

## **Does Extant Work-family Research Generalize to African Nations? Meta-analytic Tests**

Jenny M. Hoobler

*Department of Human Resource Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

*ORCiD: 0000-0001-7725-6889*

Eileen Koekemoer (corresponding author)

*Department of Human Resource Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

*ORCiD: 0000-0002-3234-4532*

*Corresponding author e-mail: Eileen.koekemoer@up.ac.za*

Suzanne Gericke

*Department of Human Resource Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

*ORCiD: 0000-0002-9344-0384*

### **Disclosure statement**

The authors declare no competing interests in respect to the research.

### **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to Misses Monique Buys, Lindri du Toit, and Tiffany Webster and Mr Theo

Heyns who assisted with data collection.

### **Funding**

None.

## Abstract

This study explores the question of the generalizability of extant work-family research, most of which has been conducted in Western cultural contexts, to workers in African nations. We conducted a meta-analysis of African research, comparing means for work-family conflict (WFC) and enrichment (WFE) to those same means in Western contexts. We also compared the magnitude of the relations between WFC and WFE and common individual employee outcomes in Africa with the West, finding a few differences. For example, we found smaller associations between conflict and job satisfaction in Africa than in the West, and WFC had medium, negative effect sizes with work engagement in Africa, as compared to positive, small effect sizes in the West. Yet, across all results, our findings most closely support a cross-culturally invariant perspective on work and family—meaning very similar effects for workers in Africa and the West.

*Keywords:* Developing cultural contexts; Work-family conflict; Work-family enrichment

## Introduction

For over thirty years, research on work and family intersections has been an interest for scholars across the world, especially in the human resource management and organizational psychology disciplines. And today this research is perhaps more relevant than ever before (Allen & Eby, 2016). A rapid increase in technological advancements and the multinational nature of commerce have contributed to “a new world of work” where employees are now more than ever expected to work long hours, and to be available whenever and wherever work tasks arise, leading to intrusion into what used to be time reserved for home and family. This intrusion is often termed domain spillover. A significant body of research has accumulated on work and family spillover, much of it under the rubric of work-family conflict (the degree to which work and family roles are perceived as incompatible in some way - Greenhaus & Beutell,

1985) and, to a lesser extent, work-family enrichment (the beneficial influence of work and family on each other – Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

A large body of research on work and family has been published, but the overwhelming majority of the work has been based on the traditions and values of Western countries and/or has been conducted in Western cultural contexts (also sometimes referred to as the Global North)<sup>1</sup>. That is, the majority of this research has originated in North American and Western European countries (Hassan, Dollard, & Winefield, 2010). Indeed, in general, management and organizational theories are still being formulated and tested in Western countries and then “exported” abroad (Kriek, Beaty, & Nkomo, 2009). The generalizability of such studies and models has been criticized for several reasons. One criticism is that theories and research findings can only generalize from one country to another country when the relationships among focal variables are identical (Rosensweig, 1994). That is, findings should not generalize when variables are conceptualized in different ways across cultures. As well, the strength of the relations amongst variables may differ across cultures. In regard to work and family, Korabik, Lero and Ayman (2003) state that scholars must conduct research on work-family relationships in different countries in ways that both capture and respect the influence of different values and accepted roles within each culture. These differences “make a difference” in how work and family intersect and the outcomes that result. According to Farivar, Cameron, and Yaghoubi (2016), the way to dispel doubts about the transferability of Western work-family theoretical models to developing nations is to investigate work-family issues in non-Western settings. African work and family scholars have called for replicating existing research done

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms the West or the Global North generally represent the economically developed societies of Europe, North America and Australasia. In contrast, The Global South implies less developed countries which are listed in the lower part of international development indexes and some of which are formerly colonised countries affected by international aid agendas. These include many African nations, Mexico, India, Brazil, Indonesia, and others (Global South Studies Centre, 2017). The historical power of this dichotomy has resulted in scholars and other elites of the West not only generating more academic knowledge but also has traditionally meant that the West’s knowledge seemingly speaks for (or over) non-Western cultures (Berger, 1997).

in Western settings in African nations as a way of establishing its generalizability to the latters' cultures (Nyengele, 2004). For example, in transitioning or developing economies, where people are more likely to hold traditional views toward gender roles, women may report interrole conflict to a greater extent than women in more economically developed countries with more egalitarian gender role values (Aycan, 2008). As well, the former group, due to their expanding roles and the tension that this exerts against societal norms, may suffer more detrimental outcomes from interrole conflict, such as higher reports of anxiety and job stress. Despite this, in a recent review of cross-cultural work-family research (Shockley, Douek, Smith, Yu, Dumani, & French, 2017), Sub-Saharan Africa was listed as one of three regions (together with Southern Asia and the Middle East) with the least amount of work-family research. According to the authors, this scarcity is problematic because Sub-Saharan Africa has many notable cultural and economic differences, as compared to Western regions, which may cause people to construe the meanings of conflict between work and family differently. For example, if jobs are difficult to obtain and families are struggling for basic necessities (as would be the case in African countries with high unemployment rates), a job holder and his/her family may be unlikely to see the job as a source of conflict.

In this manuscript we offer African work and family research as a test case for the question of the need to replicate studies done in Western settings in non-Western contexts. We investigate whether or not basic relationships indicative of the work-family interface that have been theorized and tested in Western settings hold in African cultural contexts. To do this, we conduct original meta-analyses to examine two research questions: *1) Do workers in Africa experience negative work and family spillover (e.g., work-family conflict) and positive work and family spillover (e.g., work-family enrichment) to the same extent as workers from Western contexts? 2) Are basic relations between work-family spillover and common outcomes (e.g.,*

*stress and strain, job satisfaction) the same, as far as magnitude, when comparing research done in Africa with research from Western contexts?*

We contribute to the work and family research in at least two ways. First, cross-cultural comparisons, especially operationalization of cross-nation comparisons of various organizational phenomena are quite common research endeavours for human resource management and organizational psychology scholars. Our research sheds light on whether studies which pit comparisons between western and non-Western cultural contexts should continue, that is, whether there are insights to be gained in continuing with this vein of research. Second, we contribute to theory on work-family. As presented in the following sections, the discipline is divided on whether work and family perceptions are unique to specific cultures or whether they are general, psychological phenomena which should be invariant across cultures. Scholars have found and employed different theories to support both sides of this argument. Our study contributes to understanding which theoretical perspectives should continue to underpin cross-cultural work and family research.

### **To Replicate or Not to Replicate?**

Hill, Yang, Hawkins, and Ferris (2004) explored whether models of work-family interface developed in more affluent Western settings are transportable across a wide range of cultures. Their findings provided initial support for the possibility of a culturally invariant, or generalizable, view of the work-family interface. In contrast, culturally invariant views emphasise the extent to which cultural dimensions explain variations in work-family related attitudes, behaviours, and other consequences for individuals. Typical dimensions predicted to vary across cultures in work-family research include individualism-collectivism, gender egalitarianism, specificity-diffuseness, paternalism, and performance orientation (Aycan, 2008; Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2017). In many studies, culture is treated as the main cause for observed differences (mean levels) of work-family variables such as conflict and

enrichment or is used as an explanation for relations between antecedents and outcomes (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2015; Hassan, et al., 2010; Lu, Gilmour, Kao, & Huang, 2006; Shockley et al., 2017; Siu et al., 2015; Yang, Chen, Choi, & Zou, 2000). Allen (2013) suggested that although the majority of cross-national work and family research seems to indicate that the same predictors and outcomes may generalize across various national contexts, the strengths of these relations likely vary. She concludes that what the work-family literature requires is both the development of emic (ground-up) as well as etic (transportable) approaches to research that can yield a clearer understanding of how individuals from various cultural contexts experience the combining of work and family domains.

As Rosensweig (1994) argues, science requires the revisiting of theories and research findings to assess their generalizability. So a question for the work and family research is: Should scholars now undertake the project of replicating in other contexts the abundance of studies that have been done in Western cultural contexts? Given limited research funding at institutions, especially at emerging universities in Africa, and competing demands for researchers' time and energy across the world, the question of whether or not to engage in replications of studies in various cultures is an important one. Is there anything to be gained?

Although revisiting earlier studies to evaluate their applicability to new contexts, that is, replication of research, is an important aspect of advancing knowledge in any field of study (Samaddar & Kadiyala, 2006), replication continues to be a rare occurrence throughout the social sciences (Mezias & Regnier, 2007). At its best, replication can confirm the accuracy of empirical findings, clarify the conditions under which an effect can be observed, and estimate the true effect size (Brandt et al., 2014). Yet various negative views regarding replication studies persist. For example, replication is often viewed as time-consuming and less original, that is, not "path-breaking" (Uncles & Kwok, 2013). As such, it is often viewed as less prestigious and less career-enhancing, as compared to publishing new breakthroughs in

research (Lyndsay & Ehrenberg, 1993). As well, uncertainty abounds about how best to perform replications of others' work, and how to get replication studies published in an academic publication environment that shows documented bias against such work (Hubbard, Vetter & Little, 1998; Schmidt, 2009). As a result, the degree to which work and family theories apply to transitional societies/emerging markets, remains for the most part unexplored.

In work and family research, we found two general theoretical arguments dominating current cross-national studies. The first argument is that work-family phenomena are universal and therefore generalizable across countries, while the second is a more variant, culture-specific view of the work and family interface. In the next section we summarize these theoretical perspectives and illustrate research findings respective of the two as a way of grounding our study's research questions.

### ***Generalizability of Work-Family Research***

Aryee, Fields, and Luk (1999) have argued that work-family psychological processes (e.g., the relationship among stressors like conflict, and strain, such as job stress and anxiety) should be universal. That is, the process of how persons experience spillover should be based on human psychology, with little influence of culture. One of the first large-scale studies providing evidence for the generalization of a work-family interface model across a wide range of countries was done by Hill and colleagues (2004). In their study, work-family relationships were found to be invariant across four country clusters based on the cultures of 48 countries. Overall, they found work-family perceptions related to outcome variables in the same way (direction), across national boundaries, although the size of the relations differed in some cases. Several other studies using variations of work-family models have been tested across countries, and similar relations have been found—in large part suggesting cross-country generalization (Lallukka, Chandola, Roos, Cable, Sekine, Kagamimori, & Laelma, 2010; Lapierre, Spector, Allen, Poelmans, & Kinnunen, 2008; Mortazavi, Pedhiwala, Shafiro & Hammer, 2009). These

work-family models have focused mainly on the influence of work demands on work-family conflict, and a variety of more distal outcomes such as job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and health behaviours. From Aryee and colleagues' perspective (1999), cross-cultural research studies which find mean differences in perceptions of work-family conflict and enhancement, and different effect sizes between these constructs and their antecedents and/or consequences, may simply be methodological artefacts. That is, differences in effect sizes may be due to sampling bias or other study factors rather than systematic differences between personal experiences across cultures.

The theories underpinning work-family research that subscribe to this generalizability perspective are at the individual level of analysis, that is, theories which describe the human nature of individuals (employees). There are several theories commonly used to describe the conflict perspective of the work-family interface at the individual level, with perhaps the most common being Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989). This theory states that, despite their upbringing and where they live, all individuals attempt to acquire and maintain resources. Both the loss and the threat of loss of resources as well as failure to acquire sufficient resources after significant investment of resources (e.g., energy, time) prove stressful for individuals (Hobfoll, 1989). On the positive side of the work-family interface, expansionist or role enhancement theories are often used (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974). These theories suggest that participation in multiple roles means individuals have abundant and expandable resources (e.g., energy, social contacts) rather than limited resources, where some roles may be performed without any resource loss at all, and may even create resources for use in the same or another role's performance (Marks, 1977). In many instances, boundary theories are also used to explain work-family intersections. Based on these theories, individuals vary in the extent to which their various roles are integrated or segmented across domains (Kossek, Meece, Barratt, & Prince, 2005), and these preferences motivate and explain outcomes that flow from

work and family role performance. Another individual-level theory commonly used in work-family studies is the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2003). This theory integrates a wide range of potential job demands and resources, and proposes that the well-being of a person is the result of two relatively independent processes (Bakker et al., 2003). In the first process, the demanding aspects of work are overtaxing, and, in the long run, lead to health problems (e.g., burnout, fatigue). In the second process, the availability of job resources may help employees cope with the demanding aspects of their work.

Taken together, these individual-based theories suggest that work-family intersections are “context free” and that psychological processes should be universal. That is, the process of how persons experience interrole perceptions should be culturally invariant (Aryee et al., 1999). Therefore, work-family phenomena should be universal and research findings should generalize across countries, despite different cultural values, national affluence, and the like. In the next section we present the alternative perspective—the idea that culture and context do play a role in how employees come to perceive the work-family interface and the consequences that result.

### ***Cultural Specificity in Work-Family Research***

Aycan (2008) argues that cultural context influences the ways in which family and work demands are perceived, appraised, and experienced in different societies. According to Powell, Francesco and Ling (2009), work-family studies that include cultural context are usually classified into three types: culture-as-nation, culture-as-referent, and culture-as-dimension studies. In *culture-as-nation studies*, a comparison is made across nations in individuals' experiences of the work-family interface, although these studies do not refer explicitly to culture as a construct. These studies thus offer the potential to test theory about cultural influences on work-family interface because they make comparisons between samples of

employees from different nations (see Hassan et al., 2010; Lu et al., 2006; Masuda, et al., 2012 and Yang, Chen, Choi & Zou, 2000 as example studies). Similarly, *culture-as-referent studies* refer to notions of culture in formulating hypotheses and interpreting results of work-family interface in one nation, but they do not measure culture or make cross-cultural comparisons (see Aryee, 1999 and Tang, Siu & Cheung, 2014 as example studies). However, *culture-as-dimension* studies offer the greatest promise to future research, according to Powell et al. (2009), as these studies propose and test theory about the influence of specific cultural dimensions on the work-family interface, by measuring cultural dimensions (e.g., Haar, Russo, Sune & Ollier-Malaterre, 2014). Although not a work and family study, Yang, Spector, Sanchez, Allen, and Poelmans (2012) provided empirical evidence in this regard, via a cross-national examination of the work demands-strain relationship and the moderating effect of the cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism (the degree to which the society in which one lives values sole actions and achievements versus the group as the primary unit of identity and purpose). Their findings indicate that individualism-collectivism moderates the relationship between factual and perceived work demands, such that employees in individualistic countries experience stronger relations than their collectivistic country counterparts. This was also the case for relations between perceived work demands and job satisfaction and turnover intentions. In more collectivistic societies, people seemed less reactant to the negative effects and implications of work.

Utilising a cultural specificity approach to work and family, Korabik et al. (2003) conducted a large-scale, global study of the work-family interface. These researchers examined both the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict using a multi-level approach (i.e., incorporating both micro-level [e.g., work support, work demands, family support, and family demands] and macro-level variables [e.g., sociocultural, contextual and policy variables such as gender role ideology, vertical and horizontal individualism/collectivism,

monochromic/polychromic time orientation, social policy initiatives and degree of public policy support]). They confirmed a general model which they argue should apply in all cultures, but with cultural variations due to gender-role ideology, individualism/collectivism, and the nature of societal support systems. In their study, culture played a significant role in determining the type and prevalence of family demands, family support, work demands, and work support individuals experienced. This view is also supported by Shaffer, Joplin and Hsu (2011), who argued that since the JD-R model is differentially applicable to a variety of occupations and jobs, its relevance should vary across different cultural contexts. An inherent aspect of the JD-R model is the recognition that different demands and resources may be more relevant in some contextual situations than in others. In fact, these authors go so far as to argue that what may be considered a demand in one cultural context may represent a resource in another. As an example, in some cultures, autonomy is highly prized and is motivating, while in other cultures, ambiguity stemming from autonomy may have a debilitating effect. In Allen et al.'s (2015) meta-analysis, results revealed that workers from less collectivistic (i.e., individualistic) countries reported less family-interference with work. The explanation was that close family ties act as a resource that helps mitigate work-family conflict. But, based on their findings, it may also suggest that family ties can increase opportunities for family interference with work, that is, close family ties can act as a demand rather than as a resource. Another cross-national meta-analysis examined the predictors and outcomes associated with work-family conflict (Allen, French, Dumani, & Shockley, 2019) based on regional cluster configurations (e.g., Eastern Europe, South Asia), finding work-family conflict relationships differ in strength by region.

Other work-family research finds the gender-role ideology of countries to be an important factor: With more traditional gender-role ideologies, such as those common in India, working women face greater family caregiving expectations than in countries with more gender

role egalitarian views, for example in the USA (Korabik et al., 2003). Also, family-related support systems should be more readily available in countries high in collectivism, whereas institutional support systems (that is, employer-provided family-friendly benefits) may be more relied upon in countries higher in individualism. This culturally variant view of work-family phenomena is also supported by Spector et al. (2007), who argue caution should be taken in assuming that Western approaches can be readily transported to culturally dissimilar regions. Regarding Africa, a systematic review of general management research in Africa (Kolk & Rivera-Santos, 2016) revealed that scholars working in Africa tend to emphasise the role of context, including national culture, in their work significantly more than in other contexts. That is, context matters.

### **Research Questions**

We have explored the question of the issue of the generalizability of work-family research from Western cultural contexts to non-Western cultural contexts based on the two competing theoretical perspectives above. To operationalize this, we tested our research questions in two ways. First, we wanted to use all available published research to see if workers in Africa, as compared to workers employed in Western contexts, report experiencing negative work and family spillover (e.g., work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) and positive work and family spillover (e.g., work-to-family enrichment and family-to-work enrichment) in similar magnitudes<sup>2</sup>.

*Research Question #1: Do workers in Africa experience negative work and family spillover and positive work and family spillover to the same extent as workers in Western cultures?*

---

<sup>2</sup> Following previous research (Schaffer & Riordan, 2003), we rely on nation as proxy for distinct cultures, although we acknowledge this is an imperfect proxy given cases of large within-country culture variation as well as cases where countries are quite homogenous. We acknowledge grouping workers' experiences from all African nations together is potentially problematic due to large variations in cultural contexts within and across African nations (Mokomane, 2018).

Second, we ask whether the *consequences* of work and family perceptions are of similar magnitude in Africa as they are for workers in Western contexts. Various qualitative and quantitative studies have summarised the relationships between work-family intersections and a number of consequences (Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005). Based on the theoretical perspectives detailed above, negative spillover has been found to link to many detrimental outcomes for workers, including work related outcomes (e.g., job exhaustion, psychological distress, job dissatisfaction, turnover intention, absenteeism, and work-related strain and performance); family related outcomes (e.g., marital dissatisfaction, family related performance, family related strain); and non-domain-specific outcomes (e.g., health problems, psychological strain) (Amstad, Meier, Elfering & Semmer, 2011; Anderson, Coffey & Byerly, 2002; Curbow, McDonnel Spratt, Griffin & Agnew, 2003; Gozukara & Colakoglu, 2016; Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts & Pulkkenin, 2006; Shimada et al., 2010).

From the positive side, positive spillover, usually studied from a work-family enrichment or balance perspective, has been found to predict mostly positive outcomes, which are categorised by Shaffer et al. (2011) as work consequences (e.g., job and career satisfaction, organisational commitment, work performance, career enhancement), family consequences (e.g., family/marital/parental satisfaction, home commitment, family performance) and personal consequences (e.g., life and emotional satisfaction, happiness, well-being, positive personal benefit) (Carlson, Hunter, Ferguson & Whitten, 2014; Karatepe & Bekteshi, 2008; McNall, Masuda & Nicklin, 2010). So, with the second research question we are interested in whether the effects of the work-family interface are experienced similarly by workers in Africa as compared to what we know about the consequences of work-family intersections for workers in Western contexts.

*Research Question #2: Are basic relations between work-family spillover and common outcomes for workers the same, as far as magnitude, when comparing research done in Africa with research done in Western contexts?*

In the next section we provide detail on the context for this study, Africa.

### ***The African Context***

According to the African Economic Outlook (African Development Bank, 2017), in 2013, Africa was the world's fastest-growing continent at 5.6% Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per year. And the expected GDP growth is expected to average over 6% per year between 2013 and 2023. In 2017, the African Development Bank reported Africa to be the world's second-fastest growing economy. Several international business observers have also named Africa as the future economic growth engine of the world (Africa Rising, 2011). In general, globalization is on the rise in the whole of Africa, with multinational corporations eyeing Africa as the next frontier (Sayre, 1999). Central to this paper, MNC expansion brings with it Western work pressures, including corporate/global working hours and client-driven deadlines. This development stands in stark contrast to the sacred importance of the family in most African cultures. Family has traditionally been the fundamental unit of African "production, consumption, reproduction, and accumulation" (Mokomane, 2018, p. 323), a site where the well-being of persons is tended to, via highly specified gender and intergenerational roles (Mokomane, 2018).

As far as the development of women—which is central to any work-family study—education levels for women are increasing in Africa. Specifically in South Africa, more women than men are currently enrolled in tertiary institutions (57%; a ratio of almost 3:2) (Department of Women, Republic of South Africa, 2015). This rate is similar to other African countries such as Kenya (40.1% female enrollments in 2008) and Nigeria (45% female enrollments in 2009) (Fatunde, 2010; Mulongo, 2013). These rates map onto women's education rates in the United

Kingdom, for example, where a higher proportion of female students (56.2%) as opposed to males (43.8%) were studying in higher education in 2013 (HESA, 2013). Accordingly, Mokomane (2018) notes that the most striking contemporary development in work and family in Africa is increased female labor force participation and, with it, notable changes in the structure and function of extended families. Together these issues have surfaced work-family management as a matter of dire importance for employees, families, employers, societies, and governments in Africa (Dancaster & Baird, 2008).

## **Method**

We utilized Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) method to conduct our original meta-analyses. In late 2015 and again in mid-2018, we performed exhaustive searches of international and national (e.g., South African) databases for published empirical research on work and family using African samples. Databases included: PsycInfo, ABInform, EbscoHost, ProQuest, Google Scholar, and Sabinet—a South African research database. Search terms included individual paired combinations of: work-life balance, work-life conflict, work-family conflict, work-life interface, work-family interface, work-life integration, work-family integration, work-life enrichment, work-life interference, work non-work balance, work non-work conflict, work non-work interface, work non-work integration, work non-work enrichment, work non-work interference AND the names of the 54 African countries respectively. These many terms were searched due to the many names for quite similar work-family phenomena in the literature. We specified inclusion criteria such that sample respondents had to have been living and/or working in one of the African countries when studies were conducted, articles had to include a correlation matrix, and studies had to include a Pearson's correlation coefficient for one of the above-named work-family variables and at least one other (outcome) variable. In addition to using these databases, we culled the reference lists of journal articles identified as meeting the inclusion criteria, manually searched the tables of contents of journals known to

publish work and family research, and sent personal emails to the around 20 African scholars we know as work and family researchers. From all of these processes we found 40 African articles that met inclusion criteria which were then used in our meta-analyses. These are noted in the Reference section beginning with an asterisk. These 40 articles have a combined sample size of 12,878. Studies were coded by one of the authors and a Master's degree-qualified research assistant independently in order to ensure accuracy. The intercoder agreement was 93%. Any discrepancies were solved by discussions, through consensus.

To test research question one, we first needed to establish a Western comparison group, that is, find means that reflected the levels of conflict and enrichment experienced by workers in the West. For this we relied on Hassan et al.'s (2010) process, and we therefore needed to perform two additional original meta-analyses. First we chose the seminal scale used in Western research on WFC as Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams' (2000) measure, and the seminal scale used in Western research on WFE as Grzywacz and Marks' (2000) measure. We used the same databases listed above to search for all published studies using one of these two measures with Western samples. A listing of these 243 studies (151 for conflict and 92 for enrichment) is available from the authors upon request<sup>3</sup>. We then input the means from the work-family variables found in these studies into an SPSS datafile, along with the African means, and ANOVAs were performed to compare negative and positive WF spillover means in the West with those in Africa, respectively. A significant *F* indicated a significant differences in means.

For research question two, we referred to recently published meta-analyses on work and family to find meta-analytic correlations between work-family constructs and other variables

---

<sup>3</sup> As a further test, we noted that the means obtained from our supplementary meta-analyses were similar to means reported in Western meta-analyses. The mean we calculated for scores on WFC ( $m = 2.84$ ) and FWC ( $m = 2.12$ ) were similar to those reported in Spector and colleagues' (2007) cross-national study for Anglo/North American samples: 2.38 for WFC. Similarly Amstad and colleagues' (2011) meta-analysis of predominantly North American studies reported a WFC mean of 2.71. These authors also reported a North American mean of 2.12 for FWC, which was identical to the Western mean we meta-analytically calculated of 2.12. Therefore, we had a great deal of confidence in the rigour of the mean values to which we compared our African scores.

in countries in the West. The meta-analytic studies we identified as comparisons are footnoted in Table 3. To ensure that these meta-analyses were comprised of studies using samples from the West and not other non-Western locations, we performed a separate analysis: For each of the meta-analyses footnoted in Table 3, we obtained each individual study used in each of the respective meta-analyses. We then coded the country of origin for the sample in each individual study. Using Oluwafemi's (2012) categorization scheme, we categorized each study's sample as either Western, non-Western, or unreported. From this process we were able to verify that these published meta-analyses comprised samples consisting of: 67% workers from the West, 7.04% workers from non-Western countries, and 26.08% unreported. From this, we proceeded to have a reasonable amount of assurance that our comparison means for our Western group were indeed predominantly from Western samples. To test research question 2, we used the effect sizes from the published meta-analyses for the correlations between work-family variables and outcome variables in the West (note: these are already sample weighted and measurement corrected). When multiple meta-analyses tested the same relations (e.g., Byron, 2005 and Amstad et al., 2011 both tested the relation between work-family conflict and a measure of work strain), we averaged across the studies to come up with an overall Pearson's correlation coefficient representing the size of that association in the West. We then used that effect size as a comparison to the African meta-analytic correlations we calculated in this study.

### ***Statistical Calculations***

We used Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) and Lipsey and Wilson's (2001) method to test our hypotheses. For African studies, both means, in the case of research question one (RQ1), and correlation coefficients, in the case of research question two (RQ2), were the statistics of interest. For RQ1, we transformed all means to a 1-5 scale for comparison purposes. For RQ2, we adjusted for measurement error by correcting each independent and dependent variable for unreliability using the alpha values ( $\alpha$ ) reported in each African study. In just a few cases

where no Cronbach's alpha was reported for a particular scale, we calculated a reliability for that scale by using the mean reliability from our remaining studies. We also weighted sample means (RQ1) and correlations (RQ2) by individual studies' sample size.

We report these and several other statistics for meta-analysis in Tables 1 and 2. We report a 95% confidence interval and 80% credibility interval. The confidence interval is an estimate of a population parameter, indicating the reliability of the estimate. The confidence interval is the estimated amount of error in the corrected correlation due to sampling error (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004, p. 205). The credibility interval is based on the standard deviation of the corrected correlation and refers to the distribution of parameters. Credibility intervals are also useful in determining whether moderators are likely present. We also report a Q statistic, where a significant Q reflects heterogeneity in effect sizes across studies (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). We report fail-safe  $k$  (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001) to test for the "file drawer problem," that is, the degree to which studies that may have been excluded due to not being published could affect the meta-analysis results. Fail-safe  $k$  represents the number of studies with non-significant findings that would need to exist to reduce the effect size to a non-significant value (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). Of additional note are columns 1 and 2 ( $k^1$  and  $k^2$ ) in Tables 1 and 2 which show the numbers of studies found across Africa for each relationship ( $k^1$ ) versus the number of studies done by scholars from just South Africa using South African workers ( $k^2$ ). While these columns indicate a great deal of research is coming from South Africa in particular, they also indicate our study is not based on South African research alone.

## Results

In research question one, we asked whether workers in Africa experience negative work and family spillover and positive work and family spillover to the same extent as workers in Western countries. First, for negative spillover, i.e., for work-to-family conflict, there was not a significant difference in means between scores in the West ( $m = 2.84$ ;  $SD = 0.38$ ) and in

Africa ( $m = 2.77$ ;  $SD = 0.81$ ) [ $F(41) = 1.06$ , *n.s.*]. And for family-to-work conflict, Western ( $m = 2.12$ ;  $SD = 0.413$ ) mean scores were also not different from African scores ( $m = 2.15$ ;  $SD = 0.83$ ) [ $F(12) = 1.14$ , *n.s.*]. Comparing positive spillover means, we found much the same thing: no differences between Western ( $m = 3.23$ ;  $SD = 0.38$ ) and African ( $m = 3.25$ ;  $SD = 0.49$ ) scores for work-to-family enrichment [ $F(12) = .26$ , *n.s.*], nor for family-to-work enrichment (West:  $m = 3.63$ ;  $SD = 0.33$ , and Africa:  $m = 3.50$ ;  $SD = 0.28$ ) [ $F(8) = .27$ , *n.s.*].

For research question two, we were interested in whether Africans are affected by work and family spillover and enrichment to the same extent as workers in the West. That is, we were interested in whether effect sizes for outcomes of WFC and WFE were of similar magnitude in Africa as they are in Western studies. Because the minimum number of published studies necessary for meta-analysis is usually considered to be three (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001), the number of published studies on outcomes of WFC and WFE in Africa limited the number of outcomes we were able to meta-analyze. First, for negative spillover (conflict), we were able to meta-analyze the outcomes of work-to-family spillover and: mental health and well-being, work strain, home/family strain, support from work, job/career satisfaction and work engagement; and negative family-to-work spillover and: work strain and job/career satisfaction (see Table 1). Second, for positive spillover (enrichment), published African studies exist in enough quantity to meta-analyze the association between work-to-family spillover and: work strain, autonomy, support from home, support from work, and work engagement; and the association between positive family-to-work spillover and: work strain, autonomy, support from home, support from work, and work engagement (see Table 2). While we are calling these variables “outcomes,” it should be noted that the ordering of the work-family variables’ relations with these variables cannot be determined by meta-analysis. That is, it is possible that what we are exploring as outcome variables may indeed be antecedents to work-family spillover.

An examination of Tables 1 and 2 reveals that for only three effect sizes does the confidence interval contain zero, which means that we are not able to rule out that the relation between the two variables could be zero (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). These are: 1) the relation between positive family-to-work spillover and work strain (CI = -.20 to 00); 2) negative WF spillover and job and career satisfaction (CI = -.06 to .04); and 3) negative FW spillover and job and career satisfaction (CI = -.21 to .11). For all of the other fifteen effect sizes, we have reason to believe there is a true relation between variables.

Table 3 provides details on the results of the tests of research question 2. In general, the magnitude of the relations between the work-family variables and their outcomes are quite similar when comparing African samples to studies conducted in the West. We used Cohen's (1988) conventions for comparing the magnitude of effect sizes, which state that cutoff values of less than 0.1 indicate a very small effect size, 0.2 a small, 0.5 a medium, and 0.8 a large effect size. Across the 18 relations tested, most of the effect sizes from both geographies fell into the small or medium effect size categories. And, for only 7 correlations, was there a difference in effect sizes across geographies according to Cohen's (1988) conventions. First, for positive WF spillover: 1) the effect size for relations with support from home was considered medium in Africa ( $\rho$  = absolute value .26) versus small in the West ( $\rho$  = absolute value .19) and 2) the effect size for support from work was medium for Africa ( $\rho$  = absolute value .41) versus small in the West ( $\rho$  = absolute value .23). Second, for positive FW spillover, 3) the effect size for relations with work strain was small in Africa ( $\rho$  = absolute value .10) and very small in the West ( $\rho$  = absolute value .02). Third, for negative WF spillover, 4) the effect size for work strain in Africa can be considered large ( $\rho$  = absolute value .65) while the effect size for the West was medium ( $\rho$  = absolute value .49); 5) the effect size with job and career satisfaction was very small for Africa ( $\rho$  = absolute value .01) versus small for the West ( $\rho$  = absolute value .20); and 6) the effect size with work engagement was medium for Africa ( $\rho$  =

absolute value 0.30) and small for the West ( $\rho = \text{absolute value } .16$ ). Fourth and finally, for negative FW spillover, 7) the effect size with job and career satisfaction was very small for Africa ( $\rho = \text{absolute value } .05$ ) versus small for the West ( $\rho = \text{absolute value } .18$ ).

## **Discussion**

In research question one, we asked whether Africans experience similar levels of work-family conflict and work-family enrichment to employees working in Western countries. When considering means for Africans versus employees in Western countries, no significant mean differences were found for any of the work-family constructs (i.e., work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict, work-to-family enrichment, and family-to-work enrichment). These findings suggest that employees in Africa report experiencing conflict and enrichment at nearly identical levels as their counterparts in the West. These findings contradict the claims of various researchers who have argued that Africa is unique in terms of work and family relations. For example, an argument is that, in South Africa, indigenous cultures uniquely perpetuate traditional roles for women and require unique work-life balance considerations that may prescribe strong family (versus work) commitments (Barnard & Koekemoer, 2015; Koekemoer & Mostert, 2010; Mayer & Barnard, 2015). Yet our mean comparisons did not bear this out. To reconcile this, perhaps finding no mean differences does not necessarily reveal that Africans interpret work and family demands, challenges, struggles, and synergies in the same way as Western workers, but it may suggest that the former experiences levels of work-family phenomena, as defined by Western scholars, to the same extent. Said another way, future research should disentangle *how* employees experience and define work-family phenomena, and if Africans define conflict in the same or a different way, as compared to Western scholars' construct conceptualization. To verify our findings of "no difference," more studies like Koekemoer and Mostert's (2010) are needed, where work-family phenomena are

explored qualitatively, taking an emic approach to understanding what conflict means for employees in Africa.

In addition to investigating if African employees report work-to-family conflict and enrichment to the same extent as workers in the West, we were also interested in whether effect sizes for outcomes of WFC and WFE were of similar magnitude (RQ2). Based on our findings, in general, the magnitude of many of the associations between work-family variables and their outcomes were remarkably similar when comparing African with Western research. We found that seven out of the 18 associations between WF variables and their outcomes that we examined differed in effect size. This both supports and contradicts Allen's (2013) argument that although the majority of cross-national work and family research indicates that the same predictors and outcomes of work-family constructs may generalize across various national contexts, the strengths of these relations may vary.

We examined closely the seven associations between WF variables and outcomes that differed in effect size in Africa versus the West. In general—and at the risk of overgeneralizing across African cultural contexts—we found that two overarching African characteristics, traditional family values and underemployment, may help to explain work-family differences between Africa and the West. First, under the theme of the traditional importance of family in Africa, we found that WFE had a small, negative relation to work strain in Africa, but a very small, positive relation with work strain in the West. When work provides desired resources to the family domain that seems to lessen African workers' strain, but, in opposite fashion, contributes to Westerners' work strain. And, when Africans report work is conflicting with family this has a large effect on their work strain, but a medium effect on Westerners' work strain. Both of these findings suggest that Africans may be putting family first to a greater extent than Western workers, and that perhaps Africans are more content with integrating the work and family domains (e.g., Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005) in their identity and

actions, possibly stemming from the historical prominence of the family in African cultural contexts. In fact, we found that WFC negatively impacted Africans' work engagement, as compared to positively impacting Westerners' work engagement. Africans seem to be less comfortable at work when work negatively impacts family than are their Western counterparts. Second, under the theme of underemployment and poverty in Africa, it is true that despite African women's increased labor force participation in recent years, the majority of African women still work in the informal sector, as, for example, subsistence farmers, craftswomen, domestic workers, and informal "tuckshop" saleswomen (Mokomane, 2018). This type of employment is characterized by low and volatile earnings and few social safety nets (International Labour Organisation, 2016), which can have a devastating impact on the health, and well-being of earners and their families. While we acknowledge that the bulk of the African studies that made up our meta-analyses likely surveyed middle-class Africans, we did evidence findings that suggest the particular importance of *economic* considerations for Africans in the work-family balancing act. That is, we found that both WFC and FWC had smaller effects on Africans' job and career satisfaction as compared to Westerners'. Perhaps Africans, who are more likely to be lower wage earners, may not have "the luxury" of being dissatisfied with their jobs and careers due to interrole conflict. For example, in South Africa, 25% of the population is unemployed and earns no fixed income (Statistics South Africa, 2016), so South Africans may simply be happy to have a job and career: When work interrupts family life, it could be seen as a necessary evil in staying employed.

While we did find some differences in Africa, in general, our findings seem to contradict the recent work of Kolk and Rivera-Santos (2016), who argue that scholars working in Africa must emphasize the role of context, including national culture, in their work significantly more than in other contexts. That is, especially in Africa, these authors argue that the context is unique (see also these arguments for work-family research - Powell, Francesco

& Ling, 2009). Our findings, in contrast, suggest that employees from Africa and the West experience almost identical levels of work-family conflict and enrichment. And, as far as outcomes of spillover, most of the magnitudes of these relations were much the same. Consequently, we interpret these results as a tentative call to scholars to refrain from engaging in simple replication studies of Western work in non-Western contexts. This work may be unlikely to add much to the knowledge base, nor practically, to help with the work-family balancing act. And this suggests that from a theoretical perspective, scholars should explore work-family intersections from a culturally invariant, that is, generalizable, individual-level perspective. However, we assert that what *is* needed is rich, emic work that, on a more foundational level, ensures that concepts derived in the West such as conflict, enrichment, demands, and resources are defined in the same way in non-Western cultural contexts as they have been in Western research. While the results of the African quantitative studies we meta-analyzed may be much the same as in the West, the foundations of how the content of work-family intersections has been defined in Africa may yet be different.

### ***Limitations***

This study is not without limitations. Again we acknowledge the nonexistence of an African monoculture. So our first limitation is that our meta-analyses were not able to test culture variations as moderators of the impact of work and family variables on employee outcomes. This has frequently been cited as a limitation of work-family research (Aycan, 2008; Dumani, French, & Allen, 2018; Hill, et al., 2004; Korabik, et al., 2003). Second, as mentioned above, not finding significant differences in mean levels of WFC and WFE in Africa versus the West does not necessarily mean that these two groups of employees interpret work and family events in the same way. It merely suggests they report on Western-derived work-family scales at similar levels. Studies investigating work-family construct invariance and qualitative work are suggested to tease out this difference. Third, given the limited number of research

studies measuring outcomes of work-family conflict and enrichment in Africa, we were unable to compare effect sizes for all outcomes tested in studies conducted in Western settings. That is, we were only able to examine those work-family outcomes where at least three African studies had been published testing any one outcome variable. Perhaps more differences would have been found if more outcomes were tested. And we acknowledge that the majority of work-family research in Africa has been conducted in South Africa. Finally, a limitation of research question two is that we grouped various measures of strain together in one effect, e.g., job stress and role overload together as a measure of work strain. This is common practice in meta-analysis yet is acknowledged as the “apples to oranges” problem in conducting meta-analysis, whereby for some research questions, lumping various constructs together may not be appropriate (Cortina, 2003). As more work-family research accumulates in Africa, similar meta-analyses may be conducted with greater construct specificity.

## Conclusion

This study is the first of its kind to compare work-family phenomena from Africa to the extant, largely Western, body of knowledge. We not only investigated and compared mean levels of negative and positive work-family spillover, but also investigated the implications and consequences thereof for workers. When considering the two theoretical arguments being made in the literature that 1) work-family phenomena are universal and should therefore be generalizable across countries, versus 2) work-family intersections vary across cultures, our findings largely support the former. That is, perhaps humans are humans the world over, and we may experience work and family spillover in much the same way.

### References

- Allen, T.D., French, K.A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K.M. (2019). A cross-national meta-analytic examination of predictors and outcomes associated with work-family conflict [Online version]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, DOI:[10.1037/apl0000442](https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000442)
- African Development Bank. (2017). *African Economic Outlook*. Retrieved from [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/african-economic-outlook-2017\\_aeo-2017-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/african-economic-outlook-2017_aeo-2017-en)
- Africa rising. (2011). *The Economist*. Online publication. Retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2011/12/03/africa-rising>
- \* Akanbi, S. T. (2016). Contributions of perfectionism and social support to the prediction of work-family conflict among women academics in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Gender & Behaviour*, 14(1), 7182-7196.
- \* Akintayo, D. I. (2010). Influence of emotional intelligence on work-family role conflict management and reduction in withdrawal intentions of workers in private organizations. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 9(12), 131-140.
- Allen, T. D. (2013). The work-family role interface: A synthesis of the research from Industrial and Organisational Psychology. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology* (pp. 698-718). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, T.D., French, K.A., Dumani, S., & Shockley, K.M. (2015). Meta-analysis of work-family conflict mean differences: Does national context matter? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 90, 90-100.
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elferring, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16, 151-169.
- Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28, 787-810.

- \* Annor, F. (2016). Work–Family enrichment among Ghanaian employees: The mediating role between social support and subjective well-being. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 11(4), 1155-1171.
- \* Annor, F., & Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2017). Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two scales of work–family conflict among Ghanaian employees. *The Social Science Journal*, 54(3), 336-345.
- Aryee, S., Fields, D., & Luk, V. (1999). A cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Management*, 25, 491-511.
- Aycan, Z. (2008). Cross-cultural perspectives to work-family conflict. In K. Korabik & D. Lero (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family conflict* (pp. 359-371). London: Cambridge University Press.
- \* Bagraim, J. J., & Harrison, E. (2013). The anticipated work-family conflict of future business managers: Does gender and maternal employment matter? *South African Journal of Business Management*, 44, 41–46.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the job demands-resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 393-417.
- Barnard, A., & Koekemoer, E. (2015). Work-life balance in South African research: Patterns in progress. *Newsletter British Psychological Association*, 8, 10-14.
- Berger, M. T. (1997). The triumph of the East? The East-Asian miracle and post-Cold War capitalism. In D.A. Borer (Ed.), *The rise of East Asia: Critical visions of the Pacific century* (pp. 260–261). London: Routledge.
- Brandt, M. J., Ijzerman, H., Dijksterhuis, A. P., Farach, F. J., Geller, J., Giner-Sorolla, R. ... & Van't Veer, A. (2014). The replication recipe: What makes for a convincing replication? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 50, 217-224.
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 169-198.

- Carlson, D. S., Hunter, E. M., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2014). Work-family enrichment and satisfaction: Mediating processes and relative impact of originating and receiving domains. *Journal of Management*, 40, 845-865.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276.
- \* Coetzee, M., Oosthuizen, R. M., & Stoltz, E. (2016). Psychosocial employability attributes as predictors of staff satisfaction with retention factors. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 46(2), 232-243.
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.
- Cortina, J. M. (2003). Apples and oranges (and pears, oh my!): The search for moderators in meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 415-439.
- Curbow, B., McDonnel, K., Spratt, K., Griffin, J., & Agnew, J. (2003). Development of the work-family interface scale. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18, 310-330.
- Dancaster, L., & Baird, M. (2008). Work and care: A critical examination of South African labour law. *Industrial Law Journal*, 29, 22-42.
- \* Dartey-Baah, K. (2015). Work-family conflict, demographic characteristics and job satisfaction among Ghanaian corporate leaders. *International Journal of Business*, 20(4), 291.
- De Klerk, M., & Mostert, K. (2010). Work-home interference: Examining socio-demographic predictors in the South African context. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8, 1-10.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Department of Women, Republic of South Africa (2015). *The status of women in the South African economy*. Retrieved from [www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files>Status\\_of\\_women\\_in\\_SA\\_economy.pdf](http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files>Status_of_women_in_SA_economy.pdf)

- \* Donald, F., & Linington, J. (2004). Work/family border theory and gender role orientation in male managers. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 38, 659–671.
- \* Dubihlela, J., & Dhurup, M. (2013). Negative work-family and family-work conflicts and the relationship with career satisfaction among sport coaching officials. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 19, 177–192.
- Dumani, S., French, K. A., & Allen, T. D. (2018). Meta-analysis as a tool to synthesize global work-family research findings. In K. M. Shockley, W. Shen, & R. C. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface* (pp. 156-178). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, C. B., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 124-197.
- Farivar, F., Cameron, R., & Yaghoubi, M. (2016). Work-family balance and cultural dimensions: From a developing nation perspective. *Personnel Review*, 45(2), 315-333.
- \* Fatoki, O. (2017). Gender and the work life conflict of immigrant entrepreneurs in South Africa. *Gender and Behaviour*, 15(1), 8367-8379.
- Fatunde, T. (2010). NIGERIA: Dramatic increase in female undergraduates. *University World News: Africa Edition*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20100903175726598>
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 57-80
- \* Geldenhuys, M., & Henn, C. M. (2017). The relationship between demographic variables and well-being of women in South African workplaces. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 1-15.
- Global South Studies Center. (2017). Retrieved from <http://gssc.uni-koeln.de/23509.html?&L=1>
- Gozukara, I., & Colakoglu, N. (2016). The mediating effect of work family conflict on the relationship between job autonomy and job satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 229, 253-266.

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 72-92.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 111-126.
- Hassan, Z., Dollard, M. F., & Winefield, A. H. (2010). Work-family conflict in East vs Western countries. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 17*, 30-49.
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Sune, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work-life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 85*, 361-373.
- \* Hill, C., Mostert, K., & De Bruin, G. P. (2012). Job characteristics and work-home interaction: Does race moderate the relationship for South African police members? *An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 35*, 566-529.
- Hill, E. J., Yang, C., Hawkins, A. J., & Ferris, M. (2004). A cross-cultural test of the work-family interface in 48 countries. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 1300-1316.
- \* Hlatywayo, C. K., Zingwe, T., Mhlanga, T. S., & Mpofu, B. D. (2014). Precursors of emotional stability, stress, and work-family conflict among female bank employees. *International Business & Economics Research Journal, 13*, 861-867.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*, 513.
- Hubbard, R., Vetter, D. E., & Little, E. L. (1998). Replication in strategic management: Scientific testing for validity, generalizability and usefulness. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*, 243-254.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- International Labour Organisation. (2016). Women at work: Trends 2016. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/--->

publ/documents/publication/wcms\_457317.pdf

- \* Jaga, A., & Bagraim, J. (2011). The relationship between work-family enrichment and work-family satisfaction outcomes. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 41, 52–62.
- \* Jaga, A., Bagraim, J., & Williams, Z. (2013). Work-family enrichment and psychological health. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39, 1-10.
- \* Karatepe, O. M. (2011). Job resourcefulness as a moderator of the work–family conflict—job satisfaction relationship: A study of hotel employees in Nigeria. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 10-17.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Bektashi, L. (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family facilitation and family-work facilitation among frontline hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 517-528.
- Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work–family interface: Well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 47, 149–162.
- \* Koekemoer, E., & Mostert, K. (2006). Job characteristics, burnout and negative work-home interference in a nursing environment. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 32, 87–97.
- Koekemoer, E., & Mostert, K. (2010). An exploratory study of the interaction between work and personal life: Experiences of South African employees. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1-10.
- Kolk, A., & Rivera-Santos, M. (2016). The state of research on Africa in business and management: Insights from a systematic review of key international journals. *Business & Society*, 1-22.
- Korabik, K., Lero, D. S., & Ayman, R. (2003). A multi-level approach to cross cultural work-family research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3, 298-303.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and direction for organisational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139-149

- Kossek, E. E., Meece, D. R., Barratt, P., & Prince, E. (2005). US Latino migrant farm workers: Managing acculturative stress and conserving work-family resources. In S. Poelmans (Ed.), *International and cross-cultural perspectives on work and family* (pp. 47-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Press.
- \* Kotecha, K., Ukpera, W., & Geldenhuys, M. (2014). Technology and work-life conflict of academics in a South African higher education institution. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5, 629-641.
- Kriek, H. S., Beaty, D., & Nkomo, S. (2009). Theory building trends in international management research: An archival review of preferred methods. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 12, 126-135.
- Lallukka, T., Chandola, T., Roos, E., Cable, N., Sekine, M., Kagamimori, S., & Laelma, E. (2010). Work-family conflicts and health behaviours among British, Finnish, and Japanese employees. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 17, 134-142.
- Lapierre, L. M., Li, Y., Kwan, H. K., Greenhaus, J. H., DiRenzo, M. S., & Shao, P. (2018). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work-family enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 385-401.
- Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., Allen, T. D., Poelmans, S., & Kinnunen, U. (2008). Family-supportive organization perceptions, multiple dimensions of work-family conflict, and employee satisfaction: A test of model across five samples. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 73, 92-106.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S. F., & Huang, M. T. (2006). A cross-cultural study of work/family demands, work/family conflict and wellbeing: The Taiwanese vs British. *Career Development International*, 11, 9-27.
- Lyndsay, M., & Ehrenberg, S. C. (1993). The design of replicated studies. *The American Scientist*, 47, 217-228.
- \* Marais, E., De Klerk, M., Nel, J. A., & De Beer, L. (2014). The antecedents and outcomes of work-family enrichment amongst female workers. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-14.

- Marks, S. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936.
- Masuda, A. D., Poelmans, S. A., Allen, T. D., Spector, P. E., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., ... & Lu, L. (2012). Flexible work arrangements availability and their relationship with work-to-family conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison of three country clusters. *Applied Psychology*, 61, 1-29.
- Mayer, C. H., & Barnard, A. (2015). Balancing the scales of gender and culture in contemporary South Africa. In S. Safdar & N. Kosakowska-Berezecka (Eds.), *Psychology of gender through the lens of culture: Theories and applications* (pp. 327-352). Switzerland: Springer.
- Mezias, S. J., & Regnier, M. O. (2007). Walking the walk as well as talking the talk: Replication and normal science paradigm in strategic management research. *Strategic Organization*, 5, 283-296.
- McNall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., & Nicklin, J. M. (2010). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144, 61-81.
- Mokomane, Z. (2018). A review of work–family research in Africa. In K. M. Shockley, W. Shen, & R. C. Johnson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of the global work–family interface* (pp. 323-336). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mortazavi, S., Pedhiwala, N., Shafiro, M., & Hammer, L. (2009). Work-family conflict related to culture and gender. *Community Work & Family*, 12, 251-273.
- \* Mostert, K. (2006). Work-home interaction as partial mediator between job resources and work engagement. *Southern African Business Review*, 10, 53-74
- \* Mostert, K., Cronje, S., & Piernaar, J. (2006). Job resources, work engagement and the mediating role of positive work-home interaction of police officers in the North-West province. *Acta Criminologica*, 19, 64–87.
- \* Mostert, K., & Oosthuizen, B. (2006). Job characteristics and coping strategies associated with negative and positive work–home interference. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 9, 429–443.

- \* Mostert, K., & Rathbone, A.D. (2007). Work characteristics, work-home interaction and engagement of employees in the mining industry. *Management Dynamics, 16*, 36-52
- \* Mostert, K. (2008). South African Police Service: Time-based and strain-based work-family conflict in the South African police service: Examining the relationship. *Acta Criminologica, 21*, 1–18.
- \* Mostert, K. (2009). The balance between work and home: The relationship between work and home demands and ill health of employed females. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 35*, 145–153.
- \* Mostert, K. (2011). Job characteristics, work-home interference and burnout: Testing a structural model in the South African context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*, 1036–1053.
- \* Mostert, K., Peeters, M., & Rost, I. (2011). Work-home interference and the relationship with job characteristics and well-being: A South African study among employees in the construction industry. *Stress and Health, 7*, 238-251
- \* Mostert, K., & Van Aarde, A. (2006). Work-home interaction of working females: What is the role of job and home characteristics ? *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 34(3)*, 1–10.
- Mulongo, G. (2013). Inequality in accessing higher education in Kenya: Implications for economic development and well-being. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*, 49-61.
- Nyengele, M. F. (2004). *African women's theology, gender relations, and family systems theory*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- \* Okonkwo, E. (2013). Time-based work interference with family and emotional exhaustion among female teachers. *Gender and Behaviour, 11(1)*, 5089-5095.
- \* Oldfield, G., & Mostert, K. (2007). Job characteristics, ill health and negative work-home interference in the mining industry. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 33*, 68–75.
- Ollier-Malaterre, A., & Foucreault, A. (2017). Cross-national work-life research: Cultural and structural impacts for individuals and organizations. *Journal of Management, 43(1)*, 111-136.

- Oluwafemi, M. (2012). *Globalization: The politics of global economic relations and international business*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic.
- \* Omran, S. K. A. (2016). Work-family balance dilemma among employed parents (An empirical study). *International Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 4(1).
- \* Oosthuizen, J., Mostert, K., & Koekemoer, F. E. (2011). Job characteristics, work-nonwork interference and the role of recovery strategies amongst employees in a tertiary institution. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9, 1–15.
- \* Oosthuizen, R. M., Coetzee, M., & Munro, Z. (2016). Work-life balance, job satisfaction and turnover intention amongst information technology employees. *Southern African Business Review*, 20(1), 446-467.
- \* Opie, T. J., & Henn, C. M. (2013). Work-family conflict and work engagement among mothers: Conscientiousness and neuroticism as moderators. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39, 1–12.
- Powell, G. N., Francesco, A. M., & Ling, Y. (2009). Toward culture-sensitive theories of the work-family interface. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30, 597-616.
- \* Rautenbach, C., & Rothmann, S. (2017). Antecedents of flourishing at work in a fast-moving consumer goods company. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 27(3), 227-234.
- Rosensweig, P. M. (1994). When can management science research be generalized internationally? *Management Science*, 40, 28-39.
- Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work-family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science*, 16(3), 243-258.
- Samaddar, S., & Kadiyala, S. (2006). Information systems outsourcing: Replicating an existing framework in a different cultural context. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24, 910–931.
- Sayre, A. P. (1999). *The seven continents series*. Springfield, MO: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Press.
- Schmidt, S. (2009). Shall we really do it again? The powerful concept of replication is neglected in the social sciences. *Review of General Psychology*, 13, 90-100.

- Schaffer, B. S., & Riordan, C. M. (2003). A review of cross-cultural methodologies for organizational research: a best practice approach. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 169-215.
- Shaffer, M. A., Joplin, J. R., & Hsu, Y. (2011). Expanding the boundaries of work-family research: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 11, 221-268.
- Shockley, K. M. & Singla, N (2011). Reconsidering work-family intersections and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1-26
- Shockley, K. M., Douek, J., Smith, C. R., Yu, P. P., Dumani, S., & French, K. A. (2017). Cross-cultural work and family research: A review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 101, 1-20.
- Shimada, K., Shimazu, A., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Kawakami, N. (2010). Work-family spillover among Japanese dual-earner couples: A large community-based study. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 52, 335-343.
- Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 567-578.
- Siu, O. L., Bakker, A. B., Brough, P., Lu, C., Wang, H., Kalliath, T., . . . Timms, C. (2015). A three-wave study of antecedents of work-family enrichment: The roles of social resources and affect. *Stress & Health*, 31, 306-314.
- Spector, P. E., Allen, T. D., Poelmans, S. A., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., O'Driscoll, M., . . . Pagon, M. (2007). Cross-national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work-family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 805-835.
- Statistics South Africa. (2016). *Community survey statistical release*. Retrieved from [www.statssa.gov.za](http://www.statssa.gov.za)
- \* Steyl, B., & Koekemoer, E. (2011). Conflict between work and nonwork roles of employees in the mining industry: Prevalence and differences between demographic groups. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9, 1-14.

- Tang, S., Siu, O., & Cheung, F. (2014). A study of work-family enrichment among Chinese employees: The mediating role between work support and job satisfaction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 63, 130-150.
- Uncles, M. D., & Kwok, S. (2013). Designing research with in-built differentiated replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 1398-1405.
- \* Ugwu, F. O., Amazue, L. O., & Onyedire, N. G. (2017). Work-family life balance in a Nigerian banking sector setting. *Cogent Psychology*, 4(1), 1290402.
- \* Uzoigwe, A. G., Low, W. Y., & Noor, S. N. M. (2016). Predictors of work-family role conflict and its impact on professional women in medicine, engineering, and information technology in Nigeria. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*, 28(7), 629-637.
- \* Van Aarde, A., & Mostert, K. (2006). Work-home interaction of working females : What is the role of job and home characteristics? *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34, 1-10.
- \* Van der Westhuizen, A., & Koekemoer, E., (2015). Work-nonwork interference: Can ministers currently cope with increasing job demands against limited resources within South Africa? *HTS Theological Studies*, 71, 1-11.
- Yang, L., Spector, P. E., Sanchez, J. I., Allen, T. D., & Poelmans, S. (2012). Individualism-collectivism as a moderator of the work demands-strains relationship: A cross-level and cross-national examination. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43, 424-443.
- Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 113-123.

**Table 1: Meta-Analysis Results of the Relationship between Negative WF Spillover and Outcomes in African Studies**

| Negative Spillover         | k <sup>1</sup> | k <sup>2</sup> | N    | $\bar{\gamma}$ | $\bar{p}$ | SD $\rho$ | Q       | 95% CI |       | 80% CV |       | Fail-safe k |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|----------------|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------------|
|                            |                |                |      |                |           |           |         | Lower  | Upper | Lower  | Upper |             |
| <b>WF spillover and</b>    |                |                |      |                |           |           |         |        |       |        |       |             |
| Mental health & well-being | 3              | 3              | 1599 | -.25           | -.35      | .32       | 91.04   | -.67   | -.03  | -.97   | .27   | 9           |
| Work strain                | 18             | 15             | 5578 | .40            | .65       | .25       | 472.64* | .55    | .75   | .16    | 1.14  | 12          |
| Home/family strain         | 4              | 3              | 1245 | .46            | .46       | .30       | 3.94*   | .26    | .66   | -.14   | 1.06  | 1           |
| Support from work          | 14             | 13             | 4611 | -.21           | -.20      | .19       | 290.62* | -.25   | -.15  | -.57   | .17   | 56          |
| Job & career satisfaction  | 3              | 1              | 424  | -.06           | -.01      | .31       | 21.80   | -.06   | .04   | -.62   | .60   | 3           |
| Work engagement            | 5              | 5              | 1981 | -.20           | -.30      | .10       | 19.55*  | -.40   | -.20  | -.50   | -.10  | 10          |
| <b>FW spillover and</b>    |                |                |      |                |           |           |         |        |       |        |       |             |
| Work strain                | 4              | 4              | 1640 | .26            | .32       | .15       | 39.41*  | .19    | .45   | .02    | .62   | 2           |
| Job & career satisfaction  | 3              | 1              | 424  | -.08           | -.05      | .29       | 18.40   | -.21   | .11   | -.62   | .52   | 3           |

*Note.* WF = Work-to-family, FW = Family-to-work, k1 = total number of studies, k2 = total number of studies from South African samples, N = cumulative total sample size,  $\bar{\gamma}$  = uncorrected meta-analytic correlation,  $\bar{p}$  = corrected meta-analytic correlation, SD $\rho$  = standard deviation of corrected meta-analytic correlation, Q = Q statistic, CI= confidence interval, CV = credibility interval.

\* significant heterogeneity in the effect size.

**Table 2: Meta-Analysis Results of the Relationship between Positive WF Spillover and Outcomes in African Studies**

| Positive Spillover      | k <sup>1</sup> | k <sup>2</sup> | N    | $\bar{\gamma}$ | $\bar{p}$ | SD $\rho$ | Q      | 95% CI |       | 80% CV |       | Fail-safe k |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|----------------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------------|
|                         |                |                |      |                |           |           |        | Lower  | Upper | Lower  | Upper |             |
| <b>WF spillover and</b> |                |                |      |                |           |           |        |        |       |        |       |             |
| Work strain             | 6              | 6              | 1998 | -.12           | -.11      | .19       | 39.78  | -.21   | -.01  | -.49   | .27   | 10          |
| Autonomy                | 6              | 6              | 2394 | .28            | .35       | .15       | 46.66* | .23    | .47   | .06    | .64   | 2           |
| Support from home       | 3              | 2              | 1137 | .23            | .26       | .12       | 13.69* | .15    | .37   | .03    | .49   | 2           |
| Support from work       | 11             | 9              | 3844 | .20            | .41       | .22       | 59.91* | .26    | .56   | -.02   | .84   | 4           |
| Work engagement         | 6              | 5              | 2338 | .44            | .54       | .10       | 23.30* | .48    | .60   | .35    | .73   | 1           |
| <b>FW spillover and</b> |                |                |      |                |           |           |        |        |       |        |       |             |
| Work strain             | 3              | 3              | 980  | -.06           | -.10      | .07       | .62    | -.20   | .00   | -.24   | .04   | 4           |
| Autonomy                | 4              | 4              | 1566 | .15            | .19       | .08       | 7.37*  | .11    | .27   | .03    | .35   | 2           |
| Support from home       | 3              | 2              | 1137 | .33            | .38       | .23       | 57.06* | .16    | .60   | -.08   | .84   | 1           |
| Support from work       | 5              | 4              | 1783 | .14            | .25       | .17       | 11.69* | .11    | .39   | -.08   | .58   | 6           |
| Work engagement         | 3              | 3              | 1066 | .31            | .37       | .06       | 2.87*  | .30    | .44   | .25    | .49   | 1           |

*Note.* WF = Work-to-family, FW = Family-to-work, k<sup>1</sup> = total number of studies, k<sup>2</sup> = total number of studies from South African samples, N = cumulative total sample size,  $\bar{\gamma}$  = uncorrected meta-analytic correlation,  $\bar{p}$  = corrected meta-analytic correlation, SD $\rho$  = standard deviation of corrected meta-analytic correlation, Q = Q statistic, CI= confidence interval, CV = credibility interval.

\* significant heterogeneity in the effect size.

**Table 3: Meta-Analytic Correlation Comparisons between Studies from Africa and Western Cultural Contexts**

|                            | Africa | The West              |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|
| <b>POSITIVE SPILLOVER</b>  |        |                       |
| <b>Work-to-Family</b>      |        |                       |
|                            |        |                       |
| Work strain                | -.11   | -.21 <sup>4</sup> e   |
| Autonomy                   | .35    | .30 e                 |
| Support from home          | .26    | .19 <sup>5</sup> f    |
| Support from work          | .41    | .23 <sup>6</sup> c,f  |
| Work engagement            | .54    | .51 e                 |
| <b>Family-to-Work</b>      |        |                       |
|                            |        |                       |
| Work strain                | -.10   | .02 <sup>7</sup> e    |
| Autonomy                   | .19    | .23 e                 |
| Support from home          | .38    | .25 f                 |
| Support from work          | .25    | .18 f                 |
| Work engagement            | .37    | .38 e                 |
| <b>NEGATIVE SPILLOVER</b>  |        |                       |
|                            |        |                       |
| <b>Work-to-Family</b>      |        |                       |
|                            |        |                       |
| Mental health & well-being | -.35   | -.31 <sup>8</sup> a   |
| Work strain                | .65    | .49 a,b,c             |
| Home/family strain         | .46    | .27 a,b,c             |
| Support from work          | -.20   | -.23 <sup>9</sup> b,c |
| Job & career satisfaction  | -.01   | -.20 a,d,f            |

<sup>4</sup> The job stress composite variable (Ford et al., 2007) is used here. It consists of overall job stress, job stressors, role overload, role conflict, distress and anxiety.

<sup>5</sup> The family support variable (Shockley & Singla, 2011) is used here. It consists of psychological support, tangible support, and job flexibility.

<sup>6</sup> The job support variable (Shockley & Singla, 2011), consisting of psychological support, tangible support, and job flexibility as well as the work support composite variable (Ford et al., 2007) is used here. The work support composite variable consists of general work support, supervisor support, co-worker support, and perceived organizational support.

<sup>7</sup> This variable is made up of work hours and work role overload (Lapierre et al., 2018).

<sup>8</sup> The variable life satisfaction (Amstad et al., 2011) is used here.

<sup>9</sup> The work support composite variable (Ford et al., 2007) is also used here. This composite variable consists of general work support, managerial support, supervisor support, co-worker support, and perceived organizational support.

|                           |      |      |     |
|---------------------------|------|------|-----|
| Work engagement           | -.30 | .16  | b,c |
| Family-to-Work            |      |      |     |
| Work strain               | .32  | .28  | a,b |
| Job & career satisfaction | -.05 | -.18 | d   |

<sup>a</sup> Amstad et al., 2011

<sup>b</sup> Byron, 2005

<sup>c</sup> Ford et al., 2007

<sup>d</sup> Kossek & Ozeki, 1998

<sup>e</sup> Lapierre et al., 2018

<sup>f</sup> Shockley & Singla, 2011

## Biographies

Jenny M. Hoobler is Professor of Human Resource Management and Doctoral Programmes Manager at the University of Pretoria in South Africa. She is a South African National Research Foundation B-rated researcher, and has published over 35 articles on the topics of work and family intersections, gender, and leadership. She currently serves as Associate Editor for the *Journal of Applied Psychology*.