of this study are to explore the manifestation of work and family conflict in working women with children and understand the potential relationships of such conflict with undesirable work outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction and burnout. The effects and salience of role identities on the manifestation of conflict among working women with children are investigated. Furthermore, this research investigates whether working women with children who identify more closely with the mother-role identity experience greater work-family conflict than individuals who identify more closely with the employee-role identity. This raises the question of whether working women with children experience role salience differently from other working women, and how they experience the effects of such salience. In order to effectively achieve the research objectives, the following measurable research questions are proposed and investigated within the context of this study:

1. To what extent is there a relationship between biographical-type variables/characteristics and work-family conflict?
2. Is there a relationship between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and burnout?
3. Is there a relationship between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and job satisfaction?
4. To what extent do working women with children experience higher burnout than other working women?
5. In what ways do the role identities of working women with children differ from the role identities of other working women and men?
6. Do working women who identify with the mother-role identity experience higher family-work conflict or work-family conflict?
7. Do working women with children experience more negative family interference with work or negative work interference with family than other working women and men?
8. To what extent is there a relationship between spouse/partner support and family-work conflict among working women with children, other working women and men?

As far as could be established, no previous research could be found that has investigated the levels of work and family conflict among working women with children, the association between various role identities and experiences of burnout, and the significant impact of this conflict on the level of job satisfaction. The study builds on, and contributes to, the existing literature pertaining to the work and family interface by broadening family-work conflict literature with empirical data and insight.

1.4 The Structure of the Dissertation

In order to investigate whether relationships exist between family-work conflict, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, burnout and role identity, the research study began with a literature review. It was essential to cover and examine a wide range of pertinent topics derived from various disciplines, which included organisational behaviour, psychology, sociology and anthropology. The literature review consists of two main parts. The first part deals directly with the diversity of working families and the challenges they face in the 21st century. A multidimensional approach fosters perspectives regarding work, family and role identity. The second part of the literature review deals with job satisfaction and burnout. Only appropriate theories and constructs of job satisfaction pertaining especially to working women with children are included in the literature review.
In Chapter 3, the research argument is developed. This chapter is devoted to the integration and analysis of the literature discussed in Chapter 2. This chapter does not repeat theory or information offered in the literature review, but integrates the theory to develop the research problem, research goal and research objective. This chapter also includes a set of research questions developed from the literature study and the research argument discussions.

Chapter 4 deals with the research methodology. This chapter describes the sampling methodology and the participants, the research instruments and the statistical analytical procedures used in the study.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the different statistical analyses in order to provide answers to the eight research questions that underpin the current study. The study concludes with a discussion chapter (Chapter 6), in which the results of the study are interpreted in relation to the conceptual model, research objectives and research questions developed in Chapter 3. Limitations of the research study and recommendations for future research are also discussed in Chapter 6. A reference list and appendices follow Chapter 6.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Work-Family Conflict

A topic which has been extensively researched in organisational behaviour is the conflict that arises between work and family. In recent years, various studies have improved our understanding of the dynamics of how work affects family and family affects work (Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The work and family relationship has received considerable attention, which has been largely initiated by the increased participation of women in the workforce (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). The changing composition of the workforce, coupled with the increasing number of individuals living in non-traditional family structures, has further heightened the awareness of conflict between work and family roles (Zedeck, 1992). Owing to these unfolding changes, more and more individuals face the challenges of managing their work and family responsibilities and roles (McNall, Masuda, & Nicklin, 2010). The complexities involved in combining and managing work and family roles ultimately lead to conflict between these two domains (Nikandrou, Panayotopoulou, & Apospori, 2008). The unfavourable consequences of conflict affecting families, employers and employees has led to the recognition of the problem of integrating work and family as a social phenomenon of the 21st century (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997).

The work and family relationship is complicated and multidimensional in nature. When incompatible demands and expectations arise from work and family roles, the result is a form of inter-role conflict, more specifically known as work-family conflict (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Since work-family conflict refers to the interference between work and family domains, decisions that individuals make regarding these domains may impact upon both organisations and individuals. For example, in the work domain, individuals may choose to select career options that lessen the time in achieving career goals. In the family domain, individuals decide on the amount of time and attention they want to dedicate to their family roles. The amount of work-family
conflict an individual experiences can be attributed not only to these decisions, but also to individual and organisational characteristics (Nikandrou et al., 2008).

2.1.1 Work-family conflict and family-work conflict defined.

Two significant areas of adult life are family and work. The role expectations arising from both work and family may not always be compatible, which produces conflict between work and family roles (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Research on work-family conflict acknowledges the interdependencies between work and family domains and investigates how individuals experience role conflict. Role conflict is examined by the simultaneous performance of mutually dependent roles that individuals participate in, with their related demands in terms of time and energy that each role requires (Eagle et al., 1998). Role conflict is defined as the “simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other” (Khan et al., 1964, p. 19). That is, the demands and pressures arising from one role make performance of the other role more difficult (Katz & Khan, 1978). Kahn et al. (1964) identified the type of conflict that an individual experiences between work and family roles as inter-role conflict. Inter-role conflict is defined as “a form of role conflict in which the sets of opposing pressures arise from participation in different roles” (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 20).

Figure 2. Origin of inter-role conflict

Therefore, due to the incompatibility between roles, the demands arising from one role (family) lead to inter-role conflict with the demands arising from
another role (work) (Figure 2). There exists a strong premise that work-family conflict and family-work conflict are separate but interrelated forms of inter-role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Khan et al., 1964; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Even though several sources of work-family conflict have been acknowledged, researchers largely agree that the general demands of a role, the time dedicated to a specified role, and the strain created by a specified role are domain elements of work-family conflict and family-work conflict (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

One of the difficulties in synthesising the literature regarding the work and family relationship is the different terminology proposed by various authors to describe what is essentially the same construct (Gutek, Repetti, & Silver, 1988; Duxbury & Higgins, 1992b; Lewis & Cooper, 1988). Because of such interchangeable usage of work-family conflict and family-work conflict terminology, an overview of the work and family conflict theory is required. Figure 3 represents this overview, which is an integration of the conflict terminology utilised by Duxbury et al. (1994); Greenhaus and Beutell, (1985); and Netemeyer et al. (1996).
Figure 3 demonstrates that inter-role conflict: conflict between work and family domains, takes two forms: role overload and role interference. Role overload exists when growing demands on an individual's time and energy from two or more roles exceed the individual’s capability to execute either role proficiently. Role interference occurs when the demands from two or more roles conflict to the degree that the requirements of neither role can be satisfied (Duxbury & Higgins, 1992a). The definition of work-family conflict and family-work conflict offered by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) indicates the presence of incompatible role pressures; however, no causal direction of interference between roles is specified. The assumption of direction of role interference is, nonetheless, inherent in the work and family theory as well as in the measurement of conflict. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) propose that it may be useful to develop conflict scales that reflect the directions of role interference: interference from work-to-family and from family-to-work.

In this study, it was therefore fundamentally important to distinguish between the directions of role interference. Role interference in work-family conflict is documented as being bi-directional in nature; that is, role strain may occur out
of family interference with work (FIW) as well as out of work interference with family (WIF) (Duxbury et al., 1994). Interference occurs when the demands of two or more roles conflict to the degree that the requirements of neither role are satisfied. Conflict arises from the interference between work and family roles; therefore negative interference becomes conflict.

Conversely, the positive side of the interface between work and family: the idea that work and family may in fact be equally beneficial, has received some attention. Researchers have attempted to present a more holistic picture of the positive side of work and family interface, which is referred to as enrichment (Frone, 2003; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002). Unfortunately, such research has developed with no clear direction and there is a need for further research to be conducted on salient concepts and measures regarding the positive outcomes deriving from the work and family interface (Korabik, Lero, & Whitehead, 2008).

The conflict that arises from family interference with work and from work interference with family takes three forms (see Figure 3). The first form is time-based conflict, which occurs when the time dedicated to satisfying duties in one domain limits the amount of time accessible to execute roles in the other domain (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Pleck, Staines, and Lang (1980) suggest that dimensions of time in the form of extremely demanding working hours and work schedules are considered time-based conflict dimensions, which lead to role overload. The nature and amount of work-family conflict that an individual experiences is expected to increase in direct proportion to the hours the individual spends in each role. In a meta-analytic study conducted by Byron (2005), a correlation of $r = .26$ was reported between work-family conflict and the number of hours worked, and a correlation of $r = .65$ was reported between work-family conflict and role overload. Research has confirmed that women experience more family interference with work conflict than men do, because women spend a greater amount of their time in the family domain (Gutek et al., 1991). The total amount of time that an
individual spends on both work and family roles is positively related to role overload (Duxbury et al., 1994).

The second form of conflict under discussion in Figure 3 is strain-based conflict, which occurs when strain created by one role hinders the role demands in the other domain from being satisfied (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Strain-based conflict may take the form of anxiety, fatigue, irritability and tension (Premeaux, Adkins, & Mossholder, 2007). Extended and inflexible working hours, commuting, travel and overtime are examples of variables that may create strain-based and time-based conflict.

Although time-based and strain-based conflicts are conceptually different, they share many common sources in the work domain. In the same way, within the family domain, any role characteristic that creates extensive time commitment may also, directly or indirectly, create strain (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research conducted by Allen et al. (2000) found that time-based and strain-based conflicts are related to a number of negative work-family and stress-related outcomes variables.

Behaviour-based conflict is the third kind of conflict (Figure 3), and occurs when patterns of in-role behaviour are incompatible with the expectations relating to an individual’s behaviour within another role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). It is likely that behaviour-based conflict may also contribute to role interference, particularly when an individual is unable to change his or her behaviour to conform to the various role expectations; individuals are therefore most likely to experience interference between such roles. When individuals invest time and energy in the family domain, for example in child-rearing duties, without sufficient time for recovery, negative load interference develops and spills over into the work domain. Conversely, when the time and energy invested remain acceptable because individuals can modify their behaviour at home to suit their need for recovery, positive load interference develops and spills over to the work domain (Geurts et al., 2005). The conceptual model of work and family undertaken in the study is guided by the
work conducted by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Any role characteristics that influence an individual’s allocated time commitment and strain- or behaviour-based conflict within another role can create conflict between different roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

As mentioned, a difficulty in synthesising the literature on the work and family relationship is the different terminology used by various authors to describe essentially the same construct (Duxbury & Higgins, 1992b; Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987; Herman & Gyllstrom, 1977; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1989). Researchers have agreed that work-family conflict and family-work conflict are separate but related forms of inter-role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Khan et al., 1964; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Pleck et al., 1980). Similarly, work interference with family and family interference with work are also regarded as separate, although related, components of work-family conflict (Gutek et al., 1991; O’Driscoll et al., 1992).

Upon analysing the theory and definitions of work-family conflict and family-work conflict, Allen et al. (2000) suggests that there is ambiguity regarding the nature of the work-family construct. Geurts et al. (2005) refer to “work-family conflict” and “work interference with family” as one construct. Work-family conflict (or work-family interference) has been defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, as cited in Geurts et al., 2005, p. 320). Another study conducted by Koekemoer, Mostert, and Rothmann (2010, p. 2), contends that the most commonly used definition of the “interference” between work and family is Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985, p. 7) definition of work-family conflict as a form of inter-role “conflict”. A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict conducted by Byron (2005) refers to “work-family conflict” also as “work-family interference” as a type of inter-role conflict (Kahn et al., 1964, as cited in Byron 2005, p. 170).

Construct redundancy is a major problem in organisational behaviour and other social disciplines. New constructs that seem similar to existing
constructs are frequently proposed in the social sciences (Le, Schmidt, Harter, & Lauver, 2010). It is generally agreed that the failure to address redundancy issues between two or more constructs may result in the proliferation of constructs. Such proliferation thus hinders the process of methodical and cumulative research (Blalock, 1968; Singh, 1991). From the literature review and definitions of work-family conflict (WFC) and work interference with family (WIF), appear to be somewhat similar, with unclear distinctions between the constructs. Similarly, the constructs family-work conflict (FWC) and family interference with work (FIW) also appear to represent similar conceptualisations, in that their definitions appear to be similar.

Such interchangeable uses of the conflict and interference constructs create problems from a theoretical, empirical and practical perspective. From a theoretical perspective, redundancy issues that remain unexplained may cause considerable confusion. Some researchers may regard such constructs as different and may perhaps devote a tremendous amount of effort to research that is focused around each construct (Singh, 1991), while other researchers may treat them as “overlapping” and utilise such constructs interchangeably. Similarly, from an empirical perspective, if redundancy issues go unaddressed, the current understanding of the constructs’ sources, antecedents and consequences remain ambiguous (Singh, 1991). Lastly, it is not practical to have several constructs that elicit similar underlying phenomena without overtly understanding the nature of the redundancy issues between the constructs. If issues of redundancy remain unresolved, a substantial amount of confusion may persist. Some researchers may consider constructs as separate, and strive to build logical research arguments focused around each construct, while conversely other researchers may regard certain constructs as overlapping and use them interchangeably (Singh, 1991).

2.1.2 The nature of the work and family problem.

Research on work and family has attempted to elucidate work-family conflict from various theoretical perspectives, particularly role theory. Role theory
provides a conceptual framework that encompasses much of the work-family conflict literature (Khan et al., 1964). Role theory suggests that an individual’s participation in numerous roles leads to difficulty in satisfying the demands of these roles, and ultimately leads to conflict. Role theory ascribes gender-typical roles to men and women regarding the social roles that they occupy in society. Social roles shape the expectations of suitable behaviour and attitudes required by men and women regarding their abilities and skills (Hoobler, Wayne, & Lemmon, 2009). Role theory research has repeatedly characterised men as agentic, competitive and capable, whereas it has characterised women as emotional, sensitive and nurturing (Diekman & Eagly, 2000). Mattis (2002) notes that stereotyping of women still prevails, since organisations characterise women as less dedicated to their careers than men, simply because of the care-giving roles that women occupy. Care-giving roles in organisations are often undervalued and viewed as incongruent with leadership-type roles (Lewis, 2010). The implication of such organisational stereotyping is that women’s careers may be jeopardised because of the care-giving roles ascribed to them.

Competing demands resulting from multiple-role participation may influence the individual’s decision to either follow a career or have a family. The accountability for managing the demands that may arise from pursuing a career or having a family or both lies predominately with the individual (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). The concept of individual accountability remains consistent with the prevailing cultural values of individualism. Nevertheless, the reality is that many individuals work because of the economic necessity to support their families, regardless of the conflict that emerges (Powell, 1993). The role demands of family do not simply disappear for employed women, who usually bear the majority of the household and childcare responsibilities (Baxter, 2002).

The nature of the work-family problem became more prominent during the last century, with the increase in women’s participation in the workforce. It was generally expected that a complementary increase in men’s contribution
towards domestic and child-rearing activities would occur (Craig, 2007). It was assumed that the more time women spent in paid employment, the greater would be the increase in men’s domesticity. However, analysis conducted from time data studies shows that, regardless of the assumption of increased gender equity, women are still responsible for the greater part of the domestic labour (Baxter, 2002; Bittman, England, Sayer, Folbre, & Matheson, 2003). Empirical research conducted on the use of time patterns confirms that the division of domestic labour remains uneven. Time pattern studies consistently demonstrate that if both paid and unpaid work are aggregated, men’s and women’s average workloads are in totality very alike (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006). This means that the majority of women remain responsible for unpaid labour and paid labour, but not to the degree that women are working longer total hours than men are (Craig, 2007).

Women’s economic behaviour and the roles they occupy in the workplace have been significantly compared with the economic behaviour and the workplace roles of men (Hartmann, 2004). For instance, not only has there been an increase in women’s participation in the labour force, but also women have invested more time in educational achievements (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). According to Helfat, Harris, and Wolfsan (2006), the majority of women attain careers in disciplines such as law and economics, and graduate in numbers that are equal to those of men. Women are seeking economic independence and security by engaging in both work and family roles (Hartmann, 2004).

Professional women have various options with regard to the extent to which they embrace their family roles. An increasing number of women seem to delay marriage and children in order to first establish their careers (Hill, Märtinson, & Ferris, 2004). These decisions seem to be based on the assumption that a greater family role may lead to fewer career opportunities for women (Statham, Vaughan, & Houseknecht, 1987). On the other hand, if these women delay getting married and having children, there is the possibility that they may never marry or have children (Hewlett, 2002). Marriage and
child-rearing are essential elements of the life script of most women in professional careers, and women are looking for more effective ways to successfully integrate the demands of work and home (Galinsky et al., 2002). The successful integration of work and family has therefore aroused interest among work-family researchers. The focus of enrichment is on whether work and family roles can be beneficial to and improve one another (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Work-family enrichment suggests that an individual's participation in various roles can produce beneficial resources in these roles (McNall et al., 2010).

2.1.3 Work-family conflict and enrichment.

Conflict that originates between work and family domains has consistently been related to undesirable outcomes such as low levels of job satisfaction and burnout (Eby et al., 2005; Hill, 2005). However, a growing stream of research has reported positive implications of reciprocal enrichment between the work and family domains, such as higher organisational commitment and general well-being (Balmforth & Gardner, 2006; Damiano-Texeira, 2006; Voydanoff, 2004). These implications suggest that the work and family roles may be beneficial to each other because of the transference of positive experiences from one role to another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Work-family enrichment, or facilitation, refers to the degree to which experiences in a particular role benefit and enhance the quality of life in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Consequently, the construct of work-family enrichment is becoming prominent on the work-family research agenda (Frone, 2003). In a study conducted by Hill (2005), work-family enrichment was positively correlated to an individual's satisfaction in marriage, life, family and job. The role accumulation theory by Sieber (1974) and the expansionist theory by Marks (1977) provide insight into the enrichment process. Role accumulation theory suggests that individuals choose to engage and participate in multiple roles in exchange for
The expansionist approach proposes that participating in various roles has the potential to produce resources that access energy, which is ultimately redirected to other roles (McNall et al., 2010). Taking both the role accumulation and expansionist theories into consideration, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) have recently presented an all-encompassing theoretical framework of work-family enrichment. This proposes that enrichment occurs when resource gains such as rewards and energy in a specific role (the work role) improve performance in another role (the family role). Various resources, which include interpersonal skills and other skills; emotional and physical characteristics such as self-assurance and resilience; a flexible work schedule, and tangible benefits such as funds and gifts, all contribute to the work-family enrichment process (McNall et al., 2010).

The theory of work-family enrichment not only highlights the positive aspects of participating in numerous roles, as mentioned (Warner & Hausdorf, 2009), but also identifies the circumstances which are related to distress, as opposed to fulfilment, in various roles. However, additional understanding is required regarding the underlying reasons why individuals participate in various roles that may lead to enrichment or fulfilment. Given the limited research that is available on the positive aspects of combining work and family roles, additional investigation from the perspectives of other theories is required. An increasing amount of literature is becoming available on social support and job characteristics such as workload and flexibility, which may explain whether multiple roles can be beneficial to an individual (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

However, limited research is available on factors specifically internal to individuals which might aid the understanding of these benefits of multiple-role participation (Warner & Hausdorf, 2009). Such unexplored factors are internal mechanisms that affect the extent to which individuals experience positive spillover as opposed to negative spillover. For example, one unexplored
reason for the facilitating aspects of numerous roles may be the degree to which participating in various roles satisfies an individual's fundamental psychological needs for independence, competence and relatedness (Warner & Hausdorf, 2009). The needs theory forms the cornerstone of the self-determination theory.

The self-determination theory suggests that individuals have an inherent propensity towards psychological growth and development. Individuals strive to meet and manage their constant challenges and synthesise their experiences into a sense of self. The theory of satisfaction of basic needs, which derives from the self-determination theory, provides researchers with a platform for investigating the reasons why individuals thrive in certain roles but feel unsatisfied and alienated in others (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004). According to the needs theory, multiple-role participation should offer psychological benefits, since multiple roles present individuals with more opportunities to meet their own needs for independence, competence and relatedness. In other words, multiple-role participation provides more opportunities for individuals to engage with a sense of freedom, enabling those who experience little independence at work to acquire a sense of independence in their family interactions. Individuals may satisfy their need for competence through interacting and engaging in various roles, displaying high competence levels in a specific role (work), even when they feel less competent in another role (family). Individuals may satisfy the need for relatedness by participating in various roles, which exposes them to a broader range of people with whom they can collectively network and feel related (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

It therefore becomes important for organisations to understand how individuals can simultaneously reduce their negative experiences and capitalise on their positive outcomes in order to create a balance between work and family (Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009). Boundary theory provides insights into the negative and positive outcomes that individuals experience between their work and personal lives (Ashforth,
Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). The boundary theory explains how individuals categorise and separate certain role expectations and demands that originate from work and family domains (Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999). Individual preferences for work and family boundaries are socially developed (Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). Individuals decide how to define their boundaries between work and home. For example, some individuals prefer to institute stringent boundaries between work and family by switching off mobile phones and e-mail at the end of the day (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Other individuals prefer to integrate their work and family boundaries and will take personal phone calls at work or work at home in order to be more available to their families (Kossek et al., 2006). A boundary management strategy forms the cornerstone of an individual’s preferred approach to work-family role integration (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999).

The boundary theory allows individuals to select a preferred way to integrate work and family roles. This requires individuals to reflect on the realities of their lives in order to arrange and separate role expectations and demands within their specific work and family domains. The boundary theory is consistent with Zedeck’s postulation (1992) that maintaining a balance between work and family is the way that individuals shape the boundaries of work and family activities, construct personal meaning, and deal with the relationships between family and work.

The approach towards work-family conflict and enrichment evolves from evaluating the appropriate resources and demands affiliated with the roles of work and family (Voydanoff, 2005a). There appears to be consensus that an inclusive appreciation of the interaction between work and family must incorporate the elements of both conflict and enrichment (Innstrand, Langballe, Falkum, Espnes, & Aasland, 2009a).
2.1.4 Antecedents and consequences of work and family conflict.

A large part of the literature on work and family highlights the antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict (Eby et al., 2005; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). One antecedent of work-family conflict that is pertinent to the context of this study is the shift in the attitudes of women toward gendered roles. Autonomy, self-actualisation and fulfilment have led to a wider appreciation of the benefits of remaining single. Changing societal norms, accompanied by the improvement in women’s education and career attainment, have influenced the choices women make regarding marriage and parenthood (Hamilton et al., 2006). The changes in the participation of women in the labour force have ultimately reshaped the traditional family structure of husband as primary breadwinner and wife as homemaker.

Family structure changes have contributed to an increase in the number of dual-income couples and families headed by single parents. The number of employees with irregular schedules has increased significantly, while very little has been done to support them in managing their work and family obligations (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004). A factor contributing to work-family conflict is the active participation of women in work, which gives rise to additional pressure and demands at home. These experiences serve as work-domain predictors of work-family conflict. Likewise, disagreements between family members due to increased time spent at work, or the presence of small children at home, serve as family domain predictors of work-family conflict (Eby et al., 2005). Marital status, number and ages of children, gender, education, work schedules and organisational tenure are some of the antecedents of work-family conflict (Karatepe & Tekinkus, 2006). Relevant and applicable antecedents of work-family conflict pertaining to this study are discussed next, although the list is not exhaustive.

Parents experience changes as their children grow older, and the factors that influence work-family conflict, are not static but evolve over the course of a dependent child’s life (Darcy & MCarthy, 2007). Individuals with younger
children are more likely to experience higher levels of work-family conflict; this conflict lessens as the age of the youngest child increases (Darcy & McCarthy, 2007). A study conducted by Nomaguchi (2009) found that parents experience greater work-family conflict than non-parents. The contemporary philosophy that parents should spend time with their children reflects the idealised imagery of family togetherness, and many parents feel a sense of obligation to pursue this ideal (Daly, 2001). Many parents go to great lengths to secure time with their children. However, more and more employed parents are finding it increasingly difficult to find sufficient time to spend with their children for various reasons. For example, time spent with children is often combined with household duties or social activities as well; in this way, parents ensure that everything gets done (Bianchi et al., 2006). However, the reality remains that, regardless of the increased pace of family life, most parents feel that they do not spend sufficient time with their children due to work commitments, which consequently increases work-family conflict.

There have been a number of studies exploring work schedules as antecedents of work-family conflict. A study conducted by Lee, MacDermid, Williams, Buck, and Keiba-O'Sullivan (2002) examined factors relating to work arrangements that successfully reduced the actual workload of individuals. The study indicated that individuals utilising such work arrangements as flexible schedules and flexitime reported being more satisfied in their jobs and experienced less work-family conflict, and that their time and relationships with their children had improved. Work-related demands and resources, such as the number of hours worked, meaningfulness of work and time constraints are all significant factors relating to work-family conflict. It is therefore important for organisations to not only promote flexibility in terms of hours worked and work schedules, but also include other forms of employee autonomy that would assist employees to manage their work-family conflict (Voydanoff, 2004).

The increase in work-family conflict is largely due to women’s increased participation in the labour force, especially the participation of women who are
parents (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004; Winslow, 2005). Mixed evidence is found in the literature as to whether men and women experience different levels of work-family conflict. Duxbury and Higgins (1992b) found no differences in the work-family conflict experienced by men and women, while Behson (2002) found that women experience higher levels of work-family conflict than men do. Whether women experience higher work-family conflict in terms of intensity and frequency than men is debatable. A question arising from the inconsistency in the work-family research is whether time allocations were considered. Time-data studies found minimal gender differences with regard to the total hours of paid and domestic work performed by employed men and women. When the distribution of time is regarded as equal, women may be more likely than men to experience work-family conflict. This is partly because women usually assume the primary responsibility for child-rearing duties. Women are also more likely than men to assume responsibility for child-related crises, such as taking care of an ill child or picking up a child from school because of sickness or other emergency, which may interfere with their paid work activities to a large degree (Nomaguchi, 2009). A study conducted by Duxbury and Higgins (1992a) concluded that work conflict was the most important predictor of family conflict. In addition, in terms of work and family expectations, it was found that expectations from work were a stronger predictor of work-family conflict for men, whereas expectations from family were a stronger predictor of family-work conflict for women.

The number and ages of children also influence working parents’ work-family conflict to a large degree. Having more children is associated with greater pressure, responsibility and demands on parents. The presence of young children in the home may be related to greater work-family conflict, since young children require parents’ commitment and time (Voydanoff, 2004). However, empirical studies have not always confirmed a relationship between children’s ages and work-family conflict (Keene & Quadagno, 2004).

Although many adults are delaying having children in order to acquire and develop their careers (Casper & Bianchi, 2002), a study conducted by
Winslow (2005) found that older and more mature parents experience less work-family conflict than younger parents. This may be because older parents generally have more resources at their disposal to deal with the multiple responsibilities of work and family. Older parents are also in stable and established positions in their lives, and are financially more independent than younger parents are. Therefore, the increase in the average age of parents may have supported a decline in work-family conflict (Winslow, 2005).

2.1.5 Forms of work-family conflict.

Three main forms of work-family conflict are presented in the work-family literature: time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based conflict. Time-based and strain-based conflict have been widely measured and researched in the work and family literature (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). Time-based conflict occurs when the time committed to a role makes it difficult to participate in another role. For example, an inflexible work schedule is likely to compete for time that a mother would have spent with her children at home (Grice et al., 2007).

Strain-based conflict occurs when strain experienced in a particular role affects performance in another role. For example, reduced levels of social support received from work (from supervisors or colleagues) or from family (from spouse or partner) can lead to strain-based conflict (Grice et al., 2007).

Behaviour-based conflict occurs when a specific set of behaviours in one role is inconsistent with behaviours required in another role. For example, unresponsive and detached emotional behaviour may be tolerable at work but not suitable in parenting (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Any aspect of a particular role that causes time or strain or affects behaviour in that role produces conflict with another role. When work or family roles are salient to an individual’s self-concept, one can expect role pressures to intensify and increased work-family conflict to be experienced (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).
**2.1.5.1 Time-based conflict.**

Numerous roles may compete for an individual's time. Time-based conflict takes two different forms. The first form occurs when time pressures associated with commitment to a particular role make it difficult, if not impossible, to fulfil expectations from another role. The second form occurs when demands create a preoccupation with a specific role even when an individual is physically trying to satisfy the demands of another role (Bartolome & Evans, 1979). Demands may be left unfulfilled if an individual is either mentally preoccupied with another role or physically absent from that particular role. For example, a mother may be present at work but continuously preoccupied and worried about a sick child at home. Time-based conflict therefore involves the transfer of limited personal resources such as time, attention and energy from one role to another. The implication of this is that the transfer of time or attention from one role ultimately results in the demands of that role being unfulfilled (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

Sources of time-based conflict may be work-related or family related. Work-related sources of conflict include demands of working hours, work schedules, overtime and inflexible working arrangements. Previous research and meta-analytic reviews show that those individuals who have greater autonomy over their work schedules and working hours experience less work-family conflict (Byron, 2005; Kossek et al., 2006; Moen, Kelley, & Huang, 2008). Individuals utilise several adaptive strategies to lessen the work-family conflict they experience. Such strategies include reducing their working hours or reducing their spouse's working hours. These strategies often strengthen gender inequality, since women are more generally expected to either cut back on working hours or leave work permanently (Ammons & Edgell, 2007; Stone, 2007). Changes in working conditions or organisational policies would arguably do more than individual strategies to lessen the conflict and the disparity regarding gendered responses to work-family conflict (Kelley, Moen, & Tranby, 2011).
Family-related role characteristics that require an individual to expend large amounts of time in family activities ultimately create work-family conflict. Bellavia and Frone (2005) found that individuals who were married reported higher levels of work-family conflict than unmarried individuals. Similarly, parents were found to experience higher levels of work-family conflict than non-parents did (Winslow, 2005). The responsibilities of raising children are significantly salient in the lives of most mothers and fathers in paid employment.

Family-role strain is usually synonymous with the stress of combining paid work with raising children. Parenthood is regarded as one of several family-domain predictors of potential conflict with job demands (Elliot, 2003). The presence or absence of a marriage, work pressures on an individual’s partner or spouse and dependent elderly parents and children have progressively become salient issues in the lives of working individuals (Elliot, 2003). Many working adults are left with elder-care responsibilities which coincide with the most intensive years of the adults’ own child-rearing life stages.

Marital status becomes an important issue to consider when investigating family role-strain. For example, a spouse who contributes a steady income will increase the financial steadiness of the household, while an unemployed spouse becomes a financial burden on the family, with a resultant increase in conflict (Albelda, 1999). The degree to which a spouse assists with household tasks should affect the strain that is experienced between the work and family domains (Elliott, 2003).

**2.1.5.2 Strain-based conflict.**

Strain-based conflict occurs when symptoms of exhaustion and anxiety created by the demands of one role interfere with another role, thus preventing the demands of that role from being satisfied (Netemeyer et al., 1996; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Work stressors can create strain symptoms of tiredness, melancholy, anxiety, and irritability (Greenhaus &
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Beutell, 1985). Such strain symptoms have been found to relate to physical and mental ill health (Martinussen, Richardsen, & Burke, 2007). The experience of burnout, anxiety, or fatigue caused by negative emotional spillover from work-to-family roles suggests that certain traumatic occurrences, such as a new job, can make it difficult to pursue a well-balanced family life (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Multiple-role participation has been related to various health outcomes, especially for women. Professional working women not only engage in paid work but are also responsible for most of the household responsibilities (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). The time that employed mothers spend on domestic activities such as childcare is greater than the time their husbands spend on these activities, regardless of the number of hours working mothers still spend at work (Dilworth, 2004). Research on multiple-role participation suggests role overload is harmful to women’s well-being (Staland-Nyman, Alexanderson, & Hensing, 2008). A woman’s ability to display compassion and enthusiasm makes work satisfying but emotionally exhausting, especially when she is expected to demonstrate those qualities at home (Anderson, 2000).

2.1.5.3 Behaviour-based conflict.

Behaviour-based conflict refers to a specific pattern of role behaviour that is incompatible with the expectations that are required from another role (Schabracq, Winnubst, & Cooper, 2003). For example, behaviours required from a family role, such as being sensitive and emotional, are regarded as inappropriate behaviours when applied to the work role (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Behaviour-based work-family conflict is different from time-based and strain-based conflict in that it displays an incongruity between the behaviours expected within each role (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Individuals may blame their organisations for having exhausted the time and energy they require for partaking in family activities, and therefore be less fulfilled in their jobs (Lapierre et al., 2008). One can assume that an individual will invest more time and energy into the role that is more salient to him or her.
Men usually behave very differently when they are at work compared with when they are spending time at home with their children (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). At home, men are expected to be warm, nurturing and emotional, while at work they are expected to be more aggressive and assertive. If an individual is unable to modify the behaviour required for a particular role, the likelihood of conflict being experienced between different roles is high (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Behaviour-based conflict may possibly be more prevalent among women than men because of the various transitions women are required to make between various roles (Bartolome, 1972). For example, women are required to transition from the employee-role at work to the subservient wife-role and the caring mother-role at home (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).

By analysing the different forms of work-family conflict, it appears that working women with children will be affected by time-, strain- and behaviour-based conflict in the following ways. Time-based conflict is experienced because of the hours that women spend at work, and the limited amount of time they are able to spend with their children. Strain-based conflict is brought about by the role conflicts that are experienced between work and family roles; for example receiving little social support from spouse or supervisor. Behaviour-based conflict is experienced by the role transitions that working women with children are required to make between their work and family roles.

2.1.6 Role theory and work-family conflict.

A large part of the work and family literature has focused primarily on the conflict created by competing role responsibilities and demands (Pedersen, Minnotte, Kiger, & Mannon, 2009). An overarching theoretical perspective that assists in explaining the relationship between competing role demands is role theory (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006). Role theory highlights the context in which various roles are performed and differing role expectations and responsibilities are satisfied. Role theory includes the influences of role
demands, as well as individual and social resources, in shaping role performance and domain outcomes (Pedersen et al., 2009). Roles are defined as “explicit and systematically enforced prescriptions for how organisational members should think and feel about themselves and their work” (Kunda, 1992, as cited in Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003, p. 1168).

The scarcity perspective deriving from role theory suggests that all individuals participate in several role relationships, each with rather different responsibilities (Innstrand et al., 2009a). In the midst of these, contradictory performances may be obligatory, and conflicts of time, place, or resources may occur. According to Goode (1960), these are referred to as conflicts of allocations. The role-scarcity argument (Rothbard, 2001) contends that individuals have restricted resources such as time and energy at their disposal. Commitment of resources to one role requires the commitment of fewer resources to the other role. As individuals experience greater conflict between various roles due to participation in these roles, they will make certain decisions to lessen the conflict between the roles (Nikandrou et al., 2008).

The ability to transition from one role to another when necessary has been conceptualised as a way to reduce conflict between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Winkel & Clayton, 2010). Role transition is defined as the psychological and physical movement between different roles (Nippert-Eng, 1996). Empirical research conducted by Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, and Bulger (2010) indicated that the transition from work-to-family roles was positively correlated with family-work conflict. Similarly, the transition from family-to-work roles was positively correlated with work-family conflict. The more transitions that individuals reported between their work and family roles, the more they recognised that work and family roles were in conflict with one another. The empirical study by Matthews et al. (2010) therefore found that combining work and family roles might result in individuals experiencing increased work-family conflict between these roles.
The boundaries that are formed between the work and family roles are defined in terms of their permeability. Boundary permeability refers to the extent to which a role permits individuals to be physically positioned in the role but psychologically occupied in another role (Pleck, 1977). Research has indicated that pressures in different roles are directional and generate unconstructive effects from one domain to another owing to the permeability of roles (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007).

The literature suggests that men and women experience role demands from family and work differently. As men and women both combine work and family roles, the interaction between these roles and the different genders is significantly important. Duxbury and Higgins (1992b) carried out an inclusive study on gender differences in work-family conflict. Their study found that gender differences depended on societal requirements and behavioural expectations, as opposed to innate biological differences between men and women. Differences in the behaviour of men and women, according to role theory, occur from the traditional distribution of men and women into social roles (traditional breadwinner and homemaker role). These social roles create gender roles, which are mutual expectations regarding how individuals of each sex characteristically behave or are required to behave (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000).

Childcare responsibilities play a critical role in a mother’s life. Mothers’ obligations towards their families consist of the practical tasks and emotional aspects that are associated with attending to their children’s needs (Comer & Stites-Doe, 2006). As society and culture have dictated and indoctrinated women into devoting more of their efforts and time to their children, the mother assumes the primary role of caregiver. Women are expected to contribute more to their children than men (Hartmann, 2004). Even working women with children are challenged by ongoing demands to conform to the traditional gender-role philosophy regarding primary parenting. Social support from partners or spouses plays a significant role in promoting women’s
psychological well-being and helping to minimise work-family conflict (Michel, Mitchelson et al., 2010), especially among working women with children.

Multiple-role participation, according to role theory, is organised in a hierarchy of salience, and roles are created actively rather than enacted passively. At the pinnacle of this hierarchy are the most essential, prominent, and salient roles. Even though the majority of individuals own several identities, identities may differ with regard to salience (Bagger, Li, & Gutek, 2008). The salience of a specific role relies on two factors: firstly, the degree to which an individual is engaged with a particular identity; and secondly, the relative strength of the bond the individual has with others who share the same identity (Stets & Burke, 2000). Role salience is the individual’s emotional commitment to a particular role, as well as the time and energy the individual dedicates to achieving success in that role. The individual’s association with a particular role involves a deep psychological focus on the activities of that role (Rothbard, 2001). Even though most individuals have multiple identities as a result of the social roles they participate in, these identities may differ in terms of importance or salience (Bagger et al., 2008), and the most salient roles for working individuals are typically work and family roles (Werbel & Walter, 2002).

2.1.7 Competing role demands.

In the preceding section, three factors were identified from the literature that might influence an individual’s decision of when to take part in a work role vis-à-vis a competing family role. The factors identified as deriving from participation in these roles and determining the direction of interference between work and family roles are role pressures, salience of roles and role support.
2.1.7.1 Role pressure and participation in a work or family activity.

In their analysis of organisational stress, Khan et al. (1964) investigated the process by which an individual responds to various role demands. Khan et al. (1964) define the process by which individuals respond to various role pressures simply as communication of expectations between role-sender and the focal individual. Thus, a role sender may be a manager from the work domain or a spouse from the family domain. A role-sender communicates to the focal individual the expected and appropriate behaviour that the individual needs to enact. The sent expectation corresponds to a role pressure that is intended to persuade the focal individual to conform to the expectation (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). A role pressure implies certain sanctions that may be either negative (for non-conformity) or positive (for conformity) to the required role behaviour the individual needs to endorse. A psychological force arouses the individual to satisfy and adhere to the expectations of the role-sender (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). A strong role pressure is more effective than a weaker role pressure, since a strong pressure involves greater sanctions for conformity (Kahn et al., 1964).

In addition to the sanctions for conformity or for non-conformity conferred by role pressures, individuals may conform to a stronger role pressure in order to maintain their relationship with the role-sender. There are, however, times when the focal individual experiences simultaneous and conflicting pressures from role-senders in both work and family domains. In such a case, it is up to the individual to decide whether to conform to the role behaviour expectations from the work role-sender or the family role-sender (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). For example, an individual may be pressured by a manager to take part in a work activity at the same time that a family role-sender asserts pressure on the individual to take part in a family activity. In this instance of inter-role conflict, the focal individual is likely to be influenced by the relative strengths of the pressures from each role (Khan et al., 1964).
2.1.7.2 Role salience and participation in a work or family activity.

Individuals may initiate pressures upon themselves to take part in a role, over and above the pressures they receive from external role senders. According to individuals’ personal concepts of what it means to be a worker, spouse, father or mother, individuals develop into their own self-senders of internally assumed expectations and pressures of a role (Khan et al., 1964). Furthermore, individuals develop more rigorous or challenging internal expectations in salient roles as opposed to roles that are less critical to their sense of self-identity. Social identity theory suggests that social roles form the foundation of an individual’s sense of self (Burke & Tully, 1977). The multiple-role participation that individuals engage in consists of various social identities that offer meaning and purpose to life (Thoits, 1991). Role salience has certain implications for an individual’s engagement in that particular role. Evidence indicates that the more salient a particular role is to the individual, the more energy, resources and time the individual will invest in the role (Piliavin, Grube, & Callero, 2002). Such an investment is the result of an individual’s desire to sustain and reinforce his or her identity by engaging in highly salient roles (Thoits, 1991). A highly salient role leads to extensive involvement in that role and consequently interferes with involvement in another role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003).

2.1.7.3 Role support and participation in a work or family activity.

The support that an individual receives from a role-sender regarding expected participation in various role activities may influence the individual’s decision whether to engage in work or family activities or not. Such role-sender support may cause individuals to become more receptive to pressures created in the role in which the support is received. For example, family-friendly policies offered by organisations, such as childcare facilities, elder-care amenities, and flexible working arrangements usually have a positive effect on individuals’ attitudes (Hill, Jacob et al., 2008). However, managers who are
opposed to executing those policies (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003) can undermine such family-friendly policies. A supportive manager who understands an individual’s desire to manage work and family obligations encourages the use of such work-family policies (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). Individuals with supportive managers may decide to participate in a work activity rather than a family activity as a way of showing appreciation towards these managers for being supportive of their participation in family activities.

2.1.8 Role identity and role salience among working women.

In the preceding review of work-family conflict, the majority of studies discussed regarding antecedents of work-family conflict have focused on situational variables of work and family. It appears that working women with children adopt role identities that are, in part, based on the stereotyping of women by organisations. The internalisation of women’s role identities may carry certain implications for work-related and behavioural perceptions. These behavioural perceptions could potentially result in the development of conflict between women’s work and family roles (Siebert & Siebert, 2007).

The role identity construct is often applied in both the social and behavioural sciences. Consequently, various theoretical models have explored the construct, resulting in several conceptualisations of the term “role identity” (Burke, 2003). Identity theory defines an individual’s identity as the “parts of a self composed of the meanings that persons attach to the multiple roles they typically play in highly differentiated contemporary societies” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 284). Social identity theory proposes that an individual’s identity is related to the social environment to which the individual belongs, as opposed to the personal identity theory, which focuses on the individual’s sense of self as the core of his or her identity (Hogg et al., 1995). The conceptualisation of self consists of an array of social role identities that materialise from constant social relations and expectations from others, which in turn direct an individual’s behaviour in the future (Finkelstein, 2008). Together these
concepts form the definition of role identity: the disposition of a role that an individual occupies within a specific social position (Siebert & Siebert, 2007). The number of structured role relationships that an individual occupies (Stryker, 1980) limits participation in multiple identities. The idealised concept of self and the justification of role identity through role performance are significant for individuals. Society plays a vital part in role-identity formation. Society requires that all individuals claim some form of identity; if an individual does not claim an identity, society imposes one, so that classification of that individual is made easier. Once an identity is claimed, behaviour must be consistent with that particular identity, especially in the presence of others, to ensure the identity is confirmed (Siebert & Siebert, 2007). In other words, if an individual’s behaviour is consistent with the conceptualised perception of self, this idyllic perception becomes legitimate. For example, the role of mother is internalised by women and “adopted as a component of the self” (Piliavin et al., 2002, p. 472). Therefore, this identity ensures that a working mother displays the appropriate behaviour, as she behaves in coherence with her transformed concept of self (Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005).

A study conducted by Piliavin et al. (2002) investigating the influence of role identity found that role identity enactment is initiated through the expectations of significant others. The perceived expectations of others lead to the formation of a role identity, and ultimately to the intention to continue with the enactment of the particular role identity. The researchers concluded that the most optimal predictor of role identity is the perceived expectations of significant others (Grube & Piliavin, 2000). Despite the fact that the expectations of significant others are vital to the development of role identities, the organisational environment in which an individual enacts a particular role identity is also essential for maintaining that particular identity (Grube & Piliavin, 2000). When individuals perceive their particular roles as pivotal to the success of an organisation, their commitment and self-esteem in relation to their roles increase. If individuals experience positive feelings toward the organisation, any role identity that strengthens their relationship to the
organisation will be reinforced through the organisational environment (Jain, George, & Maltarich, 2009).

Roles predominately direct behaviour, and greater meaning is allocated to a role when it is internalised by the individual (Callero, 1985). As identity is the internal part of what constitutes role identity, the role is the external part. Roles do not stand in isolation; instead, they are more effectively understood when related to counter-roles, as is the case with identities (Burke & Tully, 2003). As Burke and Tully (1977) postulate, “the role identity husband does not stand in isolation but presupposes and relates to the role identity wife” (p. 83). It becomes important to assess the meaning of the “self-in-role” as an object to the self when measuring role identity. For these reasons, the present study attempts to establish whether working women with children identify more with the role of mother than with the role of employee. Even though it is critical to recognise the exclusive characteristics of working women with children, a more holistic understanding of their assumed identity is necessary. Working women with children often find it difficult to achieve a balance between their careers and their personal lives. This balance is affected by the demands that are imposed on them by their work, spouses or children (Hamilton et al., 2006). The more salient the role of mother is to a woman’s self-identity, the more time and energy she will dedicate to the role, as it portrays her sense of self (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003). Working women with children are often referred to “super-women” or “super-mothers”, by family and friends, whose expectations and behaviours support the social roles of mother and employee (Siebert & Siebert, 2007).

Women construct their identities, or define themselves, by the relationships they have with their families (Dalton, 1992). Societal norms regarding marriage and courtship have, however, changed, as more women are establishing their careers before settling down and starting a family. These changes have altered women’s view of self-identity formation; that is, women have moved away from the traditional perspective of homemaker into multiple-role participation (Hamilton et al., 2006). Yet, as we have seen, this
participation in multiple roles leads to inter-role conflict by virtue of involvement in, and the salience of, other life roles (Siebert & Siebert, 2007). Such inter-role conflict is particularly pervasive among women, as they do not always receive the necessary support when attempting to manage both work and family roles (Wilson, 2004). Role support is the set of behaviours enacted by others to confirm or support the idealised perception of self as an occupant of a particular social position (Siebert & Siebert, 2007). Women create the ideal view of their role identity from their participation in social and personal roles.

It becomes critical to examine and investigate role identity, as it provides a frame of reference for evaluating an individual’s feelings and behaviour toward work and family roles. One can argue that women with children are not only bound by the roles of wife and mother according to the prevailing societal norms, but also that their identities are shaped by the identities derived from various other life roles such as work.

2.2 Family Interference with Work

Research examining the work and family relationship has increased significantly, probably due to fundamental societal changes in the composition of work and family roles. As we have seen, the increased participation of women in the labour force and the digression from traditional gender roles have led to conflict arising from participation in multiple roles (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Conflict created by attempting to cope with a career in combination with motherhood has received much attention in the work and family literature (Frone, 2003). Working women with children are continuously trying to manage and integrate the dual needs of being a good mother while engaging in paid work (Gersick & Kram, 2002). Working mothers often find it difficult to combine parenting with maintaining their adult entitlements in the form of privacy, leisure and time for themselves (Comer & Stites-Doe, 2006). As strongly as women may be drawn to raising their children and taking care of their families, career and life goals still remain considerably significant. For
this reason, working women with children constantly look for ways to integrate both their professional and family roles (Hattery, 2001).

Family interference with work conflict refers to the degree to which role demands arising from the family domain are incompatible with the work domain. In other words, the involvement in the family role is made more complicated by virtue of involvement in the work role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Family characteristics may influence family interference with work conflict. Several studies investigating the antecedents of family interference with work conflict have examined the structural characteristics of the family situation. Such antecedents include the number and ages of children, whether the spouse or partner is in employment, and childcare responsibilities; however, this list is not exhaustive. A study conducted by Grzywacz and Marks (2000) found that men and women who have children, regardless of the children’s ages, experienced higher family interference with work conflict than men and women without children. Furthermore, domestic differences regarding financial issues, household responsibilities, and leisure activities were strong predictors of family interference with work conflict (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008).

Research has shown that a high level of family interference with work conflict is prominent among individuals confronted by various pressures from family roles (Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005). The most consistent family antecedent predicting family interference with work is parenting (Tausig & Fenwick, 2001). Upon examining the relationship between parenting and the work and family interface, Moen and Roehling (2005) found that parenting alters men’s and women’s work and family roles. For women, the conversion to motherhood is associated with increased time spent in the family domain, which is achieved by adjusting the demands from work to accommodate family demands and activities (Hinze, 2000). For men, the conversion to fatherhood has been associated with increased working hours and greater prioritisation of work (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000). New fathers who have not yet established themselves financially may experience pressure to work
longer hours to support their families. Employed new mothers not only experience increased child-rearing responsibilities but also simultaneously attempt to manage a career to acquire income and career opportunities (Moen & Roehling, 2005).

Research findings indicate a decline in marital satisfaction with individuals’ transition to parenthood (Cowan & Cowan, 2000). Increases in childcare and household responsibilities are the reasons for the decline in marital satisfaction. These additional responsibilities produce further strain and in turn influence work and family roles (Cowan & Cowan, 2000). The exposure to increased role activities in both work and family domains entails a higher probability of increased conflict in the work and family roles in the transition to parenthood. A study conducted by Martinengo, Jacob, and Hill (2010) found that the presence of young children in the home was regarded as a strong catalyst for gender differences in the work-family interface. Greater gender differences were established when children required more temporal and financial resources from their parents.

Researchers have examined work and family roles extensively in the lives of working individuals. Lobel (1991) argues that work and family researchers need to change their approach when addressing multiple-role participation. The approach adopted when examining work and family roles requires a shift from examining role conflict in isolation to a more constructive integration of an individual’s self-concept within his or her various roles. Lobel (1991) is of the opinion that individuals can achieve a balance in work and family roles by upholding standards of responsibility in the performance of both roles. Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, and King (2002) agree with Lobel (1991) that greater focus is required from researchers on the benefits of combining both work and family roles. In a study conducted among female managers and executives, a correlation of $r = .18 (p < .01)$ was found between women’s participation in and commitment to numerous roles, with life satisfaction. Furthermore, Ruderman et al. (2002) interviewed women in a qualitative study and found that women’s private lives provided psychological resources that
assisted in improving their role performance at work. A study of 30,000 randomly selected individuals found that individual commitment to both work and family roles led to an overall positive effect on general well-being (Nordenmark, 2002). Yet although there are both positive benefits and psychological consequences related to combining work and family roles, inevitably, role conflict does persist. Because of this, participation in various roles leads to significant challenges for both organisations and individuals (Ballout, 2008).

Recent research on the work and family interface suggests that family interference with work has different outcomes from those of work interference with family (Byron, 2005). While the potential consequences of work-family conflict are documented, little is known about the causes and their effects on work interference with family and family interference with work (Byron, 2005). Consequently, one purpose of this chapter is to systematically review the work and family literature to ascertain the possible antecedents of family interference with work conflict. This review of the literature will assist in elucidating the conflict between family and work that working women with children experience.

2.2.1 Parenting and paid work.

According to the work and family literature, parenting is considered a critical area of gender-role differences between men and women. Recent work-family research has called for a re-examination of parenting life, concluding that gender may be most optimally understood within the context of family life (Martinengo et al., 2010; Moen & Sweet, 2004). The following section offers an overview of parenting differences that men and women experience in integrating work and family.
2.2.1.1 Mothering.

Across various demographic profiles, classes and differences in marital status, raising her children remains a vital obligation to any mother. Mothering constitutes an essential part of women’s lives, one in which women have the ability to express creativity and affection and exercise influence (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). Women in dual-parent families carry the majority of the household and parenting responsibilities. Paid employment does not provide a comprehensive explanation for the gender gap in parenting. For instance, full-time employed mothers with pressured careers allocate more time to childcare activities than men (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).

Numerous organisations have implemented programmes and policies for granting working women flexibility in the time and place of work (Fredriksen-Golsen & Scharlach, 2001). Flexible working arrangements and family-friendly programmes also enable new parents to integrate their role demands more effectively. Such flexible working arrangements have been recognised in the literature as helpful to new parents and especially to mothers with younger children (Hill, Grzywacz et al., 2008). Mothers with younger children are especially vulnerable to family interference with work conflict (Moen & Roehling, 2005). Having young children at home is a predictor of greater family interference with work for self-employed mothers (Hundley, 2001). Furthermore, mothers with young children are likely to skip work because of their family demands (Dilworth, 2004). The availability and utilisation of flexible working arrangements have been explored as mechanisms that reduce conflict at the work and family interface. However, additional investigation is required to examine whether flexibility is more effective for men or women (Hill, Jackson, & Martinengo, 2006). The implementation of family-friendly practices has been related to positive outcomes and experiences for working individuals and for organisations.

A study of employed and self-employed men and women found that individuals who had greater opportunity to participate in flexible working
arrangements were notably more likely to experience lower levels of work-family conflict (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002). Job flexibility was particularly appreciated by mothers with young children, but its effectiveness in lessening conflict at the work and family interface has not yet been examined with reference to gender (Hill, Jacob et al., 2008; Jacob, Bond, Galinsky, & Hill, 2008). Flexibility enables working mothers to spend a greater proportion of their time with their children.

However, women are often fearful that taking time off work or opting for a reduction in a work week may create animosity from co-workers who are responsible for the tasks of these women while they are away (Armenti, 2004). Some women avoid participating in flexible working arrangements, or conceal their family responsibilities, to ensure they are perceived as committed to the organisation. For this reason, many women are actually restricting the number of children they have, or giving up the option of parenting altogether (Drago et al., 2004). Similarly, another study examining the use of family-friendly policies found that such policies were not being utilised adequately, as individuals were fearful that doing so might lead to negative career consequences (Frye & Breaugh, 2004).

A study investigating the amount of time spent on family activities found that the number of hours spent on housework and care-giving responsibilities was not a significant predictor of family-to-work interference for mothers (Dilworth, 2004). The perceived success of mothers with young children in performing both work and family roles was strongly related to perceptions of success in other areas of life (Staudinger & Bluck, 2001). Regardless of the multiple roles women engage in, they still value spending time on other important aspects of their lives such as friendships and organisational life (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000). Mothers with young children may experience more negative perceptions of life and personal achievement when they do not feel they are successful in satisfying their family-role activities. In a study conducted by Nomaguchi, Milkie, and Bianchi (2005), women reported
greater emotional distress than men when they felt work hindered the time
allocated to spend with their children or spouses.

2.2.1.2 Fathering.

The traditional family structure consisted of a father who engaged in paid work
to provide for his family financially, and a mother who was responsible for
household and child-rearing activities (Craig, Mullan, & Blaxland, 2010). The
traditional family structure changed as more women entered the workforce. It
became extremely difficult for women to find the time to meet the demands of
household activities, family responsibilities and paid work (Jacobs & Gerson,
2004). Evidence has indicated that although men are participating in and
taking more ownership of domestic duties, this change is not occurring as
quickly as women would like (Bianchi et al., 2006; Fisher, Egerton, Gershuny,
& Robinson, 2007). The slow transition in the allocation of domestic tasks has
left the majority of family responsibilities for women to assume. Mothers are
especially heavily burdened, and for that reason, households with children
have a more powerfully gendered division of labour than households with no
children (Craig, 2006b).

An interesting study conducted by Barnett and Gareis (2007) found that when
mothers working on shifts worked in the evenings, fathers performed
“motherly type” activities like preparing children for bed. Conversely, when
mothers worked normal hours during the day, the family structure resembled a
traditional family in which the mothers were more involved with childcare
activities than fathers. It is likely that being alone at home, especially during
the day, may be a significant factor in increasing a spouse’s share of
traditionally female household tasks, for both fathers and mothers (Presser,
2003). Moorehead, (2003) has coined the phrase “the power of absence” to
indicate that shift work makes it possible for mothers to be absent during peak
periods of domestic activities. Husbands and fathers are frequently required
to assume a larger portion of domestic workload during these periods
(Probert, 2005).
Conflicting interpretations regarding the allocation of men’s time and the influence of time utilisation on gender equality have been acknowledged in the work and family literature. The mid-1980s saw an increase in the time fathers spent with their children, though the average amount of time that a mother spent looking after children remained relatively high (Bianchi et al., 2006; Sandberg & Hofferth, 2005). A number of studies conducted between 2000 and 2010 have indicated that the gap between men and women’s allocation of time for paid and unpaid work has narrowed considerably (Sayer, 2005). The narrowed gender gap in household activities is a consequence of men’s allocating a greater proportion of their time to family activities (Bianchi et al., 2006). Child rearing still remains more the responsibility of the mother than the father, regardless of fathers’ increased participation in family and home activities (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). In another study using time data, Craig (2006a) found that mothers engaged in more multitasking, spent more time with children, and were more accountable for looking after the children than fathers.

2.2.2 Theories from social psychology of work and family conflict.

To gain a holistic understanding of how social psychology can inform research on work and family, a review of pertinent theories from the field of social psychology is presented. These theories have been utilised to counteract gendered roles and endorse the possibility of gender equality in both work and family roles. Four theories are relevant to the work and family issues within the context of this study. The attachment theory suggests that an individual’s behaviour at work is psychologically embedded in family relationships. The other theories (social-role theory; group norm and gender-construction theory; and spillover and compensation theory) identify the mechanisms through which gendered norms of work and family are substantiated and preserved, and suggest ways in which these norms may be dismantled. Social psychological research on the following theories can inform our understanding of work and family life (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).
2.2.2.1 Attachment theory.

The attachment theory derives from contemporary theories of social psychology and research on intimate relationships (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). Such relationships incorporate the interface between family relationships and functioning at work (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Attachment theory proposes that an individual’s functioning at work is directly influenced by the quality of the relationships that persist within his or her family structure. As a means of survival, individuals are born with a need for attachment. This need directs individuals to seek proximity to caregivers, particularly under threatening conditions (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). Social psychologists have proposed that attachment techniques remain pertinent in intimate relationships throughout an individual’s life. Adults may be classified according to the various styles of attachment they demonstrate. Styles of attachment differ along two distinct dimensions: high to low anxiety of rejection and high to low reassurance with relationship proximity (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003).

For example, secure individuals with lower levels of anxiety and high levels of reassurance are more inclined to establish intimate, gratifying relationships at work. These individuals are able to offer comfort and deal more appropriately with conflict. Insecure individuals are more inclined to attach to their partners, are particularly sensitive to rejection and continuously seek attention (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). A secure style of attachment in adulthood provides the emotional freedom necessary to feel satisfied in a working environment (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). In contrast, an anxious attachment style gives rise to an obsession with relationships that may influence the individual’s functioning at work. An avoidant style of attachment may develop into a neurotic work style that can be utilised to evade proximity with family members (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).

Research conducted by Hazan and Shaver (1990) exploring romantic partnerships suggested a possible association between work and love. It was
found that individuals with secure attachment styles appeared to have positive experiences at work. These individuals reported higher job security and less likelihood of putting off work or experiencing rejection from colleagues, and they placed higher value on their intimate relationships with family than on work. Individuals with anxious attachment styles seemed to be apprehensive towards work and felt unacknowledged by colleagues, and reported that love interfered with their work. These individuals made less money than the other participants in the study, claiming that their performance was influenced by their preoccupation with how colleagues perceived them. Individuals with avoidant attachment styles were comparable to secure individuals in terms of their work experiences, with the exception that their colleagues perceived them negatively. In addition, the orientation towards work of individuals with avoidant attachment styles appeared to be irrational. When not working, these individuals felt anxious and reported valuing work over love. Avoidant individuals seemed to be compulsive workers who engaged in work to avoid closeness. Although this study by Hazan and Shaver (1990) focused predominately on attachment security figures for romantic couples, a significant similar attachment figure for married couples would be their spouses.

During times of heightened stress and anxiety, whether produced at work or at home, a spouse remains the pivotal figure of potential reassurance and support (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). The ability to receive support at home is associated with positive functioning in the workplace. The conversion to parenthood is a demanding time for women especially, as they seek support from their husbands. Marital interactions are influenced and shaped by wives’ particular attachment styles during the transition to parenthood. A study conducted on marital changes during the transition to parenthood found that apprehensive, insecure women were perceived to receive less support from their husbands prenatally than women who were less anxious in their attachment style. Anxious new mothers who felt unsupported by their husbands prenatally reported higher marital dissatisfaction (Simpson, Rholes, Campbell, Tran, & Wilson, 2003).
A longitudinal study of new parents demonstrated the connection between the benefits to family and work of a secure attachment style compared with an anxious attachment style (Vasquez, Durik, & Hyde, 2002). Attachment security in postpartum mothers and in fathers during year one and year four resulted in more rewards and less experience of stress in family relationships. Attachment theory research definitively indicates that there is a psychological relationship between work and family. Furthermore, attachment theory research proposes future directions for work and family researchers. For example, the negative interference effects from work-to-family and from family-to-work may be moderated by individuals’ attachment styles. Whether stress at work negatively interferes with family life may be dependent upon whether the stressed individual receives spouse support. Nevertheless, although a link exists between attachment theory, work, and family, this does not appear to enlighten our understanding of the gendered nature of work and family life (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).

**2.2.2.2 Social role theory.**

Social role theory suggests that variations in men and women’s behaviour emerge from the inequitable distribution of their various social roles. Social role theory posits that gender stereotypes are derived from the work and family roles that men and women occupy in society (Eagly et al., 2000). Traditional social roles regarding role behaviours for men and women were stereotypically perceived as breadwinner versus homemaker (Kite, Deaux, & Haines, 2008). Breadwinning has been characterised as providing economic support for the family, and serves as a benchmark for male identity (Warren, 2007). In other words, gendered roles are created by the social roles that individuals hold, which are collective expectations of how men and women should characteristically behave (Innstrand et al., 2009b).

Feminine qualities such as compassion and the urge to nurture are usually adopted by women and are perceived as significant in the family domain. Masculine qualities such as aggressiveness and independence are usually
adopted by men and are perceived as significant in the work domain (Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). The male breadwinner role is associated with certain masculine identities. For example, a husband’s employment or unemployment may influence his perception of his masculinity (Smithson, Lewis, Cooper, & Dyer, 2004). Three main social roles associated with masculinity have been identified by Nock (1998). These are: the role of father, in that men need to be father figures to their children; the role of provider, in that men need to take care of and provide for their families; and the role of protector, in that men need to protect and look after their wives and children.

The breadwinning wife may challenge a man’s ability to perform the last two social roles proposed by Nock (1998), and consequently challenge his masculinity. A study conducted by Meisenbach (2010) on women’s experiences as primary breadwinners found that more than half of the women in the study took pleasure in the control they experienced as breadwinners. A possible explanation for this sense of pleasure was that these women enjoyed the way in which they had more power in their relationships than they had in the past. Quite a few of these women openly reported that they experienced more happiness when deviating from the traditional “housewife” gender-norm.

A longitudinal study conducted by Abele (2003) found that the perceptions of identities derived from the self and others are created from the tenancy and performance of various roles. Due to the fact that these roles are diversely different for men and women, gendered stereotypes materialise. There is, however, a possibility that stereotypes in principle lead to self-fulfilling prophecies that maintain gendered family and work roles for men and women (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). For example, if women are seen to lack agentic traits in the workplace, it may jeopardise their chances of being considered for highly influential jobs. Similarly, if men are perceived to lack communal and nurturing traits at home, their partners or spouses may not feel that they can be trusted to take care of young children. Self-attributions of gendered traits may propagate choice of and success in adopting gendered roles. The theoretical logic of social role theory disregards power associations
between men and women, as gender roles are considered in childhood by
gender socialisation procedures (Lippa, 2005) and later emphasised in
adulthood (Roese & Sherman, 2007).

### 2.2.2.3 Gender construction theory and group norm theory.

We have seen that women continue to assume the majority of the domestic
responsibilities despite their increasing participation in paid work (West &
Zimmerman, 1987). The prevailing theory from the work and family literature
that is invoked to explain the disproportionate number of domestic activities
assumed by women is the gender construction theory. The gender
construction theory posits that by doing disproportionately less or more
domestic work, men and women are respectively reacting to normative
conceptions regarding their genders. Women “do gender” by engaging in
domestic activities; conversely, women also “do gender” by not regarding their
paid employment as breadwinning. Men “do gender” by withholding
themselves from housework and treating their paid employment as
breadwinning. The gender construction theory illustrates the power of gender
norms in shaping behaviour, but does not describe the internal psychological
processes that lead individuals to feel obliged to conform to those norms (Pitt-
Catsouphes et al., 2006).

Group norm theory deals with the issue of norms. Although this theory may
not overtly focus on work and family issues or even gender, understanding
how norms operate may be relevant to understanding how gender norms
function at home and work. Norms regarding motherhood are especially
powerful because there is so much pressure surrounding the various roles
mothers participate in (Kallgren, Reno, & Cialdini, 2000). Mothers may be
criticised by others because of their career aspirations or for their impatience
with childcare. Disapproval may leave mothers feeling pressured by their
peers or families to articulate acceptable feelings and goals. Gradually, the
suppression of their feelings may become more internally motivated and may
ultimately be experienced as reality. Women who are adamant that decisions
to compromise their work lives are established on choice may, in fact, feel that way because they have internalised the norms (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). Their failure to blame their husbands for the unequal distribution of domestic work may be a consequence of having suppressed resentment by shifting their attention from a comparison between their spouses and themselves to a comparison between their spouses and other men. The suppression of feelings that conflict with gender norms, as illustrated by the group norm theory, is similar to the emotion work that Hochschild (1989) refers to as “second shift”. Hochschild (1989) focused on how men and women differ in feeling what they think they should feel regarding gendered roles; the group norm theory focuses on the social context that provokes those “shoulds”.

2.2.2.4 Spillover and compensatory models.

Research regarding work and family linking mechanisms has increased significantly, owing largely to the changes in traditional family structures (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The work and family literature has consistently highlighted the way in which individuals’ behaviours, attitudes, and experiences spill over into, or influence, work and family domains. Linking mechanisms are the relationships that exist between work and family constructs, and only exist when work and family are conceptually distinctive from one another (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Modern technology as a form of linking mechanism has improved the way in which individuals communicate with one another. Examples of the sophisticated communications technology available are mobile phones, laptops and BlackBerries. For instance, a BlackBerry allows an individual to receive and respond to e-mails at any place or at any time via wireless network (Towers, Duxbury, Higgins, & Thomas, 2006). Such technological improvements have equipped and enabled individuals to converse with each other at any place and any time, and are regarded as a spillover mechanism from work-to-family (Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009). Consequently, these innovations have blurred the boundaries between the allocated times for work and family, thus escalating the probability of spillover across domains (Ilies et al., 2009).
Work-family spillover is defined as the negative or positive effects of both work and family domains on one another (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Positive spillover improves an individual’s role performance, while negative spillover is detrimental to the quality of the role (Pedersen et al., 2009). Two theories proposed in the literature demonstrating the effect that family domains have on individuals’ job attitudes are the spillover theory and the compensatory theory (Wilensky, 1960). The spillover theory suggests that positive reciprocal relationships exist between individuals’ job satisfaction and family satisfaction. The spillover theory supports the perception that life and work satisfaction are interconnected, and that satisfaction in one aspect of an individual’s life may spill over to satisfaction in another domain. Compensatory theory postulates that dissatisfied individuals compensate for their frustrations at work by seeking satisfaction outside work (Van der Walt, 2007).

Research into the nature and antecedents of spillover assists our understanding of how individuals manage the competing demands of work and family life. Spillover effects based on gender are of particular interest in the context of this study. Various studies have examined the issue of gender differences with regard to the division of domestic activities and accountabilities (Dilworth, 2004). The consolidation of such studies has concluded that gender-based division of labour is still pertinent, both in commitments of time and gender-segregated activities, regardless of working hours (Coltrane, 2001; Ferree, 1991; Hochschild & Machung, 1989; Pittman, Teng, Kerpelman, & Solheim, 1999). Working mothers continue to spend more time on household and childcare activities than their husbands, irrespective of the total number hours that either spouse works (Dilworth, 2004). Husbands and wives who hold traditional beliefs regarding the division of labour feel that family activities largely remain the women’s responsibility (Dilworth, 2004).

2.2.3 Social support.

Social support involves the exchange of resources between at least two individuals, with the objective of assisting individuals who receive the support
(Van Daalen, Willemsen, & Sanders, 2006). Social support may be received from work-related or non-work related sources (Adams, King, & King, 1996). Men usually receive a greater amount of social support from their spouses than women (Reevy & Maslach, 2001), whereas women usually receive more social support from family and friends than men (Joplin, Nelson, & Quick, 1999). Women who receive such personal and social resources are able to combine work and family roles more effectively and experience less conflict (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). Research has indicated that domain-specific effects of social support are associated with reduced levels of work-family conflict. For example, spousal support reduces family interference with work conflict, while organisational support reduces work interference with family conflict (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). A meta-analysis conducted by Ford et al. (2007) found a weighted mean correlation of $r = .23$ between work interference with family conflict and manager support, and a correlation of $r = .17$ between family interference with work conflict and family support.

Social support as an antecedent of work-family conflict may mitigate work-family conflict, with its influences mediated by stress (Seiger & Wiese, 2009). Managers, colleagues, spouses and other family members may contribute to the stressors at work and at home that create work-family conflict. On the other hand, support received from either work or family members is regarded as a resource that creates positivity in a specific domain, which improves the quality of life in the other domain (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). The accessibility of resources in the family domain influences the degree to which family enhances work life (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Social support is an essential resource that enables an individual to feel accepted, recognised and valued, and fosters affect in the family domain, which in turn enhances functioning at work.

The conservation of resources model proposes that individuals are encouraged to acquire and sustain resources such as social support networks while dealing with stress. This acquisition and sustainability of resources implies that social support has a direct influence on work-family conflict.
(Aycan & Eskin, 2005). Three types of social support pertaining to the context of this study are spouse support, organisational support and childcare support. Spousal support as a component refers to the assistance, counsel and appreciation that spouses provide for one another. Two types of spousal support have been conceptualised and empirically measured: instrumental and emotional support (Adams et al., 1996).

Instrumental support refers to behaviours and attitudes of family members that assist spouses with the daily household and domestic activities. For example, a husband’s assisting his wife with the household chores or accommodating her work requirements has been shown to act as a buffer against negative work perceptions (Fu & Shaffer, 2001). Family instrumental support has been shown to affect both life and job satisfaction, and positively influence the individual’s performance at work (King, Mattimore, King, & Adams, 1995).

Emotional support includes empathy, consideration, listening, warmth, counsel, and concern for the welfare of the partner (Van Daalen et al., 2006). Emotions and behaviours in the family may positively influence an individual’s experience of positive affect and performance in the work domain (Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). Research has indicated that emotional support received in the family, such as spouse support, can decrease workplace stress (Noor, 2002). While instrumental spousal support alleviates the burden of family demands and allows women to dedicate more time and energy to work, emotional spousal support improves feelings of self-efficacy both in the workplace and in the family domain (Aycan & Eskin, 2005). Increased spousal support is associated with lower levels of work-family conflict (Erdwins, Buffardi, & Casper, 2001).

Support from a spouse or partner plays a vital role towards sustaining an individual’s ability to integrate both career and parenting roles. For instance, a supportive partner reduces the negative effect that children have on a working woman’s psychological well-being (Roxburgh, 2002).
According to Hartmann (2004), a critical way to bring about a more equitable division of labour is to understand the double standard in parenting. Currently, society acknowledges a double standard, in that women carry out more of the parenting work than men. Women also spend more of their time caring for and nurturing their children, take more time off work, and place higher value on care-giving abilities than men. Mothers experience more guilt than fathers do, especially when working longer hours at work (Hartmann, 2004). Since research has shown that it is the traditional roles that facilitate this type of role behaviour, particular attention has been paid in this study to the role demands of mothers in the context of work and family.

Organisational support plays an important part in an individual’s ability to manage work and family obligations effectively (Behson, 2002). Three types of organisational support (supervisor support, organisational policies and flexibility regarding time demands and jobs) pertinent to the context of this study have been integrated in this section. Like spousal support, supervisory support can be seen as consisting of two types of support: instrumental and emotional (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). The provision of direct support and guidance, with the intention of assisting the worker to manage his or her family obligations, is referred to as instrumental supervisory support (Frone et al., 1997). Supervisors who are supportive towards their subordinates are instrumental in creating the organisation’s work-family policies (Eby et al., 2005). On the other hand, empathetic listening, consideration towards work-family issues and sincere concern for the welfare of an individual and his or her family are referred to as emotional supervisory support (Frone et al., 1997).

The second component of organisational support consists of organisational policies directed at reducing employees’ work-family conflict. Family-friendly policies are services that include flexible working arrangements, job sharing, and childcare amenities. Family-friendly policies are designed to assist individuals in making specific arrangements to manage their work and family obligations (Aycan & Eskin, 2005). The third component of organisational
support addresses time demands and inflexibility of jobs. Organisational time demands refer to the number and flexibility of working hours (Behson, 2002). A consequence of heavy organisational time demands is work overload which, coupled with long work hours, leads to an increase in work-family conflict (Clark, 2001).

An important type of social support relates to childcare. Although work-family researchers have not comprehensively explored childcare support, it remains a vital support function, especially for dual-career couples with young children and single women with children. A primary reason why women leave their paid work is the failure to find suitable childcare facilities (Stone, 2007). Satisfaction with childcare support has been shown to lead to reduced levels of work-family conflict among women (Ahmad, 2010). However, to avoid repetition of the overlap occurring between the various types of social support described in the work-family literature, for the purposes of this study only spousal and organisational support have been investigated.

2.3 Job Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction has developed into one of the main business objectives in recent years (García-Bernal, Gargallo-Castel, Marzo-Navarro, & Rivera-Torres, 2005). South African businesses are being exposed to factors influencing the work economy such as technological advancements and international competition. Such exposure creates enormous pressure on organisations to improve performance levels and transform themselves into more globally competitive entities (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). In the South African competitive landscape, the primary concerns for organisations are profitability and people. Organisations are unable to remain competitive if their workforce is dissatisfied and does not identify with the organisation (Stewart, 1996). Conversely, a motivated and dedicated workforce can be an influential factor in the success of an organisation. Job satisfaction is perceived as a multidimensional concept comprising individuals’ favourable or unfavourable perceptions of their jobs (Bowen & Cattell, 2008). Such
favourable and unfavourable attitudes towards work may wield influential effects on many forms of organisational behaviour. Job satisfaction is an important concept to investigate, as it assists in ensuring the sustainability of organisational success (Gunlu, Aksarayli, & Percin, 2010).

The construct of job satisfaction has been investigated over several years and different authors have postulated a variety of definitions. Even though the wording of the various definitions presented in Table 1 is slightly different, it seems that most authors are in agreement regarding what constitutes job satisfaction. To derive a complete understanding of the construct, it is necessary to take cognisance of the various definitions that have been presented in the literature. These are shown in Table 1.
### Definitions of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lofquist and Dawis (1969, p. 53)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is defined as “a function of the correspondence between the reinforcer system of the work environment and the individual's needs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975, p. 53)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is “determined by the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of the outcome he feels he should receive”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke (1976, p. 1300)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke (1983, p. 1319)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is termed “the result from the appraisal of one’s work as attaining or allowing the attainment of one’s important work values in congruence with, or helping to fulfil, one’s basic needs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin and Bateman (1986, p. 158)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is defined as “a global construct encompassing such specific facets of satisfaction as satisfaction with work, pay, supervision, benefits, promotion opportunities, working conditions, co-workers, and organisational practices”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranny et al. (1992, p. 1)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is “an affective (that is, emotional) reaction to a job that results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, and so on)”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivancevich and Matteson (1999, p. 123)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is defined as “an attitude people have about their jobs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg and Baron (2008, p. 75)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is termed “an individual's positive or negative attitude toward their job”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theme of the definitions presented in Table 1 relates to an attitudinal assessment of an individual’s work, with the exception of Locke’s definition (1983, p. 1319), which alludes to the acquisition of work values. Even though Locke’s definition does not overtly refer to the attitudinal aspect of job satisfaction, his definition refers to it indirectly because of the relationship that exists between positive attitudes and values.

Most working adults spend the greater part of their lives at work. Understanding the factors that are associated with job satisfaction becomes important for enhancing the well-being of such adults. Job satisfaction has certain implications for the social lives of individuals at work, forms part of an individual’s assessment of well-being, and is regarded as an essential component for organisations (Demirel & Erdamar, 2009). Improved individual well-being is related to enhanced levels of job performance and lower levels of absenteeism and turnover, and is of particular significance for an organisation’s success (Frey & Stutzer, 2002; Kaiser, 2007). Another reason why job satisfaction is of interest to organisations is that a satisfied workforce leads to increased productivity, and this in turn leads to organisational profitability (Rafferty & Griffin, 2009). In examining job satisfaction, it becomes important to take note of the following factors, which affect every working individual (Williamson, 1996, p. 17):

- Individual participation in work contributes to and defines an important element in the human experience. Although work occupies a great deal of time and energy, it is regarded as a central element in people’s lives; therefore, job satisfaction can be significantly related to overall life satisfaction.
- Work activity will always be necessary for human sustenance.
- Work does not only identify human experiences; work proceeds to identify humans. Humans are both created and creative beings, continuously interacting with their work.
The topic of job satisfaction has been extensively examined within organisational research. Job satisfaction encompasses individuals’ general attitudes and feelings regarding their jobs as well as the characteristics of their jobs (Demirel & Erdamar, 2009). Although the list of examples is not exhaustive, examples of job characteristics include the working environment and conditions, equitable rewards, and communication with colleagues (Kim, Leong, & Lee, 2005). Job satisfaction is experienced when individuals feel that their capabilities, experiences and values are utilised in their work and that, in turn, work reciprocates with opportunities and rewards. Job satisfaction therefore concerns the individual’s personal assessment of conditions existing in the job, or consequences that arise as a result of having a job which are influenced by the individual’s particular needs, values and expectations (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). Individuals therefore assess their jobs on factors that they consider as being important to them (Sempane, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002).

2.3.1 Historical analysis of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been extensively investigated and examined over the years; in fact, it is the most widely researched variable in organisational behaviour (Oshagbemi, 2000; Spector, 1997). The reason for the interest shown by industrial psychologists in the job satisfaction construct has been to gain a deeper understanding of the individual’s work experiences and how optimally to improve productivity in organisations (Lipińska-Grobelny & Wasiak, 2010). The rationale for such interest resides in the association between individuals’ satisfaction with their jobs and their aspiration to remain with the organisation.

Several reasons why researchers should be concerned with job satisfaction have been postulated in the literature, which can be classified according to whether they focus on the individual or the organisation. The humanitarian perspective posits that all individuals are entitled to be treated equitably and with respect. To some extent, job satisfaction is an effective indicator of
respectful treatment in organisations, and is considered a reflection of an individual’s emotional and psychological well-being (Spector, 1997). The utilitarian perspective views job satisfaction as leading individuals to behave in a way that affects organisational functioning. As discussed later in this section, there are significant implications for individuals’ experiences, which may lead to positive or negative behaviours. Assessing employee job satisfaction is a common activity in many organisations in which management feels that individual well-being is essential. The motives for ensuring job satisfaction may be humanitarian or practical, but either way individual job satisfaction is an important organisational objective to investigate (Spector, 1997)

2.3.2 Antecedents of job satisfaction.

A thorough examination of job satisfaction and its antecedents is essential in order to redefine the development of policies that may not only prevent women’s dissatisfaction but also encourage job satisfaction and general health in organisations (Cortese, Colombo, & Ghislieri, 2010). Owing to the significant influence that job satisfaction has on organisational outcomes, outlining and describing the antecedents of job satisfaction become important (Fassina, Jones, & Uggerslev, 2008). More specifically, organisations are interested in understanding how work-family conflict impacts on job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and the effect this may have on organisational outcomes (Rutherford, Boles, Hamwi, Madupalli, & Rutherford, 2009).

There are two levels of antecedents of job satisfaction: organisational and individual. The organisational level is concerned with the working environment. The work environment consists of various elements pertinent to the individual, such as job characteristics, organisational constraints, role variance, work-family conflict, remuneration and job stress. These elements are associated with the job and are regarded as important indicators of job satisfaction. Research into organisational characteristics and job satisfaction has considered different types of leadership styles (Rad & Yarmohammadian,
The individual level is concerned with personal characteristics such as locus of control, negative affectivity and person-job fit. Such characteristics include the unique attributes that individuals bring to the job, such as personality and prior experiences (Spector, 1997). The individual level has received much of the attention in the job-satisfaction literature (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). Research pertinent to the context of this study into individual personal characteristics as antecedents of job satisfaction has dealt with issues such as marital status (Demirel & Erdamar, 2009), number of children, educational level (Koustelios, 2001), gender (Oshagbemi, 2000), rank (Koustelios, 2001), age (Moyes, Williams, & Koch, 2006), tenure (Oshagbemi, 2003), and emotional welfare (Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007).

A study conducted by Koustelios (2001) investigating relationships between job satisfaction and personal characteristics found correlation coefficients for work itself ($r = .75$); remuneration ($r = .71$); promotion ($r = .70$); supervision ($r = .81$); and working environment ($r = .79$). Furthermore, differences in individuals’ personal characteristics denoted different predictors of job satisfaction. For example, gender was regarded as an important predictor variable only for the working environment subscale. It was further concluded that working women tended to be more satisfied with their working environment than men. These conclusions were similar to those of Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957), in a study which found that working women were more inclined than men to regard the working environment as significant. Oshagbemi (2000) examined differences between men’s and women’s job satisfaction, and found a general job satisfaction score of 4.220 for women compared with 4.206 for men. The results indicated that working women were slightly more satisfied with their jobs than men and that job satisfaction increased with rank and age (Oshagbemi, 2000). In another study investigating the relationships between personal characteristics of women and
job satisfaction, Oshagbemi (2003) found that rank \((p < .001)\) and tenure \((p < .1)\) were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction.

### 2.3.3 Gender and job satisfaction.

The changing composition of the workforce and the number of women participating in paid work has not created a convergence of men’s and women’s perceptions regarding job attributes. Several studies have indicated that the relative importance of job characteristics and attributes is to a large degree gender based (Beutell & Marini, 1995; Lueptow, Garovich, & Lueptow, 1995). Men in general place higher value on extrinsic attributes such as remuneration, career opportunities and promotions. Women, on the other hand, value intrinsic rewards such as job satisfaction and positive relationships with colleagues (Moyes et al., 2006). A study conducted by Moyes et al. (2006) exploring perceptions of job characteristics found that even though attitudinal differences regarding job attributes are gender related, some are related to age as well. For example, younger individuals perceive promotional opportunities as positive, while older individuals, regardless of gender, experience fulfilment and satisfaction from the jobs they have. Although both younger and older working women are aware of gender bias, it is more prominent among older than younger women (Moyes et al., 2006).

Demographic characteristics from previous organisational research were utilised as proxies for an individual’s background and experiences (Helms & Stern, 2001). Within the context of the current research study, the effect of gender plays an important role in establishing whether women in general experience more work-family conflict than men do. Various researchers have investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and gender (Antonakas & Mironaki, 2009; Boles, Wood, & Johnson, 2003; Clark, 1997; Kim, Murrell, & Lee, 2009; Lipińska-Grobelny et al., 2010; Mayrhofer, Meyer, Schiffinger, & Schmidt, 2007; Mora & Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2009; Morrison, 2009; Moyes et al., 2006; Oshagbemi, 2003; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Usui, 2008).
Findings by various research studies regarding job satisfaction in relation to the gender of the individual have been conflicting. Such conflicting findings may be because men and women experience and perceive the various aspects of their jobs, such as remuneration and promotional opportunities, differently. The degree to which the same job satisfies individual requirements also differs, as men and women use different criteria in the assessment of their jobs. For example, a job high on social satisfaction and low in skill utilisation may result in higher job satisfaction for women than for men. Conversely, in jobs permitting limited scope for social relationships, the differences in satisfaction may be in the opposite direction (Oshagbemi, 2003). Studies conducted by Okpara (2006) and Oshagbemi (2000) on job satisfaction and gender concluded that their findings did not reveal cohort gender differences with regard to general satisfaction. However, gender was regarded as an important predictor variable. The results of these studies showed significant gender differences between men and women that related to overall job satisfaction ($\beta = .519$, $r = .64$, $p > .049$).

A study conducted by Kim (2005) investigating gender and job satisfaction, and focusing on reasons why women experience lower job satisfaction than men, found women’s jobs to be more mediocre in terms of remuneration, authority and promotional prospects. Kim (2005) reports women’s average job satisfaction as higher than men’s, and the difference in mean scores as statistically significant at $p < .001$. On average, women achieved a mean score of 2.99, while men were rather dissatisfied, with a mean score of 2.70. Furthermore, women reported a mean score of 3.07 for job security, while a mean score of 2.71 was reported for men, with a mean difference that is statically significant at $p < .001$. Kim’s (2005) study found that women’s satisfaction was higher than men’s, with statistically significant differences ($p < .001$ or $p < .05$) in the majority of the facets of job satisfaction, such as offering service, work itself, social reputation, pay and promotion.

Lack of job satisfaction has been regarded as one of the most consequential job outcomes affected by role stress. Researchers have argued that role
stress, consisting of role conflict and role ambiguity, has greater influence on job satisfaction for some types of individual than others (Kim et al., 2009). Differences in gender have been utilised as a moderator in the association between role stress and satisfaction with the job (Boles et al., 2003; Karatepe, Yavas, Babakus, & Avci, 2006). It has been hypothesised that women acquire a socialising-oriented, collective behaviour, whereas men express a more task-oriented, agentic behaviour in the workplace (Eagly, 1987). Women are therefore more satisfied with their jobs when they are able to network and socialise with others who share the same appreciation and understanding of their roles. Men, on the other hand, are inclined to be more satisfied when their performance is appreciated and recognised by others. Consequently, women are more prone to experience job dissatisfaction and role stress than men are unless the expectations of their role have been specified to them (Kim et al., 2009).

Kaiser (2007) holds that the opinion that women are disadvantaged in the workplace with regard to income or career advancement almost compels women to lower their job expectations. However, Ghazzaw and Smith (2009) disagree with Kaiser, and contend that the majority of women are moving towards becoming more career oriented, and that women have shifted from the traditional care-giving roles to more career-oriented roles. Various possible reasons explain why women may be less satisfied with their jobs than men. Women struggle to balance the conflicting demands of work and family roles, which has an impact on their work attitudes (Spector, 1997). The ever-changing social roles that women occupy at work imply that their perceptions regarding the centrality of work have become comparable to men’s (Ghazzaw & Smith, 2009). Women embrace a holistic picture of their lives, and satisfaction with life in general is related to self, family, work and the multiple roles that women occupy. The family role remains central in many women’s lives, while the employee-role and being satisfied at work represent a source of self-esteem and self-efficacy. The research study assists our understanding of the extent to which working women with children experience
job satisfaction by participating in multiple social roles both at work and at home.

2.3.4 Measuring job satisfaction.

Measures of job satisfaction that assess the various levels of specificity have been extensively used in research. One approach to acquiring measures of job satisfaction is to enquire directly about overall feelings regarding the job; this approach is referred to as a global measure. A global measure of job satisfaction requires individuals to combine their reactions to the various components of the job in a single, integrated answer. The utilisation of a global measure fails, however, to take into account the various facets of job satisfaction (Boles et al., 2003) and is unsuccessful in providing a precise and complete evaluation of job satisfaction (Churchill, Ford, & Walker, 1974). Many studies examining job satisfaction have focused mainly upon a single job satisfaction construct, and not taken into consideration the various facets of job satisfaction (Boles et al., 2003).

To overcome the innate limitations of the global measure of job satisfaction, a number of multidimensional individual job satisfaction scales were developed to allow researchers to gain a comprehensive and precise evaluation of the job satisfaction construct (Boles et al., 2003). To assess job satisfaction accurately, several characteristics or facets of the job that measure the individual's beliefs and attitudes regarding his or her job need to be taken into consideration (Churchill et al., 1974). The facet approach is used to examine which components of the job generate satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This type of approach can be beneficial for organisations wanting to diagnose and assess areas where individuals are dissatisfied. A job satisfaction facet may relate to any characteristic or part of a job (Spector, 1997). The facet approach presents a more comprehensive framework of an individual's job satisfaction than the global approach (Spector, 1997). Such job satisfaction facets may not be of equal significance to various individuals. For example, a working mother may specify that she is content with her manager,
remuneration and organisational policies, but unhappy with the other aspects of her work, such as the job itself.

2.3.5 Theories of job satisfaction.

Feminists' reports suggest that because women perceive the world differently from men they are likely to develop and maintain specific interpretations of their workplace (Franklin, 1997; Ramazanoglu & Hollard, 2002). The distinctive world of women provokes a diverse reality, which subsists not by comparison with men's reality, but stands as a self-governing and equitable one (Franklin, 1997; Tong 1994). The researcher has therefore integrated an epistemology of existing theories and concepts into the study, in which, as working women with children are the focus, special attention is paid to the job satisfaction of working women.

Various theories of job satisfaction have discussed elements that assist our understanding of job satisfaction in totality (George & Jones, 2000; Williams, 2000). Two influential theories have been selected for the study that are relevant to the job satisfaction of working women with children: the facet model of job satisfaction, and the job characteristics theory of Hackman and Oldham (1980).

2.3.5.1 The facet model of job satisfaction.

To gain a holistic assessment of job satisfaction, it is necessary to consider the various facets that constitute the job. Such a holistic measure includes individuals' beliefs and attitudes regarding their jobs (Churchill et al., 1974). The facet measure of job satisfaction is designed to cover each primary area within the general satisfaction domain separately. The facets are designed to be comparatively homogeneous, and different from the other facets. The facet model of job satisfaction is primarily concerned with the individual's working environment (Spector, 1997). By dissecting a particular job into its various facets, one can ascertain how satisfied individuals are with each facet of their
jobs (George & Jones, 2000). Table 2 shows the various job satisfaction facets that are found in a number of popular job-satisfaction instruments.

Table 2

Facets of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (human relations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (technical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Spector (1997), Utilising the faceted approach to job satisfaction as indicated in Table 2 offers a more comprehensive picture of an individual’s job satisfaction than the global approach to job satisfaction. Not only do individuals differ in terms of their satisfaction across the various facets, but also the job satisfaction facets are modestly related to one another (Spector, 1997). Analysing the various facets of job satisfaction as indicated in the facet model reveals that not all the facets mentioned are of relevance to this study, more specifically to working women with children. For example, the security facet may be of paramount importance to single working women with children. The need for authority may also be high among working women with children. Authority refers to the extent to which a job offers the individual sovereignty and diplomacy in scheduling work and determining how the work will be performed (Weiss et al., 1967).

The facet approach is used to understand which aspect of a particular job generates an individual’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This can be essentially beneficial for organisations that would like to understand the
various areas of employee dissatisfaction. Facets that are regularly measured include rewards, such as remuneration or fringe benefits; colleagues or managers; the nature of the work; and the organisation itself (Snipes, Oswald, La Tour, & Armenakis, 2005). The facet model of job satisfaction is useful as it enables researchers to understand how work affects individuals, and that certain facets of a job may be more significant to some individuals than others. Men and women may look for or be selected for different jobs that have differing levels of job resources. Men approach work as a means to success and are inclined to emphasise wealth, position, and power. Women, on the other hand, value growth, development, and the opportunity to nurture others in their work environment (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Men and women may construe or experience the same working environment and the various facets of work differently. Such differences exist purely because what women aspire to in a job is different from what men aspire to in a job (Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson, & Kacmar, 2007).

Kim (2005) conducted a study investigating whether gender adds to the differences in job satisfaction between men and women. Kim evaluated the variances between men and women with regard to the meaning of job satisfaction, and evaluated the impact of gender on the criticality and satisfaction of each job facet against general job satisfaction. Kim found that women regarded the following job facets as highly important to them: working conditions, supervision, personal growth, work itself, colleagues, job stability, and the offering of service. Men, on the other hand, valued promotional opportunities more highly than women did. A mean score of 4.23 was reported for women on the value of working conditions, whereas men reported a mean score of 4.03 (statistically significant p < .001). Women reported a mean score of 4.10 for the importance of work itself, while men reported a mean score of 3.91. A mean score for men on the value of promotional opportunities reported 4.22, while women reported 4.13. Kim (2005) concluded that women have higher job satisfaction on the various job satisfaction facets than men, and that among work and demographic
variables, gender may be regarded as the single most significant predictor of job satisfaction.

2.3.5.2 Job characteristics theory.

Jobs that are experienced as inherently uninteresting and are associated with simple and routine tasks have often been found to be dissatisfying (Spector, 1977). Researchers have promoted job redesign as a tool to enable and enhance job satisfaction by making jobs more appealing (Herzberg, 1968). Jobs are redesigned by modifying certain characteristics within the content and nature of the job (McKnight, Phillips, & Hardgrave, 2009). The content and nature of tasks within the actual job are referred to as job characteristics; only a limited number of characteristics have been researched as contributors to job satisfaction (Wall & Martin, 1987). The job characteristics theory of Hackman and Oldham (1980) is the most influential theory explaining how the characteristics of a job affect individuals at work. The job characteristics theory posits that individuals are encouraged by the intrinsic satisfaction they discover in executing job tasks. When individuals perceive that work is pleasurable and significant, they become engaged in their work and motivated to perform well in their jobs (Spector, 1997).

The five core dimensions of the job characteristics theory can be applied to any job (McKnight et al., 2009; Spector, 1997); these are shown in Table 3.
Table 3

*Dimensions of job characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Characteristics</th>
<th>Description of Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>The skills required by an individual to do the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>Depends on whether or not an individual completes an entire job or a part of a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>The influence the job has on other individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>The degree to which individuals are free to carry out their jobs as they deem appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Feedback</td>
<td>The degree to which it becomes clear to individuals that they are executing their jobs accurately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The five core job characteristics have been proposed to lead to three psychological states: skill variety, task identity, and task significance (De Dreu & Nauta, 2009). These three psychological states together induce experiences of meaningfulness at work. Jobs high in autonomy offer the individual a sense of personal accountability. Job feedback results in the individual's understanding of the outcomes related to products of work. The job characteristics theory suggests that if skill variety, task identity and task significance are present in a job, the individual views the job as being significant and meaningful (Spector, 1997). The job characteristics dimensions indicated in Table 3 have been utilised in this study for measuring and interpreting individuals’ satisfaction in their jobs. The three psychological states consequently contribute to job satisfaction outcomes and individual
motivation. Accordingly, the five core job characteristics indicate how motivating a job is expected to be.

A personality variable was added to the job characteristics theory of Hackman and Oldham (1976): growth need strength. The growth need strength variable plays a moderating role between the effects of the core job characteristics. The growth need strength variable reveals an individual’s need for the attainment of higher-order needs, such as job autonomy or development and growth. The job characteristics theory posits that the motivating effects of job characteristics will take place only if individuals have high growth need strength. In other words, individuals who favour challenges and significance in their work will be more content and motivated if they have jobs that are complex as defined by the five core characteristics. Such individuals are more likely to avoid jobs that are simplistic in nature, and may be attracted to managerial jobs that offer greater levels of complexity.

Chovwen and Ivensor (2008) conducted a study to determine how skill variety, autonomy and job feedback on job characteristics and organisational justice could predict the job security and motivation of working women. The findings of the hierarchical regression analysis showed a significant combined effect of job characteristics on job loss for working women ($r = 0.04$, $p < .05$). Furthermore, a combined influence of job characteristics and organisational justice on perceived motivation and insecurity was found for women. In other words, when problems materialise as a consequence of job characteristics and unfair processes, women may feel that their job security is endangered and their level of motivation may be affected.

Because of the centrality of the role that work plays in many individuals’ lives, it becomes necessary for organisations to understand how individuals may feel satisfied in their jobs. A motivated workforce implies many benefits to an organisation; therefore the creation of a working environment that cultivates motivation becomes important (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk, & Schenk, 2003). Various motivational theories need to be taken into consideration in
creating this type of working environment. Motivational theories have been formulated in order to explain and predict the impact of motivation on organisational variables such as job satisfaction, productivity, absenteeism and turnover (Swanepoel et al., 2003). A discussion on the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation follows.

2.3.6 The relationship between job satisfaction and motivation.

Work psychology has for some time endeavoured to examine the reasons why individuals differ in terms of their motivation to work. Work psychology attempts to establish how individual differentiation interrelates with organisational and situational factors to impact upon satisfaction on the job (Furnham, 2002). Despite the fact that many researchers have presented various reasons for the sources of both job satisfaction and work motivation, there has been very limited focus on and measurement of individual differences (Furnham, 2002).

According to Westwood (1992, p. 288), motivation can be defined as “an internal state, giving rise to a desire or pressure to act”. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, refers to the degree to which individuals are satisfied with their jobs (Warr, 2002). Both work motivation and job satisfaction are discussed side by side; as it is arguable that the degree to which individuals are satisfied at work may be influenced by the existence of factors and conditions that have a motivating effect (Furnham, 2002). The underlying principle behind the more modern theories of job satisfaction and work motivation is to offer a foundational framework by means of which organisations are better equipped to motivate their employees and increase their excitement within their roles (Furnham, Eracleous, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2009). For the purposes of this study, only Herzberg’s theory of motivation (1959) will be utilised, owing to its applicability to job satisfaction and work-family conflict.

Herzberg’s theory of motivation (1959) is based on his seminal two-factor theory. Herzberg contends that satisfaction and dissatisfaction should not be
viewed as two opposing extremes but rather as a continuum, with two interdependent concepts caused by and derived from different facets of work. These two concepts are known as the extrinsic, or “hygiene” factors, and the intrinsic, or “motivational” factors. Hygiene factors, or lower-order needs, are considered as extrinsic factors of the job that may add to an individual’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job (Oplatka & Mimon, 2008). For example, hygiene needs include elements such as supervision, working conditions, benefits, remuneration, and interpersonal relations. Herzberg’s theory of motivation (1959) postulates that job dissatisfaction is highly likely in situations where hygiene (extrinsic) factors are lacking or limited in the individual’s working environment (Gunlu et al., 2010).

Motivators, or higher-order needs, are intrinsic to the actual job and consist of elements such as appreciation, accomplishment and acknowledgement (Furnham et al., 2009). Herzberg (1959) hypothesised that motivators or intrinsic factors such as appreciation or accomplishment are fundamental in motivating individuals to carry out their daily tasks at work, and are related to job satisfaction. Reinardy (2009) conducted a study utilising Herzberg’s motivational-hygiene theory to assess the effects on overall job satisfaction of motivational factors, such as social and organisational support, and hygiene factors, such as job demands, work-family conflict and role overload. Reinardy found a strong positive, statistically significant, relationship between overall job satisfaction and social support ($r = .46$). Furthermore, a weak negative, statistically significant, relationship was reported between job satisfaction and work-family conflict ($r = -.26$) and between job demands ($r = -.27$), and role overload ($r = -.27$). Reinardy’s (2009) results indicate that motivational factors may be consequential predictors of job satisfaction. Hygiene factors, although partially supported, may be consequential predictors of job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg (1959) argues that only intrinsic factors can essentially generate high levels of motivation. Extrinsic factors do not motivate individuals; nonetheless, neglecting these elements may be detrimental to an individual’s
commitment to his or her work. Ebrahimi (1999) recognised gender as a vital consideration in the literature of work motivation and Aycan (2001) contended that there was a need for more research into influences of gender on work motivation. Worthley, MacNab, Brislin, Ito, and Rose (2009) investigated factors relating to work motivation for men and women employees in Japan, utilising Herzberg’s (1959) motivational-hygiene theory. A significant difference was found with regard to extrinsic motivation ($p < .05$) in which women on average achieved a higher score than men (Worthley et al., 2009). In addition, men placed significantly greater emphasis on intrinsic motivators ($p < .01$), while women did not. While men were more likely to emphasise intrinsic aspects over extrinsic ones, women did not make a significant distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic aspects. Extrinsic factors that were of particular interest to women in the study were social relationships, equality, job security and quality of managers.

Most of the studies investigating job satisfaction and work motivation have focused on organisational or situational predictors such as remuneration, support and supervision (Locke, 1976), while disregarding the importance of individual differences (Staw & Ross, 1985). It is important to take into consideration the significant differences between the ways in which individuals, especially working women, perceive their jobs (Furnham et al., 2009). The modern individual may not necessarily experience job satisfaction and motivation solely because of the financial aspect associated with work. Moreover, the same hygiene factors and motivators may not guarantee that all individuals are motivated and satisfied in their jobs (Van der Walt, 2007). It appears that modern employees have a greater concern with intrinsic motivating factors such as a sense of achievement in family life, but not to the detriment of the hygiene factors. It would be advantageous if organisations considered the hygiene factors; but to guarantee motivation and job satisfaction, intrinsic needs which are family based should also be met by the organisation (Furnham et al., 2009).
2.3.7 Intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is an attitude that reflects three factors: the intrinsic and extrinsic factors, and general reinforcement. The job satisfaction dimensions that measure intrinsic job satisfaction in the MSQ Short-Form are ability utilisation, activity, achievement, independence, moral values, responsibility, security, creativity, social service, social status and variety. Similarly, the job satisfaction dimensions that measure extrinsic job satisfaction are advancement, company policy, compensation, recognition and supervision (human relations and technical). Job satisfaction in general incorporates two additional factors: working conditions and co-workers. When intrinsic and extrinsic factors are combined with the working environment, general job satisfaction is created (Feinstein & Vondrasek, 2001). A review follows of intrinsic and extrinsic factors pertinent to the context of this study.

Financial reward is regarded as one of the extrinsic benefits of work; such rewards seek to satisfy the temporary needs of individuals and enable the attainment of physical assets for continued satisfaction. Throughout human history, the financial rewards that work provides have been of importance in the lives of individuals engaged in the world of work (Markovits, Davis, & Van Dick, 2007). A study conducted by De Klerk, Boshoff, & Van Wyk (2001) investigating “man’s will to meaning” reported a statistically significant correlation between meaning and an individual’s intention to continue working without financial gains ($p < .044$). The study by De Klerk et al. showed that individuals search for meaning in their work, a meaning that is greater than mere financial gain. Herzberg (1959) postulated that individuals accumulated interest on the psychological benefits that they gained from their jobs, saying, “when the worker is not pushed for such basic things as food, clothing and shelter, he also thinks more about some of the pleasurable and personally rewarding aspects of his job, recognition, responsibility, and interesting work”. The meaningful work that Herzberg (1959) refers to is associated with more refined skills and greater complexity, and provides greater opportunities for intrinsic job satisfaction (Markovits et al., 2007). It is important to understand
how single mothers with low income manage their work and family lives. Research has indicated that work is meaningful for mothers working in family-friendly environments (Sahibzada, Hammer, Neal, & Kuang, 2005). For example, giving working mothers the opportunity to take time off work to handle family and childcare issues without the reduction of income alleviates the strain of their work-family conflict (Son & Bauer, 2010).

The number of hours worked is another factor that can increase single mothers’ work-family conflict and decrease job satisfaction. Low-income single mothers are more likely to engage in jobs with non-standard working hours, which results in their experiencing more work-family conflict than married mothers do (Presser, 2003). Single mothers have very limited resources available to them and are confronted by various family and work demands and job insecurity (Son & Bauer, 2010; Urban & Olsen, 2005). The degree of differentiation of work-family conflict is based on the nature of demands and the availability of resources for mothers. Demands are composed of goals or actions, and the means that fit with these demands and actions are resources (Son & Bauer, 2010).

From an extrinsic perspective, research has recently focused on the career development and advancement of working women in managerial positions (Davidson & Burke, 2004; Vinnicombe & Bank, 2003). Researchers are in agreement that working women continue to experience difficulty in progressing through the ranks of senior management levels, regardless of their qualifications, tenure and levels of job performance (Burke & Mattis, 2005; Burke & Nelson, 2002; Ruderman & Ohlott, 2002). More recently, organisations have begun to support women’s career aspirations to more senior roles (Burke & Mattis, 2005; Burke & Nelson, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Such organisational support involves bringing women who have the appropriate education, experience and track record into managerial roles (Hewlett, Luce, & Shiller, 2005). Women in managerial positions may be exposed to certain obstacles in the workplace, such as prejudice, scrutiny, conflict between work and family life, exposure to higher performance
measures and standards and unfavourable working conditions (Hochschild, 1989). However, Schein (2007) proposes that the greatest challenges that confront women with regard to career progression are the attitudes, prejudice, observation and behaviour that they will receive from men in the workplace. The culture of working excessively long hours also prejudices women in the workplace, as a woman’s key accountability is her family and home (Burke, Koyuncu, & Fiksenbaum, 2008). Available resources derived from the work domain, such as supervisor support, flexible working arrangements and job benefits, appeal to the capabilities of working mothers, who are attempting to manage the responsibilities of work and family (Mammen, Lass, & Seiling, 2009; Pedersen et al., 2009).

A study conducted by Aycan (2004), investigating the factors that influence women’s career advancement, concluded that regardless of the organisational support women receive, gender-role stereotypes remain rigid. Aycan (2004) added that women hold more traditional attitudes regarding gender roles. This might be because women strongly internalise societal attitudes regarding their gender roles, although women sometimes find it more suitable to “think like men” and repress their “feminist” attitudes in order to gain approval in a male-dominated working environment (Kabasakal, 1998). Furthermore, Aycan (2004) found that women in managerial positions had constantly to fight against gender-role stereotypes. These women needed to persuade themselves that it was acceptable not to execute domestic activities themselves, but to obtain assistance from family members or paid help instead. Women in managerial positions had to learn not to feel guilty in a cultural situation in which significant others criticised them for leaving their children to go to work. They had to persuade their husbands or partners to acknowledge them as professional women and share the household activities. These women also had to prove to their organisations that they were capable of managing greater accountabilities, and that their family responsibilities did not interfere with their work.
In general, men place higher value on extrinsic attributes such as remuneration and opportunities for career advancement. Women, on the other hand, seek intrinsic attributes such as job satisfaction and positive social relationships with colleagues (Moyes et al., 2006). These differences support the alleged tendency of women to choose the teaching and nursing professions, while men are more interested in complex occupations (Moyes et al., 2006). However, this is not the case for all men and women. Assuming that both extrinsic and intrinsic job benefits and rewards may be of significance to most individuals, it may be valuable to sufficiently measure specific facets of the job. It would be of particular interest to ascertain whether gender differences exist in the job satisfaction of working women with children compared to that of other working women and men.

2.3.8 Work-family conflict and job satisfaction.

The increasing numbers of dual-career families, in which husband and wife work, are likely to create even greater conflict between work and family (Livingston & Judge, 2008; Major & Germano, 2006). Employed women have greater combined demands from their work and families, which leads them to experience conflict between work and family domains (Davidson & Burke, 2004). The increased interest in work-family conflict is based on the idea that work-family conflict may lead to negative work-related outcomes such as job dissatisfaction (Frye & Breaugh, 2004). Work-family conflict and job satisfaction are discussed within this study; the next part of this discussion highlights the significance of job satisfaction and its effects on work-family conflict.

Researchers have effectively established relationships between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. A study by Namasivayam and Mount (2004) investigating relationships between work-family conflict, family-work conflict and job satisfaction found that when individuals’ work roles interfere with family roles, the individual experiences lower job satisfaction. In addition, research conducted by Karimi (2008) found that work interference with family
conflict had a significant and negative influence on job satisfaction \((r = -0.19, \ p < .01)\) for employed women. These results demonstrated that higher levels of work interference with family conflict were related to lower job satisfaction for working women.

An investigation by Ngah, Ahmad, and Baba (2009) investigated the mediating effect of work-family conflict on the relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction for single working mothers. The study found that work-family conflict was significantly correlated to job satisfaction. Single mothers with lower levels of work-family conflict experienced higher job satisfaction. Such results show that when single employed mothers believe that they have the power to control the events that occur in their lives, they are more satisfied with their jobs and experience less conflict between the obligations of work and family. A study conducted by Boles et al. (2001) concluded that work-family conflict is significantly related to all facets of job satisfaction \((p < .05)\), with the exception of satisfaction with co-workers. Similarly, family-work conflict is also significantly related to all facets of job satisfaction, with the exception of satisfaction with promotion. The findings indicate that increased levels of work-family conflict and family-work conflict are negatively correlated to employee job satisfaction. The results also propose that work interference with family is a potential predictor of low job satisfaction.

Cohen and Liani (2009) investigated work-family conflict among female employees. The findings of the study confirmed a strong significant relationship between work attitudes, predominantly job satisfaction, and work-family conflict \((r = -0.29, \ p < .01)\). The findings demonstrate that higher job satisfaction may be related to lower levels of work-family conflict. A research study by Ahmad (1996), investigating the consequences of work-family conflict of married women by using path analytic associations of work-family conflict, job satisfaction, family and life satisfaction, found work-family conflict led to significantly lower job satisfaction \((r = -0.40, \ p < .01)\) and family satisfaction \((r = -0.29, \ p < .01)\). The data implies that work-family conflict is a
significant concern for individuals and organisations owing to its unfavourable consequences, such as reduced job satisfaction. According to the studies and investigations regarding job satisfaction and work-family conflict, it can be confidently stated that when work roles interfere with family roles, individuals experience lower job satisfaction (Boles et al., 2001; Cohen & Liani, 2009; Karimi, 2008; Namasiyam & Mount, 2004; Ngah et al., 2009; O’Driscoll, Brough, & Kalliath, 2004). Considering the available evidence, it seems that job dissatisfaction, as a work factor, has consistently been demonstrated to be the most important consequence of conflict in the family domain.

2.3.9 Role variables and job satisfaction among working women.

One approach to viewing the interaction of individuals and jobs is from the perspective of role theory (Katz & Khan, 1978). A role is described as the required pattern of behaviour that an individual takes on within the organisation (Hamilton et al., 2006). In terms of the role theory, certain variables have been hypothesised to be important influences on job satisfaction. Role ambiguity and role conflict have been the most thoroughly examined, the latter being pertinent to the context of this study. Role ambiguity refers to the degree of certainty individuals have concerning what their outputs and responsibilities should be. For example, if a supervisor’s expectation of an employee’s role is not accurately described to the employee, role ambiguity will result. Role conflict exists when individuals experience incompatible demands regarding their roles and responsibilities (Hamilton et al., 2006). Such a situation provokes negative emotional responses and reduces job satisfaction and effectiveness in a position. Both role ambiguity and role conflict have been shown to correlate with low levels of job satisfaction.

Tarrant and Sabo (2010) conducted a study investigating role conflict, role ambiguity and job satisfaction among nurse executives. The study reported a mean score of 3.04 for role conflict. Role ambiguity reported a mean score of
2.91, and job satisfaction reported a mean score of 4.01. Upon examining the relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity and job satisfaction, a moderate negative relationship was found between role conflict and job satisfaction \( (r = -.49) \), signifying that as individuals’ role conflict increases, their job satisfaction decreases. The analysis of the data also revealed a moderate negative relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction \( (r = -.54) \), signifying that as individuals’ role ambiguity increases, their job satisfaction decreases.

Roles form part of an individual’s social structure and are recognised and used by all members within a social community. While roles are shared behavioural expectations, role identities are internalised role expectations. Certain dimensions such as gender may have the characteristics of a role identity, but frequently modify role identities (Verdonk, De Rijk, Klinge, & De Vries, 2008). Role theory integrates the influences of role demands, individual resources and social resources in shaping role performance and domain outcomes. It is likely that multiple-role participation and the process of satisfying various demands, although potentially demanding, can be a positive experience that yields rewards. This is particularly true when resources such as family-friendly policies are accessible to assist individuals to meet their specific family needs (Pedersen et al., 2009).

A study conducted by Karatepe et al. (2006) investigating gender differences in the banking industry found that these had a significant moderating impact on the association between role conflict and job satisfaction. Relationships were found between role conflict and job satisfaction \( (r = -.38) \) and role ambiguity \( (r = -.47) \) for women; and role conflict \( (r = -.23) \) and role ambiguity \( (r = -.44) \) for men. Men and women have varying perceptions regarding their roles in society, and they experience role conflict and role ambiguity differently. Two theoretical perspectives that distinguish between men and women’s role stress have been proposed in the literature. The first suggested theory is that, as men and women are biologically different, differences will exist with regard to their attitudes in the workplace. Women seek roles that do
not interfere with their family, especially with their roles as mothers (Mackey & Coney, 2000). The second proposed theory is the role theory, which categorises women as enacting collective and nurturing roles, while men engage in more agentic or influential roles (Eagly, 1987). Such theoretical perspectives suggest that men and women differ in their outlook regarding their jobs, and experience varying degrees of work-related consequences, based on the demands deriving from work and family domains (Boles et al., 2003). It may be concluded that men and women have conflicting job expectations, which may lead to role conflict, role ambiguity and work-family conflict.

2.3.10 Demand-control model and job satisfaction.

The demand-control model has been utilised in several previous studies to explain individual well-being in a high job demand context (Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). A basic tenet of the demand-control model is that in jobs characterised by a combination of high job demands and low job control, strain will be more evident. According to a study conducted by Johnson and Hall (1988), social support from managers and co-workers also plays a significant role in coping with job demands. A few studies have verified this finding (De Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman, & Bongers, 2003; Van der Doef & Maes, 1999), while other studies have incorporated the emotive and physical demands in the demand-control model in addition to workload (De Croon, Blonk, De Zwart, Frings-Dresen, & Broersen, 2002; Van Vegchel, De Jonge, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2002). Demands such as workloads constitute stressors that have the potential to produce strain in individuals. Control, on the other hand, functions as a buffer to limit the effects of the demands. For example, an individual who has a high level of job control will find that the demands of the job have little effect on job strain. If an individual has limited job control, then the demands of the job will result in job strain. Therefore, one can assume that jobs with greater demands and low control will be characterised as “high-strain jobs” (Bakker, Van Veldhoven, & Xanthopoulou, 2010). A significant implication for organisations of the
The demand-control model is that the negative effects of demands may be reduced by increasing the control that individuals have over their jobs.

The affiliation between an individual’s health, working hours and family functioning is intricate, as not all individuals are affected in the same manner by working long hours (Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2008). These authors conducted a study investigating the relationship between working hours, job satisfaction and general well-being among women. The study found that women who worked 56 hours or more per week were more inclined not to have children than were women who worked 55 hours or less per week. Higher job satisfaction, more promotional opportunities and salary increases were reported by the women working more hours. However, greater psychological stress was reported by women working 56 or more hours per week, suggesting that working long hours was also associated with some psychological costs. One could argue that women are more vulnerable to difficulty in an organisational culture of long working hours, especially if they are career driven and have family obligations as well. According to Hewlett et al., (2005), women with a family are disadvantaged in a work environment that demands long working hours because of their dual life responsibilities. Women may decide not to take part in work that requires long working hours as it may prevent them from attending to their family responsibilities (Hewlett et al., 2005).

Organisations need to recognise that a culture of long working hours, which may be appealing to some individuals and contribute to productivity in the short term, may be impractical in the long term. Working in “extreme” jobs may over time lead to turnover, especially among talented women, and to exhaustion and emotional distress among those who stay with the organisation (Burke & Fiksenbaum, 2008). An extreme job is described as one that requires 60 working hours or more per week (Hewlett et al., 2005).
2.4 Burnout

Many behaviours and individual outcomes have been proposed to be a consequence of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Some of these outcomes include not only work variables such as performance and individual turnover but also outcomes not related to work, such as health and well-being. Burnout, for instance, is an example of an emotional and psychological state that an individual experiences on the job. Job satisfaction is regarded as attitudinal in nature; burnout, however, is regarded as more of an emotive response to the job (Hewlett et al., 2005).

The two main resources that parents are responsible for providing for their children are time and money (Thomson, Hanson, & McLanahan, 1994). However, providing for their children inevitably requires parents to spend time working. The obligation to spend time on paid work interferes with the amount of quality time that the individual may spend in the family domain (Bulanda & Lippman, 2009). Similarly, spending too much time at work may result in a reorganisation of domestic activities, and may leave an individual feeling stressed and overworked (Bulanda & Lippman, 2009). Stress in the workplace has been the subject of a great deal of research throughout the years (Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001). Continuous exposure to stress at work may have a negative influence on an individual’s health and may ultimately lead to burnout (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004; Martinussen et al., 2007). The burnout construct is a significant and controversial element in the literature on organisational behaviour and research, as it incorporates the reality of individual experiences in the workplace.

Burnout research has focused primarily on role characteristics of work (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004), as burnout has been defined as a state of mind that is related to work characteristics (Maslach et al., 2001). A study conducted by Schreuder and Coetzee (2010) investigating the frequency of published research in Industrial and Organisational Psychology found that research trends not only evolved over time but keep up with the unyielding challenges of a changing work and socio-economic context. Overall, the
findings show an increase in research relating to organisational psychology and employee and organisational wellness. The proportional increase in employee and organisational wellness research is aligned with the increasing changes in the nature of jobs due to the rapid technological and socio-economic changes (Rothmann & Cilliers, 2007). The proportional increase of research on employee and organisational wellness seems to be a global trend. Schaufeli (2001) postulates that from 1990 until 2001 over 6000 scientific publications with ‘burnout’ in the title were published globally. This trend could be ascribed to the continuing demands of a globally volatile, highly competitive organisational environment that impacts on both employee and organisational wellness (Rothmann & Cilliers, 2007).

The concept of burnout was criticised in the past as a non-academic construct and was relegated to the realm of “popular psychology”. This term is used to characterise different types of mental frameworks that may or may not be scientifically confirmed. Given the consequential empirical studies, investigations and supporting models on burnout, the question of whether burnout is an academic construct or not has been answered (Maslach et al., 2001). What has materialised from theoretical models and research is a conceptualisation of the construct of job burnout as “a psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 399). Burnout is an important construct to examine because of the increasing number of individuals who experience and suffer from it. Burnout as an occupational disorder is a significant dilemma in the modern workplace (Ten Brummelhuis et al., 2008).

Several work-related variables have been shown to be related to burnout. Such variables include job demands and physical workloads (Jassen, Bakker, & De Jong, 2001), increased psychological strain caused by modern-day jobs and physical work environments (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006), low levels of autonomy (Demerouti et al., 2001), poor supervisor support (Sundin, Hochwälder, Bildt & Lisspers, 2007), inadequate job resources and high job demands (Demerouti et al., 2001). Increasing demands arising from an
individual’s job lead to greater workloads, conflicting roles and limited resources, elevating the individual’s risk of burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001). According to recent research conducted by Ten Brummelhuis et al. (2008), burnout may be traced back and related to the family domain, as the majority of individuals affected have also experienced an increase in family-related duties. The combined demands of work and family frequently lead to stress, time pressures and conflict in satisfying both roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). However, research examining the impact of family duties and responsibilities on job burnout is limited (Eby et al., 2005; Hill, 2005). This study examines the time pressures that are caused by the combination of work, family and burnout.

Satisfaction in women’s lives is often related to their families, work and their sense of self derived from multiple-role participation (Blau, Ferber, & Winkler, 2006). Compared with their participation in family roles, the role of work signifies a basis of self-worth and self-efficacy. Job and career growth, developmental opportunities and the ability to manage a job that requires certain levels of accountability may be direct sources of life satisfaction for many women. Financial and career security also contributes to the general health and welfare of women (Campione, 2008). Furthermore, a sense of accomplished self-efficacy derived from work affords women the opportunity to manage both work and family roles more effectively.

Although women take a global perspective of their lives and may undeniably be satisfied with their lives in general, they are usually more concerned with daily life activities (Campione, 2008). As we have seen, working women continue to assume a greater part of caregiving and domestic responsibilities, in conjunction with paid work, on a daily basis. Family networks may offer some form of time and financial relief to women (Campione, 2008). However, there may be instances when family networks may become depleted of the resources required to support women. In such cases, women turn to their employment as a source of support (Voydanoff, 2005b). Some organisations provide an array of fringe benefits, such as flexible working arrangements or
telecommuting, as a way to assist individuals to manage their time and family obligations (Brett & Stroh, 2003). Certain employers, however, can make it very hard for individuals to manage their various roles, which may ultimately lead to stress and affect their well-being (Campione, 2008). Depending solely on family networks is not sufficient in modern-day life; the work role affords entry into another network where women can acquire support and assistance.

2.4.1 Defining the construct: the three dimensions of burnout.

Burnout was first defined as “a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward” (Freudenberger, 1980, p. 13). Later, Maslach et al. (2001, p. 399) defined burnout as a “psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job”. The consensus in the literature is that burnout can be seen as the result of commencing work with high motivational and commitment levels; by not attaining favourable outcomes, individuals are left highly dissatisfied (Ben-Zur & Michael, 2007). Winstanley and Whittington (2002) contend that burnout can be viewed as a dynamic process, linked to stress, caused by the combination of elevated levels of workloads and limited coping alternatives. Burnout is an extended reaction to constant stressors associated with the job, and thus plays a unique role, especially in the healthcare industry, in which employees suffer from both emotional and physical stress (Piko, 2006).

The MBI-HSS was developed to measure burnout as an occupational issue for individuals offering human services (Sundin et al., 2007). It became apparent that there was a need to measure burnout in other occupations that did not have direct contact with service recipients, and in response, the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS) was developed. The MBI-GS is used to measure individuals’ relationships with their work on a continuum from engagement to burnout (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996).
The instrument was selected to measure burnout in this study. The MBI-GS consists of three subscales that parallel those of the MIB-HHS: emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. The burnout dimensions are related differently to each other and cannot be summarised or viewed as a distinct scale of burnout. The weakest correlations are between emotional exhaustion \( (r = .04) \) and professional efficacy \( (r = .34) \), while the strongest correlations are between emotional exhaustion and cynicism \( (r = .44 \) and \( r = .61) \).

Emotional exhaustion is regarded as the most apparent expression of the intricate syndrome of burnout. When individuals consider themselves experiencing burnout, they very often report the presence of exhaustion. Exhaustion has been consistently established to be more frequently reported in women (mean 33.6) than in men (mean 28.6) (Sjogren & Kristenson, 2006). The likelihood of women working in positions with higher job demands and little authority to make decisions is great; therefore, women tend to report more job strain than men (Sjogren & Kristenson, 2006). In a study conducted by Canivet et al. (2010), exhaustion (as well as family-work conflict, poor self-rated health, working overtime, job strain and low job support) was reported to be more prevalent in women (15.6%) as opposed to men (8.3%) in a sample of 12 607 men and women.

According to Maslach et al. (2001) of the three dimensions of burnout, exhaustion is probably the most extensively researched and thoroughly analysed. Even though exhaustion reveals the stress dimensions of burnout, it is not successful in capturing the significant elements of the relationship individuals have with work. Exhaustion is not viewed as a simplistic experience; instead, it evokes behaviour in which individuals are emotionally and mentally restrained from performing their work as a mechanism to manage and deal with work overload (Maslach et al., 2001).

The second dimension is depersonalisation, or cynicism. Cynicism is defined as an effort to place distance between oneself and one’s clients (service
recipients) by intentionally disregarding the aspects that make them exclusive and engaging individuals (Maslach et al., 2001). Outside the human services, individuals utilise cognitive distancing by developing an unresponsive or cynical attitude when they are exhausted and disheartened. Distancing oneself is such an immediate response to exhaustion that a strong relationship between exhaustion and cynicism is consistently found in burnout research (Maslach et al., 2001). The cynicism dimension is not commonly discussed in the stress literature; however, it constitutes a fundamental feature of the burnout experience. Cynicism refers to a negative, unsympathetic, or extremely detached reaction towards people, as well as other characteristics of the job (Maslach, 2003).

Professional inefficacy is the third dimension of burnout and refers to the tendency to evaluate oneself negatively, especially with regard to one’s work with clients (González-Romá, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Lloret, 2006). The relationship between professional efficacy (personal accomplishment) and the other two burnout dimensions is somewhat complicated. In some instances, it seems to be a function, to some extent, of either exhaustion, cynicism, or a combination of the two (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). A work situation with constant, unrealistic demands that contribute to exhaustion or cynicism has the potential to wear down the individual’s sense of efficiency. Furthermore, exhaustion or depersonalisation interferes with effectiveness: that is, an individual finds it difficult to attain a sense of achievement when feeling exhausted. However, within the job context, inefficacy seems to develop in parallel with exhaustion and cynicism rather than sequentially (Leiter, 1993). The lack of efficacy appears to emerge from limited resources, while exhaustion and depersonalisation arise from social conflict and overload (Maslach et al., 2001).

Owing to the nature of the various “nurturing” roles working women assume in their personal and professional lives, it may be surmised that women are more vulnerable to experiencing higher levels of burnout than men. One significant aspect of organisations that influences the psychosocial work environment
and produces job-related stress is role conflict (Kalliath & Morris, 2002). A study conducted by Piko (2006) investigating the interrelations between burnout, role conflict and job satisfaction found that emotional exhaustion was strongly correlated with decreased job satisfaction ($p < .001$), while role conflict was a factor contributing positively to emotional exhaustion ($p < .001$) and depersonalisation scores ($p < .001$). Furthermore, women were more inclined to report a higher repetition of psychosomatic symptoms on all three dimensions of burnout than men. A study conducted by Bezuidenhout and Cilliers (2010) investigating the negative consequences of burnout claim that if burnout symptoms are not effectively managed and contained, work that is viewed as significant, meaningful and stimulating could become unpleasant to female academics in higher-education institutions. These women could start to experience work as unrewarding and meaningless. Furthermore, the study found that involvement amongst female academics turned into cynicism, with associated negative symptoms.

2.4.2 Situational factors: where does burnout occur?

Burnout is perceived as an individual experience that pertains predominantly to the work context. The focus of research conducted over the past 25 years has been on the situational factors of burnout, which are regarded as the major correlates of this phenomenon (Maslach et al., 2001). The next section outlines certain situational factors that are deemed relevant to the study.

2.4.2.1 Burnout and job characteristics.

Researchers have investigated and examined the impact of job demands on individuals when the workload is too great for the amount of time allocated. The results of such investigations have supported the general idea that burnout is a response and reaction to work overload (Maslach et al., 2001). Burnout is directly related to the individual’s workload and time pressures; this is especially significant for the exhaustion dimension of burnout. A study investigating gender differences with regard to workload found that men
spend more of their time in professional work, while women spend more of their time on childcare activities (Bergman, Ahmad, & Stewart, 2008). As we have seen, women are more accountable for managing the majority of household and family activities (Bergman et al., 2008). Women carry an uneven distribution of work or perhaps even a “double workload” because they are largely responsible for household duties over and above their paid work (Ahmad, 2010).

The acknowledgement of the adverse psychological consequences of emotional exhaustion has directed interest towards the role of contributing factors such as workload and work-family conflict in tackling the problem of emotional exhaustion (Ahmad, 2010). The findings below are from the study by Ahmad (2010) investigating the mediating influence of work-family conflict on the relationship between exhaustion and role overload among working women. The results of the correlation analysis indicated that role overload was significantly related to work-family conflict ($r = .55, p < .001$) and emotional exhaustion ($r = .56, p < .001$). Furthermore, work-family conflict was significantly related to emotional exhaustion ($r = .55, p < .001$). Multiple regression analysis in Ahmad’s study showed that among working women, work-family conflict mediates the relationship between role overload and emotional exhaustion.

Various studies have been conducted investigating qualitative job demands and their influences on burnout. Such studies have focused predominantly on role conflict and role ambiguity. Both role conflict and role ambiguity have consistently demonstrated a modest to high correlation with burnout. A study conducted by Tunc and Kutanis (2009), investigating role conflict and role ambiguity among female nurses, found significant levels of role conflict ($p < .001$) and role ambiguity ($p < .005$). The linear regression analysis indicated that role conflict may be associated with burnout variables (.31 to 45; $p < .01$) and to role ambiguity (.20 to .23; $p < .01$). This indicates that role conflict can increase emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation and that role ambiguity can significantly increase emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation.
Furthermore, Tunc and Kutanis (2009) postulated that women reported higher levels of burnout on the emotional exhaustion dimension and lower levels of personal accomplishment than did men. In investigating and analysing the presence of job demands, researchers have considered the absence of job resources (Maslach et al., 2001). Thompson, Kirk and Brown (2005) indicate that social support as a job resource construct has been widely examined, and a vast body of evidence has indicated that a lack of social support is related to burnout.

2.4.2.2 Burnout and occupational characteristics.

The increasing scope of occupational sectors has necessitated a re-examination of the situational context for burnout. Researchers examining burnout were previously inclined to focus more on the immediate work environment, such as a nurse’s work with patients at a hospital or the work a teacher performs with her students in a classroom setting. However, work also occurs within a larger organisation that includes hierarchical structures, company policies and resources (Maslach et al., 2001). The situational context of burnout can have a significant influence, especially when such a context infringes on basic expectations of equality and fairness. Consequently, contextual focus has been extended to incorporate the organisational and management environment in which work occurs. Such a focus has heightened the importance of values inherent in organisational processes and structures, and how these values outline the emotional and cognitive relationship that individuals develop with their jobs (Maslach et al., 2001).

The reality is that the majority of organisations have undergone significant changes, which in turn have had a significant effect on the morale of employees. Such changes as downsizing and mergers are largely driven by economic, social and cultural forces that occur within the organisational context. Undoubtedly, the most apparent changes occur in the psychological contract between employees and organisations (Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly,
A psychological contract can be defined as “a set of individual beliefs or perceptions regarding reciprocal obligations between the employee and the organisation” (Knights & Kennedy, 2005, p. 57). Individuals may now be required to give more of their time and skills in exchange for fewer intangible benefits, such as job security. Violation of the psychological contract has the potential to create burnout because it wears away the concept of reciprocity, which is vital in maintaining well-being (Maslach et al., 2001).

Given the increased demands and pressures in organisations, researchers utilise various models of stress that integrate factors specific to burnout and organisational stress. Constant stress at work creates burnout; over time, burnout accumulates and leads to lower job performance, and ill health associated with anxiety and stress. The increase in work stressors such as working longer hours, downsizing, job insecurity, role ambiguity and role overload has led to an increase in stress and anxiety (Twenge & Campbell, 2008).

As a result of the fundamental changes in women’s roles, the current generation of women are scoring higher on assertiveness traits that may be beneficial for them in the workplace (Twenge & Campbell, 2008). As the participation of women in the workforce continues to increase, so does their suitability for promotion into leadership roles. The perception of women’s roles in the workplace has also changed; by the 1980s, women perceived the likeness between “female” and “manager” exactly as they did between “male” and “manager” (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, & Schein, 1989). Nonetheless, the ideals and beliefs surrounding gender stereotypes regarding how men and women are required to behave, feel and think still prevail (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Such beliefs are particularly prevalent at senior organisational levels. Stereotypes surrounding sex differences have shaped individuals’ perceptions and comparisons of male and female leaders. Women’s leadership style is perceived as focusing more on having good listening skills and being sympathetic, people-centric and less aggressive in the achievement of organisational outputs and goals. However, the stereotypes regarding
women’s leadership styles can hamper prospects for the development of women in leadership roles (Twenge & Campell, 2008). There is a need for organisations to work harder to dismiss the perceptions that persist regarding men and women in leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

### 2.4.3 Individual factors: who experiences burnout?

Maslach et al. (2001) state that individuals do not merely respond to the work environment: rather, individuals bring unique qualities to the relationship with their work. Demographic variables such as age and gender are examples of such exclusive qualities. A number of such individual characteristics have been established to be associated with burnout. Nevertheless, the relationships between burnout and situational factors are much greater than the relationship between individual characteristics and burnout. Therefore, burnout is regarded as a social phenomenon rather than an individual one (Maslach et al., 2001).

#### 2.4.3.1 Burnout and demographic characteristics of individuals.

Age is one of the most extensively researched demographic variables that has been consistently related to burnout. Maslach et al. (2001) postulate that higher burnout is reported among younger working individuals than individuals who are over thirty or forty years of age (Garner, Knight, & Simpson, 2007). Age is often associated with an individual’s working experience; therefore, age can be assumed to be much more of a risk earlier in an individual’s life and career (Lent, 2010). Gender as a demographic variable has not been positioned as a strong predictor of burnout; despite countless debates that burnout is a female experience. Mixed findings have been documented with regard to burnout and sex or gender (Leon, Visscher, Sugimura, & Lakin, 2008). Several studies have demonstrated that women experience higher burnout; others have indicated that men experience higher burnout and some have discovered no significant differences in burnout levels between the
sexes (Antoniou, Polychroni, & Vlachakis, 2006; Comerchero, 2008). There is, however, a small but reliable gender difference between men and women: men often achieve a higher score on cynicism, while there is a tendency in some studies for women to achieve a higher score on exhaustion. Such results may be associated with gender-role stereotypes, but may also reflect the confusion of sex with occupation. For example, firefighters are more likely to be male, and nurses more likely to be female (Maslach et al., 2001).

Marital status also has certain implications for levels of burnout. Unmarried individuals are perceived to be more susceptible to experiencing burnout than married individuals are. Moreover, single individuals experience higher burnout levels than do those who are divorced. Several studies have concluded that educational levels may also have some bearing on burnout. Individuals with higher qualifications are reported to experience more burnout than less qualified individuals (Stevens, Minnotte, Mannon, & Kiger, 2007). However, according to Maslach et al. (2001), it is not clear how to construe this finding, as education may be confused with other variables, such as occupation and rank. It is plausible to assume that individuals with higher qualifications may have jobs with greater responsibilities that are particularly stressful. On the other hand, it may be that more highly qualified individuals have higher job expectations and are thus more concerned if these expectations are not met.

The assumption that burnout is more pronounced among women is not an unusual one (Maslach et al., 2001). Such assumptions may be potentially damaging for the following reasons. In a working environment, colleagues and managers may perceive women as experiencing higher burnout than men do. Research has shown that, because of the stereotypes associated with women, women are seen as being at risk of experiencing more stress and, to some degree, burnout, than men (Matlin, 2004). If managers’ perceptions are that women are more susceptible to experiencing greater burnout, women may not be offered challenging projects and promotional opportunities. Another factor to take into consideration is the lack of awareness or support
from men when women experience stress and burnout (Wilcox, 1992). Men and women experience burnout in different ways. For example, a qualitative investigation conducted by Maslach et al. (2001) found that women reported a significantly higher score on the emotional exhaustion dimension of the burnout scale than men, and men were more inclined to attain a higher score on the depersonalisation dimension than women. This qualitative review is consistent with the gender-role theory (Maslach et al., 2001). According to the gender-role theory, women are more likely to demonstrate emotional and physical exhaustion because they are conditioned to express their feelings. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to withdraw under stress because they are conditioned to hide their feelings (Purvanova & Muros, 2010).

Being a working mother with children has consequences for general health and well-being (Herbst, Coetzee, & Visser, 2007). A key challenge for working women is the incongruity between the roles they hold as spouses and mothers and the roles they occupy in paid work (Vosloo, 2000). Managing the various roles contributes to an increase in stress and can lead to difficulty for working women who have children. This has several implications for organisations in terms of efficiency and productivity, as the majority of working women with children remain accountable for household and childcare responsibilities (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). In a South African study, Vosloo (2000) found that women do not operate in isolation but rather form part of a wider system that includes the organisation. Vosloo adds that women also operate within an individual system that encompasses their families and demographic variables. The interaction between these two systems, and the possible conflict that can emerge from this interface, necessitates certain mechanisms for managing the numerous roles efficiently (Herbst et al., 2007). The personality characteristics and sense of coherence of working women are considered as significant mechanisms that may have an impact on the way in which women deal with their numerous roles successfully (Herbst et al., 2007). Personality dimensions or traits are one area through which different behavioural responses can be understood. Trait theories assist in providing reasons why individuals respond differently to stress in their environments,
and encourage an understanding of the various sources of what is deemed stressful for individuals. More critically, trait theories assist in discovering possible strategies for coping more efficiently (Saville & Hodsworth, 1999).

According to Saville and Hodsworth (1999), personality traits may assist in comprehending the differences between working mothers’ behavioural reactions to their environments. Personality traits may consequently be variables that have an impact on the level of stress that working mothers in a given situation are likely to experience. Antonovsky (1979) developed the “salutogenic” (source of health) theory, which emphasises an individual’s ability to remain healthy and flexible during stressful events, and in managing and coping with daily life. The main notion of this theory pivots on positive circumstances of psychological well-being. Herbst et al. (2007, p. 58) define Antonovsky’s (1979) theory of coherence as “an internalised sense of control, which guides individuals’ orientation towards events”. A study conducted by Carrim (2000) found a relationship between the strength of working women’s “salutogenic” (containing a sense of coherence) scores and their ability to manage various roles in their environments. Another study conducted by Herbst et al. (2007) found that personality and sense of coherence acted as determinants of the way in which working women experienced and coped with various levels of stress. Herbst et al. further postulated that personality and sense of coherence might determine the style in which working mothers manage with the stresses and pressures of life. Working mothers require proficiencies to be successful wives and mothers and competent employees (Vosloo, 2000). It is particularly important for organisations to take cognisance of this, especially in attempting to retain the human capital (Senior, 2003).

### 2.4.3.2 Burnout and job attitudes of working women with children.

A variance exists with regard to the expectations that individuals bring to their jobs. In some instances, the expectations that the individual holds of the job
may be too high, especially concerning the nature of the job and the probability of attaining success within that job (Maslach et al., 2001). Whether such high expectations are rated as realistic or impractical, one assumption has remained: that these expectations are regarded as a risk for burnout (Kutcher, Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, & Masco, 2010). Individuals who have high expectations about their jobs work harder, and this hard work eventually leads to exhaustion and cynicism. This is especially true when the results do not match the individual’s expectations. Nevertheless, longitudinal studies with repetitive evaluations are required to shed light on the issue (Maslach et al., 2001).

Working women with children are usually confronted with numerous sources of stress. These sources include pressure from time constraints, inflexible self-expectations, demands arising from conflict, personal resources, and difficulty in obtaining social support from families, organisations and managers (Kushner & Harrison, 2002). The influence of social ideology on the experiences of working women with children has centred mainly on motherhood ideology (Johnston & Swanson, 2006). This focus explains the evaluation of and the concern about women in relation to the socially constructed principles of “the good mother”, but it fails to consider the various demands that are made of mothers in paid and non-paid work. The principles of motherhood ideology have also wholly emphasised motherhood as women’s fundamental role (Mudry, Kushner, & Neufeld, 2010). Support derived from family is believed to be beneficial in reducing work-family conflict and stress.

However, limited literature is available to assist in understanding the impact of expectations and social ideology, especially worker ideology. Mothers in paid work are therefore confronted with the conflicting social ideologies of a “good mother” and a “good worker” (Mudry et al., 2010, p. 906). The perception of a good mother is “selfless, independent with children, naturally endowed for nurturing, and successful in the domestic sphere”, while the perception of a good worker is “promoting self, demonstrating independence, and fulfilling her
potential in the public sphere” (Johnson & Swanson, 2003, p. 245). Women perceive paid work and being a mother as opposing binaries, and feel that marketplace logic is opposed to the cultural ideology of being a mother (Hays, 1996). Exhaustive and demanding motherhood remains the leading ideology (Hattery, 2001), and working women continue to experience demands in selecting between the mother-role and the employee-role (Blair-Loy, 2001).

2.4.4 Job demands, family demands and burnout.

The association between work and family roles and ill health has often been overlooked in research. A more unified, coherent picture would be obtained by incorporating and assessing the demands that arise from the family domain. Limited evidence exists on the probable impact of family characteristics on individuals’ health (Mostert, 2009). According to a study conducted by Peeters et al. (2005), demands originating from work and family had a direct impact on burnout, over and above the effect of work interference with family, and family interference with work. The demands arising from the family domain also necessitate a degree of cognitive and physical effort that is related to physiological and emotional cost (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Job demands refer to the extent to which physical, social or organisational elements of the job necessitate physical and mental effort and are consequently related to certain physiological and psychological costs, such as exhaustion (Demerouti et al., 2001). Furthermore, the concept of job demands implies unfavourable outcomes if they require further effort over and above the standard manner of attaining work goals (Demerouti et al., 2001). The majority of studies pertaining to the association between job demands and strain have predominately been concerned with quantitative demands, such as workload. The most renowned model that focuses on this area is Karasek’s (1979) demand-control model.

The demand-control model focuses specifically on the probable comprehensive nature of job demands. The urgent need to assess the
various job demands was brought about by the reality of the changing world of work. Various forces, environmental, political and legislative in nature, led to the need to assess job demands in order to contribute to the reformation of work (Cooper et al., 2001). Technological innovation has been one of the prime reasons for the materialisation of the new ways of working (Peeters et al., 2005). With regard to emotional job demands, a large proportion of individuals are working either in a client-service environment or as service professionals. This type of work is demanding in terms of additional cognitive and emotional effort, as opposed to physical effort (Peeters et al., 2005). Against this backdrop, work overload appears to be one of the most prominent contributors influencing work interference with home. Job demands can be evaluated by examining the cognitive, emotional and quantitative demands of a job (Peeters et al., 2005). Cognitive job demands refer to the extent to which tasks at work cause the individual to apply continuous cognitive effort in performing daily tasks at work. Emotional job demands refer to the affective constituent of work, which places the individual in very emotionally active and tense situations. Quantitative job demands refer to work overload or pressure that is too great for the individual to bear for more than limited periods of time (Peeters et al., 2005).

A holistic view of the ways in which individuals manage the responsibilities of work and home is guided by assessing the probable impact of the home demands on work outcomes. The greater part of the literature on work interference with home has examined structural home demands, such as the number of children and whether the spouse or partner was in employment. However, a literature review conducted on structural variables by Montgomery (2003) found limited evidence connecting them to either work interference with home or home interference with work. This suggests that there may be a need to study the family domain of the work-family relationship and its connections in greater psychological detail.
2.4.5 Models of stress: the job demands-resources model.

The job demands-resources model is considered a more suitable model to predict employee well-being, work engagement and burnout as it can be used to assess any type of job (De Braine & Roodt, 2011). Most of the research into job burnout pivots on the antecedents of burnout within the working environment, job characteristics, or organisational outcomes (Maslach et al., 2001), proposing that stressors derived from roles, such as role conflict, role ambiguity and work overload are significant constructs in burnout (Thompson et al., 2005). Models of stress and coping offer theoretical direction and further assist our understanding of how individuals deal with stressful situations. According to the cognitive stress model (Lazarus, 1999), stress is viewed as the outcome of environmental demands that exceed an individual’s capability to manage them. Therefore, the actual assessment of a particular situation depends on the individual’s feelings, beliefs, and actions during stressful situations.

The cognitive stress model consists of both primary and secondary appraisals. During the primary appraisal, the stressful event is perceived as a failure, risk, or challenge, based on individual differences derived from social support networks, demographic characteristics, and past individual experiences (Ben-Zur & Michael, 2007). During the secondary appraisal, the situation is analysed and the individual is required to assess what he or she can do to resolve the issue, eliminate the threat, or rectify the loss. These types of evaluation are based on accessible resources, an individual’s ability to cope, and processes available for coping (Ben-Zur & Michael, 2007).

Individuals manage stressful situations by using coping mechanisms that represent the individuals’ cognitive and behavioural efforts (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Such efforts result in a number of actions that are categorised according to emotion-focused and problem-focused modes. Emotion-focused coping is directed to reducing or tolerating the emotional and physiological reactions that are characterised as stressful. Problem-focused
coping, by contrast, refers to actions that individuals take to manage future risks by altering their interactions with the environment (Ben-Zur & Michael, 2007).

A qualitative study conducted by Hinton and Earnest (2010), examining women’s narratives and perceptions concerning coping with personal adversity, investigated women’s coping strategies. The study found that, in the presence of adverse working conditions, most of the women reported that their coping strategy was being self-reliant and confident in their ability to meet economic demands and to provide for their families. Another study, conducted by Hattar-Pollara, Meleis, and Nagib (2003), investigating the multiple-role stressors of women in clerical jobs, found that women often take total accountability for their own struggles without expecting assistance from others. Both the studies conducted by Hinton and Earnest (2010) and Hattar-Pollara et al. (2003) found similar themes in women’s coping patterns. Another finding in the study by Hinton and Earnest (2010) suggested that social relationships might not necessarily be supportive in nature, and might at times become stressors in the lives of many women who participated in the study. If social relationships are perceived as potentially negative in nature, they may have an impact on an individual’s capability to cope (Karlsen, Idsoe, Hanestad, Murberg, & Bru, 2004). Many women in the study by Hinton and Earnest (2010) reported being in unaccommodating marital relationships, characterised by a lack of emotional, social and financial constancy. Furthermore, these women experienced heavy workloads and were left resolute in the conviction that this was a direct consequence of being a woman (Hinton & Earnest, 2010). To cope with unsupportive marital relationships, the main coping strategies of some of these women incorporated seeking social support, while others articulated their confidence in passive, emotion-focused ways of coping, such as denial, acceptance and mental disconnection (Hinton & Earnest, 2010).

Various other stress and coping models are available that share the same perspective as the one posited by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). However,
these models highlight the role of social and personal resources in assisting individuals to manage stressful situations (Brotheridge & Lee, 2005). The job demands-resources model (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003a; Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003b) proposes two basic assumptions. The first assumption is that working environments may vary; therefore, in this model the attributes of these working environments are arranged in two groups: job demands and resources. Job demands are defined as “physical, psychological, social, or organisational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort or skill and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006, p. 312). Job resources are defined as “physical, psychological, social, or organisational features of the job, which, in turn, are functional in (1) achieving work goals, (2) reducing job demands and the physical and or psychological cost associated with them, and (3) stimulating personal growth and development” (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2006, p. 212).

The second assumption of the job demands-resources model is that there is an underlying relationship in which an individual’s physical and psychological well-being are the consequence of two comparatively autonomous processes (Bakker et al., 2003a; Bakker et al., 2003b). In the first process, the challenging components of work, such as overload, lead to regular overtaxing and eventually to health complaints. During the second process, the presence of job resources assists individuals to manage the challenging components of their work and at the same time inspires them to develop in their jobs, which leads to feelings of attainment and commitment.

The underlying model that is used to demonstrate the functioning of the two processes mentioned above is the effort-recovery (E-R) model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). The E-R model proposes that the quality and quantity of recovery forms a critical part of the first process. During a certain period of time, limited or no demands are made on the psychobiological systems that are utilised for task performance. These systems eventually become more
stable at a particular baseline level, and individuals recuperate from the load effects that have accumulated during the task performance (Bakker & Geurts, 2004). Daily work generally consists of loads that are not essentially harmful, as they usually occur on a daily basis and consequently operate as a consistent source of pressure. However, if inadequate opportunities exist for recovery after exposure to heavy workloads, the psychobiological systems are triggered again before they have had a chance to stabilise at the baseline level. The individual, still operating in a sub-optimal state, will be required to exert added effort (Bakker & Geurts, 2004). The outcome of this additional effort leads to an elevated intensity of load reactions, which ultimately leads to higher demands on the individual's recuperative process.

According to the E-R model, the readiness to exert effort in performing tasks could be essential for the second process. A working environment that presents numerous resources, such as autonomy, career development and feedback on performance, could promote eagerness among workers to apply their skills to the task and achieve positive results. Due to the mobilisation of energy and the associated reduced requirement for recuperation, individuals start the following working day operating in an optimal condition (Bakker & Geurts, 2004).

Work-family conflict is expected to result in various strain reactions such as stress or burnout, while a limit to resources for example, limited job control or social support) would almost certainly hinder goal achievement, resulting in disappointment (Mauno et al., 2006). Alienated behaviour and adverse job attitudes, such as reduced job satisfaction, are most likely to develop as a response to such experiences. It has been postulated that job resources may also protect against the unfavourable consequences of job demands on the individual’s well-being, even though empirical substantiation of such indirect effects remains limited (Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005).

The job demands-resources model suggests that burnout is central to the relationship that occurs between the high demands of the job and their effects
on general health (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The progression of burnout follows two routes. The first begins with the high demands of the job, which lead to exhaustion; the second begins with limited resources, which make it challenging to fulfil the demands required by the job, and lead to withdrawal behaviour. According to the job demands-resources model, the effect of high job demands, such as work overload and conflict, in combination with poor resources, such as low levels of support and autonomy, is additive and constitutes an exclusive contribution towards the development of burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001). It is therefore important to understand burnout among working women with children, as burnout is associated with both individual and work-related outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction. A study conducted by Koekemoer and Mostert (2010a) investigating the interaction between personal life and work life in a South African context found that individuals in other countries also experience similar antecedents and consequences of stressors (overload, stressful work and workload) and resources (flexible or inflexible work schedules, and work relationships). A study conducted by De Braine and Roodt (2011) found that managers should place a greater emphasis on increasing job resources as it predicts work engagement. Furthermore, the findings of the study also offer support for the use of the job demands-resources model as a human resource management tool for the enhancement of employee well-being and performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen, Schaufeli & Ahola, 2008).

2.4.6 Work-family conflict and burnout.

According to González-Roma et al. (2006), burnout is caused by constant job stress and by the draining of cognitive resources. Burnout is an indicator of work-related psychological well-being. A great proportion of research has recognised both job demands and work interference with family conflict as antecedents of burnout. It can, however, be argued that some stressors of a job cause work interference with family conflict and this may lead to the impairment of an individual’s psychological health. This assumption, which is also known as the mediation hypothesis, is well articulated within the context
of the effort-recovery model (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). According to the effort-recovery model, both the extent and the quality of an individual’s recovery are important.

The model contends that job demands that require more effort are associated with the accumulation of unfavourable load effects that are spilled over to the family domain (Geurts et al. 2005). In other words, excessive job demands make it more difficult for individuals to recuperate sufficiently at home because of the amount of effort that has been expended in their job. This suggests that there is a high probability that excessive job demands may affect psychological health. Studies have verified the mediating role of work interference with family within the context of the stressor/strain relationship (Janssen, Peeters, De Jonge, Houkes, & Tummers, 2004). According to Peeters et al. (2005), job demands are a good predictor of work interference with family and, subsequently, of burnout, while family demands, on the other hand, are a good predictor of family interference with work and, subsequently, of burnout. In other words, the demands deriving from the family domain that necessitate more effort are often related to burnout.

A majority of research studies on the effects of spillover have focused attention on work interference with family conflict, instead of family interference with work conflict. According to Frone (2003), research findings maintain that the characteristics of the work domain are the most critical antecedents of work interference with family conflict, whereas the characteristics of the family domain are the major antecedents of family interference with work conflict. Peeters et al. (2005) suggest that work interference with family and family interference with work conflict are led predominately by the demands that exist in the particular domain that generates the actual interference. Regardless of the fact that work interference with family and family interference with work conflict play only a partial mediating role, it becomes important to ascertain not only the direct effects on job and home demands, but also on burnout. It is important to note that some job demands are contextual in nature; not all job demands interfere
with an individual’s personal or home life, and vice versa. Anthropological studies analysing the manner in which individuals divide work and family postulate that there are some individuals who compartmentalise certain areas of their work life and home life, thus organising their lives in a way that ensures that the characteristics of one domain do not interfere with the other domain (Peeters et al., 2005).

One of the objectives of the study has been to understand the construct: dimensions and antecedents of burnout, and to examine the consequences of burnout, especially among working women with children. Derived from social problems, the phenomenon of burnout has thus grown into a more systematic series of theoretical models and empirical studies (Maslach et al., 2001). The information discussed in this section has the potential to assist our understanding of the construct of burnout and its causes and, importantly, it offers insights into strategies for coping with burnout to assist those individuals who experience it.
Chapter 3: Research Objectives, Research Argument, and Research Questions

3.1 Research Problem

The phenomenon of multiple-role participation is the underlying theme of the current study. Existing theories addressing the consequences of multiple-role participation fail to explain the persistence of gender differences in men and women’s lives. Earlier research conducted from various theoretical approaches focused on the role-accumulation hypothesis developed by Sieber (1974). The role-accumulation theory suggests that individuals elect to participate in various roles in exchange for rewards. Sieber’s view is that the accumulation of roles is positive and that its benefits outweigh the stress related with role conflict. According to the role-accumulation theory, the more roles individuals participate in, the more engaged and enriched they may be.

However, within the context of this study, it is suggested that multiple-role participation may not necessarily lead to enrichment, as Sieber (1974) proposed. One can argue the opposite of enrichment; that is, that occupying multiple roles may not always be beneficial, especially for working women with children. The current research explores individual experiences of demands relating to the pressures of multiple-role participation. Participating in several roles such as work and family can be very demanding and time consuming. Multiple-role participation accompanied by limited time and energy creates increased conflict between various roles and ultimately leads to undesirable work-related outcomes such as burnout and lower job satisfaction. The meaning of work and family roles has significant bearing on the current study, which also investigates the possibility that role identities may result in greater conflict for working women with children.

The net effect of demographic changes, according to Mostert (2009), is a feminisation of the South African labour market. The majority of working women with children continue working, despite their domestic obligations and demands (Brusentsev, 2002). However, despite women’s increased
participation in the labour force, there appears to be no change with regard to gender-role expectations within society. Traditionally, men have experienced greater sanctions for non-conformance with work-role demands than with family-role demands. Women, on the other hand, have been subjected to greater sanctions for non-conformance with family demands (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In view of the extent to which work and family roles are perceived as interdependent for men and independent for women (Simon, 1995), one can assume that the combination of these roles gradually produces more conflict for women than for men. The specific nature of work and family roles has certain implications for individuals, as some roles may contribute to more overload than others. Such overload depends on the associated obligations of the role (Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010b). Men enact their roles in succession (that is, work then family), while women, because of structural expectations, are challenged by simultaneous role demands (work and family) (Hall, 1972). Nevertheless, although Hall’s (1972) comment may imply that women experience greater conflict than men, such an expectation is not explicitly supported throughout various research studies.

To effectively account for the differences of role identity, the researcher of the current study seeks to understand the self-in-role of the identity of working women with children. The concept of self-in-role encapsulates such women’s assumed identity in various life roles, and such differences are more effectively understood by the social roles that women occupy. The concept of self-in-role, within the context of this study, refers to beliefs regarding what constitutes an ideal employee and an ideal mother. More importantly, working women with children may view the roles of employee and mother as independent rather than interdependent. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), individuals who regard one role (for instance family), as significantly salient above another role (for instance work) contribute a disproportionate amount of time and energy to that particular role. Because the mother-role identity is assumed to be significantly more salient than the work role for women with children, it is therefore more representative of woman’s self, and
consequently her definition of self reflects the salience of the mother-role identity.

This raises questions as to whether working women with children experience role salience differently from other working women, and how they experience the effects of such salience. Consequently, the meaning related to being a mother closely corresponds to the meaning associated with the general self, and therefore affects the overall evaluation of self of working women with children. The assumption that working women with children experience greater work-family conflict than family-work conflict is further reinforced by the fact that family is regarded as more salient than work for women (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This raises the question of whether women who regard the mother-role identity as more salient will experience greater work-family conflict.

3.2 Objectives of the Research

The primary objective of the research is to investigate the manifestation of work and family conflict in working women with children and to explore potential relationships of such conflict with undesirable work outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction and burnout. The research also explores the effects of role identity and the salience of such identity on the manifestation of family-work conflict in working women with children.

3.3 The Research Argument

Given the socialisation of roles that men and women occupy in society and the assignment of different meaning to such roles (Hochschild, 1989), it is plausible to assume that men and women may react differently to experiences of work and family conflict. The examination of current research on multiple-role participation takes into account the entire constellation of roles that individuals take part in. However, the current study focuses on only two role possibilities: work and family role identities. Although such a selection may be
viewed as a limitation, the researcher took into consideration two of the most significant life roles that are applicable to the current study: employee-role identity and parent (mother) role identity.

Identity theory elucidates the relationship of the role to the self and, in so doing, offers a distinct way of examining conflict. From this perspective, a source of stress would be conflict between behaviours that confirm different identities. An even greater source of conflict would be an apparent choice between actions that confirm identities with different levels of salience (Stryker, 1980). Under such conditions, one would expect an individual to act in a manner that corroborates the more salient identity to which he or she is committed. However, if individuals are faced with a choice between role behaviours that corroborate identities of similar salience and dedication, stress and conflict may materialise (Stryker, 1980). Therefore, if working women with children consider the mother-role identity as significantly salient, maintaining a single role identity in an organisational setting may come at a considerable cost, because in the workplace another identity with related characteristics is expected.

In order to purpose a sound research argument, the chapter needs first to present the basic tenets of Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) work-family conflict model (Figure 4). Role salience and the effect on conflict were initiated by utilising deductive reasoning, and enriched by an interest in the work and contribution of Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) work-family conflict model.
Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) theoretical model provides a synopsis of how work and family conflict are manifested in individuals’ work and family life. The work-family conflict model indicates the three sources of work-family and family-work conflict. This model takes into account an individual’s constraints regarding time and role participation. Moreover this model highlights the fact that role demands and pressures are particularly accentuated when the work and family roles are salient or fundamental to an individual’s self-concept and identity (Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002). According to the work-family conflict model, role-pressure incompatibility exists and is derived from opposing work and family roles. Role salience has various implications for an individual’s engagement in a specific role. Such implications materialise when a limited amount of time and energy is available for an individual to invest in a
particular role (Stryker, 1980). The role characteristics that influence an individual’s time, strain, or behaviour within a role can generate conflict between those particular roles, as well with other life roles. The research study therefore incorporates Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) work-family conflict model and Stryker’s (1980) role identity research, which leads to the research argument summarised in Figure 5 that is applicable to individuals in general, thereafter a more specific conceptual framework for working women with children will be discussed (Figure 6).

The researchers’ intention is not to test any of the frameworks in either Figure 5 or Figure 6. Rather, both these figures are used illustratively to clarify and demonstrate the conceptual thinking that formed conceptual frameworks of potential relationships that may exist between the work-family conflict as the independent variable and other dependent variables (burnout, job satisfaction and role identity).
According to Stryker (1980), the investment of time and energy in various life roles may be due to individuals’ desire to maintain and reinforce their self-identity to provide meaning and purpose. Depending on the role identity that an individual regards as more salient, participation in that role (work or family) is accompanied by various role stressors. Role stressors are inherent in a specific domain: work or family domain. For instance, if working women with children regard the family role as more salient than the work role, they are most likely to be exposed to an array of family role stressors such as childcare or domestic responsibilities. Therefore, the more working women with children participate in the family role, the greater exposure to family-role stressors they will experience. Continued exposure to family-role stressors is
further intensified because of the limited amount of time and energy that working women with children have to participate in other life roles. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) and Stryker (1980), individuals decide on the amount of time and energy that will be invested in a role, depending on the salience of that role. Such an investment of time and energy may lead to interference with another role. An individual therefore experiences role interference as a result of the demands from another role, to the extent that the requirements of neither role can be achieved (Duxbury et al., 1994). Role interference is recognised as bi-directional, and in this case can be conceptualised as having two components: FIW and WIF (Duxbury et al., 1994; Eagle et al., 1998). Role interference is further intensified when certain role characteristics affect the time dedicated to, strain created by, and the behaviour required for, participating in a role. This may lead to conflict between that role and another role.

The type of conflict that working women with children may experience is typically associated with increased time spent in a specific domain (work or family domain), which results in either WFC or FWC. Consequently, if the family role is regarded as more salient to the role identity of working women with children, then they are more likely to experience WFC, because they will not allow work to interfere with their family responsibilities. One can therefore assume that working women with children may experience more WFC than FWC because they prefer to spend their time and energy on family activities; this in turn prevents work demands from being satisfied. On the other hand, if the work role is regarded as significantly more salient to the role identity of working women with children, then they are more likely to experience FWC. The cost of such multiple-role occupancy is most often evaluated in terms of organisational outcomes such as burnout and lower job satisfaction. The researcher's intention is not to test the model (Figure 5) but to test the relationships depicted in the model.

Because of the unique characteristics of working women with children, a more specific conceptual framework was developed to understand how such women experience burnout and job satisfaction from other working women
and men. This framework was deduced systematically from various work and family theories that were studied in the research. Such a conceptual framework illustrates how role identity is manifested in work-family conflict for working women with children (Figure 6). This conceptual framework is illustrated in Figure 6 and forms the premise of the research questions.

Although the conceptual framework would lend itself to Structural Equation Modelling, it is important to note that the researchers’ intention is not to test the conceptual framework presented in Figure 6. Rather, the figure represents an illustrative conceptual framework that is presented to clarify the conceptual thinking of that formed the deduction of the potential relationships and differences that working women with children specifically experience.
According to Thoits (1991:105), the “more salient the role identity, the more meaning, purpose and behavioural guidance the individual should derive from its enactment, and thus the more that identity should influence psychological well-being”. Role identities may govern certain aspects of the self, taking preference over other role identities and thus affecting the general actions and perceptions of the self (Callero, 1985). By applying the underlying framework of the role identity theory by Stryker (1980), one can understand that the mother-role plays a vital part in working mothers’ self-concept. Mothers’ experiences outside the family domain may to some extent promote women’s identification with the mother-role identity.
The argument proposed in Figure 6 states that a working women with children may regard a particular role identity as salient, for instance either the mother-role identity or the employee-role identity. Working women who identify more with the mother-role identity (self-in-role) may experience greater role interference than do others who do not identify as strongly with this identity. Such role interference is further exacerbated by the presence of work stressors that generate additional strain for these women. An example of a work stressor that creates interference between work and family roles is a mother’s rigid working schedule that prevents her from attending a child’s extra mural activity. Existing role strains may, however, be perceived as less threatening if managers are seen to allow scheduled flexibility and are supportive towards these working mothers.

Therefore, the kind of interference experienced by working women who identify closer to the mother-role identity is therefore negative in nature because of the constant exposure to the various work-role stressors. For instance, working women with children who respond to simultaneous role demands by dedicating increased time to their families at the expense of work are likely to perceive work as interfering with family in a negative way. If working women who identify with the mother-role identity regard family as more important than work, then not only will WIF but also WFC be greater for them than for individuals that do not identify with this identity. A reason for this is that women who identify with the mother-role identity will avoid work activities that interfere with their family life.

One can therefore expect such working women to be more vulnerable and susceptible to the effects of burnout and experience lower job satisfaction. The degree to which these women regard their jobs as unsatisfying largely depends on the extent to which their paid job is perceived as a threat to their family life. In this case, the social roles of women who identify with the mother-role identity may be threatened, and the source of the threat may be perceived in a condescending and negative manner, thus lowering their satisfaction on the job. For instance, such women search for jobs that will
offer minimal interference with their family, especially in their roles as mothers (Mackey & Coney, 2000). If work demands and pressures interfere with family activities, women that identify with the mother-role identity are more inclined than other women to experience negativity towards their jobs. Such a proposition is illustrated in Figure 6 and can be reinforced by the structural factors that contribute to women’s commitment to and identification with the mother-role identity.

3.4. Research Questions

The research objectives under investigation are to explore the manifestation of work and family conflict in working women with children and understand the potential relationships of such conflict with undesirable work outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction and burnout. The effects and salience of role identities on the manifestation of conflict among working women with children are investigated. In order to effectively achieve the research objectives, the following measurable research questions are proposed and investigated within the context of this study:

1. To what extent is there a relationship between biographical-type variables/characteristics and work-family conflict?
2. Is there a relationship between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and burnout?
3. Is there a relationship between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and job satisfaction?
4. To what extent do working women with children experience higher burnout than other working women?
5. In what ways do the role identities of working women with children differ from the role identities of other working women and men?
6. Do working women who identify with the mother-role identity experience higher family-work conflict or work-family conflict?
7. Do working women with children experience more negative family interfering with work or negative work interfering with family than other working women and men?

8. To what extent is there a relationship between spouse/partner support and family-work conflict among working women with children, other working women and men?
Chapter 4: Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In order to address the research questions set out in the previous chapter, a quantitative research design through self-administered questionnaires was used to investigate work-family conflict in the context of this study.

4.2 The Sample and the Participants

The unit of analysis of this research study was individuals in a working environment, with specific focus on working women with children. As it would be impossible to include the entire population of all working individuals, it was decided to focus on a smaller subset of the larger population. The study was conducted among brewing, sales and distribution employees of a large South African fast-moving consumer goods organisation. The organisation was easily accessible for doing the research study, as the researcher has a standing relationship with it. A major advantage of using this organisation is the significant business footprint it has in South Africa. Six of the company’s regions, each consisting of various departments, were selected, to ensure a diverse and representative range of individuals included in the study.

The sampling frame was compiled by obtaining a complete list of white-collar employees in the six regions from the Human Resource Department of the selected organisation. The reason for focusing on white-collar employees was the centrality of the role that work plays in their lives (De Klerk et al., 2006). The list of workers included people working in the following regions: Egoli, North, East Coast, Cape, Central regions and Central Office.

The popular Hay Job Evaluation grading system developed by Hay (1943) was used to distinguish between the various managerial categories within the six regions. Individuals in positions with a Hay Job Evaluation grade of 1 to 5
(blue-collar workers) were excluded from participating in this study. The reasons for excluding these employees (grades 1 to 5) were language and literacy barriers, as well as lack of access to a computer. Only grades FA (senior management), PE (middle management), OE (junior management), and A-F (supervisory and clerical) employees were included in this study. Names and Hay Job Evaluation grades of all the potential respondents within the various regions were arranged alphabetically through systematic sampling. Every second name was selected from the alphabetical list for each region. Specific attention was paid to including as many women with children as possible, as this group formed the focus of this study. For this reason, all women with children (within the specified grades) who had access to a computer and who had a company e-mail address were included in the final sample.

Babbie (1998) suggests that surveys are excellent vehicles for assessing beliefs and orientations within a large population, and for this reason a survey was considered the most appropriate selection for this research study. The appropriate research methodology used for this sample group was self-administered electronic questionnaires. The rationale for selecting this method was based on the following reasons. Firstly, electronic questionnaires are easily accessible for respondents to access over vast geographies than paper-based questionnaires. Secondly, all respondents selected to participate in this study had access to a computer and were adequately computer literate. The selected organisation conducts electronic surveys on a regular basis for assessing organisational effectiveness. Individuals were thus expected to be more receptive to participating in electronic questionnaires than to paper-based questionnaires. The sampling methodology rendered 1095 potential respondents, to whom the questionnaires were sent out electronically. Babbie (1998) suggests that a 50% response rate is adequate for investigation and reporting, a 60% response rate is satisfactory, and a 70% response rate is highly recommended. The researcher aimed for a response rate of at least 50%.
The total sample and the response rates from the six regions are reflected in Table 4 and illustrated in Figure 7.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Sent out</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>% Region</th>
<th>%Total returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egoli Region</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Region</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Region</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Region</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Region</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1095</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 7: Questionnaire response rates](image)

Figure 7. Questionnaire response rates

It can be seen that the overall response rate was adequate (Babbie, 1998), as 545 (49.8%) of the initial 1095 questionnaires were returned. The response rate for each of the six regions included in the sample differed slightly, with North region reflecting the highest return rate of 55.2% (69 responses out of a sample of 125); the lowest response rate of 36% (40 responses out of a sample of 111) was obtained from East Coast region.
The biographical questions were the first component of the questionnaire, as these questions would be less threatening to participants. Details of the biographical and family characteristics of the sample are discussed next in order to obtain a picture of the sample group. Majority of the information is illustrated in both table and graphic formats. The number of missing responses in the total questionnaire was considered very low.

Table 5 and Figure 8 indicate the age distribution of the sample respondents.
Table 5

Age distribution of respondents (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Age distribution of respondents

The mean age of respondents ($N = 545$) was 35.8 Standard Deviation ($SD = 8.4$), suggesting that the respondents are relatively young. The youngest respondent was 21 years old ($N = 3$) while the oldest respondent was 63 years old ($N = 1$). Additional information (Table 6 and Figure 9) was provided to categorise the respondents’ ages into cohorts in order to provide better clarity on the age distribution trend.

Table 6
Age cohorts of respondents ($N = 545$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 29</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents in the largest age cohort are aged between 30 and 39 years old and make up 43.0% \((N = 234)\) of the sample. Respondents who are 29 years old constitute 27.3% \((N = 149)\), while 22.8% \((N = 124)\) are between the ages of 40 and 49. Only 6.9% \((N = 38)\) of respondents are older than 50 years. According to Remery, Schippers, and Eкамper (2003), productivity levels of workers tend to decrease at around the age of 50 years. However, the majority of the workforce (43%) in this study are between 30 and 39 years old.

The gender distribution of the respondents is illustrated in Table 7.

**Table 7**  
*Gender distribution \((N = 545)\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents (100%) provided information on their gender. Female respondents constitute a slightly larger portion of the sample than males
(53.1%, \( N = 290 \)). Male respondents constitute 46.9% (\( N = 255 \)) of the sample.

Table 8 illustrates the number of women with children compared with women without children and men.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Distribution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women with children</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 8 that women with children constitute 37.4% (\( N = 204 \)), other women constitute 15.8% (\( N = 86 \)) and men constitute 46.8% (\( N = 255 \)) of the sample group. Although women’s total representation in the sample (53.2%, \( N = 290 \)) is higher than men’s (46.7%, \( N = 255 \)), a substantial number of the women in the sample have children.

Table 9 and Figure 10 indicate the distribution of respondents’ Hay Job Evaluation Grades in the selected organisation.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior management</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory &amp; clerical</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution of respondents’ job categories indicates that 42.0% \((N = 229)\) come from supervisory and clerical positions. Senior management levels represent 39.1% \((N = 213)\) as the second-largest category. Middle management constitutes 12.3% \((N = 67)\) and junior management 6.6% \((N = 36)\). The high representation of supervisory and clerical categories was expected, as this category makes up the larger proportion of the population and therefore the sample.

The distribution of ethnic grouping of respondents is illustrated in Table 10 and Figure 11.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All respondents (100%, \(N = 545\)) provided information on their ethnic grouping. The sample consist predominately (45.7%, \(N = 249\)) of white people. The second-largest group (29.7%, \(N = 162\)) is represented by African people. The other ethnic groups of respondents are respectively Indian or Asian (12.1%, \(N = 66\)), Coloured (11.9%, \(N = 65\)) and “Other or non-defined” (0.6%, \(N = 3\)). For the purposes of this study, the African, Indian and Asian, Coloured and Other groups are referred to as the Previously Disadvantaged Group. This sample group constitutes 54.3% (\(N = 296\)) of total respondents.

Table 11 and Figure 12 indicate the distribution of qualifications held by respondents.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post School</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/Degree</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the respondents (26.1%, \( N = 142 \)) have a diploma or a bachelor’s degree, while a large portion of the respondents (20.2%, \( N = 110 \)) have an honours degree as their highest qualification. Nearly a fifth of the sample (19.3%, \( N = 105 \)) are in possession of a post-school certificate. Respondents who have a Standard 10 (Grade 12) constitute 16.3% \( (N = 89) \). Respondents with a secondary school qualification lower than Standard 10 or Grade 12 represent 3.3% \( (N = 18) \). Respondents with a masters degree or doctorate degree represent 14.9% \( (N = 81) \) of the sample. It is clear from Table 11 and Figure 14 that a large proportion of the respondents in the sample (61.1%, \( N = 333 \)) have tertiary diplomas and degrees and can be seen as a highly educated group of workers.
The marital status of the sample group at the time of the survey is indicated in Table 12 and Figure 13.

Table 12

*Distribution of marital status of respondents (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married &amp; Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced &amp; Cohabiting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed &amp; Cohabiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 13. Distribution of marital status of respondents](image)

More than half of the respondents (54.7%, N = 298) in the sample group are married, while of the remaining respondents (45.3%, N = 247) are either single, cohabiting, married but separated, divorced, divorced or cohabiting, separated, widowed or widowed and cohabiting. The variations in marital status are required in the context of this study. Previous research indicates that variations in marital status are common variables in the work-family
literature. For example, married individuals with children are often suggested to have more family-role responsibilities that interfere with work responsibilities than non-married individuals (Michel, Kotrba et al., 2010).

Table 13 indicate respondents in the sample who are the primary breadwinners in their households.

Table 13

*Primary breadwinner in household (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Breadwinner</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 13 that the majority of respondents in the sample group are the primary breadwinners in their households (67.5%, N = 368).

The next part of this discussion deals with the respondents’ dependants (children, spouses or partners, and elderly persons). For the purpose of this study the word “dependant” will be defined as an individual (regardless of age) who relies on another individual for support. This support may be of a financial, emotional or physical nature. All respondents answered the questions concerning the various types of dependants “living with me” and “not living with”. Because of the different family scenarios that individuals might have, the following situations were included in the questionnaire: (a) dependants living with respondents, (b) dependants not living with respondents, (c) no dependants.
Table 14 and Figure 14 indicate the number of dependent children living in the same household as respondents.

Table 14

*Dependants (children) living in same household (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependants (children) living in same household</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One child</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three children</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14. Dependants (children) living in same household*

This information indicates that 38.2% (N = 208) of respondents have no children, while 61.8% (N = 337) have either one or more children who are dependent upon respondents and live in the same household. Previous research indicates that both large numbers of children and the presence of young children living at home are associated with work-family conflict (Hosking & Western, 2008).
Table 15 and Figure 15 indicate the number of children who are dependent upon respondents, but do not live in the same household as respondents. Various scenarios exist for circumstances in which some respondents have dependent children living with a divorced parent, or have assumed responsibility for the children of a new partner, or inherited children living with a guardian. Regardless of the situation, there are some instances where children are in some way financially or emotionally dependent on respondents, but do not necessarily share the same household.

Table 15

*Dependants (children) not living in same household (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One child</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 15. Dependants (children) not living in same household*
This information indicates that the majority of the respondents (73.4%, \( N = 400 \)) do not have dependent children living with them in the same household. This does not rule out the fact that these respondents do have children; it is just that these children do not rely on respondents financially, emotionally and or physically. The remaining respondents (26.6%, \( N = 145 \)) have either one or more dependent children living in separate households. One can assume that these children are living with another parent or guardian who holds the responsibility for looking after them. These children could also be in boarding school, attending university, or living abroad, but are still dependent on respondents in some way.

Table 16 indicates whether respondents have a spouse or partner who is dependent on them and whether they live together in the same household.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependents (spouse/partner) living in same household (( N = 545 ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Spouse nor Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that 68.4% (\( N = 373 \)) of respondents do not have a dependent spouse or partner living with them in the same household. The remaining 31.6% (\( N = 172 \)) have a dependent spouse or partner living in the same household. It is important to note that respondents were asked to indicate whether they had a “dependent” spouse or partner living with them. This is different from respondents’ answers to the questions concerning marital status which are reflected in Table 12 and Figure 13. The work-family literature indicates that one of the differences between married and cohabiting couples is that individuals who are cohabiting tend to have limited economic
and social resources at their disposal to cope with their family and work demands (Eggebeen, 2005).

Table 17 indicates respondents’ answers as to whether they have spouses or partners who are dependent on them financially, emotionally or physically but live in separate households. As with the previous question, a number of possible scenarios exist for such circumstances. For example, a spouse or partner who is regarded as the breadwinner of the family unit may be working in another geographical location but still supporting the other dependent spouse or partner.

Table 17

Spouse or partner not living in same household (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Spouse</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 indicates that the majority of respondents (98.2%, N = 535) do not have a dependent spouse or partner living with them in the same household. The remaining 1.8% (N = 10) of the respondents have a spouse or partner who is dependent upon them but does not share the same household as the respondent.

Table 18 and Figure 16 indicate respondents’ answers as to whether they have any elderly dependants, and whether they live with the respondents or not.
Table 18

_Elderly persons living in same household or not (N = 545)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly person/s living with respondents</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly person/s not living with respondents</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Elderly person/s</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16. Dependants (elderly persons) living in same household or not*

A clear majority of the respondents (78.7%, \(N = 429\)) indicated that they have no elderly dependants. A small percentage of the respondents (7.9%, \(N = 43\)) indicated that they have an elderly person or persons dependent upon them and living in the same household. Respondents who indicated that they have an elderly person or persons dependent on them but not living in the same household represent 13.4% \((N = 73)\). Various scenarios exist for such circumstances, such as an elderly person who depends on the respondents financially but lives in an old-aged home or elsewhere.
Table 19 and Figure 17 indicate the number of years that the sample group have been employed by their current employer.

**Table 19**  
*Number of years with current employer (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 545 100.0
Figure 17. Number of years with current employer

From Table 19 and Figure 17 it is clear that respondents tend to have short- to medium-term relationships with their current employer. The majority of the respondents (83.1%, $N = 453$) have less than 12 years’ service with their current employer, and there is a mean employment term of 7.4 years ($SD = 7.10$). The longest employment history is 38 years of service.
The number of hours that respondents work per day, both during office hours and after hours, is reflected in Table 20 and Figure 18.

Table 20

Average office hours and after-hours worked per day (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Hours Worked</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>26.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>53.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>66.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>85.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>89.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>94.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>96.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>98.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>99.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>99.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 545 100.0

Figure 18. Average office hours and after-hours worked per day
It is evident from Table 20 and Figure 18 that respondents tend to work long hours, with the mean reported working hours being 10.75 per day ($SD = 2.41$). The largest group of the respondents (26.8%, $N = 146$) indicated that they work 10 hours per day. Of all the respondents, 84.6% ($N = 461$) work between 7 and 12 hours per day (this includes both office and after hours). The highest reported number of working hours per day was 25 hours and the lowest reported number of working hours per day was 2 hours. Caution should be taken with the interpretation of answers that indicate that respondents work between 18 and 25 hours a day. It is also not plausible that respondents would work 2 hours per day, even if they had flexible working arrangements. This data may be speculative.

The number of respondents who work over weekends is shown in Table 21

Table 21

Respondents who work over weekends ($N = 545$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Over Weekends</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents (54.1%, $N = 295$) reported that they regularly work over weekends. The majority of the respondents who indicated working regularly over weekends (42%, $N = 229$) form part of the supervisory and clerical Hay Job Evaluation grade A–F. However, 35.4% ($N = 193$) seldom work over weekends, and a very small proportion of the respondents (7.5%, $N = 41$) do not work at all over the weekends.
Respondents’ indications of the time they spend travelling to and from work daily are represented in Table 22.

Table 22

*Average daily travel time (in minutes) to and from work (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 545 100.0
In order to better interpret the information obtained about respondents’ travelling time, the travel time has been grouped into minute cohorts, namely (≤ 30, 31-60, 61-90, 91-120, 121-150, 151-180, > 180). The minute cohorts are indicated in Table 23 and Figure 19. Caution should be taken with the interpretation of answers that indicate travel times such as 1 minute or 240 minutes to and from work; this data may be speculative.

Table 23 and Figure 19 illustrate the aggregate travel time respondents spent travelling to and from work each day.

Table 23

*Aggregated travel time to and from work (in minutes) (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes in Travel Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 60</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 120</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 - 150</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 180</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 19. Aggregated travel time to and from work (in minutes)*
Respondents who reported spending less than 30 minutes driving to and from work constitute 32.4% \((N = 176)\). Respondents who indicated spending between 31 and 60 minutes travelling to and from work constitute 32.8% \((N = 179)\). Those who spend between 61 and 120 minutes travelling constitute 26.0% \((N = 142)\). Respondents who spend more than 121 minutes travelling constitute 8.8% \((N = 48)\). The mean reported travel time is 64.26 \((SD = 48.06)\). It is clear from Table 23 and Figure 19 that the majority of respondents (65.1%, \(N = 355\)) travel for up to 60 minutes per day to and from work.

Respondents taking part in flexible working arrangements are indicated in Table 24.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Working Arrangements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (64.6%, \(N = 352\)) do not take part in flexible working arrangements, while 35.4% \((N = 193)\) of respondents do take part in the flexible working arrangements offered by the organisation. The work-family conflict literature postulates that flexitime may be more effective than flexiplace, which permits individuals to select the location where work is carried out, in reducing work-family conflict (McNall et al., 2010; Shockley & Allen, 2007).
Table 25 indicates the after-hours utilisation of a desktop computer for work purposes.

Table 25

*Desktop computer utilisation after hours (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desktop</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 shows that the majority of the respondents (81.8%, N = 446) do not use a desktop after hours for work purposes. A probable reason why so many respondents do not use a desktop after hours is that a desktop is not as portable as a laptop and cannot be taken home.

Table 26 indicates respondents’ answers to the questions of whether or not they use a BlackBerry for work purposes after hours.

Table 26

*BlackBerry utilisation after hours (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BlackBerry</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents (54.7%, N = 298) indicated that they do not use a BlackBerry after hours for work purposes, but nearly half of them do so. Work-family conflict literature within the telecommunication environment (Golden, Veiga, & Simsek, 2006) does not reflect the pervasive
nature of mobile technology, nor does it reflect the nature of work that is extending beyond office hours (Menzies, 2005).

Table 27 indicates respondent’s utilisation of laptop computers for work purposes after hours.

Table 27

*Laptop computer utilisation after hours (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laptop</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents, 56.3% (N = 307), indicated that they use a laptop after hours for work purposes.

The amount of paperwork done for work purposes after hours is shown in Table 28.

Table 28

*Paperwork done after hours (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paperwork</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents (58.0%, N = 316) do some form of paper-based work after hours. Paperwork refers to any form of work that involves the handling of reports, forms, correspondents, documents and letters. The remaining 42.0% (N = 299) do not use any form of paper-based work to work after hours. It is clear from Tables 25, 26 and 27 that even
though a large proportion of respondents rely on technology to perform daily job tasks, paperwork is still an important tool which individuals use after hours.

Time spent working after hours using the various tools (desktop, laptop, or BlackBerry, and doing paperwork) has been grouped into hour cohorts, namely (≤ 10, 11-20, 21-30, > 31) hours. This is shown in Table 29 and Figure 20.

Table 29

Average after-hour use on various tools (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours spent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Aggregated time spent after hours using various work tools

It is clearly indicated that the majority of respondents (78.8%, N = 429) spend up to 10 hours (after hours) per week using a desktop, BlackBerry, laptop and/or doing paperwork. The mean reported hours are 7.7 and the $SD = 8.4$. 
Furthermore, 15.0% ($N = 82$) of respondents spend on average between 11 and 20 hours (after hours) per week, which is considerably longer than stipulated. Respondents who spend between 21 and 30 hours after hours in this way constitute 3.3% ($N = 18$), while those who spend more than 31 hours after hours on average per week utilising the tools for work purposes constitute 2.9% ($N = 16$). These results could be indicative of a high performance and work ethic within the organisation. However, caution should be taken with the interpretation of some responses, as the data may be speculative. For example, some respondents indicated working 35 to 40 hours per week (after hours).

Respondents were required to indicate the reasons why they work. These are illustrated in Table 30 and Figure 21.

Table 30

*Reasons for working ($N = 545$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do You Work?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-development</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both income &amp; self-development</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost three-quarters of the respondents (73.2%, \( N = 399 \)) indicated that they work both for income and self-development purposes. Respondents who engage in work solely because of the financial element constitute 13.2% (\( N = 72 \)) of the sample group, while those who work for self-development purposes constitute 13.0% (\( N = 71 \)).

Table 31 indicates how frequently respondents sleep eight hours at night.

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Sleep</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the information provided that slightly more than half of the respondents (51.6%, \( N = 281 \)) indicated that they seldom sleep for eight hours a night, while 25.1% (\( N = 137 \)) of respondents never sleep for eight hours a night. Respondents who regularly sleep for eight hours a night constitute 23.3% (\( N = 127 \)).
Table 32 and Figure 22 contain information regarding the assistance respondents receive with childcare from a child minder, domestic helper, family member or au pair worker.

Table 32

**Assistance with childcare (N = 545)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance with childcare</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 22. Assistance of respondents with childcare*

Table 32 and Figure 22 show that 46.1% (N = 251) of respondents indicated that assistance received with childcare is not applicable to them. This could be due to the fact that these respondents do not have children living with them or that their children are older and do not require assistance. Respondents who indicated that they regularly receive assistance with their children constitute 33.8% (N = 184), while those who seldom receive assistance...
constitute 6.4% \( (N = 35) \). The respondents who never receive any assistance with childcare constitute 13.7% \( (N = 74) \).

Table 33 contains information regarding assistance with household chores that respondents receive from a child minder, domestic helper, family member or au pair worker.

Table 33

**Assistance with household chores \( (N = 545) \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance with Household Chores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that 46.1% \( (N = 251) \) of respondents regularly receive assistance with household chores. Those who seldom receive such assistance constitute 8.8% \( (N = 48) \). Respondents who never receive household assistance constitute 13.0% \( (N = 71) \). Almost a third (32.1%, \( N = 175 \)) of respondents indicated that assistance with household chores was not applicable to them.

Table 34 indicates the number of annual leave days that respondents take to look after a sick child or children.
Table 34

*Annual leave taken to look after sick children (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Leave Days</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half of the respondents (59.1%, N = 322) indicated that taking annual leave to take care of sick children was not applicable to them. One can assume either that these respondents do not have any children or that they have a good support structure at home that assists when a child is sick. Respondents who take more than two annual leave days constitute 21.5% (N = 117), while those who take between three and four days constitute 9.7% (N = 53). Between five and six annual leave days are taken by 5.5% (N = 30), of respondents, while between seven and eight days per year are taken by 1.7% (N = 9). The remaining 2.6% (N = 14) take more than eight days annual leave to take care of their sick children per year. This information shows that respondents are tapping into their annual leave days to look after their sick children.

Respondents were asked to indicate how many special leave days they had taken in the past year to take care of children or a family emergency. Special leave days taken by respondents per year are indicated in Table 35.
Table 35

Special leave taken to look after sick children (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Leave Days</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 545 100.0

Possible reasons why this question may not be applicable to 60.4% (N = 329) of the respondents may be that they do not have any children, or that they have a support structure in place that will care for their children when they are ill. Of the respondents who answered this question, 31.2% (N = 170) took between one and four special leave days, while 8.5% (N = 46) took between five and eight special leave days in the past year to look after a sick child. An example of family interference with work is a child or children who prevent a parent from attending work (Boyar, Maertz, & Pearson, 2005).

Table 36 and Figure 23 indicate whether respondents feel that their children keep them too busy to participate in recreational activities.

Table 36

Responses to children preventing participation in recreational activities (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Constraints</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 545 100.0
Respondents who feel that their children regularly keep them too busy to participate in recreational activities comprise 20.4% \((N = 111)\) of the sample group, while 19.8% \((N = 108)\) of respondents indicated that their children seldom keep them too busy to participate in recreational activities. Of the respondents, 15.4% \((N = 84)\) reported that they never experience their children keeping them too busy to take part in recreational activities. The remaining 44.4% \((N = 242)\) indicated that this question was not applicable to them. One can assume either that these respondents do not have children, or that their children may be older and do not require so much of the respondents’ time.

Table 37 indicates whether travelling far distances is required as a work prerequisite.

Table 37

*Travel away from home for work purposes (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travelling Prerequisite</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicate that 13.6% ($N = 74$) of respondents are never required to travel as part of their jobs. However, 53.7% ($N = 293$) are required to travel either on a regular or occasional basis. Respondents who reported that travelling was not applicable to them constitute 32.7% ($N = 178$) of the sample.

Responses to the question asking whether respondents had a child or children suffering from a mental, physical, emotional or life-threatening condition is illustrated in Table 38. According to Stevens et al. (2007), having young or disabled children is related to family-work conflict.

### Table 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Child with Mental Illness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A little more than half of the respondents (51.0%, $N = 278$) indicated that they do not have any children who suffer from a mental, physical, emotional or life-threatening condition. The respondents that do have children who suffer from some form of disability constitute 3.9% ($N = 21$). Parents who raise children with disabilities are often emotionally burdened (McKeever & Miller, 2004).
4.3 Measuring Instruments

4.3.1 General.

The aim of the present study is to investigate whether significant differences or relationships exist between the work-family conflict experienced by working women with children, working women without children and men, and the impact of this conflict on job satisfaction and burnout. Furthermore, men and women’s experiences of work-family conflict differ, with various implications on their burnout and job satisfaction levels. The measures used in this study were selected from existing standardised psychometric instruments. The instruments used in this study have undergone extensive development and have displayed acceptable psychometric properties, as demonstrated elsewhere in this chapter. The following instruments were used to measure the variables in the study:

- The Survey Work-Home Interaction-NjmeGen (SWING), developed by Geurts et al. (2005)
  - Measures the differentiation between the quality of influence of conflict (negative influence versus positive influence) and direction of interaction (influence from work to family and influence from family to work).

- The Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict Scale, developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996)
  - Measures work-family conflict and family-work conflict based on time-based, strain-based, and behaviour-based conflict.

- The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss et al. (1967)
  - Measures general job satisfaction.

- The Maslach Burnout Inventory Questionnaire (MBI), developed by Maslach et al. (1996)
Measures individual burnout based on three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy.

- Role Identity Measurement, adapted from Burke and Tully (1977)
  - The Burke-Tully (1977) principles were incorporated into the measurement of role identity; however, the procedure was adapted to suit the specific needs of this study.

4.3.2 SWING questionnaire (Geurts et al., 2005).

Geurts et al. (2005) developed and validated the SWING, an instrument for measuring work-home interaction that could measure both negative and positive interactions between work and home domains. A four-step procedure was applied in developing the instrument. Firstly, certain components were validated and defined, based on the general definition of work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW). Secondly, an item pool of 187 items was obtained from seventeen existing instruments that measured WIF and FIW from an item generation. Thirdly, 30 items were discarded due to duplication with other items, based on an evaluation.

According to Geurts et al., (2005), the validation procedure mentioned in step one, found four types of interactions (negative WIF, negative FIW, positive WIF and positive FIW). Negative work interference with family (-WIF) refers to the negative load reactions experienced at work that affect an individual’s functioning within the family or home domain. This factor consists of eight items (for example, “How often does it happen that your work schedule makes it difficult to fulfil domestic obligations?”) Negative family interference with work (-FIW) refers to the negative load reactions experienced within the family or home domain that affect an individual’s functioning at work. This factor consists of four items (for example, “How often does it happen that you have difficulty concentrating on your work because you are preoccupied with domestic matters?”) Positive work interference with family (+WIF) refers to the positive load reactions experienced at work that facilitate an individual’s
functioning within family or home domain (Geurts et al., 2005). This factor consists of five items (for example, “You manage your time at home more efficiently as a result of the way you do your job?”) Positive family interference with work (+FIW) refers to the positive load reactions experienced at home or in the family that facilitate an individual’s functioning at work. This factor consists of five items (for example “After spending a pleasant weekend with your spouse/family/friends, you have more fun in your job?”) (Geurts et al., 2005).

Based on the item evaluation mentioned in step three, the remaining 157 items were selected according to the following criteria (Geurts et al., 2005):

- There must be an appropriate fit to the four dimensions of WIF and FIW.
- Clear line of sight needs to be established with regard to the item’s origin in one domain and the impact on the other domain; that is, the quality of the interference must be either negatively or positively stated.
- Items should not be confounded with external variables such as fatigue, or antecedents such as social support.
- Items should not include jargon that is difficult to interpret into other languages.
- All items should be applicable to all working individuals, regardless of their marital or parental status.

With regard to the fourth and final step in the development of the instrument, four researchers from the field of occupational health psychology were selected. These researchers were required to determine independently whether each item was an adequate fit for one of the four types of interference, and to determine whether items met the criteria mentioned above (Geurts et al., 2005).
The results of the SWING instrument development obtained a four-factor model. Confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Geurts et al., (2005) further confirmed the proposed four-factor structure of the SWING for their sample. Table 39 indicates the inter-correlations, means, standard deviations and reliabilities of the four-factor SWING scales.

Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative WIF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative FIW</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive WIF</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive FIW</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations significant at \(p < .01\), except *.


It is clear from Table 39 that the alphas are relatively high, suggesting the robustness of the four-factor structure of the SWING. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for all four scales demonstrated acceptable internal consistency for each factor. The inter-correlations are the highest between the two negative scales (negative WIF and FIW) \((r = .30, p < .001)\) and between the two positive scales (positive WIF and FIW) \((r = .56, p < .001)\). Pieterse and Mostert (2005) examined the psychometric properties of the SWING instrument within a South African context. Confirmatory factor analyses with Direct Oblimin rotation supported the four-scale structure of the SWING. Items loaded on the first factor relate to negative WIF and the second factor deals with positive WIF. Items loaded on the third factor relate to negative FIW, while the fourth factor consists of items that represent positive FIW. Pieterse and Mostert (2005) noted Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of .87 (negative WIF), .79 (negative FIW), .79 (positive WIF) and .76 (positive FIW) in their psychometric analysis of the SWING in the South African environment.
According to Pieterse and Mostert (2005), the SWING instrument’s ability to capture both the negative and, the positive dimensions of the work-to-family interference makes it unique. The SWING instrument uses the word “home” instead of “family” because not every individual has a family (consisting of spouse and children) and the intention is to ensure that the instrument is suitable for every individual.

The SWING instrument was administered to the sample in the current study in its original format. Once all the respondents had completed all the questions, this researcher obtained express permission from the original author and developer of the SWING questionnaire, Sabine Geurts, of the Radbound University, Nijmegen, to replace the word “home” as used in the SWING instrument with “family” for the purposes of this study (S.A.E. Geurts, personal communication, 23 March, 2011). Thus, work interference with home (WIH) now becomes work interference with family (WIF), and home interference with work (HIW) becomes family interference with work (FIW). The changes of the word “home” to “family” have only been made in the review of the literature and the results within the current study and not in the original SWING instrument.

4.3.3 The Work-Family and Family-Work Conflict Questionnaire

Work-family conflict and family-work conflict were measured using the work-family and family-work conflict questionnaire designed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). The instrument consists of two scales, which measure work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC) respectively. Five of the items in the instrument measure work-family conflict, while the other five items measure family-work conflict. Responses to these items are provided through a seven-point Likert scale. Larger numbers relate to greater inter-domain conflict within each scale, in which 1 represents “strongly disagree” and 7 equates to “strongly agree” (Netemeyer et al., 1996).
Certain procedures were carried out by Netemeyer et al. (1996) in the development and validation of the work-family and family-work conflict instrument. Item generation and judging accumulated a large pool of items that were selected to reproduce the conceptualisation of work-family and family-work conflict respectively. Certain items were slightly modified to suit the Likert format utilised. A total of 110 items supplied the preliminary pool of statements. Of the 110 items, 18 were generated to represent general demands of WFC and general demands of FWC. A panel of four faculty members from various universities, whose primary area of research was organisational behaviour, judged the items for representativeness. The responsibility of the four faculty members was to reduce the number of items to a more manageable number. Inter-rater reliability coefficients were thus created and a variation of Cohen’s kappa was used. The coefficient varied from high (1) to low (0) (Jones, Johnson, Butler, & Main, 1983). Additional exploratory analyses reduced the item pool to 43 items for the three sample groups. Using iterative confirmatory procedure with LISREL VII (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989), Netemeyer et al. (1996) obtained the final forms of the work-family and family-work conflict scales. The 43 items were specific to a correlated two-factor confirmatory model for every sample, the two factors representing a 22-item work-family conflict factor and a 21-item family-work conflict factor. The next iteration was to reduce the number of items to those that met certain criteria. Items were removed if (Netemeyer et al., 1996):

- they constantly resulted in within-factor correlated assessment error, across-factor correlated assessment error, or both
- they consisted of entirely standardised factor loadings < .50
- they were highly unsuitable in terms of wording with other items
- they were exceptionally high standardised factor loadings (i.e., > .90), or
- their expected values failed to load higher on their intended factor.

Items that consisted of very high factor loadings were removed and this resulted in within-factor correlated measurement error. After this iteration, 13
work-family conflict and 11 family-work conflict items were reserved for the next iteration, for which a different set of processes was utilised. Items were removed if they did not meet the next set of criteria, i.e. if they (Netemeyer et al., 1996):

- still displayed correlated measurement errors
- consisted of cross-factor loadings that were comparatively equal to within-factor loadings
- consisted of standardised factor loadings < .60
- represented redundancy in terms of functioning with other items.

Following the second iteration, seven work-family conflict and six family-work conflict items were reserved. The third iteration deleted three more items, based on the redundancy of item functioning. Finally, ten-item forms of the scale were established (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Confirmatory factor analysis was carried out by Netemeyer et al., (1996) to measure scale dimensionality, discriminant validity, and internal consistency of the work-family and family-work instrument (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). A two-factor model displayed values that were higher than .90 across the three samples. Confirmation of internal consistency is offered by construct reliability, coefficient alpha, and average variances, as indicated in Table 40 (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Scale reliability for family-work conflict is .94; scale reliability for family-work conflict is .82 (Boles et al., 2001).
Table 40

*Internal consistency for WFC and FWC scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>WFC Construct α</th>
<th>Coefficient α</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>FWC Construct α</th>
<th>Coefficient α</th>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 40 indicates that the two alpha estimates varied from .82 to .90. Average variance-extracted estimates measure the amount of variance captured by a construct’s measure comparative to random measurement error. Average variance showed estimates of .50 or above, suggesting further confirmation of internal consistency for the constructs’ measure (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

**4.3.4 Weiss et al. (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).**

The MSQ was developed by Weiss et al. (1967) in order to measure an individual’s satisfaction with his or her work. The MSQ measures satisfaction with a number of aspects of work. The MSQ questionnaire makes it possible to gain a more holistic picture of employee satisfaction by using an overall measure of satisfaction with the job in totality. Two individuals may possibly display the same level of general satisfaction, but for completely different reasons; therefore this individualised measurement of job satisfaction is useful. Furthermore, individuals find satisfaction in different aspects of their jobs, and in order to better understand these differences, it is useful to measure satisfaction within the various aspects of their work and their working environment (Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ consists of three dimensions, namely intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. The MSQ Short-Form was used in the context of this study.
In the development and validation of the MSQ instrument, Weiss et al. (1967) gathered and utilised a total pool of 80 items to develop a multi-scale satisfaction measure for various occupational groups (assemblers, clerks, engineers, janitors and maintenance men, machinists and salesmen). The outcomes of the measures had suitable reliabilities, but were cumbersome to score. In addition, the developed scales predominately assessed satisfaction with environmental or extrinsic reinforcement factors, such as working conditions, manager and colleagues. All the extrinsic factors excluded intrinsic reinforcement factors such as nature of work, attainment, and utilisation of abilities. To correct these measures, Weiss et al. (1967) constructed a new 20-point Likert scale format instrument. The new questionnaire was developed to measure both intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement dimensions (Weiss et al., 1967).

A factor analysis was conducted on the various dimensions measured by the instrument, namely intrinsic, extrinsic and total (general) job satisfaction. Inter-correlations of the 21 MSQ items were generated for 14 sample groups, each group consisting of at least 100 individuals from various occupational groups. The correlations of the 20 items within the general satisfaction scale characterise part-whole correlations. Therefore, the general satisfaction scale according to Weiss et al. (1964) was excluded from the factor analysis. Weiss et al. (1967) carried out another factor analysis using a principal factor solution on the inter-correlations matrix. Kaiser criterion was utilised for the number of factors to extract and rotate to a varimax solution. Two factors were obtained for the sample groups, with the first factor explaining 58% of the total variance and the second factor explaining 55% of the total variance.

The results of the factor analysis propose a two-factor structure. Factor one represents intrinsic satisfaction, which is satisfaction with the work itself. Factor two represents extrinsic satisfaction, which relates to the supervision factor. It appears, according to Weiss et al. (1964), that job satisfaction is composed primarily of satisfaction with the job and the supervision, for this sample group of workers.
The MSQ has been widely utilised within South African samples: Adonisi (2003); Boshoff and Hoole (1998); Buitendag and De Witte (2005); Kamfer, Venter, and Boshoff (1998); Van der Walt (2007). A study by Kamfer et al. (1998) reported that all 20 items of the original items in the instrument resulted in a two-factor solution. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were concluded as .87 and .75, explaining 40.6% of the total variance. Other studies, conducted by Adonis (2003) and Buidendach and De Witte (2005), resulted in findings similar to those of Kamfer et al. (1998), indicating that the MSQ consisted of two factors, namely intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. A study conducted by Van der Walt (2007) also indicated a two-factor structure, with Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of .91 and .90, and factor correlations of .54. Factor one in Van der Walt’s (2007) study explained 39.4% of the total variance, and factor two explained 6.4% of the total variance. Due to the high correlation between the two factors and the higher variance by one factor, Van der Walt (2007) executed a further Principal Factor Analysis on a one-factor solution.

A one-factor solution was clearly identified for Van der Walt’s (2007) study. Factor one displays a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .93 and explained 40.2% of the total variance. Van der Walt (2007) suggests that a one-factor (which is general satisfaction in a South African environment) can therefore be measured by the MSQ. This conclusion is consistent with a previous South African study measuring job satisfaction (Boshoff & Hoole, 1998). In their study Boshoff and Hoole (1998) found no differentiation between the MSQ’s two factors in a sample of 1791 professional individuals. The authors concluded that the job satisfaction instrument was possibly essentially one dimensional (Adonisi, 2003).

4.3.5 The MBI-GS (Maslach et al., 1996).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) was developed for circumstances in which respondents offer a service, care or treatment to beneficiaries (Maslach, 1982). The three-factor structure of the MBI-HSS has been demonstrated to be invariant across professions and is only pertinent to individuals who work with people (Demerouti & Bakker,
In response to this limitation, Maslach et al. (1996) developed the MBI-GS, which can be utilised in contexts that do not require respondents to interact with clients. The MBI-GS was therefore used to measure burnout within the context of this study. The MBI-GS developed by Maslach et al. (1996) is seen as a valuable tool for assessing individuals’ attitudes and feelings in determining whether individuals are experiencing burnout. Items regarding personal attitudes or feelings are written in statement format in this questionnaire. The statements in the instrument are designed to be rated on frequency (how often) and intensity (how strong).

The MBI-GS provides a three-dimensional perspective on burnout, as burnout is considered to consist of emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. High scores on exhaustion and cynicism and lower scores on professional efficacy indicate a high degree of burnout (Maslach et al., 1996). The 16 items of the instrument generate three total scores, one for each of the three dimensions. Five items assess emotional exhaustion (for example, “I feel used up at the end of the work day”); five items assess cynicism (for example, “I have become less enthusiastic about my work”); and six items assess professional efficacy (for example, “I can effectively solve problems that arise in my work”). The three dimensions of burnout are conceptualised in broader terms relating to the job and not just to the personal relationships that may be part of the job (Maslach et al., 2001). All items are scored on a seven-point frequency-rating Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always/daily).

Maslach et al. (2001) reported internal consistencies from .87 to .89 for exhaustion, .73 to .84 for cynicism and .76 to .84 for professional efficacy. Reliability analyses conducted by Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, and Schaufeli (2000) indicated that the exhaustion and professional efficacy dimensions were internally consistent. Numerous studies concerning the MBI-GS substantiated the reliability of the psychometric properties of the instrument, incorporating the variance of factor loadings as reliable and valid (Leiter &
In determining whether the MBI-GS was relevant to various disciplines, Maslach et al. (1996) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with four occupational groups, namely managers; clerical and maintenance workers; technologists and therapists; and nurses. A three-factor structure of the MBI-GS was established for each of the four groups, indicating that the MBI-GS is applicable to a broad range of occupations. A three-factor structure of the MBI-GS has been confirmed both in South Africa (Jackson & Rothmann, 2005; Storm & Rothmann, 2003) and in studies abroad (Roelofs et al., 2005; Schaufeli, Martínes, Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002). Schaufeli, Van Diederendonck, and Van Gorp (1996) reported internal consistencies with Cronbach Alpha coefficients ranging from .87 to .89 for emotional exhaustion, from .73 to .84 for cynicism and from .76 to .84 for professional efficacy. Test-retest reliabilities were conducted after one year, in which Cronbach Alpha coefficients were .65 for emotional exhaustion, .60 for cynicism and .67 for professional efficacy.

Suitable internal consistencies of the MBI-GS, ranging from .73 for cynicism and .91 for exhaustion, have been found internationally (Marais, Mostert, & Rothmann, 2009). Satisfactory Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were also found within various South African studies. Jackson and Rothmann (2005) reported four burnout scales to be reliable with Cronbach Alpha coefficients of .66 for exhaustion, .70 for cynicism, .66 for professional efficacy and .76 for cognitive weariness. Various studies of the MBI-GS have supported an invariance of the instrument’s factor structure across a variety of occupation groups (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2002; Leiter & Schaufeli, 1996). However, the MBI-GS has unfortunately one critical psychometric limitation compared with the original version of the MBI-HSS. The items in each dimension are all structured in the same direction. Consequently, all items of the exhaustion and cynicism dimension are framed negatively, while all items of the professional efficacy dimension are framed positively. From a psychometric
perspective, such one-sided dimensions are inferior to dimensions that comprise both positively and negatively phrased items (Price & Mueller, 1986). This can, for example, lead to inaccurate factor solutions in which positively and negatively phrased items are prone to group together (Doty & Glick, 1998). However, according to González-Romá et al. (2006), the core dimensions of burnout are confirmed by exhaustion and cynicism, while professional efficacy is perceived as part of an engagement factor (Naudé & Rothman, 2004; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Rothmann, Steyn, & Mostert, 2005).

4.3.6 The Role Identity Questionnaire adapted from Burke-Tully (1977).

The Burke-Tully (1977) procedure was adapted for the purposes of this study to measure the identity of working women with children and other working women. Instruments for measuring role identity should meet the following criteria (Burke & Tully, 1977, p. 881):

- The measures should generate a quantitative score.
- The incorporation of the measure should include the “multi-dimensional character” of the majority of the role identities, and define the fundamental dimensions in order to ascribe meaning to the quantitative score.
- The measure should incorporate the concepts of both the self and the role.

To measure role identity effectively, according to the Burke-Tully technique (1977), one needs to establish a list of opposing adjectives that are robust enough to reflect the differences in meanings linked with the role and the pre-determined counter-role. Respondents are required to judge, against each of the adjective pairs, the roles whose meanings are to be evaluated. The pairs of adjectives against which the rating scores are most different are expected to tap the responses that are most significant in differentiating the role from the counter-role. Respondents are then required to rate self-in-role against the identical adjectives. These ratings are then multiplied by the coefficient
weightings of every adjective to generate one numerical value that represents the meaning of self in a specific role (Burke & Tully, 1977).

The Burke-Tully (1977) technique was followed for the purposes of this study; however, the social-role theory was used as an organising framework that guided the process of measuring identity within this study. The social-role theory suggests that men and women participate in various roles and are expected to have specific skills to fulfil these roles. Women are therefore expected to participate in more communal and nurturing roles than men. In contrast, men are expected to assume more competitive and domineering roles (Stuhlmacher, Citera, & Willis, 2007). The social-role theory suggests that certain situations make gender roles for men and women more or less salient.

The following steps were taken into consideration when designing the role-identity measure. The researcher identified a list of characteristics related to the role of “mother” from the social-role theory literature, as discussed in the literature review. This was then developed into sets of opposing adjectives that were deemed relevant to both the mother and employee-role identity. Ten employees within the sample organisation were selected to take part in a focus-group discussion. The participants were selected because of the commonalities they shared in relation to the topic being discussed. Krueger and Casey (2000, p. 25) refer to such individuals as being “information rich”. During the focus group, participants were asked whether the list of opposing adjectives was reflective of the mother-role and the employee-role identities. Based on the discussion and feedback from the focus-group, slight modifications were made to the list of opposing adjectives. In total, 17 adjective pairs were selected. The researcher then organised the list of adjectives in a semantically differential format on a Likert 7 point scale. Larger numbers represent relating closer to the mother-role identity, and smaller numbers relating closer to the employee-role identity. The identity measure was based on the perceived meanings that respondents attach within the specific contexts to the role of a mother and an employee. All
respondents were asked to complete the set of adjectives relating to their views on the role of identities typically expected from or ascribed to a mother, as opposed to the role identities that are typically expected from or ascribed to an employee. In addition, working women with children were asked to complete the set of adjectives relating to themselves in the roles of mother as opposed to their role as employee.

4.4 Procedures

4.4.1 Administration of the questionnaire.

Bailey (1994) advocates that a questionnaire should start with the most appealing set of questions first in order to encourage the participant to complete the questionnaire. Bailey (1994) adds that the easiest questions to answer in the questionnaire should be positioned first in order to keep the participant stimulated. Most of the instruments utilised in this study could be experienced by the participants as intimidating, as they assess feelings, beliefs and preferences that individuals may consider to be extremely private. Therefore, it was decided to position the general biographical questions first. The reason for this was that the biographical questions seem less threatening to the respondents, as they require only general demographic information. The biographical questions were followed by the SWING (Geurts et al., 2005); the Work-family and Family-work Conflict Scale (Netemeyer et al., 1996); the MSQ Short-Form (Weiss et al., 1967); the MBI-GS (Maslach & Jackson, 1981); and lastly the Role Identity Measure adapted from the Burke-Tully (1977) technique. Appendix A contains a copy of the final questionnaire. The original instructions of all the instruments were followed throughout this study. To avoid ambiguity in the questionnaire, and consequently increase the response rate and quality of the responses, Babbie (1998) suggests keeping the various instruments separate. This approach was necessary in this case as the various instruments utilised different response scales. The original response scales were maintained so as not to jeopardise the validity and reliability of the response scales.
Babbie (1998) suggests that a pre-test or pilot test of a questionnaire assists in reducing the possibility of error. A pilot test was conducted to evaluate the questionnaire to eliminate any problems in answering the questions. By having participants complete the electronic questionnaire, the researcher was able to assess the online system and elicit whether the instructions were clear and that the completion time was adhered to and precise. For the pilot test, eight permanent employees who formed part of the sampling population, but not part of the final sample, were selected from various occupational groups within the sampling organisation. A face-to-face session was held with each participant to discuss the purpose of the study and to explain the instructions for completing the online questionnaire. On completion of the online questionnaires, there was an hour-long feedback session with each participant. The feedback sessions enabled the researcher to document any concerns or recommendations the participants had with regard to the flow of questions and structure of the online questionnaire. One useful benefit that arose from the feedback sessions was to change the electronic format of the answers from drop-down tabs to a bullet format. Where possible, a drop-down tab has an arrow that allows the respondent to click down on a selection of answers provided for that particular question. A bullet format, on the other hand, allows the selection of answers to be displayed next to each other. The bullet format is much easier to visualise and quicker to complete.

The self-administered electronic questionnaire was stored on a secure in-house website-based tool on the organisation’s internal network, from which the questionnaire could be accessed by respondents. The reasons for using electronic questionnaires were as follows:

- All employees in the sample group had access to a computer and were computer-literate individuals who could be contacted by e-mail.
- Using electronic questionnaires via e-mail, with a personalised e-mail address for each respondent, heightened confidence that the right employee had responded.
• The likelihood of contamination or distortion of respondent’s answers was low, as the questionnaire was sent to the correct respondent, and no other respondent could complete the questionnaire without the actual respondent’s computer log-on details and password.

• Though the sample was geographically dispersed, electronic questionnaires could be easily distributed across various geographical locations.

• The selected organisation and the researcher agreed to carry any financial cost.

• Once all respondents had completed the questionnaire, the organisation’s internal network allowed the researcher to download all the responses in electronic format, which shorted the lead-time for analysis.

• Owing to the fact that the selected organisation conducts electronic questionnaires on a regular basis, individuals were expected to be more receptive to participating in electronic questionnaires than paper-based questionnaires.

Each selected employee was e-mailed an introductory letter stating the purpose of the research. General completion guidelines were also outlined in the introductory e-mail. These are shown in Appendix A (Appendix A consists of the final copy of the online questionnaire with the introductory letter). In order to ensure anonymity, respondents were not listed on the e-mail header. Respondents were given the option of requesting feedback on the findings of the study, by sending a blank e-mail back to the researcher, with the subject heading, “feedback requested”. An electronic folder was created on the researchers personal e-mail mailbox so that all received e-mails requesting feedback were stored.

If respondents chose to complete the survey, they were required to click on a link in the body of the e-mail, which took them to the first page of the questionnaire on the intranet site. The first page informed respondents that the questionnaire was confidential, and that anonymity was guaranteed. A set
of instructions was given at the top of each page. Should the respondents agree to participate in the study, they were required to click on the “start completing survey” button. Once the “start completing survey” button was activated, the respondents were taken through the following steps:

- Respondents were required to complete and submit their biographical details at the end of this section.
- Once this step was completed, an electronic screen with ten categories was shown to the respondent.
- The respondents were required to complete each category, but to avoid the last one if they did not fit into the category, “working women with children”.
- The summary screen indicated if the respondent had answered each category of questions, by showing “not started” or “started” next to each category.
- Once a category was selected, detailed instructions at the top of each category page advised respondents how to complete the section.
- If a question was “not applicable” to a respondent, the “not applicable” selection was made available for that particular question.
- After the last question of the final category, a “submit” button took respondents back to the main category page where the display showed them which categories they had completed, by indicating “started” or “not started”.
- Once all the categories had been completed, and this was reflected in the summary page, respondents were instructed to end the survey by clicking on the “end survey” button, which navigated them to a final page that thanked them for completing the survey.

Once a respondent who had completed all sections of the questionnaire clicked the “end survey” button, those answers were stored against a computer-generated random number for each respondent who had completed the questionnaire. This ensured that no user or login details of the respondents were stored, thus ensuring anonymity and confidentiality. The
responses from the completed questionnaires were then retrieved from a structured query language (SQL) database, which consisted of a number of data tables. (A data table is a structural repository where data is stored).

Babbie (1998) recommends that the return rates of questionnaires should be recorded and suggests sending a reminder if respondents have not completed their questionnaires within a certain length of time. It was therefore decided to send the respondents a reminder e-mail, to increase the rate of responses. A first reminder (which can be seen in Appendix B) was sent via e-mail with an attached letter ten days after the initial invitation to participate in the study was sent out to respondents. This reminder e-mail encouraged respondents to complete the questionnaire. A final reminder e-mail with the attached letter (which can be seen in Appendix C) was sent to respondents five days after the first reminder.

4.4.2 Ethical considerations.

Research ethics is concerned with what is deemed acceptable or unacceptable in terms of the research process. With this in mind, it is important to make it clear that this study was undertaken with the express permission, in writing, of the Human Resource Director of the organisation concerned. Owing to the questionnaire being administered electronically by means of the selected organisation’s web-based tool, assistance from an administrator specialising in electronic questionnaire development was required. The questionnaire administrator is employed by the organisation and is responsible for developing and constructing electronic surveys for the organisation on an on-going basis. As part of her conditions of employment, the questionnaire administrator is required to ensure a strict level of confidentiality at all times. This means that, unavoidably, the questionnaire administrator was privy to the names of the employees selected to participate in the study. To compensate for this, when the researcher granted the questionnaire administrator the right to assist in constructing the online questionnaire, a confidentiality letter was signed by the administrator to
ensure that respondents’ anonymity was protected. After the questionnaire was developed on the organisation’s web-based tool, the administrator’s services were no longer required. Precautionary measures were set in place to prevent respondents attempting to complete the questionnaire for a second time when the reminder e-mail was sent out. The online system was designed to block any respondents attempting to complete the online questionnaire more than once, by allocating a generated random number to each respondent upon completing the questionnaire.

While a number of processes were put in place to mitigate the risk of anonymity being breached, a breach is theoretically possible. The researcher acknowledges the fact that many loopholes exist in programming for electronic questionnaire development. It is for this reason that the data tables where the respondents’ answers have been stored are password-protected with an alphanumeric password that is extremely difficult to decipher. Only the researcher has the right to access the information in the specific sequel (SQL) data tables, which are password-protected.

Once the “start completing survey” button was activated in the body of the invitation e-mail, all respondents consented to take part in this study. After the completion of the questionnaire, all the information obtained from the respondents in the data tables was deleted from the organisation’s server and stored on a compact disc for a period of five years by the researcher of this study. The disc will remain in the secure possession of the researcher for prescribed data auditing purposes, should it be required. There is a possibility that the information may never be deleted from the system due to the organisation’s daily memory storage processes, but even if the data tables are accessed, the data is password-protected and cannot be accessed without the secret password.

Respondents were made aware in the introductory letter that, once feedback was requested, they gave up their rights to anonymity, although confidentiality was still guaranteed.
4.4.3 Handling of data and return of questionnaires.

The statistical analysis was carried out at the Department of Statistics of the University of Pretoria. The returned questionnaire responses were coded to compensate for the reverse-score items, after the data had been captured into the computer. The BMDP and SAS programmes were utilised to conduct the statistical analysis of this study.

The five instruments were the SWING, the Work-Family and Family-work Conflict Scale, the MSQ Short-Form, the MBI-GS and the Role Identity Measure.

Factor analysis was used to investigate the dimensionality of the psychometric instruments in this South African context, which may differ from that of earlier published studies. Given the use of existing instruments, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) could have been used to test the fit of this set of data, followed by Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to adjust for any mismatches (Gorsuch, 1997). Since the primary objective of this research is to explore various relationships between conflict and undesirable work outcomes rather than to measure factor fit, it was decided to use EFA immediately to explore the underlying dimensionality in the belief that EFA can provide “a more direct picture of dimensionality than goodness-of-fit measures used with CFA” (Hurley et al, 1997). Principal Factor Analysis (PFA) with Direct Quartimin rotation of the axes was used to identify dimensions or factors in the data for each of the five psychometric instruments. Aggregate scores were calculated for each of the factors identified in the EFA and these scores were used to represent the factors in the subsequent analyses of the relationships.

Principal Factor Analysis (PFA) with Direct Quartimin Rotation of the axes was used to explore the factor structures in this sample. Once the factor structures of the various instruments were established, the next step was to investigate the relationships of the biographical variables with work-family conflict. It was not the researcher’s objective to test the fit of a theoretical model on the data. Rather, the objective was to assess the respective relationships of interest as
presented in the research framework. It was therefore not deemed appropriate to run a CFA or SEM (Structural Equation Model) on the research framework summarised in Figure 6.

The procedure Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was selected as the correct statistical procedure for this investigation. The aim of the ANOVA was to establish whether relationships existed between variables (marital status, number of dependants, assistance with household responsibilities, assistance with childcare, children with a physical, emotional or mental illness, spouse and manager support, average working hours, after-hours work, and time spent travelling) and work-family conflict.

Levene’s test was carried out to determine the variance between two groups. Levene’s tests are used to determine equal homogeneity of variance between two groups. If variances are significantly different, the separate variance version of the \( t \)-test is used. However, if variances are not significantly different, then the pooled variance version of the \( t \)-test is used.

- The following \( t \)-tests were used in this study:
  - Matched \( t \)-tests were used to measure differences between gender, primary breadwinners in households, participation in flexible working arrangements and work-family conflict.
  - Matched \( t \)-tests were used to measure the role identity between two distinct groups (employee and mother), to compare the differences in means of the two groups and to determine if these differences were statistically significant.
  - Mann Whitney \( t \)-tests were used to determine differences in variance between the burnout of working women with children and that of other working women.
  - Mann Whitney \( t \)-tests were used to determine whether differences existed between working women with children, other working women and men as regards work interfering with family conflict and family interfering with work conflict;
Mann Whitney t-tests were used to assess the differences between working women and men as regards negative work interference with family conflict.

Mann Whitney t-tests were used to establish differences between levels of work-family conflict among working women with children and other working women.

The next step in the statistical analysis was to investigate the relationships between independent and dependent variables. Work-family conflict is the independent variable in this research. The other constructs in this study are all dependent variables. Parametric tests were used because, although the items were scored on ordinal Likert scales, the mean score for the items in each factor was used for the statistical analysis. The Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient was considered for statistical analysis for this investigation. The Pearson’s Correlations Coefficient was used to investigate inter-correlations between the scores of different instruments representing the independent and dependent variables. More specifically, the following relationships were investigated:

- Family-work conflict with burnout for working women with children, other working women and men
- Work-family conflict with job satisfaction of working women with children, other working women and men
- Spouse support with work-family conflict for working women with children, other working women and men

Fisher’s z transformation tests were conducted to indicate whether two correlations coefficients differ significantly. Fisher’s z transformation tests were specifically used to investigate:

- Correlations between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and job satisfaction for working women with children, working women and men
Correlations between family-work conflict, work-family conflict and burnout for working women with children, working women and men

The Central Limit Theorem explains that the larger the absolute size of a sample, the closer to the normal distribution and therefore the more robust it will be (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007). Therefore, given the large sample size of this study ($N = 545$) and the factor structures, the Central Limit Theorem assumes normality. Non-parametric equivalent analysis was conducted and the results are in agreement with and very similar to the parametric test results. Therefore, the Central Limit Theorem, in the context of this study, assumes normality.
Chapter 5: Results

5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the results of the analyses in order to provide answers to the eight research questions that underpin the current study. It was necessary to assess the relationship between the independent variable (WFC) and the dependent variables (job satisfaction, burnout and role identity). Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient was used because of the large sample size, with the aggregate score based on ordinal data. The original scoring of the SWING and burnout factors was used in these analyses.

The following abbreviations have been utilised in the remainder of this study:

- Principal Factor Analysis (PFA)
- Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)
- Work-Home Interaction-NjmeGen Questionnaire (SWING)
- Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)
- Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)
- Role Identity Employee (RIE)
- Role Identity Mother (RIM)
- Role Identity Working Women with Children (RIW)
- Work-Family Conflict (WFC)
- Family-Work Conflict (FWC)
- Negative Work Interference with Family (-WIF)
- Positive Work Interference with Family (+WIF)
- Negative Family Interference with Work (-FIW)
- Positive Family Interference with Work (+FIW)
- Emotional Exhaustion (EE)
- Cynicism (CYN)
- Professional Efficacy (PE)
5.2 The Factor Structure of the Total Questionnaire

Factor analysis was used to investigate the dimensionality of the psychometric instruments in this South African context and to adjust for any mismatches (Gorsuch, 1997). As noted before, the focus was not on confirming theoretical factors or those found by other researchers, the use of CFA on the five individual questionnaires was not deemed necessary and EFA was deemed more appropriate to adjust for any mismatches (Hurley et al, 1997). Each instrument was therefore independently subjected to PFA to explore the factor structure in the present sample. The factor structures of all the instruments were determined by essentially the same procedure:

- Eigenvalues that were > 1.00 as clear distinctions of possible factors were identified.
- The potential identified factors were subjected to PFA, for example in the case of one-, two- and three-factor structures as explained by Scree-test and Eigenvalues.
- Items that did not display suitable loadings ($r \geq .25$) with no significant cross-loading between two or more factors were removed following the first round of factor analysis. The PFA was repeated until all the items remaining specified suitable loadings (Van Wyk, Boshoff, & Owen, 1999).

5.2.1 The factor structure of the individual instruments.

The results of the statistical analysis of the various instruments used for measuring the variables incorporated in the study are presented next.

5.2.1.1 The factor structure of the SWING instrument.

Geurts et al. (2005) describe the SWING instrument as measuring four types of work-home interference: negative work interference with family (WIF); negative family interference with work (FIW); positive work interference with
family (WIF) and positive family interference with work (FIW). PFA was conducted on the SWING instrument. Within the context of this study, a three-factor structure was obtained for the SWING instrument. The original research by Geurts et al. (2005) obtained a four-factor structure of the SWING instrument. Within PFA, the researcher ensured that all variables measured in the same direction.

Table 41 indicates the Eigenvalues of the SWING instrument. The Scree test suggests a three-factor structure (Eigenvalues >1).

Table 41

*Eigenvalues from the PFA of the SWING instrument (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The histogram of the Eigenvalues is indicated in Figure 24.
The PFA of 5.85 represents negative work interference with family (-WIF). The second factor of 3.49 represents positive work interference with family and positive family interference with work (+WIF/+FIW). The third factor of 1.29 represents negative family interference with work (-FIW). Furthermore, the PFA indicated that all the positive items grouped together and all the negative items grouped together, irrespective of the direction of the items.

Although Geurts et al. (2005) describe the SWING as consisting of four types of interference, the PFA failed to yield a satisfactory four-factor structure solution as proposed by Geurts et al. (2005).
FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

The outcomes of the PFA are shown in Table 42.

Table 42

PFA of the three-factor structure of the SWING scale (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 (-WIF)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (+WIF +FIW)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (-FIW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 (Irritable at home, work demanding)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 (Difficult to fulfil home obligation)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 (Activities cancelled due to work)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 (Difficult to fulfil family obligations)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8 (Lack of energy to engage in leisure)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9 (No time for hobbies, just work)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11 (Difficult to relax due to work)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12 (Work takes up family time)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15 (Domestic matters occupying work)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17 (Irritated with work due to home)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19 (Problems at home affect performance)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22 (Do not feel like working due to family)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS3 (Time at home managed due to work)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS5 (Good home integration due to work)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS6 (Appointments kept due to work)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS10 (Home duties fulfilled due to work)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS13 (Pleasant work, engagement at home)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS14 (Fun at work after pleasant weekend)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS16 (Work duties serious due to home)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS18 (Appointments kept due to home)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS20 (Time at work managed due to home)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS21 (Confident at work, home life organised)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha             | .91             | .84                  | .85             |
Total variance explained   | 47.4%           | 28.0%                | 10.6%           |

Note. Factor Loadings >.25 are in boldface.

All 22 items showed satisfactory loadings (r ≥ .25) between .37 and .81 on a three-factor solution with a resulting Cronbach Alpha of .86. The three factors individually also had satisfactory Alphas, namely negative work interference with family (-WIF) .91 (loadings r = .58 to r = .81); positive work interference with family and positive family interference with work (+WIF/+FIW) .84 (loadings r = .37 to r = .73); and negative family interference with work (FIW) .85 (loadings r = .63 to r = .80). The three factors cumulatively explained 86.0% of the variance in the data space.
Table 43 indicates the inter-correlations between factors.

Table 43

*Inter-correlations between three factors of SWING (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this study, the inter-correlations of the three-factor structure of the SWING were deemed sufficiently low to support a three-factor structure. Both positive factors (+FIW and +WIF) in the factor analysis of the SWING (Geurts et al., 2005) showed an inter-correlation of .56. Within the context of this study, both positive factors combined into one factor. One can conclude that the SWING scale by Geurts et al. (2005) is portable to the South African sample used in this study. It is therefore an acceptable instrument for measuring the constructs: -WIF, -FIW, +WIF and +FIW. The three-factor structure including all 22 items of the SWING measure was utilised in this study.

**5.2.1.2 The factor structure of the WFC and FWC scale.**

The WFC and FWC instrument (Netemeyer et al., 1996) consists of two scales that measure work-family conflict and family-work conflict. PFA was conducted on the WFC and FWC instrument.
Table 44 indicates the Eigenvalues of the WFC and FWC instrument.

Table 44

Eigenvalues from PFA of WFC and FWC (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The histogram of the Eigenvalues is indicated in Figure 25.

![Figure 25. Eigenvalues for WFC and FWC instrument](image)
The PFA of 5.77 represents WFC. The second factor of 1.75 represents FWC. The outcomes of the PFA of the WFC and FWC instrument (Netemeyer et al., 1996) are shown in Table 45. A two factor solution was obtained which closely represent the original factors of the WFC and FWC instrument (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Table 45

**PFA of the two-factor structure of WFC and FWC (N = 545)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 (WFC)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (FWC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFC1 (Work demands interfere with home)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC2 (Difficult to fulfil family duties due to job)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC3 (Work hinders duties at home)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC4 (Job strain difficult to fulfil family duties)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC5 (Change family plans due to work duties)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC1 (Family demands interfere with work)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC2 (Work duties on hold due to family demands)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC3 (Family hinders duties at work)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC4 (Home interferes with responsibilities at work)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC5 (Family related strain interferers with job)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha                                              | .95            | .93            |
Total variance explained                                      | 74.5%          | 22.9%          |

*Note.* Factor Loadings ≥ .25 are in boldface.

All 10 items showed satisfactory loadings ($r \geq .25$) and between .74 and .98 on a two-factor solution, with a resulting Cronbach Alpha of .93. The Alphas of the two factors were substantially high, which indicates that the two scales measured by this instrument are independent of each other (.95 for WFC and .93 for FWC). The two factors cumulatively contributed to 97.4% of the variance in the data space.

A moderate correlation exists between the two factors ($r = .52$) of the WFC and FWC scales, and was deemed satisfactory to support a two-factor structure. One can conclude that the two factors of the WFC and FWC instrument (Netemeyer et al., 1996) are portable to the South African sample used in this study. It was therefore deemed an acceptable instrument for
measuring the WFC and FWC constructs. The two-factor structure of the WFC and FWC instrument, including all 10 items according to Netemeyer et al. (1996), was utilised in this study.

5.2.1.3 The factor structure of the MSQ Short-Form instrument.

The MSQ instrument consists of two dimensions: extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction. PFA was conducted on the MSQ instrument. Table 46 indicates the Eigenvalues of the MSQ instrument.

Table 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The histogram of the Eigenvalues is indicated in Figure 26.
Figure 26. Eigenvalues for MSQ Short Form instrument

The outcomes of the PFA are shown in Table 47.

Table 47

PFA of the one-factor structure of the MSQ scale (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1 (Keep busy all the time)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2 (Work alone on the job)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3 (Do different things)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4 (Be somebody in community)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS5 (How boss handles workers)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS6 (Supervisor competence)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS7 (Doing things not against conscience)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS8 (Job provides steady employment)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS9 (To do things for others)</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS10 (Tell people what to do)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS11 (Utilise my abilities)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS12 (Company policies)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS13 (Pay and amount of work)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS14 (Advancement on this job)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS15 (Freedom to use judgement)</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS16 (Try own methods on the job)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS17 (Working conditions)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS18 (Way co-workers get along)</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS19 (Praise for doing a good job)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS20 (Feeling accomplishment)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach Alpha</strong></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total variance explained</strong></td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Factor Loadings > .25 are in boldface.*
A one-factor structure is supported against the original two-factor structure of the MSQ instrument (Weiss et al., 1967). PFA of 8.94 for the completed dataset, which is general job satisfaction, was obtained. The 20 items in the MSQ instrument (Weiss et al., 1967) showed satisfactory loadings \( r > .25 \) between .37 and .94 on a one-factor solution, with a resulting Cronbach Alpha of .94. The one factor explains 77.9% of the variance in the data space. One can conclude that the MSQ instrument (Weiss et al., 1967) is portable to the South African sample used in this study. It is therefore an acceptable instrument for measuring the construct: general job satisfaction. The one-factor structure, including all 20 items of the MSQ instrument (Weiss et al., 1967), was utilised in this study.

5.2.1.4 The factor structure of the MBI-GS survey.

The MBI-GS consists of three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional efficacy. PFA was conducted on the MBI-GS instrument. A two-factor structure of the MBI-GS is supported against the original three-factor structure of the MBI-GS (Maslach et al., 1996). According to Leiter and Schaufeli (1996), the three-factor structure of the MBI-GS requires that cynicism differs qualitatively from exhaustion, in that indifference and a lack of enthusiasm were direct indicators of exhaustion; the items would combine as one factor. Positive items were reverse-scored to ensure all items measured the same direction. One item, M15 “I doubt the significance of my work” had a strong cross-loading (factor one .54 and factor two .41); therefore, considering that the cross-loading is higher than .25 on both factors; it can arguably belong to either one of the two factors. For this reason, it was decided to execute the PFA again without item M15.
Table 48 indicates the Eigenvalues of the MBI-GS instrument.

Table 48

*Eigenvalues from the PFA of the MBI-GS instrument (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The histogram of the Eigenvalues is indicted in Figure 27.

*Figure 27. Eigenvalues for MBI-GS instrument*
PFA of 6.73 for the first factor represents exhaustion and cynicism. The second factor of 1.79 represents professional efficacy.

The outcomes of the PFA of the MIB-GS are shown in Table 49.

Table 49

*PFA of the two-factor structure of the MBI-GS scale (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 (EE &amp; CYN)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (PE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 (Emotionally drained from work)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 (Feel used up at end of day)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 (Tired when I get up in morning)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 (Work all day is a strain)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 (I feel burned out from work)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 (Less interested in my work)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9 (Less enthusiastic about work)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13 (I do not want to be bothered)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14 (Cynical if work contributes anything)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM5 (Effectively solve problems)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM7 (Making effective contribution)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM10 (I am good at my job)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM11 (Exhilarated when work is accomplished)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM12 (Accomplished many things in job)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM16 (Feel confident that things get done)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total variance explained</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor Loadings $\geq .25$ are in boldface.

The 15 items showed satisfactory loadings ($r \geq .25$) between .43 and .91 on a two-factor solution, with a resulting Cronbach Alpha of .91. The two factors individually indicate satisfactory Alphas, namely exhaustion and cynicism .93 (loadings $r = .43$ to $r = .91$), and professional efficacy .83 (loadings $r = .46$ to $r = .75$). The two factors cumulatively explained 89.5% of the variance in the data space.
Table 50 indicates the inter-correlations between the factors.

Table 50  

Inter-correlations of two-factors on MBI-GS (N = 545)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation between factors one and two is $r = .42$, which indicates that a moderate relationship exists between factor one (exhaustion and cynicism) and factor two (professional efficacy). For the purposes of this study, the inter-correlations of the two-factor structure of the MBI-GS were deemed satisfactory to support a two-factor structure. One can conclude that the two-factor structure of the MBI-GS, with the removal of item M15, is portable to the South African sample. It is therefore an acceptable instrument for measuring the construct of burnout for the purpose of this study.

5.2.1.5 The factor structure of the role-identity measurement.

The role-identity measure assesses the relative strength of a specific identity in relation to another identity. The role-identity measure is based on the assumption that the meaning of self in a role is only significant as it relates to a suitable counter-role (Burke & Tully, 1977). PFA was conducted for the role-identity scale. The adjective pairs were selected from a review of the social role theory literature and verified within the focus group.
Table 51 indicates the Eigenvalues of the role-identity measure.

Table 51

*Eigenvalues from PFA of role identity (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The histogram of the Eigenvalues is indicated in Figure 28. The PFA showed a two-factor solution for the role identity employee and self-in-role for working woman with children.

![Figure 28. Eigenvalues for Role Identity adapted instrument, all items included](image)

The first factor of 10.5 represents working woman with children’s view of self-in-role (RIW). The second factor of 10.1 represents the role identity of employee (RIE). Given that identities are formed and enacted in relation to applicable counter identities, they cannot be assessed in isolation from these counter identities (Burke & Tully, 1977). In effectively assessing role identity, a list of opposing adjectives that robustly reflected the differences in meanings related to the role and predetermined counter-roles were used. This was followed by the organisation of adjectives in a semantically differential format for each role.
The outcomes of the PFA are shown in Table 52.

Table 52

Two-factor structure of Role Identity Measure (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 RIE</th>
<th>Factor 2 RIW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIE1 Competitive</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE2 Ambitious</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE3 Critical</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE4 Professional</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE5 Theoretical</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE6 Logical</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE7 Rigorous</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE8 Assertive</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE9 Career driven</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE10 Intellectual</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE11 Intolerant</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE12 Intelligent</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE13 Directive</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE14 Self-Reliant</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE15 Methodical</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE16 Serious</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE17 Impatient</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW1 Generous</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW2 Selfless</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW3 Praising</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW4 Responsible</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW5 Spiritual</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW6 Instinctive</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW7 Tolerant</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW8 Tender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW9 Family driven</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW10 Emotional</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW11 Understanding</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW12 Compassionate</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW13 Accommodating</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW14 Nurturing</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW15 Intuitive</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW16 Loving</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIW17 Patient</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha .96       .96
Total variance explained 41.8% 43.3%

Note. Factor Loadings > .25 are in boldface.
All 34 items showed satisfactory loadings \((r > .25)\) between .63 and .90 on a two-factor solution, with a Cronbach Alpha of .93. The two factors individually also had satisfactory Alphas: working women with children’s self-in-role (RIW) .96 (loadings \(r = .68\) to \(r = .84\)), and employee-role identity (RIE) .96 (loadings \(r = .63\) to \(r = .90\)). The two factors cumulatively explain 85.1% of the variance in the data space.

The inter-correlations between the two factors were -.03, which indicates a negative weak relationship between the two factors. This is indicative that the employee-role identity and working women with children’s self-in-role measured by this instrument are independent of each other. One can conclude that the two factors of the Role Identity measure are applicable to the South African sample used in the study. It is therefore an acceptable instrument for measuring the construct of working women with children perceptions of self-in-role and the role identity for employees.

### 5.3 Relationship Between Various Instruments

To investigate the inter-correlations between all the instruments utilised in the current study and their respective factors, Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient was used to ascertain whether different constructs were identified and/or measured. According to Cohen (1988), any correlation \((r\) value) that is greater than 0.5 is considered strong, between 0.3 and 0.5 moderate and between 0.1 and 0.3 weak. Any \(r\) value smaller than 0.1 is insubstantial and of very little practical value. The researcher of the current study adhered to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines when interpreting the strength of relationships established in the data.

Table 53 shows the relationship between WFC and the dependent variables. All values in Table 53 are \(r\) values.
## Table 53

*Results from Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWING (-WIF)</th>
<th>SWING (+WIF/+FIW)</th>
<th>SWING (-FIW)</th>
<th>WFC</th>
<th>FWC</th>
<th>MSQ</th>
<th>MBI (EE &amp; CYN)</th>
<th>MBI (PE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWING (-WIF)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWING (+WIF/+FIW)</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWING (-FIW)</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI (EE &amp; CYN)</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.65*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI (PE)</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .0001 \)
-WIF shows weak negative correlation coefficients of $r = -.18$ with factor two of the SWING (+WIF/+FIW) and with professional efficacy ($r = -.20$). The relationship between –WIF and job satisfaction found a correlation coefficient of $r = -.35$, thus indicating a moderate negative relationship. –WIF represents moderate positive relationships with FWC ($r = .38$) and with -FIW ($r = 4.9$). A correlation coefficient of $r = .54$ was explained for emotional exhaustion, thus indicating a strong positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and –WIF. A strong positive relationship of $r = .74$ was found between –WIF and WFC, possibly indicative of construct redundancy between these two constructs, which were previously shown to be conceptually very similar.

The second factor of the SWING (+WIF/+FIW) represents weak positive correlation coefficients of $r = .01$ with –FIW, $r = .18$ with professional efficacy and $r = .26$ with job satisfaction. A correlation coefficient of $r = -.05$ was found between the SWING factor two (+WIF/+FIW) and FWC, thus indicating a weak inverse relationship. WFC shows weak negative relationship ($r = -.26$) with factor two of the SWING (+WIF/+FIW), and similarly with emotional exhaustion and cynicism ($r = -.22$).

Factor three of the SWING (-FIW) found moderate positive relationships with WFC ($r = .36$), and with emotional exhaustion and cynicism, ($r = .48$). A strong positive relationship ($r = .58$) was found between the constructs –FIW and FWC. This strong correlation may be indicative of a possible case of construct redundancy between the constructs, which have been shown to be conceptually very similar. Moderate inverse relationships were found between –FIW and job satisfaction ($r = -.42$) and between –FIW and professional efficacy ($r = -.37$).

The relationship found between WFC and FWC shows a correlation coefficient of $r = .50$, and thus, according to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines, is regarded as moderate in strength. Furthermore, WFC shows moderate inverse relationship ($r = -.40$) with job satisfaction. A strong positive relationship ($r = .60$) was found between WFC and emotional exhaustion and
cynicism, while a weak negative relationship \( r = -0.27 \) was found between WFC and professional efficacy. A correlation coefficient of \( r = 0.55 \) between FWC and emotional exhaustion and cynicism was presented, while moderate negative relationships were found for job satisfaction \( r = -0.49 \) and professional efficacy \( r = -0.45 \). A strong inverse relationship \( r = -0.65 \) between job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion was found, while a strong positive relationship \( r = 0.51 \) exists between job satisfaction and professional efficacy. Lastly, a correlation coefficient of \( r = -0.48 \) was found between emotional exhaustion and cynicism with professional efficacy. The focus of this study is the interrelationships between the dependent variables and WFC as the independent variable. As can be seen from Table 53, all variables show statistically significant differences. Very weak relationships that are statistically significant but of very low practical value will be discussed in Chapter 6.

5.4 Summary of Data

The summary of the respondents’ scores in the sample on WFC, FWC, job satisfaction and burnout is presented in Table 54. Table 54 presents the mean, standard deviation, maximum and minimum scores of the responses and the item count per instrument used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on level of respondents’ scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWING -WIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWING +WIF/+FIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWING –FIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE &amp; CYN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54 shows that SWING factor one (-WIF) has a mean score of 1.2 and a SD of .70. For this sample, the mean score and SD are somewhat higher than those in other studies conducted on the same factor one (-WIF). For instance, the following mean scores and SD of -WIF were confirmed by the following researchers in previous studies. Geurts et al. (2005) found a mean score of .86 and SD .48; Demerouti, Geurts and Kompier (2004) found .84 and SD .50; Demerouti and Geurts (2004) found .81 and SD .50; and Dikkers et al. (2007) found a mean score of .85 and SD .45.

The SWING factor two (+WIF/+FIW) has a mean score of 1.6 and SD of .61, and mean score for factor three (-FIW) of .50 and SD of .59. For this sample, the mean and SD are relatively higher than in other previous studies, which confirmed mean scores and SD for –FIW as .40 and SD .38 (Demerouti et al., 2004); .38 and SD .34 (Demerouti & Geurts, 2004); and .47 and SD of .40 (Dikkers et al., 2007).

A mean score of 4.3 and SD of 1.8 were found for WFC, and a mean of 2.6 and SD of 1.5 were found for FWC. The mean scores show that for this sample, respondents’ experienced higher WFC than FWC. A mean score of 3.6 and SD of .72 were found for the MSQ. For this sample, the mean score is similar to a study conducted on a South African population by Buitendach and De Witte (2005), who found a mean score of 3.5. A mean score of 2.6 and SD of 1.6 were found for emotional exhaustion and cynicism and a mean score of 4.7 and SD of 1.1 for professional efficacy. Professional efficacy has a higher mean score than emotional exhaustion and cynicism.

5.5 Relationship Between Biographical-Type Variables and WFC

The statistical procedure Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether any statistically significant differences exist between WFC scores of biographical groups. Such differences were based on F statistics, and p values ≤ .05 were regarded as statistically significant. In instances
where there were two or more biographical groups, Scheffe’s test was used to discern significant differences in the level of response scales.

The results of the ANOVA procedure per biographical variables showing statistically significant differences with WFC are presented in Table 55. Degrees of freedom (df) are indicated in parentheses after the variable description.

Table 55

Statistically significant differences with WFC (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(df)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Classes description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support with children</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.0085*</td>
<td>Seldom support</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular support</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporting children</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.0427**</td>
<td>&gt; 30 minutes</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 30 minutes</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01  
** p < .05

A statistically significant difference was found between WFC scores of respondents that seldom receive support and those that never receive support with childcare. However, one would rather expect a statistically significant difference between “regularly receiving support” and “never receiving support”. Concerning the results found for transporting of children, Scheffe’s test does not show significant differences between the WFC scores of any of the three groups. The F test indicates that there are differences between the WFC scores of the three groups but the Scheffe’s test could not identify which groups differ significantly.

The results of the ANOVA procedure per biographical variable that failed to show statistically significant differences with WFC are presented in Table 56.
The degrees of freedom (df) are indicated in parentheses after the variable description. Mean scores are specified, but no ranking of groups' scores was made, as the differences were not statistically significant (p ≤ .05).

Table 56

No statistically significant differences with WFC (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(df)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Classes description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support with household chores</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.2931</td>
<td>Seldom support</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular support</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/children with conditions</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.4181</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status &amp; Gender</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.2171</td>
<td>Couple (Male)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couple (Female)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single (Male)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single (Female)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table 56 consequently support the proposition that work-family conflict is independent of certain biographical-type variables such as support with household chores, children with a physical, emotional or mental condition and marital gender status.

A t-test was used to determine whether statistically significant differences exist between men and women and WFC. The Levene test was used to determine whether the variance differs significantly between these groups. The results of t-test are indicated in Table 57.
Table 57

*T-test for men (N = 255) and women (N = 290) on WFC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Working Women</th>
<th>Working Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.5887</td>
<td>4.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.2 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57 indicates the mean scores and SD on WFC for women and men respectively. The mean scores show that WFC for women (4.3) is slightly higher than for men (4.2). A p value of .5887 indicates, however, that the difference in mean scores between women and men on WFC is not statistically significant.

A *t*-test was used to determine whether differences in the mean scores between primary breadwinners (N = 368) and non-primary breadwinners (N = 177) in the household and WFC exist. The Levene test was used to determine whether the variance differs significantly between these groups. The results of the *t*-test are indicated in Table 58.

Table 58

*T-test for primary (N = 368) and non-primary breadwinners (N = 177)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Primary Breadwinners</th>
<th>Non-Primary Breadwinners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.0879</td>
<td>4.3 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.1 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58 indicates the difference in the mean scores and SD of WFC for primary and non-primary breadwinners in the household. The mean scores of primary breadwinners (4.3) is slightly higher than that of non-primary breadwinners (4.3); however, the *p* value of .0879 indicates that the difference
in WFC mean scores between primary and non-primary breadwinners is not statistically significant.

A *t*-test was used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores on WFC for those respondents who reported that they receive manager support (*N* = 419) and those who do not receive support (*N* = 126). The results of the *t*-test are indicated in Table 59.

Table 59

**T-test for differences in WFC and manager support (N = 545)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th>Yes Mean (SD)</th>
<th>No Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager reputation</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>.0861</td>
<td>4.4 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.9 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to take care of children</td>
<td>-3.77</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
<td>4.2 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.1 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager values my contribution</td>
<td>-5.72</td>
<td>.0000**</td>
<td>4.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.5 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to try new things</td>
<td>-5.55</td>
<td>.0000**</td>
<td>4.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.3 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to take care of family issues</td>
<td>-6.97</td>
<td>.0000**</td>
<td>4.0 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.5 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p* < .001  
** *p* < .0001

Table 59 indicates the differences in the mean scores and *SD* on WFC and manager support for the entire sample. The mean scores of respondents that do not receive managerial support are somewhat higher than the mean scores of respondents that do receive managerial support. No statistically significant difference was found for manager reputation, and conceptually this variable should not be related to WFC, as manager reputation is irrelevant to manager support.

Pearson’s Correlation analysis was conducted to investigate whether a relationship exists between WFC and the following variables:

- Spouse/partner support;
- Children living in same household as respondents;
- Children not living in same household as respondents;
• Working hours and utilisation of work tools (desktop, laptop, BlackBerry and paperwork; and
• Travel time.

The results are indicated in Table 60.

Table 60

Correlation Coefficients of WFC and biographical variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>WFC (r)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/partner support</td>
<td>-.08†</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children living with respondents</td>
<td>.07†</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children not living with respondents</td>
<td>.28†</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours per day</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time to and from work</td>
<td>.04†</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hour use of tools per week</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .0001\)
† \(p > .1\)

Table 60 shows insubstantial correlation \((r = -.08)\) between WFC and support that respondents receive from their spouse/partner in taking care of children and domestic activities. An insubstantial relationship was found between children living in the same household as respondents and WFC \((r = .07)\). WFC shows a weak relationship with children not living in the same household as respondents \((r = .28)\). The correlations between spouse or partner support in taking care of the children, and children living and not living in the same household as respondents with WFC are statistically insignificant \((p > 1)\).

The data received on working hours, travel time and utilisation of work tools appears not plausible; for example, some respondents indicated working between 18 to 25 hours a day. Such working hours are highly unlikely to impossible, even if respondents take part in a flexible working arrangement. Due to such speculative data, outlier values of more than two standard deviations above or below the mean scores were omitted in the calculations.
for statistical analyses from the findings pertaining to working hours, travel
time and utilisation of work tools. Such outlier values would have an undue
influence on the data and were disregarded. With this correction in the data, a
relationship \( r = .27 \) was found between working hours and WFC, with a
statistically significant difference. Travel time shows an insubstantial
relationship \( r = .04 \) with WFC. A moderate positive relationship \( r = .34 \) was
found between average hour utilisation of tools for work purposes (desktop,
laptop, BlackBerry and paperwork) and WFC. The insubstantial correlation
coefficients found in Table 60 are not statistically significant and have very
little practical value.

A \( t \)-test was used to determine whether statistically significant differences
exist in the mean scores of respondents participating \( (N = 193) \) and not
participating \( (N = 352) \) in flexible working arrangements. The Levene test was
used to determine whether the variance differed significantly between these
groups. The results of the \( t \)-test are indicated in Table 61.

Table 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Flexible Participation Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Non Flexible Participation Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>.0092*</td>
<td>4.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>4.4 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .01 \)

Table 61 indicates the differences in WFC for respondents’ participation or
non-participation in flexible working arrangements for the entire sample. The
mean WFC score of respondents participating in flexible working
arrangements (4.0) is slightly lower than that for respondents that do not
participate (4.4). A \( p \) value of .0092 indicates that the difference in the mean
scores on WFC between participation and non-participation in flexible working
arrangements is statistically significant.
5.6 The Relationship Between FWC, WFC and Burnout

In order to investigate whether a relationship exists between FWC, WFC and burnout for working women with children and other working women and men, Pearson’s Correlation analysis was carried out.

The correlations between the two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) with FWC are indicated in Table 62.

Table 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>FWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Women with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children ((r))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion &amp; Cynicism</td>
<td>.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .0001\)

Table 62 shows a strong positive relationship between FWC and the two factors of burnout, namely exhaustion and cynicism (\(r = .64\)) and professional efficacy (\(r = .56\)) for working women with children. Moderate positive relationships exist between FWC with exhaustion and cynicism (\(r = .42\)) and with professional efficacy (\(r = .31\)) for other working women and men. Fisher's \(z\) transformation was used to determine whether the differences in the correlations between the two groups of respondents are statistically significant. This analysis indicates that FWC in working women with children correlates statistically significantly \((p < .05)\) stronger with exhaustion and cynicism \((r = .64)\) than in other women and men \((r = .42)\), and on professional efficacy \((r = .56\) versus \(r = .31\)).

The correlations between the two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) with WFC are shown in Table 63.
Table 63

Correlation Coefficients of WFC and burnout (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>WFC Working Women with Children (r)</th>
<th>WFC Working Women and Men (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion &amp; Cynicism</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .0001

Strong positive relationships were found between emotional exhaustion and cynicism and WFC for both working women with children (r = .65) and other working women and men (r = .58). A moderate positive relationship exists between WFC and professional efficacy for working women with children (r = .34). A weak positive relationship was found between WFC and professional efficacy for other working women and men (r = .21). Statistically significant differences exist between WFC and burnout for working women with children and other working women and men. Fisher’s z transformation test was used to determine whether the differences in the correlations between the two groups of respondents are statistically significant. This analysis found that the correlation between WFC and two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) are not statistically significantly different for working women with children (p > .05) and other working women and men.

5.7 The Relationship Between FWC, WFC and Job Satisfaction

In order to investigate whether a relationship exists between FWC, WFC and job satisfaction for working women with children and working women and men, Pearson’s Correlation analysis was conducted.

The correlations between FWC and job satisfaction are indicated in Table 64.
Table 64

*Correlation Coefficients of FWC and job satisfaction (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>FWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.60*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001

Table 64 shows a strong inverse relationship between FWC and job satisfaction (r = -.60) for working women with children, and a moderate inverse relationship was found for other working women and men (r = -.42). Statistically significant differences exist between FWC and job satisfaction for working women with children and other working women and men. The Fisher's z transformation was used to compare the confidence intervals of the correlation coefficients for the two groups and indicated a statistically significant difference (p < .05) between the correlation coefficients. This analysis indicates that FWC correlates more strongly with job satisfaction for working women with children than for other working women and men.

The correlations between WFC and job satisfaction are showed in Table 65.

Table 65

*Correlation Coefficients of WFC and job satisfaction (N = 545)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>WFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001

Table 65 shows a moderate negative relationship between WFC and job satisfaction (r = -.43) for working women with children. A moderate negative relationship was also found between WFC and job satisfaction for other
working women and men ($r = -.38$). Both of these correlations are statistically significant ($p = .0001$). The Fisher's z transformation was used to compare the confidence intervals of the correlation coefficients for the two groups and indicated a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between the correlation coefficients. This analysis indicates that the difference in the correlations of WFC with job satisfaction for working women with children and other working women and men is not statistically significant ($p = .57$).

### 5.8 Differences Between Burnout Factors

A $t$-test was used to determine whether statistically significant differences exist between the burnout scores of working women with children and other working women. The Levene test was used to determine whether the variance differed significantly between working women with children ($N = 204$) and working women ($N = 86$). The pooled variance version of the $t$-test was used because the variances are not significantly different. The results of the $t$-test are indicated in Table 66.

#### Table 66

* $p < .05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Working Women with Children</th>
<th>Working Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ($SD$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion &amp; Cynicism</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.0379*</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>2.6 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.4937</td>
<td>1.5 (1.2)</td>
<td>1.4 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores on exhaustion and cynicism are higher for working women with children (3.1) than other working women (2.6). A $p$ value of .0379 for exhaustion and cynicism shows this difference is statistically significant. The mean scores of professional efficacy for working women with children (1.5) and other working women (1.4) indicate a small and statistically insignificant difference, $p$ value of .4937.
5.9 Differences Between Mother and Employee-role Identity

This section presents data pertaining to the perceived difference between the employee- and mother-role identities on a set of opposing adjectives. The Burke-Tully (1977) technique makes use of the semantic differential scale of Osgoo, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957). This scale maximally distinguishes a particular role from its prearranged counter-role by using mediated responses. Given that identities are created and performed in relation to pertinent counter-identities, they should not be evaluated in isolation from the counter-identities (Burke, 1988). The semantic differential scale also takes into account the counter-roles, as the semantic differential space is based on comparisons and differences between role identity and counter-role identities. Two different role identities and the differences between such identities on a set of opposing adjectives are examined in this section: mother-role identity and employee-role identity. Firstly, there is the role identity that is typically expected of or ascribed to a mother (RIM). Secondly, there is the role identity that is typically expected of an employee (RIE). Thirdly, working women with children will assess themselves (self-in-role) against both the mother-role and employee-role identity (RIW).

To determine whether statistically significant differences exist between mean scores of role identities for working women with children and other working women and men, a \( t \)-test was used. The \( t \)-test compares the rating of themselves by working women with children self-in-role and their rating of the employee-role identity (counter-role) on a set of opposing adjectives.
Table 67 shows the identity that working women with children (RIW) perceive themselves to fulfil in relation to the employee-role identity (RIE).

Table 67

*Matched t-test for RIE (N = 545) and RIW (N = 204)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived differences between RIE and RIW</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>RIE Mean</th>
<th>RIW Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Competitive – Generous</td>
<td>-11.5*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ambitious – Selfless</td>
<td>-12.7*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Critical – Praising</td>
<td>-7.9*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Professional – Responsible</td>
<td>-6.8*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Theoretical – Spiritual</td>
<td>-11.3*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Logical – Instinctive</td>
<td>-9.4*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Rigorous – Tolerant</td>
<td>-9.3*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Assertive – Tender</td>
<td>-11.3*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Career-driven -Family-driven</td>
<td>-13.7*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Intellectual – Emotional</td>
<td>-12.9*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Intolerant – Understanding</td>
<td>-6.8*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Intelligent – Compassionate</td>
<td>-13.2*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Directive – Accommodating</td>
<td>-11.8*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.Methodical – Intuitive</td>
<td>-9.3*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.Serious – Loving</td>
<td>-13.5*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.Impatient – Patient</td>
<td>-6.8*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0001

Table 67 shows that all the mean scores of RIW are higher than the mean scores of RIE. Furthermore, all 17 adjective pairs have p values < .0001, therefore indicating that the differences in the mean scores between RIE and RIW are statistically significant. From this result, it is clear that the perceptions of working women with children’s self-in-role (RIW) differ significantly from the perceived role identity of an employee (RIE). In other words, working women with children identify more with the mother-role identity than with the employee-role identity.

While the previous section explored the differences between the perceived self-in-role in relation to the employee-role identity, the next table explores
data pertaining to the differences between ratings of self-in-role (RIW) and mother-role identity (RIM). Table 68 shows the identity that working women with children (RIW) perceive themselves to fulfil in relation to the mother-role identity (RIM).

Table 68

T-tests for RIM and RIW (N = 204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived differences between RIM and RIW</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>RIM Mean</th>
<th>RIW Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Competitive – Generous</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ambitious – Selfless</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Critical – Praising</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Professional – Responsible</td>
<td>6.2*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Theoretical – Spiritual</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Logical – Instinctive</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Rigorous – Tolerant</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Assertive – Tender</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Career-driven – Family-driven</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Intellectual – Emotional</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Intolerant – Understanding</td>
<td>5.8*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Intelligent – Compassionate</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Directive – Accommodating</td>
<td>3.3*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.Self-Reliant – Nurturing</td>
<td>4.5*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.Methodical – Intuitive</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.Serious – Loving</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.Impatient – Patient</td>
<td>6.6*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .0001

Table 68 shows that all the mean scores of RIM are higher than the mean scores of RIW. Furthermore, all 17 adjective pairs have p values < .0001, therefore the differences in the mean scores between RIM and RIW are statistically significant. This result indicates that the rating of self-in-role of working women with children is significantly different from the role identity ascribed to mothers in general.

The final section of the data presents a holistic summary of the average mean scores between ratings of self (RIW), RIE and RIM. The summary is presented in Table 69.
Table 69

Means of RIE, RIW and RIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean RIE</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean RIW</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean RIM</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mother-role identity has the highest mean score; the perceived self-in-role for working women with children has a slightly lower mean score than the mother-role. The difference in the mean scores indicates that the perceived self-in-role of working women with children appears to be situated closer to the mother-role identity. This is consistently found for each of the 17 adjective pairs, and not only found for the averages of the means. One can assume that this is indicative of where tension and conflict accumulates between various conflicting roles; work domain (employee-role) and family domain (mother-role).

Based on the analysis reflected in Table 69, it is interesting to note that the RIM has the lowest standard deviation and is the only role identity for which the SD is lower than 1. It appears that there is the most agreement on the role identity of a mother.

5.10 Identification with the Mother-role Identity and Conflict

The next section pertains to working women with children’s identification with the mother-role identity and their experiences of conflict. This research question explores whether working women with children who identify more closely with the mother-role identity experience higher FWC than WFC. A t-test was conducted to measure whether the differences of mean scores are statistically significant. The results are presented in Table 70.
Table 70

*T-test for working women with children and conflict (N = 204)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences in Mother Role identity</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>FWC Mean</th>
<th>WFC Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Women with Children</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .0001

The data from Table 70 clearly indicates that the mean score on WFC is higher than the mean score on FWC. This difference is statistically significant (p < .0001). Therefore, working women with children who identify more closely with the mother-role identity experience statistically significantly more WFC than FWC.

5.11 Differences Between –FIW and -WIF

To understand the quality of interference (positive interference or negative interference) and direction of interference (from family-to-work or from work-to-family), a t-test was used. T-tests determine whether differences in the mean scores between the quality and direction of interference of working women with children and those of other working women and men is statistically significant. The Levene test was used to determine whether the variance differs significantly between these groups. The results of the t-test are indicated in Table 71. Table 71 indicates the differences in the mean scores for direction (from work-to-family and from family-to-work) and quality (positive or negative) of interference.
Table 71 shows the mean score on -WIF is slightly higher for working women with children (1.3) than other working women and men (1.2), with no statistically significant differences in the scores. The mean scores for +WIF and +FIW are the same for both working women with children (1.6) and other working women and men (1.6), with no statistically significant differences. However, working women with children reported a statistically significantly higher mean score (0.7, \( p < .0001 \)) for –FIW than other working women and men (0.4).

5.12 Relationship Between Social Support and Family-Work Conflict

The relationship between social support and FWC was investigated through the application of Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient among working women with children and other working women and men. The correlations between FWC and spouse/partner support are indicated in Table 72.
A correlation of $r = .05$ was found between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women and men. A weak negative correlation ($r = -.15$) was confirmed between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women with children. A $p$ value of .0285 indicates a statistically significant difference between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women with children. Due to the insubstantial correlation coefficient ($r = .05$) found between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women and men, it is of very little practical value.

5.13 Summary of Results

The findings derived from the quantitative data are summarised as follows:

1. Negative weak relationship was found between $–\text{WIF}$ and the second factor of the SWING ($+\text{WIF}/+\text{FIW}$).
2. $–\text{WIF}$ shows moderate positive relationships with $–\text{FIW}$ and FWC.
3. Inverse relationships were found between $–\text{WIF}$ and MSQ, and similarly with professional efficacy.
4. Correlation of $r = .54$ was found between $–\text{WIF}$ and EE/CYN.
5. Weak inverse relationship was found between $+\text{WIF}/+\text{FIW}$ and WFC.
6. Insubstantial negative correlation was found between $+\text{WIF}/+\text{FIW}$ and FWC, thus of little practical significance.
7. Insubstantial relationship was found between $+\text{WIF}/+\text{FIW}$ and $–\text{FIW}$.
8. $+\text{WIF}$ and $+\text{FIW}$ show a weak relationship with MSQ and a weak inverse relationship with EE/CYN.
9. A very weak positive correlation coefficient was presented between $+\text{WIF}/+\text{FIW}$ and professional efficacy.
10. Moderate positive relationships were found between $–\text{FIW}$ and WFC, and similarly with EE/CYN.
11. $–\text{FIW}$ shows moderate inverse relationships with MSQ and professional efficacy.
12. A moderate correlation coefficient was presented between WFC and FWC.
13. A strong relationship exists between WFC and EE/CYN.
14. A weak inverse relationship exists between WFC and professional efficacy, while a moderate inverse relationship exists between WFC and MSQ.

15. FWC shows moderate inverse correlation coefficients between MSQ and professional efficacy.

16. A strong relationship was found between FWC and EE/CYN.

17. MSQ shows a strong negative relationship with EE/CYN and a strong positive relationship with professional efficacy.

18. An inverse correlation coefficient was found between EE/CYN and professional efficacy.

19. Strong correlations were found between –FIW and FWC, while an even stronger correlation was found between –WIF and WFC.

20. Statistically significant difference was found for WFC scores of respondents that seldom receive support and those that never receive support with childcare.

21. The mean scores on WFC of respondents that do not receive manager support are statistically significantly higher than the mean scores of respondents that do receive managerial support.

22. Insufficient correlation coefficient was found between WFC and spouse/partner support.

23. Insufficient correlation coefficient was found between children living in the same household as respondents and WFC.

24. WFC shows a very weak relationship with children not living in the same household as respondents.

25. A weak relationship was found between working hours and WFC, with a statistically significant difference.

26. Travel time shows an insubstantial relationship with WFC.

27. A moderate, positive relationship was found between average hour utilisation of tools for work purposes and WFC, with a statistically significant difference.

28. Mean scores on WFC of respondents participating in flexible working arrangements are statistically significantly lower than for respondents that do not participate.
29. A strong relationship was found between FWC and the two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) for working women with children.

30. Moderate positive relationships exist between FWC and the two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) for other working women and men.

31. Fisher's z transformation tests show that FWC correlates statistically significantly stronger on both factors of burnout for working women with children than is the case for other women and men.

32. A strong relationship was found between EE/CYN and WFC for both working women with children and other working women and men.

33. A moderate relationship exists between WFC and professional efficacy for working women with children and a weak positive relationship was found between WFC and other working women and men.

34. Fisher's z transformation tests show that the correlation between WFC and the two factors of burnout (EE/CYN and PE) are not statistically significantly different for working women with children and other working women and men.

35. A strong inverse relationship was found between FWC and job satisfaction for working women with children and a moderate inverse relationship was found between FWC and job satisfaction for other working women and men.

36. Fisher's z transformation tests show that FWC correlates statistically significantly strongly with job satisfaction for working women with children than for other working women and men.

37. Moderate inverse relationships were found between WFC and job satisfaction for working women with children and other working women and men.

38. Fisher's z transformation tests show that the correlations between WFC and job satisfaction are not statistically significantly different for working women with children and working women and men.

39. The difference in mean scores on EE and CYN is higher for working women with children than for other working women. However, the mean scores on PE are not statistically significant for working women with children than for other working women.
40. Statistically significant differences in mean scores were found between RIE and RIW on all 17 adjective pairs.

41. Statistically significant differences in mean scores were found between RIM and RIW on all 17 adjective pairs.

42. The mean score for RIW is numerically situated between the mean score of RIE and RIM. This appears to be where tension and inter-role conflict between work and family roles originates.

43. The mean scores on WFC are statistically significantly higher than FWC for working women with children.

44. Negative WIF is statistically significantly higher for working women with children than for other working women and men.

45. The mean scores on +WIF and +FIW are the same for working women with children, and for other working women and men.

46. Working women with children report a higher mean score on –FIW than other working women and men. Differences in the mean scores are statistically significant. Negative interference represents conflict.

47. Insubstantial correlation was found between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women and men.

48. A weak inverse relationship exists between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women with children, p value indicates statistically significant differences.
Chapter 6: Discussion

This final chapter answers the research questions pertaining to this study, and discusses the major findings of the study. Subsequently, the contributions and limitations of the study are explained, followed by recommendations for future research.

6.1 The First Research Question

The first research question investigated the relationships between WFC and certain biographical-type variables and characteristics. The variables that were investigated included support received with children and household duties, marital status, gender, spouse and manager support, being the primary breadwinner, working day schedules and flexibility, travelling time and utilisation of work resources.

Biographical-type variables and characteristics that were found to be statistically significantly related to WFC are discussed first. This is followed by a discussion on the variables that failed to confirm statistically significant differences in their relationships with WFC.

Statistically significant differences were found for the entire sample between WFC scores of respondents who seldom received support with children and respondents who never received support with children. Support with children entails any assistance or support from a nanny, domestic worker, family member or au pair. Such a finding does not make conceptual sense and one would have expected a significant difference to exist between participants regularly receiving support with children and those not receiving support with children. Although this biographical variable is regarded as a finding, the researcher will not work with this finding further. Statistically significant differences were also confirmed between respondents’ WFC scores and transporting of children to and from work. WFC is related to child-rearing
activities and responsibilities (Sariati & Martin, 2003). Therefore, respondents who are the primary caregivers in their families may not perceive their family life as interfering with work because of the salience of the family role. Therefore, such respondents who occupy the primary caregiver role, experiences of WFC may be higher due to child-rearing activities.

Biographical-type variables and characteristics that failed to show statistically significant differences with WFC were support with household chores, child/children with an illness, marital status and gender for the entire sample.

The results of the question on support with household chores are the opposite of what the researcher had anticipated. One would have expected to find a statistically significant relationship between respondents who receive assistance from a nanny, domestic worker, family member or au pair with WFC. The presence of such an individual provides a major source of social support for working individuals. A study conducted by Lo, Stone and Ng (2003) found that the availability of such individuals assisting with household chores eliminated a lot of the pressures on working individuals, especially working mothers.

No statistically significant relationship was found between WFC and respondents who indicated that they had a child or children who suffered from a mental, physical, emotional or life threatening condition(s). One would expect that having to care for a chronically ill child or children at home might be a potential high-risk factor for experiences of WFC. According to a study conducted by Green (2007), the life of a mother who has a child with a disability is emotionally complex. The majority of the research based on work-family conflict and children with disabilities confirms the distress of a mother raising a child with a disability. Because the type and severity of the mental, physical, emotional or life-threatening conditions were not investigated within the scope of this study, one can assume that such children might have been placed in a special facility that medically catered for their needs. Another reason why no relationship was found between WFC and an ill child could be
because a dedicated spouse stayed at home and took care of the child, or a full-time nurse might be employed who assumed primary responsibility for the child. One could assume that if either of the above scenarios were true, then participants would experience less WFC because of the additional support received with their ill children.

No statistically significant difference was found for the entire sample between participants’ marital status and gender with WFC. One would expect that married or partnered individuals with children are likely to experience greater WFC than single individuals. There is, however, a possibility that married working women with children may take on less challenging jobs in order to successfully combine work with household responsibilities, thus experiencing less WFC. A variable that could be further investigated to mitigate levels of WFC across marital status and gender is the role of spousal support in providing an enabling environment that minimises the interference between work and family responsibilities.

With regard to the difference between men’s and women’s level of WFC experiences, no statistically significant differences were found, even though the mean score for working women’s experiences of WFC (4.3) was slightly higher than the mean score reported for men (4.2). From a societal expectations perspective, work is regarded as the traditional domain for men, as family is regarded as the traditional domain for women. Although working women’s traditional roles have changed, women still exhibit a unidirectional relationship between work and family (Posig & Kickul, 2004). The reason why no statistically significant differences were evident between men’s and women’s level of WFC is unclear. Perhaps for the current sample it could possibly be true that domestic and child-rearing responsibilities are important to both the men and the women. However, before such an argument can be acceptable, further investigation needs to be conducted into additional factors affecting family dynamics, to broaden our understanding of the work and family factors that lessen conflict for both men and women.
In terms of primary breadwinners in the household, no statistically significant difference was found between WFC, being the primary breadwinner and not being the primary breadwinner. According to the normative nature of gender roles, men are assigned the breadwinner role in the family unit, while women occupy the caregiver role. As respondents were only asked to indicate whether they were the primary or not the primary breadwinner in the family, the number of men and women who answered this research question was unknown. It might therefore be valuable to investigate the WFC of working women in the total sample that occupy the primary breadwinner role in their families. WFC is believed to be strongest when individuals do not conform to the expectations of a given role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Therefore, because women are subjected to societal expectations to occupy the caregiver role, WFC may be greater for working women than for men, owing to their limited preoccupation in the work domain.

With regard to whether differences exist between WFC and support from one’s manager, higher mean scores on WFC were confirmed for respondents who did not receive support from their managers. As expected, manager support variances were statistically significantly related to WFC for the entire sample. The findings suggest that working individuals who perceive their managers as being accommodating and supportive may experience less WFC because they have the flexibility to change their work demands to suit and satisfy their family responsibilities; for example, having the ability to leave work early to attend to family issues. One can assume that such perceived flexibility has the ability to lessen feelings of anxiety when managing work and family responsibilities, especially when family emergencies occur. Conversely, when work and family challenges arise and a manager is unable to offer some form of assistance, it may be likely that WFC may increase. Manager-support practices may play a more vital role in mitigating individuals’ WFC in their various roles. Caution needs to be taken, however, concerning the manager-support instrument that was developed for this specific study; it needs to be further utilised in other samples before firm conclusions can be drawn. Relationships that were found to be statistically significant with WFC
will be discussed next. These relationships included the following variables: spouse/partner support, children living or not living at home, work hours, utilisation of work resources and travelling time.

A weak inverse relationship was found between spouse/partner support and WFC ($r = -0.08$). Spouse/partner support refers to child-rearing support, support with household chores and financial support. Similar findings were also found in Aycan and Eskin’s (2005) study, with a correlation coefficient of ($r = -0.09$) between spouse support and WFC. Existing literature on social support and WFC confirms that higher levels of spousal support with family activities assist individuals to manage both work and family responsibilities. An apparent source of support for working women, whether married or cohabiting, is a spouse or a partner (Baxter & Alexander, 2008). Because the number of working women with children with a spouse or partner was not measured, and because the correlation is so low, it may be considered of little practical significance, even though the relationship is statistically significant. One can speculate that the insignificant relationship between spouse support and WFC is due to the buffering effect that spouse support has on the detrimental job demands from work that increase individuals’ experiences of WFC.

Upon examining the relationship between children living at home and WFC, a weak positive relationship ($r = 0.07$) was found. This finding did not yield the expected result that children living at home potentially increased WFC, and because the correlation is so low, it is considered of little practical significance, even though the relationship is statistically significant. A moderate relationship ($r = 0.28$) was found between children not living at home and WFC. A possible reason for the statistically significant differences found for children living and not living at home with WFC may be that respondents have good support structures in place that alleviate the extent of WFC.

In a study conducted by Mazerolle, Bruening, and Casa (2008), working long hours directly contributed to WFC for men and women. In this research study,
a correlation was found for the entire sample between working hours and WFC ($r = .27$). Working long hours and inflexible working schedules have frequently been cited in the literature as job-related stressors and antecedents to job dissatisfaction and burnout (Scriber & Alderman, 2005). The literature has frequently alluded to the fact that women are less likely to conform to organisational expectations than men are because they do not have as much free time as men do. This is because of the primary caregiver role that women assume. Further investigation may be required to understand the potential impact that organisations supporting a culture of long working hours may have on working women with children’s WFC.

A very weak relationship was confirmed between WFC and travel time to and from work ($r = .04$). This research question was specifically asked to discern whether travelling to and from work contributes to respondents’ experiences of WFC. For many individuals, time is viewed as a limited resource and the more time and energy individuals exert in a particular role, the less time and energy the individual has available to spend in another role, thus resulting in conflict (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Due to the low correlation, the relationship found between travel time and WFC is of little practical significance, even though it is statistically significant. A moderate positive relationship was found between average hours per week utilised on work tools such as desktop computers, laptop computers, BlackBerry devices and paperwork and WFC. Organisations place certain expectations on individuals who utilise these resources; that is, individuals may be required to work over weekends or after hours. If such individuals regard the family role as more salient than the work role, and much time is utilised on the work tools mentioned above, such individuals are likely to experience greater levels of WFC.

The last section pertaining to this research question was to determine whether respondents participating in flexible working arrangements experienced less WFC than participants not participating in flexible working arrangements. The differences in WFC scores between participation and non-participation in flexible working arrangements are statistically significant. As expected,
respondents not participating in flexible working arrangements reported a statistically significantly higher mean WFC score (4.4) than the mean score of participants who participate in flexible working arrangements (4.0). The use of technological tools, such as the laptop, provided to employees by organisations, creates the flexibility to work in any location and at any time. Airport lounges, buses, car parks, even cafés, have all become virtual workplaces (Felstead, Jewson, & Walters, 2005). Employees feel that they are expected to work over weekends to demonstrate their career commitment (Roberts, 2007). It is to be expected that participation in flexible working arrangements would potentially lessen experiences of WFC. It may also be valuable to understand the extent to which flexible working arrangements impact on working women’s WFC in senior roles. Working women in senior positions may be required to attend meetings or handle daily issues that may arise at work, regardless of the flexible working arrangement. This means that working women who have opted to take part in flexible working arrangements do not always utilise this benefit, for fear of being perceived as not being productive at work.

6.2 The Second Research Question

The second research question enquired about the relationships between FWC and WFC with burnout among working women with children, other working women and men. FWC and WFC were measured by the conflict scales of Netemeyer et al. (1996), and burnout was measured by the Burnout Inventory General Survey of Maslach et al. (1996). The relationship between FWC and burnout will be discussed first, followed by a discussion on the results of the relationship between WFC and burnout.

The results indicate that FWC for working women with children is statistically significantly stronger on both the EE/CYN dimension ($r = .64$) and the PE dimension ($r = .56$) of burnout, when compared with other working women and men. Other working women and men reported correlation coefficients of ($r = .42$) with the EE/CYN dimension and ($r = .31$) with the PE dimension of
burnout. Although the relationship between FWC and both factors of burnout is statistically significantly different for working women with children, other working women and men are also prone to the experiences of FWC and burnout, but to a lesser degree. These findings clearly indicate that the relationship between FWC with both burnout factors (EE/CYN and PE) is statistically significantly different for working women with children than for other working women and men. The findings are consistent with a growing body of research which has found that work and family conflict variables have significant relationships with several work and individual health outcomes such as burnout (Van Daalen, Willemsen, Sanders, & Van Veldhoven, 2009). Moreover, respondents who work specifically more with people, as opposed to information processing, may be more likely than other respondents to experience stress resulting from the pressures of their work and family roles (and experience high FWC). This may be especially true when most of a respondent’s work and family roles consist of high emotional management.

It is generally presumed, in job stress research, that job resources (such as autonomy and social support) may buffer the negative consequences of job demands on individuals’ burnout levels (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Furthermore, the interaction between job resources and FWC moderates the prevention of emotional exhaustion, regardless of respondents’ high levels of FWC. In essence, the presence of job resources in the form of autonomy and social support may lessen respondents’ experiences of FWC, regardless of gender.

Working women with children reported statistically significant differences from other working women and men in both EE/CYN and PE dimensions of burnout with FWC. As FWC was statistically significantly stronger on both burnout dimensions for working women with children, the following patterns may provide some insight into this finding. Demographic changes within the family structures, such as the increase in single-parent households, dual-career couples, and families with child- and elder-care responsibilities, have elevated the discourse about satisfying responsibilities at work and at home. Owing to
these demographic changes, participating in multiple incompatible roles may cause working women with children to experience greater emotional exhaustion and cynicism towards their work. Exhaustion is not simply perceived as an experience; rather, exhaustion evokes an emotional behaviour that makes an individual withdraw emotionally from work as a way to deal with and manage work overload (Maslach et al., 2001). The results therefore indicate that working women with children’s experiences of burnout on both dimensions (EE/CYN and PE) are more prevalent with FWC than with WFC.

The second part of this research question was to investigate whether a relationship exists between WFC with burnout for working women with children, other working women and men. The results indicate that WFC, for working women with children, is positively related with both the EE/CYN dimension ($r = .65$) and with the PE dimension ($r = .34$) of burnout. Other working women and men reported a strong relationship ($r = .58$) between the EE/CYN dimension, and a weak relationship ($r = .21$) between the PE dimension of burnout with WFC. The results indicate that the differences found between WFC with both burnout dimensions (EE/CYN and PE) for working women with children and those of other working women and men are not statistically significant, indicating that experiences of WFC are prevalent in both working women with children and other working women and men.

6.3 The Third Research Question

The third research question enquires into the relationships between FWC, WFC and job satisfaction for working women with children and other working women and men. FWC and WFC were measured through the scales of Netemeyer et al., (1996), and job satisfaction was measured by the MSQ instrument of Weiss et al. (1967). The relationship between FWC and job satisfaction will be discussed first, followed by a discussion on the results of the relationship between WFC and job satisfaction.
The results indicate that the relationship between working women with children's experiences of FWC and job satisfaction is statistically significantly stronger than that of other working women and men. A moderate inverse relationship was further found between FWC and job satisfaction of other working women and men, indicating that as levels of FWC accumulate, satisfaction on the job decreases. Moderate inverse relationships were also found between WFC and job satisfaction for working women with children and other working women and men, thus implying that an increase in WFC contributes to lower levels of job satisfaction. Although the correlation coefficients between WFC and job satisfaction are statistically significant, a comparison of the confidence intervals indicated no statistically significant differences between working women with children and other working women and men.

The gender-role theory may assist in providing a possible explanation for the statistically significant differences between FWC and job satisfaction for working women with children. The gender-role theory plays a significant part in understanding working women with children's experience of job dissatisfaction, and is largely due to such women's multiple-role participation. The more time and emotion that is invested in a role, the more salient the role becomes to that individual's sense of self. If the demands and pressures in the work domain drain time and energy that is required for the family role, working women with children may perceive this as a threat to their self-identity (Noor, 2004). It makes sense that the source of conflict will be regarded negatively and viewed as a threat to individual goals and ideals. This therefore suggests that work is endorsed as the source of such conflict, which may lead working women with children to develop negative perceptions towards their jobs. Because working women with children regard the family as more salient, work will be less likely to intrude and interfere with family activities.

Another possible reason why a statistically significant difference between FWC and job satisfaction is found for working women with children may be
based on the perception that when family interferes with work, the demands of the job are not being achieved. Working women with children are more willing to permit family activities to interfere with work responsibilities, thus reflecting the uneven permeability of the work and family domains (Pleck, 1977). The role of a spouse or partner may further reinforce such women’s negative appraisals towards work and job dissatisfaction. For example, if a spouse or partner perceives that the prescribed mother-role is being violated, family conflict and resentment develop, thus making the working woman with children shift the blame onto her job. Taken together, the results support the notion that when working women with children’s work conflicts with family roles; such inter-role conflict predicts the lower level of job satisfaction they may experience. The findings show that working women with children have considerably higher FWC than other working women and men, thus supporting the notion that women still assume the caregiver role in the family. The findings of this research question clearly indicate that FWC is statistically significantly related to job satisfaction, and the relationship between FWC and lower job satisfaction is statistically significantly stronger for working women with children than it is for other working women and men.

6.4 The Fourth Research Question

The fourth research question investigates whether differences exist between burnout for working women with children and other working women without children. The findings show that working women with children’s experiences of EE/CYN is higher than for other working women, while mean scores for PE failed to show statistically significant differences between these two groups.

There may be various possible reasons for the statistically significantly higher levels of EE/CYN in working women with children’s experiences, compared with those of working women without children. Because individuals are exposed to stressful situations that extend beyond the work environment, it can be assumed that conflict persists due to the multiple participation in various roles. A primary distinguishing factor between working women with
children and other working women is the presence and management of children. This is not to say that the presence of children is the only differential factor between the two groups, but children are regarded as a potential strain in attempting to manage both work and family responsibilities.

The job demands-resources model developed by Bakker et al. (2003) may be used as a framework for understanding how working women with children experience role pressures. If the theoretical framework of the job demands-resources model is applied to working women with children, one can speculate that higher burnout could be experienced because of the simultaneous management of work and domestic obligations. Working women with children’s experiences of stress may be due to a lack of available resources, with childcare support in particular. Another explanation that could cause working women with children to experience higher EE/CYN than other working women may be the demands of the job. That is, when the demands of the job require more effort and time, working women with children may not have these at their disposal to fulfil such requirements. Therefore, the negative load effects that build up during the workday eventually spill over into the family domain, and ultimately lead to emotional exhaustion and perceived cynicism towards work. Working women with children may feel that work is taking up much of their time and energy that they would have preferred to spend with their family and children.

The findings of this question confirm that a statistically significant difference exists between working women with children and other working women on the EE/CYN dimension of burnout. However, no statistically significant differences were found for PE between working women with children and other working women. One can assume that the management of multiple roles in the face of competing demands from work and family carries inherent challenges for working women. To a certain degree, gender role behaviours play an important role in working women with children’s status and progression at work. For instance, when such women return home after a day at the office they frequently find domestic demands waiting for them,
accompanied by work demands that have accrued at work. Therefore, working women with children’s levels of emotional exhaustion and cynicism at this stage are at their peak. The significant differences between working women with children and other working women’s burnout levels may be a function of the conflicting social roles and expectations that accompany work and family life.

6.5 The Fifth Research Question

The fifth research question investigates the differences between the role identities of working women with children and other working women and men. The different role identities identified in this study are employee-role identity, self-in-role, and mother-role identity. The first part of this research question compares the rating of themselves or self-in-role (RIW) of working women with children and ratings on the employee-role identity or counter-roles (RIE). The second part compares working women with children’s ratings of themselves (RIW) and ratings on the mother-role identity (RIM) on a set of opposing adjectives.

The results indicate that the role identity (RIW) differs significantly from the perceived role identity of employee (RIE) in the case of working women with children. That is, the differences in the mean scores between RIE and RIW are statistically significant for working women with children. The second part of this research question found that working women with children identify more closely with the mother-role identity (RIM) than with their self-in-role identity (RIW). The mother-role identity has the highest mean score; the perceived self-in-role for working women with children has a slightly lower mean score than the mother-role. The difference in the mean scores indicates that the perceived self-in-role of working women with children appears to be situated closer to the mother-role identity. This is indicative of the tension and conflict that working women with children experience, which may potentially reside in the fact that they see themselves as caught between two prominent
role identities. Conflict arises for working women with children as they simultaneously try to be good employees and good mothers.

The above findings imply that working women with children’s family role (the role of being a mother) is more salient than that of other working women and men. A reason may be that working women with children not only regard family as important, but also experience greater conflict between work and family roles. Another interesting concept that has relevance to this study is Mead’s (1934) inference that social identities influence relationships with other individuals. Therefore, because the mother-role identity is regarded as salient by working women with children, there is a high possibility that working women with children enact such maternal behaviours in the workplace. On the basis of this formulation, one can assume that when confronted by role conflicts, working women with children may find it difficult to act out their maternal role identities, which end up contained by what work requires from them.

According to Callero (1985), the most noticeable effect of role-identity salience is the relationship to an individual’s behaviour. In the light of this, one can assume that as working women with children assume the mother-role identity, they may enact and internalise the behavioural expectations associated with the salience of that particular role identity. In this way, the mother-role identity is realised. Working women with children’s dedication and commitment to their family role renders higher role salience than any other role identity, especially during their child-rearing years. One can assume that as working women with children’s commitment to, and salience of, their families intensify, so does the probability that conflict will arise. This is especially true because working women with children manage their work and family role behaviours simultaneously. The conclusions from this research question suggest that working women with children struggle to develop a career identity (employee-role identity) while satisfying social and individual expectations regarding their identity as mothers. Therefore, the more committed working women with children are towards the mother-role identity that defines their sense of self,
the greater the likelihood that the mother-role identity will conflict with the employee-role identity.

6.6 The Sixth Research Question

The sixth research question investigated whether those working women with children who identify more closely with the mother-role identity experience higher FWC or higher WFC. This study found that the experience of WFC was stronger than the experience of FWC for working women with children who identified more with the mother-role identity. Previous research studies have also indicated that due to the permeability of family domains, greater conflict spills over from work to family. Therefore, WFC is more often experienced than FWC (Garies, Barnett, Ertel, & Berkman, 2009; Anderson, Mikulic, Vermeylen, Yrjanainen, & Zigante, 2009). The findings show that working women with children who identify more with the mother-role identity not only regard their family role as highly salient but also limit the amount of conflict that interferes with the family domain.

Critical to such a finding is the assumption that the mother-role identity forms a greater part of the self of working women with children than the other role identities in this study. That is, the mother-role identity is regarded as the overriding part of the self, taking precedence over other role identities and affecting general self-perceptions and behaviours such as protecting the family domain from the influences of work. The associated meaning of being a mother corresponds with the meaning associated with the general self of working women with children. The other role identities, although represented to varying degrees in the self-definition of working women with children, are less important to their overall self-definition. It is thus apparent that the mother-role identity is regarded as more salient for working women with children, and family activities and issues are put before work.

Role identities differ from traditional conceptualisations of roles in that they are not limited to societal expectations. That is, working women with children
continue to manage both work and family role demands, but dedicate a disproportionate amount of time to their families at the expense of their work. Working women who regard the family role as salient will tend to avoid any work activity that may potentially interfere with family life. Such working women may even, according to Mackey and Coney (2000), search for jobs that will cause minimal interference with their families, and are non-threatening to their roles as mothers. If work demands and pressures interfere with family activities, these women are more inclined to experience negative perceptions towards their jobs. Such a proposition can be further reinforced by the structural factors that contribute to such women’s commitment to and identification with the mother-role identity.

A major concern for working women with children that would require further investigation is dealing with the conflict that arises from the multiple-role participation, rather than from conflicting expectations within a specified role.

6.7 The Seventh Research Question

The seventh research question aims to establish whether working women with children experience more –FIW or –WIF than other working women and men. Interference (negative or positive) and direction (from work-to-family or from family-to-work) was measured utilising the SWING instrument of Geurts et al. (2005).

This research question found that working women with children reported a statistically significantly higher mean score on –FIW (0.7) than the mean score of other working women and men (0.4). This was contrary to the researcher’s assumptions; one would have expected working women with children to experience higher –WIF than higher –FIW. A possible reason for this may be that working women with children regard family as significantly salient over work, and therefore they prefer to spend their time and energy in family-related activities. Demerouti and Geurts (2004) explain WIF as a process in which an individual’s functioning in a specific domain, such as home, is
influenced, either negatively or positively, by the demands of another domain, such as work. One can therefore expect the reverse to be true for FIW, which is a process in which an individual’s functioning in the work domain is influenced negatively or positively by the demands of the family domain.

A further investigation regarding demographic and family characteristics would also be helpful in clarifying the reasons why statistically significant differences exist for working women with children and –FIW. The presence of young children at home may have some bearing on why working women with children experience greater –FIW than –WIF. Research indicates that –FIW has the potential to increase with the presence of young children in the household (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Behson, 2002). It seems plausible to expect that if there are young children still at home, the demands of the family may interfere more with work in a negative way. Other family characteristics that are domain predictors of FIW are childcare support (Fox & Dwyer, 1999), spouse or partner relationships (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), high family involvement and greater time demands from family (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001), employment status (Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000) and lack of a family support structure.

6.8 The Eight Research Question

The eight research question enquires whether a relationship exists between social support (from spouse/partner) and FWC among working women with children as opposed to other working women and men. A weak inverse relationship ($r = -.15$) was found between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women with children. However, the correlation is so low that it is of little practical significance, even though this relationship is statistically significant. The relationship found between spouse/partner support and FWC for other working women and men is also considered low ($r = .05$) and therefore of little practical significance.
It is evident that working women with children require a spouse or partner to provide and create an enabling environment at home in order to minimise the constant interference of work and family demands. It is, however, clear that the findings from this research question imply that support from a spouse or partner reduces the severity of family role demands and in turn minimises FWC. Perhaps another reason for the statistically significant difference between FWC and spouse/partner support for working women with children may be the additional support received with household and child-rearing activities, which may alleviate working women with children’s experiences of conflict. Such support allows working women with children to combine the responsibilities of family and work more effectively.

6.9 Contributions of the Present Study

The current research makes several significant contributions to the body of knowledge in the field of organisational behaviour and especially the study of work and family conflict, job satisfaction, burnout and role identity among working women with children. The concept of role identity is introduced as a significant variable to consider in the investigation of work and family conflict, as well as burnout and job satisfaction, for working women with children. By incorporating the role-identity variable as a construct, this study was able to link the mother-role identity, or self-in-role, with the development of WFC for women with children working in a brewing, sales and distribution industry. A further contribution of the present research study was to bring new insight and understanding into the significant role that identity plays in work and family, and the salience of specific roles that working women with children assume. The study has further shown that working women with children who identify more closely with the mother-role identity experience greater conflict than do other working women. Therefore, one can infer that role identity is a contributing factor when conflict is experienced, especially for working women with children.
This study also assists in understanding the work and family role integration of working women with children versus other working women and men. The study provides a wide range and consolidated overview of the current work and family theories within a conceptual and unifying framework. The conceptual framework shows how WFC contributes to undesirable work outcomes such as burnout and decreased job satisfaction. Therefore, this research is not only descriptive in nature, but offers a conceptual framework that outlines the relationship between WFC and role identity and burnout and job satisfaction, by investigating the mechanisms by virtue of which such relationships exist. Such a framework includes not only the variables frequently evaluated in the work and family literature, but also the less explored and under-researched constructs such as FWC. The construct of FWC has for some time been absent and neglected within organisational research. The research study also assisted in broadening the FWC literature and definitions.

This study found that conflict (both WFC or FWC) and direction of interference (–WIF or –FIW) appear to be very similar constructs. Equally, the strong correlations between –FIW and FWC are also indicative of potential construct redundancy. Several researchers refer to conflict and interference as distinct constructs, used to depict essentially the same concept. This makes it exceptionally difficult to build research streams in the work and family literature for each construct. By contrast, other researchers regard the constructs conflict and interference as overlapping in nature and use these constructs interchangeably to essentially represent the same concept. Therefore, if the conflict and interference constructs are not empirically or conceptually documented, redundancy issues seriously hinder our understanding of phenomena, and our ability to offer guidelines for further work and family research. Therefore, a major contribution to the field of work and family research is that negative interference can no longer be assumed to be a separate component of conflict, regardless of direction (from family-to-work or from work-to-family). Furthermore, it appears that the difference
between conflict and interference is that conflict may be regarded as a symptom of negative interference.

The results and recommendations of the study can be used by organisations to enable a supportive organisational culture. Specific recommendations can be made to organisations that employ women, especially if the women have children. Organisations should consider the effects of women’s challenging work environment on their work-life interaction. Organisations are required to counsel individuals regarding their well-being and assist them to manage their work and life-role integration. They have the capacity to offer preventative programmes and strategies at the organisational level. For instance, flexible working arrangements could be investigated further, to ensure that such arrangements provide working women with children the flexibility and time to fully satisfy their family responsibilities. Family-friendly programmes and strategies, accompanied by adequate resources, would help working women with children to deal efficiently with the high demands of their jobs, yet limit the risk of conflict developing between work and home.

The results also assist our understanding and demonstrate the importance of utilising flexible work arrangements as an aid to reducing WFC. A flexible working environment will foster individuals’ positive perceptions in managing their work and family integration. Organisations that want to minimise WFC need to create working environments that allow employees to exercise freedom and independence in carrying out their work. Managers need to be encouraging and supportive of employees’ work and family issues. If organisations can entrench this behaviour change, they are most likely to witness increased levels of employee satisfaction at work and a decrease in employee stress, burnout and WFC. The implementation of work-family policies and programmes alone will fail to yield the valuable effects for both organisations and their employees. In saying this, Thompson et al. (1999, p. 393) posit that, “despite formal policies and programs designed to help individuals balance work and family, it appears that unsupportive cultures and managers who enforce the norms associated with such cultures may
undermine the potential effectiveness of these programs”. Therefore, organisations can proactively encourage and construct family-friendly workplace cultures and managerial styles that are supportive of employees’ work and family integration. In hindsight, for family-friendly policies and programmes to be successful, they need to go hand in hand with the respective organisational processes.

From a practical point of view, this study shows specifically that FWC was regarded as a potential stressor, with undesirable effects on working women with children’s well-being, particularly relating to burnout, and their experiences of job satisfaction. Enriching interventions are therefore required to improve the family life of working women with children, and to avert any interference from family to work accompanied by its undesirable outcomes. For example, structural changes, such as flexible working arrangements and childcare support, will alleviate the conflict of working women with children so that their emotional well-being is further improved by their work. Therefore, by improving the quality of family life of working women with children, it would be possible to influence their work-life quality. The study further proposes that if supportive family interventions, such as family-friendly policies and measures of equality at work, are adopted, FWC with its undesirable consequences on the family may be minimised and or averted.

As identities form part of a hierarchal structure of significance, the findings of this study show that for working women with children, the mother-role identity takes priority over other role identities examined in this study. One caution, however, needs to be considered, in that it is not known whether the invocation of the mother-role identity applicable to a specific situation may be solely situational. In other words, working women with children might assume the mother-role identity only in the family domain and perhaps not in their work role. Therefore the hierarchy of salience for working women with children becomes important in the prediction and understanding of their experiences of WFC both as work and at home. The finding that working women with children experience greater WFC, utilising the role-identity theory,
is beneficial to organisations and practitioners alike. Examples that organisations and practitioners alike could use to lessen working mothers’ experience of WFC in the workplace include introducing part-time work, flexi-time and flexi-place, and family and sick leave to take care of family responsibilities.

Traditionally, high identity salience has been viewed negatively as it has been thought to lead to more FIW (Frone et al., 1992). Of the two forms of interference, FIW is more related to the specific roles that working women with children regard as salient, in this case the mother-role identity. According to Frone et al. (1992, p. 74) “the threat of not being the caretakers of the family” is more important for working women with children than “a threat to constructing or maintaining a desired job-related self-image”.

This study offers organisational behaviour practitioners direction on ways to reduce and deal with burnout, job satisfaction and role conflict in organisations. For instance, organisations should build a culture that recognises the significance of the family-identity salience of working women with children and encourages work and family balance. The way in which working women with children perceive themselves at work holds certain implications for the development of their conflict, burnout and job satisfaction levels. Organisations seeking ways to reduce the undesirable effects of conflict at work need to understand how working women with children perceive themselves in relation to the mother-role identity. By becoming conscious of various work-related variables that alter the role-identity perceptions of working women with children, and how these may influence their experiences of WFC, managers can play a critical part in developing programmes to alleviate WFC. Through the implementation of such programmes, working women with children may perceive the organisation as supportive of their family and work situations, which will assist them in achieving a balance between their work and family lives.
Lastly, limited research has been conducted to understand the specific manner in which South African employees experience the interface between their work and family lives (McLellan & Uys, 2009; Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010b) and the impact of multiple-role participation among working women with children.

6.10 Limitations of the Present Study

The research study has several limitations that should be considered when relaying and generalising the results. The Nijmegen (SWING) questionnaire developed by Geurts et al. (2005) was used to measure interference of conflict. The SWING questionnaire is the only valid and reliable instrument used in the South African context. However, although the SWING questionnaire has been well researched and regarded as psychometrically valid (Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010b; Marais, Mostert, Geurts, & Taris, 2009; Mostert & Oldfield, 2009; Pieterse & Mostert, 2005; Rost & Mostert, 2007), it is not without limitations. The SWING questionnaire measures only interference between work and family and thus excludes interference from any other dimension of an individual’s personal life, such as hobbies or roles within the community. A recommendation for future research would be to use an instrument that encompasses multiple roles over and above the work and family roles.

The MBI-GS developed by Weiss et al. (1967) was used to measure burnout. Although the MBI-GS seems psychometrically sound, equivalent and reliable instruments within a South African context seem to be limited (Marais et al., 2009). The participants in the study came from diverse backgrounds and language groups; all of them completed the original English version of the MBI-GS instrument. Various South African research studies conducted in the past have generally reported that issues of race, education and language are the key areas that influence the construct and item comparability of psychometric tests (Meiring, Van de Vijver, Rothmann, & Barrick, 2005). In future research it would be beneficial to obtain the various instruments utilised
Careful consideration was given to ensuring that the sample group was homogeneous in nature; that is, to ensure that there was a sufficient representation of working women with children, working women without children and a similar number of working men. However, the first research question that investigated biographical-type variables made no distinction between the actual number of working women with children, other working women and men. The biographical-type variable questions were tested on the entire sample ($N = 545$). It was therefore difficult to understand which specific biographic variables had an influence on working women with children’s experiences of WFC.

The current study compartmentalised working women with children and other working women and men into separate groups. The research study did not specifically measure the effects of the various facets of job satisfaction on working women with children’s experiences of WFC. Therefore, further research is required to fully understand the influences of specific facets of the job that lead to job dissatisfaction in working women with children versus other working women and men.

Another limitation of the study is that a single organisation within the brewing, sales and distribution industry was sampled. Such a limitation might imply that the findings and relationships found in the study are specific to this sample. Recommendations for future research would include expanding the current study to incorporate other similar organisations, to ensure a more comprehensive perspective.

Another aspect of this study that is viewed as a limitation is the inability to establish causality between the independent variable (work-family conflict) and dependent variables (family-work conflict, job satisfaction, and burnout and role identity). Although statistically significant relationships were
confirmed in the study, causality could not be established. It would be of particular interest to investigate whether WFC or FWC causes lower job satisfaction and burnout for working women with children. Although it would appear conceptually to be the case, one could also argue that it was perhaps the other way round. In addition, confirmation that the mother-role identity actually causes experiences of WFC for working women with children would be of significant value in understanding the direction of conflict for women who identify more closely with the mother-role identity.

6.11 Recommendations for Future Research

For organisations, practitioners, and individuals wanting to conduct further research on the work and family interface, several investigations in similar industries should also be carried out. Additional research into WFC and the psychological well-being of individuals from other organisations, especially an examination of various demographic and family characteristics, could serve to improve and add greater depth to the work and non-work roles of working women with children.

Although the study found the MBI-GS instrument to be reliable and confirming a two-factor structure, further research is required to verify the reliability and validity of the MBI-GS in other South African samples. Recent research into the burnout phenomenon has introduced a newly developed scale (‘alternative exhaustion scale’) that facilitates greater focus on the burnout instrument (Marias et al., 2009). A future recommendation would be to utilise the alternative exhaustion scale of Van Horn, Taris, Schaufeli, and Schreur (2004) to evaluate whether cognitive weariness levels of burnout for working women with children have an impact on levels of WFC. Despite being a successful instrument from a clinical perspective, the MBI-GS is restricted in capacity and needs to be supplemented by a scale that is proficient in evaluating cognitive weariness.
Greater depth could be provided for the work and family literature if an explicit life-course perspective were adopted when examining the WFC of working women with children. A life-course perspective would assist researchers, organisations and individuals to understand periods in life when higher levels of conflict are experienced. Causes might be the presence of young children at home or lack of social support from a spouse or manager. For families with older children, the discordance between work and school schedules makes life exceptionally labour intensive and emotionally exhausting. The future holds a continued growing diversity of families and employment, and a major concern for organisations of the future is the stagnation and even decrease in maternal employment due to high levels of WFC during critical periods in the mothers' lives. The future of work and family research needs to take into account the issues prevalent in the work and family interface during different life cycles, especially for working women with children.

The work and family interface is to a large degree predicated by the larger macro environment, particularly the global, social, economic and political context. South Africa is by no means immune to the effects of such influences. Comparative studies with other countries would be beneficial to investigate their cultural norms and values, legislative and public policy requirements and gender ideology with regard to work and family. Such comparative studies would assist our evaluation of the various effects of culture on WFC for working women with children.

A further recommendation for the field of work and family research is additional research on coping and support mechanisms for working women with children. Few studies have investigated the effects of family-friendly organisational supportive measures. In addition, as work and family support mechanisms take place on different levels, in other words at an individual, group, or organisational level, future research might investigate the types of support on the various levels of analysis.
From a construct redundancy perspective, two recommendations for future research are posited to avoid redundancy issues between constructs WFC, WIF and FWC and FIW. The first recommendation is that researchers be required to investigate other constructs that may be of a similar conceptual nature to the focal construct in their research. The second recommendation, and possibly a slightly more critical one, is that issues of redundancy must be examined and reviewed on an ongoing basis, especially in work and family scale development work.

It would also be interesting in future studies to construct a structural equations model of relationships between work-family/family work conflict, role identity and burnout based on the researcher’s conceptual framework and the results from this study. The measures of model fit (e.g. Chi-square test statistics, AIC, CFI, RMSEA, GFI) will be useful in future studies to evaluate how consistent the data represents the proposed framework and its primary latent factors, while the modification indices (e.g. the Lagrange multiplier test indices and Wald statistics) can be utilised to gain a better understanding into the system of relationships between the items in each factor (Hu & Bentler, 1995; Kline, 2005).

Future research into the work and family interface requires more research to be conducted on family-domain variables, as the majority of research available investigates work-domain variables. A holistic perspective of working women with children’s non-work lives is lacking; this area has not been sufficiently examined and researched. The non-work domain variables of working women with children such as leisure time, volunteer and community work and even spiritual activities, omitted from this study, need to be explored further. This might be especially valuable because multiple-role participation can act as a buffer for stress and improve working women with children’s quality of life. Another aspect omitted from this study was other sources of social support for working mothers (such as that of the extended family).
An interesting construct that was not measured in the current study is that of enrichment: the theory that participation in work and family roles produces beneficial resources within these roles (McNally et al., 2010). A future recommendation is that researchers and practitioners alike should continue investigating the relationship between work-family enrichment and WFC. For example, enrichment (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1994) is said to act as a buffer that may potentially protect working women with children from the adverse effects of various stressors that cause WFC. Yet working women with children’s participation in multiple roles can have both negative and positive effects. That is, multiple-role participation requires the application of greater resources to various other roles (which promotes enrichment), but also time limitations and stressors (which create conflict). Therefore, future research should investigate the conditions under which multiple-role participation encourages either enrichment or conflict for working women with children.

Extensive literature is available on the antecedents of WFC and FWC; however, most of the research studies on the work and family interface have relied heavily on cross-sectional designs, thus eliminating assertions on causality. While this is an issue that cannot be entirely alleviated, the research design utilised in this study is consistent with previous research studies in the work and family field. Although the researcher hypothesised that conflict precedes burnout, job satisfaction and role identity, the reverse might also hold true. Whether conflict leading to burnout, lowered job satisfaction and role-identity dilemmas is indeed the directional nature of causality is a question that researchers need to investigate by conducting studies that are longitudinal in design.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire and e-mail invitation

STUDY OF FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT

A research project undertaken from the University of Pretoria

Responsible Researchers

Vanessa De Sousa  Prof Jeremias de Klerk  Prof Pieter Schaap
PhD Candidate  Promoter  Co-promoter
Faculty of Economic &  Faculty of Economic &  Faculty of Economic &
Management Sciences  Management Sciences  Management Sciences
University of Pretoria  University of Pretoria  University of Pretoria

Dear Respondent

Your participation in this questionnaire is highly valued. This research forms part of a doctoral study in Organisational Behaviour at the University of Pretoria. The purpose of the study is to identify and examine issues related with work-family conflict from various perspectives. Your answers will be treated in strict confidence and your responses will be utilised for research purposes only.

You may, however, choose not to participate and you may stop participating at any time without any negative consequences. This questionnaire will be accessed from an electronic web based application. It is essential that you complete the questionnaire personally and honestly by clicking on the link below. Once you have clicked on the link below, you indicate your consent to participate in this study. Completion of the questionnaire should not take more than twelve minutes to complete. If you are interested in receiving
feedback with regard to the information provided, please respond to this e-
mail with the subject heading “feedback requested”. The results of the study
will be sent to you. Please note that once you request feedback anonymity will
not be assured, however confidentially is still be guaranteed. Please take
note of the different instructions that precede different sets of questions. All
the questions that you will find in the questionnaire are from well-researched
and established instruments. You will therefore find that the evaluation scale
on some of the instruments will differ. Please read and follow the instructions
as carefully as possible. Please answer all the questions.

Thank you for your cooperation.
FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

Invitation:
You are invited to participate in a research study. Your responses will be handled CONFIDENTIALLY and all your responses will be used for academic purposes only. The questions you are required to answer are anticipated to cover your views towards work and life from various perspectives. Please remember, you are participating in a scientific study therefore HONEST answers are the MOST IMPORTANT contributions you can make to its success.

PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT YOU READ THE INSTRUCTIONS AT THE TOP OF EACH PAGE. This survey is done voluntarily and by clicking on the start completing survey button below you have indicated your willingness to participate in this study. The survey is ANONYMOUS and CONFIDENTIAL is guaranteed.

Start Completing Survey

Family-Work Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Burnout Questionnaire

Please complete the biographical information for the analysis of the survey results:

Username: [Blank]
Gender: □ Female □ Male
Indicate your SA1 Grade: □ Select Response □
Region: □ Select Response □
Department: □ Select Response □
Ethnic Grouping: □ Select Response □
Highest Qualification Attained: □ Select Response □

Submit
FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

Online Survey System

Family Work Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Burnout: Questionnaire

Please complete each Category from the top by selecting a Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Organisational Details</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and Private Life</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Experience</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Identity</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS SECTION IS FOR WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN ONLY</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing all Categories of the Survey, please click here to end the survey.

---

Fill in Survey

Online Survey System

The following questions request personal and organisational information. Responses will be used purely for statistical purposes. This section will require you to either click or type in an answer that most closely represents your personal or work situation.

**STATEMENT A**

What is your marital status at this point in time?

[ ] Single
[ ] Married
[ ] Divorced
[ ] Widowed
[ ] Other

---

Are you the primary breadwinner in your household? (Majority of the income in your household)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

---

Please indicate the number of dependents you have that are LIVING WITH YOU! (You may have more than one answer)

[ ] None
[ ] One child
[ ] Two children
[ ] Three children
[ ] Four or more children
[ ] Elderly persons
[ ] Spouse Partner

---

Please indicate the number of dependents you have that are NOT LIVING WITH YOU! (You may have more than one answer)

[ ] None
[ ] One child
[ ] Two children
[ ] Three children
[ ] Four or more children
[ ] Elderly persons
[ ] Spouse Partner

---

How many years have you been working for the South African Breweries? (Round up to the nearest year)

[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7
[ ] 8
[ ] 9
[ ] 10
[ ] 11
[ ] 12
[ ] 13
[ ] 14
[ ] 15
[ ] 16
[ ] 17
[ ] 18
[ ] 19
[ ] 20
[ ] 21
[ ] 22
[ ] 23
[ ] 24
[ ] 25
[ ] 26
[ ] 27
[ ] 28
[ ] 29
[ ] 30
[ ] 31
[ ] 32
[ ] 33
[ ] 34
[ ] 35
[ ] 36
[ ] 37
[ ] 38
[ ] 39
[ ] 40
[ ] 41
[ ] 42
[ ] 43
[ ] 44
[ ] 45
[ ] 46
[ ] 47
[ ] 48
[ ] 49
[ ] 50
[ ] 51
[ ] 52
[ ] 53
[ ] 54
[ ] 55
[ ] 56
[ ] 57
[ ] 58
[ ] 59
[ ] 60
[ ] 61
[ ] 62
[ ] 63
[ ] 64
[ ] 65
[ ] 66
[ ] 67
[ ] 68
[ ] 69
[ ] 70
[ ] 71
[ ] 72
[ ] 73
[ ] 74
[ ] 75
[ ] 76
[ ] 77
[ ] 78
[ ] 79
[ ] 80
[ ] 81
[ ] 82
[ ] 83
[ ] 84
[ ] 85
[ ] 86
[ ] 87
[ ] 88
[ ] 89
[ ] 90
[ ] 91
[ ] 92
[ ] 93
[ ] 94
[ ] 95
[ ] 96
[ ] 97
[ ] 98
[ ] 99
[ ] 100

---

End Survey
FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you been working in your current position?</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours do you officially need to work PER DAY as per your contract of employment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many total hours do you work on average PER DAY both at the office and at home?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, how many official leave days do you take PER YEAR?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you work over weekends and holidays?</td>
<td>Regularly, Some, Never, Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total, type in the amount of minutes that it takes you to travel to work and back home on average PER DAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer ALL THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. This section involves questions concerning children. If you do not have any children, please select "NOT APPLICABLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate which institutions do you have a child/children that are living with you? (It is possible to select more than one answer).</td>
<td>☐ Nursery School/Preschool ☐ Primary School ☐ High School ☐ University/Technikon ☐ Children that are currently attending any of these institutions ☐ Children that are not currently attending any of these institutions ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate which institutions do you have a child/children that are NOT living with you? (It is possible to select more than one answer).</td>
<td>☐ Nursery School/Preschool ☐ Primary School ☐ High School ☐ University/Technikon ☐ Children that are currently attending any of these institutions ☐ Children that are not currently attending any of these institutions ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a name/domicile worker/family member/skipped that takes care of your children?</td>
<td>☐ Regularly ☐ Occasionally ☐ Never ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a name/domicile worker/family member/skipped that assists you with household chores (such as cooking and cleaning)?</td>
<td>☐ Regularly ☐ Occasionally ☐ Never ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many days per week does your name/domicile worker/family member/skipped work?</td>
<td>☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On average, how many annual leave days have you taken to take care of a sick child or children in the past year?</td>
<td>☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10+ ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, how many family, child care or special leave days have you taken in the past year?</td>
<td>☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10+ ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, how many minutes per day do you spend shopping and collecting children from school and extra mural activities?</td>
<td>☐ 10-20 ☐ 20-40 ☐ 40-60 ☐ 60-80 ☐ 80-100 ☐ 100-120 ☐ 120-140 ☐ 140-160 ☐ 160-180 ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that your child/children keep you too busy to participate in recreational activities?</td>
<td>☐ Regularly ☐ Occasionally ☐ Never ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you need to travel as part of your job which may require you to be away from home?</td>
<td>☐ Regularly ☐ Occasionally ☐ Never ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a child/children that suffer from a mental, physical, emotional or life threatening condition?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete each category from the top by selecting a category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Category Title</th>
<th>Sub Category Title</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select Personal &amp; Organizational Details</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Children</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Partner/Spouse Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Manager Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Job and Private Life</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Work and Family Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Present, Past</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Job Experiences</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Risk Identity</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select THIS SECTION IS FOR WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN ONLY Questions**

Not started

After completing all Categories of the Survey, please end the Survey form:

[End Survey]

---

Please answer ALL THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. This section involves questions concerning spouse/partner support. If you do not have a spouse/partner please select NOT APPLICABLE.

### STATEMENT A: RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the status of your partner/spouse in terms of employment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ![Not Applicable](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Employed Full-time](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Employed Part-time](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Not Employed](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Not Applicable](https://via.placeholder.com/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your partner/spouse help you with the daily household chores (e.g., cooking/cleaning)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ![Not Applicable](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Never](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Sometimes](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Always](https://via.placeholder.com/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your partner/spouse assist with taking care of the child/children?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ![Not Applicable](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Never](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Sometimes](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Always](https://via.placeholder.com/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your partner/spouse assist you in dropping off and picking up the child/children from school and/or extra curricular activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- ![Not Applicable](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Never](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Sometimes](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
- ![Always](https://via.placeholder.com/15)
### FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

#### Online Survey System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your partner/spouse assist you financially in covering the cost of running your household?</td>
<td>Not applicable, Never, Sometimes, Often, Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your partner/spouse assist you financially in covering the cost of your child(ren)?</td>
<td>Not applicable, Never, Sometimes, Often, Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Survey Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Sub Category Title</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Organizational Details</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner/Spouse Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and Personal Life</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preteen Job</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Experiences</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Identity</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS SECTION IS FOR WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN ONLY</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After completing all categories of the survey, please end the survey here.*
This section involves questions concerning the amount of support you receive from your manager:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT A</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager holds high regard in the organization?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I take time off work to take care of my child/children, my manager knows that I make up lost time after hours?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager values my contributions at work?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager allows me the authority to try new things at work?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager understands when I need to take leave to deal with family issues?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing all categories of the survey, please end the survey here:
The following questions concern the influence your job has on your private life as well as the influence your private life has on your job. Please select the response which most closely reflects your opinion. HOW OFTEN DOES IT HAPPEN THAT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT A</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>STATEMENT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are irritable at home because your work is demanding</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You find it difficult to fulfill your domestic obligations because you are constantly thinking about your work</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You manage your time at home more efficiently as a result of the way you do your job</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to cancel appointments with your spouse/family/friends due to work-related commitments</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are better able to interact with your spouse/family/friends as a result of the things you have learned at work</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are better able to keep appointments at home because your job requires this as well</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your work schedule makes it difficult for you to fulfill your domestic obligations</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not have the energy to engage in leisure activities with your spouse/family/friends because of your job</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to work so hard that you do not have time for any of your hobbies</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You fulfill your domestic obligations better because of the things you have learned on the job</td>
<td>Never: Sometimes:</td>
<td>Always: 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN

### Online Survey System

**Family Work Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Burnout Questionnaire**

Please complete each category from the top by selecting a category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Category Title</th>
<th>Sub Category Title</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Organizational Details</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner/Spouse Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and Private Life</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Security</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Identity</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIS SECTION IS FOR WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN ONLY</strong></td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing all categories of the survey, please end the survey here:

**End Survey**

---

**Family Work Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Burnout Questionnaire**

Please indicate your opinion on the following statements about your WORK and FAMILY, please click the response which most closely reflects the degree of your AGREEMENT or DISAGREEMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job places on me</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**survey Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Work and Family Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Family Work Conflict, Job Satisfaction and Burnout Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Report**

---

**Help**

---
The purpose of this section is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are SATISFIED with and what things you are DISSATISFIED with. Describe how SATISFIED you feel about the aspect of your job described by each statement by clicking on a response. IN MY PRESENT JOB, THIS IS HOW I FEEL ABOUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT A</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied  Dissatisfied  Neutral  Satisfied  Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount I do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family-work conflict, job satisfaction and burnout of working women with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Job Experience Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever FEEL THIS WAY about your job. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by clicking the response that best describes how FREQUENTLY you feel that way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>· Never · A few times a year or less · Once a month · A few times a month · Once a week · A few times a week · Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel used up at the end of a workday</td>
<td>· Never · A few times a year or less · Once a month · A few times a month · Once a week · A few times a week · Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>· Never · A few times a year or less · Once a month · A few times a month · Once a week · A few times a week · Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>· Never · A few times a year or less · Once a month · A few times a month · Once a week · A few times a week · Everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Online Survey System

**FAMILY-WORK CONFLICT, JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT OF WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency Options</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can effectively solve problems that arise in my work</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become less interested in my work since I started this job</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become less enthusiastic about my work</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, I am good at my job</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just want to do my job and not be bothered</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything</td>
<td>Never, A few times a year, Once a month, A few times a month, Once a week, A few times a week, Everyday</td>
<td>N14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Complete Survey**

**Category:** Role Identity

**Role Identity Questions**

Below are scales composed of pairs of adjectives separated by a series of numbers from 1-7. Each pair has been chosen to represent two kinds of contrasting states in relation to each other. Each one of us belong somewhere between these two extremes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Title</th>
<th>Group Task</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>Statement 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive</strong></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>In general, all employees are expected to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What’s Next**

**Survey Administration**

- Reports
- Help

**Help**
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**Role (MOTHER):**

In this section, you are now required to select the number that comes closest to your first impression feeling as to where you believe MOTHERS generally fit. You are NOT describing yourself in the section but rather your PERCEPTION of what you believe MOTHERS are expected to be. IN GENERAL, ALL MOTHERS ARE EXPECTED TO BE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disinterested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please complete each Category from the top by selecting a Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Sub Category Title</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Personal &amp; Organisational Details</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Partner/Spouse Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Manager Support</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Job and Personal Life</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Work and Family Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Present Job</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Job Experience</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Role Identity</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>THIS SECTION IS FOR WORKING WOMEN WITH CHILDREN ONLY</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing all Categories of the Survey, please end the survey here:

End Survey

Complete Survey

Below are scales composed of pairs of adjectives separated by a series of numbers from 1-7. Each pair has been chosen to represent two kinds of contrasting states in relation to each other. Each one of us belong somewhere between the two extremes. Select the number that comes closest to your first impression feeling as to where you believe YOU GENERALLY FALL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Title</th>
<th>Group Text</th>
<th>Statement A</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent, Identity for Women Only</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7</td>
<td>Generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Matures</td>
<td>AS A WORKING MOTHER, I USUALLY AIM</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7</td>
<td>Praying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: First e-mail reminder

14 October 2010

Dear Participant

You should have recently received an e-mail with a link asking you to participate in a study relating to work-family conflict. As explained to you in the initial e-mail, you have been selected to take part in a research study measuring work-family conflict, job satisfaction and burnout. This e-mail is a further request to click the link in the body of this e-mail to access the questionnaire and complete it at your earliest convenience. Once you have clicked on the “end survey” button at the end of this questionnaire, it serves as confirmation that the questionnaire is completed. If you did not receive our previous e-mail and access link to the questionnaire or have any questions regarding this study, please contact us at the numbers below.

Vanessa De Sousa (Researcher)
Tel: 079 892 0296
E-mail: Vanessa.ikin@za.sabmiller.com

Prof Mias de Klerk (Promoter)
Tel: 082 901 5480
E-mail: Mias.deklerk@sasol.com

The success of this study is entirely dependent on your participation. Please assist us by completing the questionnaire. If you have already completed the questionnaire, we wish to thank you for your participation.

Kind Regards
Vanessa De Sousa (Researcher)
Appendix C: Final e-mail reminder

19 October 2010

Please ignore this e-mail if you have already completed the questionnaire on work-family conflict.

Dear Participant

On the 4 March 2010, you were sent a questionnaire measuring your views and perceptions of work-family conflict, job satisfaction and burnout. The responses to the questionnaire are, however, still too low for scientific purposes. If you have not had time to complete the online questionnaire, we are reminding you to please do so, before the 24 October 2010. Once you have clicked on the “end survey” button at the end of this questionnaire, it will serve as confirmation that the questionnaire is completed. We would very much like to obtain a representative sample since the information gathered by this survey will be valuable to both yourselves and the organisations. If you have deleted the e-mail with the link that accesses the questionnaire, and would like us to resend it to you, please contact Vanessa De Sousa (Vanessa.ikin@za.sabmiller.com), and I will resend you the initial e-mail with instructions. Please assist us in completing the questionnaire. The success of the study depends entirely on the number of responses attained.

Kind Regards

Vanessa De Sousa (Researcher)
Tel: 079 892 0296
E-mail: Vanessa.ikin@za.sabmiller.com

Prof Mias de Klerk (Promoter)
Tel: 082 901 5480
E-mail: Mias.deklerk@sasol.com
Appendix D: Written copyright permission

Dear Vanessa,

You have my permission to use the ISS in your research. You can find details about the scale in the Scales section of my website. I allow free use for non-commercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included.

"Copyright Paul E. Spector, 1984. All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation).

Thank you for your interest in the ISS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector
Department of Psychology
PSY 413
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620
813-974-2157
pspector@usf.edu
http://www.psych.ufl.edu/~pspector
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