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ABSTRACT

A conceptual model examining the antecedents and outcomes of elder care based work-family conflict is presented, with family interference with work (FIW) and work interference with family (WIF) as major components. Proposed antecedents to FIW include: time spent providing elder care, type of care—personal or other, marital status, and gender. Proposed antecedents to WIF include: gender, hours worked, flexible work arrangements, family-related supervisor support, and supportive workplace culture. Outcomes explored were partial absence (FIW) and intention to seek new employment (WIF). Pre-existing data from the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce conducted by the Families and Work Institute was utilized, resulting in a sample of 388 employed elder-caregivers. Elder-caregivers were defined as employed persons currently providing special attention to someone 65 years and older. In total, fourteen hypotheses were proposed, and 7 were supported. For example, hours worked was positively related to WIF, $r = .26, p < .01$, while supervisor support was negatively related to WIF, $r = -.28, p < .01$. Additional results, implications, and future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, work and family issues have been receiving increased attention in both the professional literature and the popular press. In 1993, for example, the United States government acknowledged the competing demands of work and family by introducing the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The FMLA requires employers to grant employees up to 12 weeks unpaid leave for family or medical matters (Bennett-Alexander & Pincus, 1998). The preponderance of work and family research, however, has focused on employees with child care responsibilities, with a portion of the literature focusing on care providers to disabled adults and children. Yet children and the disabled are not the only segments of the population in need of care. The elderly represent an increasingly larger portion of the population demanding caregiving attention from employed family members and friends.

It is a myth that the majority of care received by elders is provided through formal means. In fact, only 6% of elderly persons reside in nursing homes (Creedon & Tiven, 1989). The majority of elder care is best described
as informal care. In the United States, for example, it is estimated that 70% of elder care is provided, informally, by family and friends. Further, an additional 27% receive both informal and formal care (Ettner, 1995).

Informal caregiving is provided by individuals who are not paid for their caregiving services and can range from limited interactions to coordinating care or even actual services provided. (Smith, 1998, p.1)

Employed caregivers are being coined the new moonlighters, working both at home and in the workplace (Halpern & Deck, 1989). With increased responsibilities, individuals may face conflicting work and caregiving demands. Interrole conflict occurs when “role pressures associated with membership in one organization are in conflict with pressures stemming from membership in other groups” (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964, p.20). Work-family conflict is a specific type of interrole conflict. Work-family conflict refers to the perceived incompatibility of role pressures between work and family so that participation in one role makes participation in the other role more difficult (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In other words, participation in the
family role makes participation in the work role more difficult, and vice versa. Implicit within the definition are two types of work-family conflict, work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW).

My goal in writing this thesis is to introduce a conceptual model of the antecedents and outcomes associated with work-family conflict experienced by employed caregivers of the elderly. Through this thesis, I seek to enhance the professional work-family conflict literature by specifically examining elder-caregivers. As will be evidenced by the abundance of research cited throughout this thesis from the general (no focus on caregivers), general caregiving, and child-caregiving domains, there is a need for more elder care focused research. In addition, this model will help organizations better understand the struggle experienced by their elder care providing employees and enable employers to take a proactive approach in designing programs to minimize the negative work outcomes often associated with elder care demands.

Changing Population Demographics

Three key changes in society are increasing the need to understand how employees balance elder care
responsibilities with work demands. First, the United States is undergoing a change in population demographics, with the elderly representing the fastest growing segment of the population. The Federal Interagency Forum on Aging Related Statistics (2000) reports that the number of people 65 and older in the United States is at an estimated 35 million, or 13 percent of the total population. This segment of the population is ten times larger than it was in 1990, and is expected to double, or reach 70 million, by 2030.

Further examination reveals that the 85 and older segment of the population is growing at a rate faster than any other group (Federal Interagency Forum on Aging Related Statistics, 2000). This group, often referred to as the "oldest old" and most in need of elder care, is expected to grow from 2 percent of the population, roughly 4 million, in 2000 to 5 percent, or 19 million, in 2050. Unfortunately for many older Americans, "...with increasing age there is greater likelihood of disability and dependence" (Halpern & Deck, 1989, p.10).

For example, in 1994-95, 47.3% of those aged 65 to 79 reported having at least one disability (McNeil, 1997). In addition, 10.5% of the older population reported
difficulties performing activities of daily living (ADLs), while 15.3%, had difficulties with instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs).

ADLs include bathing, dressing, eating, and getting around the house. IADLs include preparing meals, shopping, managing money, using the telephone, doing housework, and taking medications. (AARP & AoA, 1999, p.13)

As age increases, the number of individuals affected drastically increases. For example, of those aged 80 and over, 71.5% report having at least one disability, 27.5% report difficulties with ADLs, and 40.4% report difficulties carrying out IADLs (McNeil, 1997). As life expectancy increases, more people than ever will be in need of elder care.

Increased Prevalence of Women in the Workforce

A second key change in society is "... the feminization of the workforce more than any other single social trend ... (that) is forcing a redefinition of the caregiver role..." (Halpern & Deck, 1989, p.12). Traditionally, women have taken on the role of primary caregiver within the family infrastructure, as evidenced by
the statistic that 75% of all informal caregivers are women (Ettner, 1995). Yet the number of non-employed women available to provide care to an elderly friend, relative, or parent is on the decline as women continue to enter the workforce. More female caregivers than ever are employed. In July 2000, women aged 16 years and older accounted for 60.1% of the civilian labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2000) compared to 51.5% in 1980 and is projected to increase to 61.7% in 2005 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997). As women continue to have a dominant presence in the workforce, coupled with the increasing number of older Americans, the number of female caregivers balancing work and family responsibilities will inevitably increase.

Increased Mobility of the Population

A third key change in society is the increased mobility of the population, making it more likely that adult children do not live near their aging parents. Distance between caregiver and care recipient can further complicate the elder care issue. A survey cosponsored by the National Council on the Aging (NCOA) and the Pew Charitable funds found that 7 million people provided or
managed "...care, services, or financial or legal assistance for a person aged 55 or older" (National Council on the Aging, 1997, p.3) that lived at least one hour away, and this number is expected to double within the next 15 years. Employed caregivers, with only so many hours in a day, will be forced to perform a juggling act between work and elder care to fulfill all of their commitments.

These three social trends fuel the need to provide a more in depth examination of the work / elder-caregiving relationship. In a meta-analysis of 17 studies focusing on the prevalence of elder care responsibilities among the working population, Gorey, Rice, and Brice (1992) estimate that between 7.4% and 11.8% of elder-caregivers are employed. Prior to the meta-analysis by Gorey et al. (1992), the prevalence rate of 25% was the statistic most often cited by advocates of workplace elder care programs (Wagner & Hunt, 1994). The mean prevalence rate for the 17 studies examined by Gorey et al. (1992) was 21.1%, but the mean is the result of prevalence rates in individual studies ranging from 1.9% to 46.0%. Gorey et al. (1992) purport that a studies' reported prevalence rate is linked to the studies' response rate and operational definition of caregiving. After adjusting for these study
characteristics, they estimate that the 7.4% - 11.8% prevalence rate is more accurate than the previously accepted 20% to 25% prevalence rate. Regardless, the number of employed elder-caregivers is projected to increase as the population ages. For example, Kossek, DeMarr, Backman, and Kollar (1993) found that 35% of their public employee sample expected to have elder care responsibilities in the future while only 3% reported that they currently provide elder care.

Given the predicted increase in elder care demands driven by the societal changes above, it is imperative that social scientists better understand how elder care responsibilities impact work and vice versa. Therefore, a conceptual model is presented to provide insight into this relationship.

The Conceptual Model

The conceptual model as presented in Appendix A will be explained from left to right, with the components broken down into the following subsections:

A. Antecedents to Work-Family Conflict
   a. Family Variables
   b. Work Variables
B. Work-Family Conflict

C. Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict: Withdrawal Behaviors

Since elder care is a relatively new area of research in the work and family domain, literature from the general caregiving, general work-family conflict (i.e., no focus on caregivers), and child care based work-family conflict domains will be used when elder care literature on the topic is not available. Comparing research focusing on child care based work-family conflict with elder care based work-family conflict is warranted, for elder care based work-family conflict "...is not expected to be any less intense than that which derives from child-care responsibilities" (Barling, MacEwen, Kelloway, & Higginbottom, 1994, p.391).

Due to lack of consensus within the work-family literature, the terms work to family conflict (WFC) and work interference with family (WIF) will be used interchangeably. For the same reason, family to work conflict (FWC) and family interference with work (FIW) will also be used interchangeably. In addition, researchers (for example Hepburn & Barling, 1996) have used the broader
term, interrole conflict, to represent the more specific term, work-family conflict, within their research.

Antecedents to Work-Family Conflict

Family Variables

The magnitude of work-family conflict perceived by a person providing care to an elderly parent, relative, or friend does not necessarily fall equally on all caregivers. Family variables, or characteristics of the caregiver, anticipated to influence work-family conflict include time spent providing elder care per week, type of care, marital status, and gender. Each characteristic, along with its hypothesized relationship as an antecedent to work-family conflict, is developed in the following subsections.

In the first study utilizing meta-analytic techniques to examine the antecedents of work-family conflict, Maraist (1999) included hours worked per week, inflexibility of work schedule, and marital status. Her findings will be discussed throughout this section since the layout of the thesis examines each antecedent separately. Maraist’s (1999) study examines general work-family conflict, in other words, she does not focus on people who identify themselves as caregivers. Logic would indicate that if a
relationship exists within the general population, the conflict would be greater for people with elder care responsibilities because of the increased demands on their time.

Time Spent Providing Elder Care. Hepburn and Barling (1996) found both the number of hours “providing care for my parent” and “interacting with my parent” to have significant path coefficients to both parent versus work interrole conflict and work versus parent interrole conflict (p.313). Further, the largest path coefficient of 0.36 was between caregiving hours and parent versus work interrole conflict.

The presence of elder care responsibilities alone, however, is not predicted to result in work-family conflict. Dichotomizing the variable would result in a categorization including people who spend 1 hour caregiving as well as those spending 20 hours. Work-family conflict is expected to be greatest for employees with the most demands on their time. As the definition of work-family conflict states, “…participation in the work role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77). As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.
Hypothesis 1: The total time spent providing elder care per week will be positively related to family interference with work.

Type of Care. In addition, caregivers perform a variety of tasks for their elderly family and friends, each demanding different amounts of time from their employed caregiver. The present study dichotomizes time spent providing elder care into time spent providing personal care and time spent providing other care. Personal care activities include meal preparation, physical care, housework, transportation, and so on. Other care activities are defined as arranging services, making appointments, checking in by phone to make sure everything is all right, handling finances, and so on. Intuitively, given the nature of the personal care activities, they will take more time to carry out as well as require the caregiver's physical presence. The other care activities, by their nature, take less time to carry out and will not necessarily require the caregiver's physical presence. Short phone calls while on a break at work, for example, would be sufficient to allow the caregiver time to check in or arrange services, and handling finances could be
completed whenever the caregiver had time available. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between time spent providing personal care and family interference with work will be stronger than the relationship between time spent providing other care and family interference with work.

**Marital Status.** Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggest that the increased time demands at home experienced by married individuals may lead them to experience more work-family conflict than unmarried individuals. Maraist (1999) notes that research to date has produced mixed results. Maraist’s (1999) meta-analytic investigation did not find married individuals to experience more work-family conflict than non-married individuals. Maraist’s (1999) meta-analysis, however, did not specifically focus on caregivers. Further investigation is necessary with specific focus on elder-caregivers. In line with the increased time demands faced by a person juggling the roles of elder-caregiver, spouse, and worker, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 3:** Married elder-caregivers will experience more family interference with work than non-married elder care givers.
Gender. A good portion of the caregiving literature has examined whether gender differences exist in the provision of care. Although this topic was introduced earlier under the increased prevalence of women in the workforce section, it needs to be revisited in further detail. It is widely accepted that women generally provide more overall caregiving assistance than men (Ettner, 1995; Stoller, 1983). Stone, Cafferata, and Sangl (1987) add support to previous researchers through their finding that 72% of caregivers to the frail elderly are women.

Stoller (1983) found that the impact of employment on the amount of time spent caring for an elderly parent was different for sons and daughters. Employed sons provided 22.9 less hours of assistance than non-employed sons per month, while employment did not affect the amount of care provided by daughters. In addition, daughters spent more time overall providing care than sons, with the degree of difference varying by task area. For example, the degree of difference was largest in domestic areas such as food preparation and smallest in managing finances (Stoller, 1983). Tasks typically carried out by women [i.e., hands on activities such as attending to personal hygiene needs, dressing, bathing, and grooming, as well as performing
household chores (Miller & Cafasso, 1992)] are performed more frequently, increasing the likelihood that women spend more time, overall, than men performing caregiving tasks (Smith, 1998). As a result of findings like the ones above, many researchers have proposed that women will perceive greater family interference with work than men. In addition, Gutek, Searle, and Klepa (1991) found that although men and women worked virtually the same number of hours, women reported significantly more work interference with family than men. From the work-family conflict and child care literature, Hochschild (1989) describes women as experiencing much more conflict and tension between their work and family lives than men, coining the term “the second shift” to refer to their family responsibilities after work.

Gignac, Kelloway, and Gottlieb (1996) examined a model of work-family conflict separately for male and female elder-caregivers. Significant differences were found between men and women, with women reporting more family interference with work and more work interference with family as a result of elder care involvement. The difference was explained partly through the finding that women provided substantial amounts of personal care to
their elderly relatives. Gignac et al. (1996) note that activities performed by men such as transportation and financial services can take place after work hours. Men may not have the same time demands between elder care and work because of this. Further, men have been found to...

...provide less help with personal care and household tasks and report feelings of greater competence in tasks related to finances or legal matters” in previous studies (Gignac et al., 1996, p.538). As a result, the following hypotheses are proposed.

**Hypothesis 4:** Women will report more work-family conflict (WIF and FIW) than men.

**Hypothesis 5:** Women will spend more time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks.

**Hypothesis 6:** Men will spend less time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that married elder-caregivers will experience more FIW than non-married elder-caregivers. In line with hypothesis 4, presented above, proposing that women will report more work-family conflict (WIF and FIW) than men, marital status is expected to interact with
gender. In other words, since women are expected to experience more FIW than men and being married is expected to increase FIW, married women are expected to report the most FIW. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 7:** There will be an interaction between marital status and gender, so that married women will report more FIW than un-married women who will report more FIW than married men who will report more FIW than un-married men.

**Work Variables**

In addition to family variables, work variables also influence work-family conflict, in particular WIF.

**Hours Worked.** Scharlach and Boyd (1989) found that employed caregivers are more likely to report job and family conflicts than non-employed caregivers. Greenhaus and Buetell (1985) suggest that as the number of hours worked per week increases, the amount of work-family conflict perceived increases. This results from the conflict associated with the worker role interfering with the individual’s ability to fulfill responsibilities in their family role. Through meta-analytic techniques, Maraist (1999) found the number of hours worked per week to
be positively related to work-family conflict. Her finding added support to previous researchers, in particular Greenhaus and Beutell (1985).

In addition, Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) found that lower levels of work to family conflict were associated with employees working fewer hours. Similarly, Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) found significant positive correlations between number of hours worked and work to family conflict in the three diverse samples examined in the study. Sample 1 was comprised of 182 elementary school teachers, high school teachers, and administrators, while sample 2 included 162 small business owners, and sample 3 was composed of 186 real estate sales people. All three samples in the Netemeyer et al. (1996) were from a large city in the southeast United States.

Neal and Hammer (2000) utilized a sample of husbands and wives from dual earner couples caring for both children and aging parents who were assessed at two time periods. Neal and Hammer (2000) found that, at Time 2, when working more hours than at Time 1, the wives displayed an increased amount of work-to-family conflict at Time 2. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.
Hypothesis 8: The number of hours worked per week will be positively related to work interference with family.

Flexible Work Arrangements. Maraist (1999) as well as Staines and Pleck (1984) found schedule flexibility to be negatively related to work-family conflict. Maraist's (1999) work was based on Greenhaus and Beutell's (1985) proposition that in addition to total hours worked, inflexible work schedules can produce work-family conflict. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) note that flexible work schedules will not automatically reduce work-family conflict for all employees. Decreased work-family conflict is dependent on the needs of the employee as well as the degree of flexibility.

It is my contention that employed elder-caregivers would greatly benefit from flexible work arrangements by reducing the conflicting time demands of work and caregiving. Consistent with this statement is the finding by Smith, Buffardi, and Holt (1999) that increased job flexibility is directly related to decreased work interference with elder care, evidenced by a significant path coefficient of -0.34 between the two variables. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.
Hypothesis 9: Flexible work arrangements will be negatively related to work interference with family.

Supervisor Support. Wagner and Neal (1994) point out the need for more research examining the role of support and work-family conflict for elder-caregivers. In general, "...the supportive supervisor is one who empathizes with the employee’s desire to seek balance between work and family responsibilities" (Thomas & Ganster, 1995, p.7). From the general work-family conflict literature, Thomas and Ganster (1995) found supervisor support to be negatively related to work to family conflict, as evidenced by a significant path coefficient of -0.23. Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) found supervisor support and work-family conflict to share an indirect relationship (through supervisor support’s effect on work distress and work overload). Goff, Mount, and Jamison (1990) found that supervisor support predicted less overall work-family conflict in a sample of 253 parents of children 5 years old and younger employed by a large electronics and communications firm in the midwestern United States. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 10: Family-related supervisor support will be negatively related to work interference with family.
Supportive Workplace Culture. Denison (1996) conceptualizes organizational culture as “the deep structure of organizations, which is rooted in values, beliefs, and assumptions held by organizational members” (p. 624). Consistent with this definition, workplace culture provides a broader index of organizational support than supervisor support by tapping that “deep structure of organizations...” (Denison, 1996, p. 624).

From the general work and family research (i.e., no specific focus on caregivers), Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) found perceptions of a supportive work-family culture to be negatively related to work interference with family. Work-family culture explained an additional 18% of the variance in work to family conflict after controlling for demographic variables and benefit availability. It should be noted that the work-family culture measure used by Thompson et al. (1999) included supervisor support and flexible work arrangement items. Therefore, it is possible that the amount of additional variance in work to family conflict explained by work-family culture is inflated with regard to this particular measure.

From the child care literature, Parker (1999) used a sample consisting of 614 first-term enlisted soldiers in
the United States’ Army who were married and had legal custody of at least one child. Using hierarchical regression analysis, Parker (1999) found that perceived army support for family (organizational support) predicted unique variance above and beyond demographic variables. In particular, the significant, negative regression coefficient indicates that higher levels of perceived organizational support are associated with lower levels of work to family conflict.

More specific to elder care, Smith et al. (1999) found organizational support to be a direct predictor of work interference with elder care (WIE). The path coefficient of -0.19 indicates that higher levels of organizational support are related to lower levels of WIE. In summary, “...a supportive culture should make it easier for employees to balance work and family demands and, as a result, experience less work-family conflict” (Thompson et al., 1999, p.397-398). As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 11:** Supportive workplace culture will be negatively related to work interference with family.
Work-Family Conflict

As defined earlier, work-family conflict occurs when demands associated with one domain interfere with demands in the other domain (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985). "The general demands of a role refer to the responsibilities, requirements, expectations, duties, and commitments associated with a given role" (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p.401). It is generally agreed upon within the literature that work to family conflict and family to work conflict stem from the demands of, time devoted to, and strain produced by, a given role (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Work-family conflict has been investigated as a uni-dimensional construct in much of the early work-family research. However, the nature of the construct lends itself to a bi-directional measure: work interference with family and family interference with work (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Failing to examine both types of WFC (work-family conflict) may limit our understanding of the work-family interface to the extent that each is associated with different antecedents and consequences. (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992, p.66)
Netemeyer et al. (1996) note that most research has only assessed general work-family conflict, failing to recognize the conceptual distinction. With respect to measurement issues, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) found that work-family conflict measures specifying direction (work to family or family to work) performed better than general or mixed measures.

Frone et al. (1992) examined and found evidence for the reciprocal relationship between WIF and FIW among married, living as married, or children at home adults employed 20 hours or more per week. Basically, ...if one’s family-related problems and responsibilities begin to interfere with the accomplishment of one’s work-related obligations, these unfulfilled work obligations may begin to interfere with one’s day-to-day functioning at home. (Frone et al., 1992, p.66)

As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 12:** A positive relationship will exist between WIF and FIW.
Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict

A number of outcomes have been examined in relation to work-family conflict, including both non-work and work related outcomes. Examples of non-work related outcomes associated with work-family conflict include: depression, stress, life dissatisfaction, and marital dissatisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 1996; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Examples of work related outcomes studied include: job dissatisfaction, job burnout, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover-absence and intention to seek new employment (Ayree, 1992; Burke, 1988; Goff et al., 1990; Netemeyer et al., 1996).

With particular relevance to the present thesis are intention to seek new employment and partial absence. For as Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton (1999) note “...more research examining work-related behavioral outcomes is needed. Only a handful of studies have examined the effect of WFC on variables such as absenteeism... and turnover” (p.5).

Intention to Seek New Employment

As Shultz and Silverstein (1999) point out “... little research is available that looks specifically at those
providing eldercare and the potential predictors associated with their intentions to change jobs" (p. 4). Even less research is available examining the relationship between work-family conflict and intention to seek new employment. According to Rickard, Neal, Hammer, and Caubet (2000), "only a few studies in the work and family literature have included intention to quit one's job as a variable (e.g., Boles, Johnston, & Hair, 1997; Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Smith et al., 1999)" (p. 8).

From the general literature, Netemeyer et al. (1996) found intention to leave an organization to be correlated with both WFC and FWC in sample 1 (teachers and administrators) and sample 3 (real estate salespersons), but not in sample 2 (small business owners). Although both WFC and FWC were significantly related to intention to leave an organization, the correlation with WFC was larger than FWC in both samples, by 0.02 in sample 1 and 0.11 in sample 3.

From the elder care literature, Boles et al. (1997) utilized a sample of male and female sales personnel to test a model of interrole stress and work attitudes. They found a positive relationship between work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion as well as a positive relationship
between emotional exhaustion and propensity to leave. Further, Boles et al. (1997) found a negative relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction, in addition to a negative relationship between job satisfaction and propensity to leave.

Rickard et al. (2000) failed to find evidence for the mediating effect of work-family conflict between parent care rewards/stressors and intention to quit using a longitudinal research design and a sample of dual earner couples. In addition, Grandey and Cropanzano (1999), using a sample of elder care providing university faculty and a time lagged research design, did not find a relationship between work-family conflict and turnover intentions.

Similar to the hypothesis presented below, however, Smith et al. (1999) did find that interrole conflict, specifically work interference with elder care, was positively related to turnover intentions, utilizing a sample of employees with elder care responsibilities from the same Fortune 500 company. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 13**: Work interference with family will be positively related to intention to seek new employment.
Partial Absenteeism

Ettner (1995) found that women residing with a disabled parent missed 130 hours of work in an 18-week period. Women providing care for 10 hours a week or more for a non-corresidential parent missed 64.53 work hours, and women providing care less than 10 hours a week missed 0.74 work hours.

Ettner (1995) found that women providing care to a non-corresidential parent managed to balance work and care by reducing work hours. Women providing care to a corresidential parent, however, were more likely to withdraw from the labor force. Specifically, the women could not reduce their work hours (and still keep their jobs) enough to juggle the competing demands of work and caregiving (Ettner, 1995). It is likely that the elderly residing with their caregiver demanded more time and attention from the caregiver. Regardless, both groups of women (non-corresidential and corresidential) accommodated their schedules by sacrificing work.

Goff et al. (1990), from the child care literature, found that lower work-family conflict was associated with decreased absenteeism (measured by combining full absences due to personal illness, personal business, and absence
without leave). Gignac et al. (1996) found that FIW was positively related to absenteeism (both days missed and days interrupted) for both men and women.

Although caregiving duties are related to both full and partial absences (arriving late and leaving early), Hepburn and Barling (1996) believe partial absence to be "...a more sensitive indicator of how work is affected by eldercare responsibilities" (p.311). Full and partial absence may be separate phenomena, affected by elder care responsibilities in different ways (Barling & Hepburn, 1996). Barling et al. (1994), for example, measured a correlation of only 0.18 between full absence (days missed) and partial absence (leaving work early, arriving late, and telephone use).

Many of the areas that elders need assistance with, such as "...bathing, eating, and transportation to medical, government, or financial consultations..." need to be taken care of during business hours (Hepburn & Barling, 1996, p.311). These types of elder care responsibilities may interfere with work, specifically, the employee simply cannot be in both places at the same time.

In 1994, Barling et al. found elder care based interrole conflict predicted partial absence using a sample
of employees from two universities. Similarly, in 1996, Hepburn and Barling tested a model involving partial absence. Hepburn and Barling (1996), however, initially set out to test their model with both full and partial absence, but only three instances of full absence were reported (in their sample of seventeen university employees), and full absence was dropped from the analysis and model. Hepburn and Barling (1996) found interrole conflict to moderate the relationship between number of hours providing elder care and partial absence. In particular, parent versus work interrole conflict (i.e., FIW) was positively related to partial absence. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**Hypothesis 14:** Family interference with work will be positively related to partial absence.

**Summary**

In review, a conceptual model of work-family conflict has been presented. Appendix B presents the conceptual model and summarizes most of the hypotheses that have been proposed (please reference Appendix C for a complete written summary of the hypotheses).
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Data was analyzed from The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) conducted by the Families and Work Institute (see Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998). The NSCW survey was first conducted in 1992, where it was the first survey to explore work and family issues with a national cross-section of employed adults since the U.S. Department of Labor's 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn & Staines, 1979). Like the 1992 survey, data from the 1997 NSCW represents a national cross-section of U.S. workers (18 years or older).

Between March 14 and July 27, 1997, 3,551 telephone interviews were completed. The present analyses will focus on the 2,877 wage and salaried workers. Although the dataset includes information on self-employed persons, they will not be included in the present study since self-employed persons can often set their own schedule and do not have direct supervisors. From the 2,877 respondents, the elder care group will include those individuals who answered yes to the question: "Do you CURRENTLY provide
special attention to someone 65 years old or older." Thus, the final dataset will consist of 388 respondents (13.49% of the original 2,877) with elder care responsibilities.

Procedure

Using a questionnaire developed by the Families and Work Institute, the 1997 NSCW survey was carried out by Louis Harris and Associates. Interviews were conducted by telephone using a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interview) system and averaged 40 minutes in length, with random-digit-dial methods utilized to select the phone numbers. The result was a stratified unclustered probability sample. Participants were contacted by phone up to 20 times to determine sample eligibility and to finish interviews when necessary (Bond et al., 1998).

Sample eligibility was limited to people who
1) worked at a paid job or operated an income-producing business, 2) were 18 years or older, 3) were in the civilian labor force, 4) resided in the contiguous 48 states, and 5) lived in a non-institutional residence, i.e. household, with a telephone. In households with more than one eligible person, one was randomly selected to be
interviewed. Interviewers offered cash honoraria of $20 as incentives. (Bond et al., 1998, p.165)

3,739 of the original 19,057 numbers generated were determined to be eligible (8,149: non-residential or non-working, 2,338: ineligible). Of the 3,739 eligible households, 3,552 surveys were completed, for a 95 percent completion rate. The overall response rate for the survey, based upon the number of potentially eligible households, was 52.9%.

Materials
(All items are listed in Appendix D).

Time Spent Providing Elder Care

Time spent providing personal care was assessed by a one-item question asking participants to estimate the amount of time spent per week providing care in person, such as meal preparation, household work, physical care, transportation to medical services, and so on. Time spent providing other care was also assessed by a one-item question asking participants to estimate the amount of time spent per week doing other types of things, such as calling on the phone, arranging services, and handling finances. Total time spent providing elder care represents the
summation of time spent providing personal care and time spent providing other care.

Marital Status

Marital status was assessed by one-item asking participants whether they are presently married, living with someone as a couple, single and never married, divorced, widowed, or separated. For the purpose of hypothesis testing, married and living with someone as a couple will be coded one for married, with the remaining options being coded zero for unmarried. Living with someone as a couple will be considered the same as married, because these people are likely experiencing the same role demands as a legally married couple.

Gender

Gender was assessed and recorded by the telephone interviewer. The data was recorded as male, female, or not sure.

Hours Worked

The total number of hours worked per week was constructed from two items: number of hours worked at main job and number of hours worked at jobs other than main job.
Flexible Work Arrangements

This measure was assessed using five items, with mixed response scales. One item was measured with yes or no: "Are you allowed to choose your own starting and quitting times within some range of hours." One item was answered with a four-point Likert type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and one item was measured with a four-option response ranging from not at all hard to very hard. The final item: "How much control would you say you have in scheduling your work hours," had a five-option response ranging from complete control to none.

Supervisor Support

Family related supervisor support was assessed by five items utilizing a four-point Likert type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. An example of an item from this scale is: "My supervisor really cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal and family life."

Workplace Culture

Family supportive workplace culture was assessed by four items with a four-point Likert type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. An example of an item from this scale is: "There is an unwritten rule at my place
of employment that you can’t take care of family needs on company time.”

Work-Family Conflict

The measure of work-family conflict consists of five items measuring family interference with work (FIW) and five items measuring work interference with family (WIF). All items asked respondents to frame their response in terms of the last three months. The responses for each item utilized a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = never and 5 = very often. For example, participants were asked to assess their response to questions such as: “In the past three months, how often have you not had enough time for yourself because of your job?” And “In the past three months, how often has your family or personal life kept you from concentrating on your job?”

Intention to Seek New Employment

Intention to seek new employment was assessed using one-item which asked participants to rate their level of likelihood on a three-point scale ranging from very likely to not at all likely. Respondents were asked: “How likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer in the next year?”
Partial Absence

Partial absence was assessed with one-item that asked:

"During the past three months, how many days did you start work late or stop early?"
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

(A summary table with the analysis performed for each hypothesis is located in Appendix E).

Prescreening of Data

Prior to hypothesis testing, variables were screened for outliers and normality of distribution (skewness and kurtosis). Evaluation of the partial absence variable’s distribution indicated that 247 respondents (65.34% of all respondents) reported starting work late or stopping early zero times in the prior three months. Due to the lack of variability within this continuous variable, the item was dichotomized. For the dichotomized variable, respondents citing zero days partially missed were coded as zero, and respondents citing one or more days partially missed were coded as one.

Following the guideline furnished by Tabachnik and Fidell (1996) items with $z$ scores > 3.29 were identified as outliers. Outliers were found in four variables: time spent providing personal care (12 cases with $z > 3.29$), time spent providing other care (5 cases with $z > 3.29$), hours worked (3 cases with $z > 3.29$), and FIW (6 cases with
Since FIW was a candidate for transformation, outlier deletion was deferred. After performing a square root transformation of FIW, no outliers were detected. The remaining three variables, although non-normally distributed, were not considered for transformation because the scores had unique meaning. Thus, the outlying cases were deleted from the three variables.

After deleting the outlying cases in time spent providing personal care and time spent providing other care, total time spent providing elder care was computed (missing cases were assigned zero before adding the two variables). Four outliers were identified ($z > 3.29$) and subsequently deleted from the total time spent providing elder care variable.

After deleting outliers from time spent providing personal care, time spent providing other care, total time spent providing elder care, and hours worked, skewness and kurtosis greatly improved. Appendix F displays the skewness and kurtosis statistics before and after outlier deletion. Skewness and kurtosis also improved for FIW after transformation, Appendix F also contains information for this variable.
Mahalonobis distance was utilized to assess possible multivariate outliers associated with gender, WIF and FIW (the variables used in the hypothesis 4 MANOVA analysis). No outliers were found at $X^2 (3, N = 388) = 16.26$.

For hypotheses 3 and 7, assumptions for analysis of variance were met. Evidence for the normality of the sampling distribution included: (a) sample sizes less than a 4:1 ratio and (b) error term degrees of freedom greater than 20. Evidence for homogeneity of within group variances was met as evidenced by Levene's test. For hypothesis 3, Levene's statistic $(1, 386) = .085, p > 0.05$. For hypothesis 7, $F (3, 384) = 1.78, p > 0.05$. In both cases, the null hypothesis that error variance for the dependent variable was equal across all groups was supported. Evidence for independence of error components was met by the research design.

For hypothesis 4, the assumptions for multivariate analysis of variance, i.e., multivariate normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were met.
Scale Construction

Since scale construction information was not available from the NSCW, factor analyses and reliability analyses (using Cronbach’s alpha) were conducted for all scales: flexible work arrangements (5 items), supervisor support (5 items), supportive workplace culture (4 items), overall work-family conflict (10 items), family interference with work (5 items), and work interference with family (5 items). Although not utilized in hypothesis testing, the ten-item overall work-family conflict scale was included in the scale construction analyses to ensure the distinctiveness of the family interference with work (5 items) and work interference with family (5 items) scales from which the overall work-family conflict scale is comprised.

Factor and Reliability Analyses

Flexible Work Arrangements. The five flexible work arrangement items were examined utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. The five items loaded on two factors, as evidenced by the scree plot, and rotated component matrix loadings (see Appendix G). Four items loaded on component 1, with rotated factor
loadings ranging from 0.57 to 0.80. The remaining item (variable qbp34: If presently part-time/full-time, could you arrange to work full-time/part-time in your current position?) loaded on component 2, with a rotated factor loading of 0.97. Subsequently, the reliability analysis revealed Cronbach’s alpha for the five item scale to be 0.54. Alpha if item deleted statistics revealed that the reliability of the scale would increase to 0.59 if item qbp34 was removed. The factor loadings and alpha if item deleted statistic led to the removal of the item (If presently part-time/full-time, could you arrange to work full-time/part-time in your current position?) from the flexible work arrangements scale.

After deleting the item, factor and reliability analyses were replicated with the revised four item flexible work arrangement scale. The four items were assessed utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. All four items loaded on one factor, as evidenced by the scree plot showing only one eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and factor loadings ranging from 0.58 to 0.79 (see Appendix H). Cronbach’s alpha for the four item scale is 0.59, and alpha if item deleted
statistics do not indicate the possibility of increasing alpha through decreasing the number of items in the scale.

Family Related Supervisor Support. The five family related supervisor support items were examined utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. The five items loaded on one factor, as evidenced by the scree plot showing only one eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and factor loadings ranging from 0.76 to 0.88 (see Appendix I). Cronbach’s alpha for the five item scale is 0.87.

Supportive Workplace Culture. The four supportive workplace culture items were examined utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. All four items loaded on one factor, as evidenced by the scree plot showing only one eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and factor loadings ranging from 0.75 to 0.77 (see Appendix J). Cronbach’s alpha for the four item scale is 0.76.

Overall Work-Family Conflict. The ten item overall work-family conflict items were assessed utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. The ten items loaded on two factors, as evidenced by the scree plot showing two eigenvalues exceeding 1.0. The rotated component matrix (varimax
rotation with Kaiser Normalization) was utilized to interpret factor loadings. The five items (family interference with work items) loading on component 1 had factor loadings ranging from 0.69 to 0.84. The other five items (work interference with family items) displayed factor loadings ranging from 0.58 to 0.86 on component 2. However the item: “In the past three months, how often have you not been in as good a mood as you would like to be at home because of your job?” (item 5 work interference with family scale) cross loaded on the two components, with 0.42 on component 1 and .58 on component 2. (See Appendix K for overall work-family conflict scree plot and rotated component matrix).

After evaluating the minimal change in reliability (Cronbach’s alpha only decreased .0024 resulting in an alpha of .85 for the four item scale), the cross-loading item was removed from the work interference with family scale. Cronbach’s alpha for ten item overall work-family conflict scale was 0.86, and Cronbach’s alpha after removal of the cross-loading item was 0.84.

**Family Interference with Work.** The five family interference with work items were assessed utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax
rotation. The five items loaded on one factor, as evidenced by the scree plot showing one eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and factor loadings ranging from 0.75 to 0.85 (see Appendix L). Cronbach’s alpha for the family interference with work scale is 0.84.

Work Interference with Family. As discussed above (under the overall work-family conflict section), evaluation of the ten overall work-family conflict items through factor analysis led to the removal of one item from the work interference with family scale. Evaluation of the remaining four items utilizing principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation yielded the emergence of one underlying factor, evidenced by the scree plot showing one eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and factor loadings ranging from 0.76 to 0.88 (see Appendix M). Cronbach’s alpha for the four item work interference with family scale is 0.85.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were utilized to compare the overall sample (N = 2,877) to the elder care sub sample (N = 388), and Appendix N contains this information. Although some differences exist, overall, the samples are
comparable. The following section will focus on the differences between the two populations (please refer to Appendix N containing all of the variables used for comparison). Comparing the mean age of the two samples, the average age for the overall sample is 40.18 years ($SD = 11.90$) while the elder care sample is slightly older at 45.78 years ($SD = 11.97$). In addition, a larger percentage of respondents in the overall sample have a 4-year college degree, with 20.61% versus 16.49% in the elder care sample. In terms of occupations, more respondents in the elder care sample work in the service industry compared to the overall sample, 15.46% versus 10.67%, respectively.

Noticeably different across the two samples is the percentage of respondents reporting the presence of elder care responsibilities in the past year. While 25.30% of the overall sample had elder care responsibilities in the past year, 100.00% of those currently providing care had elder care responsibilities in the past year. Of those respondents reporting elder care responsibilities in the past year, 36.68% in the overall sample, and 35.57% in the elder care sample, took time off or worked fewer hours due to elder care responsibilities. Also discrepant between
the two samples is the percentage of respondents expecting to have elder care responsibilities in the next five years. While 41.19% of respondents in the overall sample expect to provide care, 81.44% of respondents in the elder care sample anticipate elder care responsibilities within the next five years.

Evaluation of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Pearson’s product moment correlation was computed to evaluate hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1, stating that the total time spent providing elder care per week will be positively related to family interference with work, was not supported, \( r (357) = -0.02, p > 0.01 \).

Hypothesis 2

To examine hypothesis 2, Pearson’s product moment correlations were obtained for use in the \( t \) formula developed by Williams in 1959 to assess the significant difference of dependent \( r \)’s. Hypothesis 2, stating that the relationship between time spent providing personal care and family interference with work will be stronger than the relationship between time spent providing other care and family interference with work, was not supported,
t (239) = -1.54, p > 0.01. For the correlation between time spent providing personal care and FIW, r (239) = -0.02, p > 0.01. For the correlation between time spent providing other care and FIW, r (239) = 0.11, p > 0.01, and for the correlation between time spent providing personal care and time spent providing other care, r (239) = 0.24, p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 3

An independent sample t-test was performed to assess hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3, purporting that married elder-caregivers will experience more family interference with work than non-married elder-caregivers, was not supported, t (386) = -0.89, p > 0.01. The mean FIW for married elder-caregivers was 3.04 (SD = 0.60) and the mean FIW for non-married elder-caregivers was 3.09 (SD = 0.61).

Hypothesis 4

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to assess hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 4, stating that women will report more work-family conflict (WIF and FIW) than men, was not supported, Wilks’ Lambda (2, 385) = 0.24, p > 0.01, eta squared < 0.01.
Hypothesis 5

Focusing the analysis only on women (select cases qsc8 = 2), a paired sample t-test was performed to evaluate hypothesis 5. Hypothesis 5, proposing that women will spend more time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks, was supported, t (143) = 8.8, p < 0.01. On average, women spent 7.60 hours per week (SD = 6.55) performing personal care tasks and 2.90 hours per week (SD = 2.44) performing other care tasks.

Hypothesis 6

Focusing the analysis only on men (select cases qsc8 = 1), a paired sample t-test was performed to evaluate hypothesis 6. Hypothesis 6, purporting that men will spend less time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks, was not supported. The analysis, however, was significant although not in the proposed direction, t (96) = 5.66, p < 0.01. On average, men spent 6.02 hours per week (SD = 5.14) performing personal care tasks and 3.07 hours per week (SD = 2.55) performing other care tasks.
Hypothesis 7

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to assess hypothesis 7. Hypothesis 7, proposing an interaction between marital status and gender, so that married women will report more FIW than un-married women who will report more FIW than married men who will report more FIW than un-married men, was not supported. Omnibus $F(3, 384) = 0.52, p > 0.01$, eta squared < 0.01.

Interaction effect (marital status * gender)
$F(1, 384) = 0.40, p > 0.01$, eta squared < 0.01.

Hypothesis 8

Pearson’s product moment correlation was computed to evaluate hypothesis 8. Hypothesis 8, proposing that the total number of hours worked per week will be positively related to work interference with family, was supported, $r(379) = 0.26, p < 0.01$.

Hypothesis 9

Pearson’s product moment correlation was calculated to evaluate hypothesis 9. Hypothesis 9, purporting that flexible work arrangements will be negatively related to work interference with family, was supported, $r(386) = -0.24, p < 0.01$. 
Hypothesis 10

Pearson's product moment correlation was computed to evaluate hypothesis 10. Hypothesis 10, purporting that family-related supervisor support will be negatively related to work interference with family, was supported, \( r (339) = -0.28, p < 0.01 \).

Hypothesis 11

Pearson's product moment correlation was calculated to evaluate hypothesis 11. Hypothesis 11, proposing that supportive workplace culture will be negatively related to work interference with family, was supported, \( r (386) = -0.21, p < 0.01 \).

Hypothesis 12

Pearson's product moment correlation was computed to evaluate hypothesis 12. Hypothesis 12, stating that a positive relationship will exist between work interference with family and family interference with work, was supported, \( r (386) = 0.36, p < 0.01 \).

Hypothesis 13

Pearson's product moment correlation was calculated to evaluate hypothesis 13. Hypothesis 13, proposing that work interference with family will be positively related to
intention to seek new employment, was supported, $r (386) = 0.17, p < 0.01$.

**Hypothesis 14**

Pearson’s product moment correlation was computed to evaluate hypothesis 14. Hypothesis 14, proposing that family interference with work will be positively related to partial absence was not supported, $r (376) = 0.09, p > 0.01$.

**Post Hoc Analysis**

After evaluating the hypotheses testing results, one post hoc analysis was carried out. The results of hypotheses 5 and 6 indicate that both women and men, respectively, perform significantly more personal care than other care per week. This raises the question: Do women spend significantly more time providing personal care each week to an elderly relative or friend than men? Assumptions for analysis of variance: normality of the sampling distribution, homogeneity of within group variances [Levene’s statistic ($1, 317) = 3.50, p > 0.05$], and independence of error components were met.
An independent sample t-test was performed to answer the question. Women did, in fact, spend more time per week performing personal care tasks than men, $t(317) = -2.12$, $p < 0.05$. On average, women spent 7.19 hours per week ($SD = 6.48$) performing personal care tasks while men spent 5.75 hours per week ($SD = 5.34$) performing personal care tasks.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

My goal in writing this thesis was to provide new insight into the relationship between elder care and work. To do so, a conceptual model of work-family conflict for employed elder-caregivers was presented and assessed. Appendix 0 presents the conceptual model and highlights significant findings with an asterisk. Overall, 7 of the 14 proposed hypotheses were supported. It is interesting to point out, however, that the entire top half of the conceptual model with associations to FIW was not supported. The bottom half of the model, on the other hand, with associations to WIF was supported. The current section will discuss the expected and unexpected findings associated with the proposed conceptual model.

Antecedents to Work-Family Conflict

As presented in Appendix 0, none of the family variables proposed to share a relationship with FIW were supported. All of the work variables, on the other hand, were associated with WIF as anticipated. The sections to
follow discuss the results of the family variable hypotheses and the work variable hypotheses.

**Family Variables**

Total time spent providing elder care per week was not related to FIW (hypothesis 1). This result was contrary to Hepburn and Barling's (1996) finding that both time spent providing care and time spent interacting with a parent had significant path coefficients to interrole conflict. Similarly, hypothesis 2 was not supported. The relationship between time spent providing personal care and FIW was not stronger than the relationship between time spent providing other care and FIW as predicted. Examining the correlations themselves, neither type of care was significantly related to FIW. This is consistent with the result of hypothesis 1, showing the lack of significance between total time spent providing elder care and FIW.

One interpretation of these results is that FIW is not influenced by time constraints as hypothesized. It is evident that FIW is more than simply an outcome to a behavioral conflict (i.e., conflicting time demands). Since the number of hours providing elder care per week (i.e., total time, time personal care, time other care) was not related to FIW, there may be another factor, that along
with the presence of elder care responsibilities, results in FIW.

For example, from the general work-family conflict literature, Frone et al. (1992) identified a relationship between family involvement and family to work conflict where family involvement was conceptualized as the degree to which the respondent’s family was central to the respondent’s self-concept. Identifying family responsibilities (of which elder care responsibilities are a part) as central to one’s self concept involves much more than the gross number of hours invested in care per week. Unfortunately, there is no way to assess the relationship of this construct to FIW using the NSCW data analyzed in this thesis. Future researchers may wish to explore this topic to further understand FIW in relation to the presence of elder care responsibilities.

A second interpretation to the lack of significant relationships between time spent providing care (i.e., total time, time personal care, time other care) and FIW involves adaptation. It is possible that the elder care providers in this study have adjusted to the constraints placed upon them. Examining the descriptive statistics in Appendix N, 100.00% of the 388 elder care providers
examined in this study (those currently providing elder care) also reported having elder care responsibilities in the past year.

Focusing their study on female caregivers to a physically disabled elderly (defined as 55 years and older) relative, Franklin, Ames, and King (1994) hypothesized that elder-caregivers adapt their employment behaviors to provide care. Franklin et al. (1994) assessed employment behaviors at two time periods, three months apart, and found that short-term work adjustments (defined as arriving late or leaving early, missing work without pay, taking sick or personal days, changing work hours, refusing a job or promotion, being kept from a job hunt or a better job, and other work effects) and leaves of absence were significantly less at Time 2.

Perhaps this outcome represents a return to the balance of work and family obligations that existed before the caregiver assumed the eldercare role. It may mean the caregiver is adjusting so successfully to the eldercare role that she finds it less necessary to adapt employment. (Franklin et al., 1994, p.38)
Results of hypothesis 3 indicate that married elder-caregivers did not experience greater FIW than non-married elder-caregivers. Married elder-caregivers were expected to report greater FIW than non-married elder-caregivers because of the increased time demands associated with being married in addition to the time demands associated with providing care. The current result, however, adds evidence to Maraist's (1999) meta-analytic finding that married individuals do not experience more work-family conflict than non-married individuals. Since Maraist's (1999) meta-analysis did not focus on caregivers, the present research aimed to examine the role of marital status and FIW in an elder-caregiving population. It appears, however, that marital status has no bearing on time demands or FIW as evidenced by the near identical mean FIW of the two groups.

Contrary to previous literature (e.g., Gignac et al., 1996; Gutek et al., 1991) reporting greater levels of work-family conflict for women, women did not report more work-family conflict (WIF and FIW) than men (hypothesis 4). Similarly, Eagle, Miles, and Icenogle (1997) did not find gender differences in regard to the permeability of work and family boundaries. In other words, men and women reported near identical levels of work to family conflict.
and family to work conflict. As more female caregivers are members of the work force than ever before, new roles as well as role exchanges have evolved for men and women. As men and women embody a variety of social roles (both family and work), the potential for interrole conflict increases for both genders, and both men and women must learn to manage their interrole conflict (Frone & Rice, 1987).

As predicted by hypothesis 5, women spent more time providing personal care than other care. Opposite to the direction expected for hypothesis 6, men spent more time providing personal care than other care, the same direction as the female population examined in hypothesis 5. Men were expected to spend more time providing other care than personal care. Although this study did not inquire as to whether the elder-caregiver was sharing care responsibilities with other persons, it is possible that respondents were not sharing responsibilities. If the respondents were the sole or primary care providers, it makes sense that the bulk of caregiving time was spent in personal care activities for both men and women. The nature of the personal care activities, meal preparation, physical care, housework, and transportation take up more of the caregivers time than the other care tasks, arranging
services, making appointments, checking in by phone, and handling finances.

Another explanation of the finding that men spent more time performing personal care tasks than other care tasks lies in the definitions of the two types of care. Gignac et al. (1996) reported that men are typically involved with transportation and financial activities. Since the definition of personal care includes transportation and other care includes handling finances, it is possible that men simply spend more time helping with transportation than handling finances, explaining the greater time spent performing personal care.

Building on the results of hypothesis 5 and 6, a post hoc analysis was performed. Although both women and men spent more time providing personal care than other care within their respective gender populations, women spent significantly more time providing personal care than men per week. This result supports the findings of previous researchers (e.g., Gignac et al., 1996; Miller & Cafasso, 1992; Stoller, 1983) in regard to time spent providing care between the different gender groups.

The results of hypothesis 5, hypothesis 6, and the post hoc analysis, however, are limited in respect to
interpretation. Ideally, information would be available on the amount of time spent on each of the different task areas, allowing exploration of the pattern of differences in task area by gender. Unfortunately, such detailed task information was not available in the NSCW dataset. To enhance interpretation, future researchers may wish to investigate the time spent on each task area in relation to FIW.

Hypothesis 7 was based on the assumptions that: (a) married elder-caregivers would report more FIW than non-married elder-caregivers and (b) women would report more work-family conflict than men (hypothesis 4). Since neither hypothesis 3 nor 4 were supported, it is not surprising that the proposed interaction between marital status and gender on FIW was not supported.

Work Variables

As anticipated, the total number of hours worked per week was positively related to WIF, supporting hypothesis 8. In 1983, Staines and Pleck suggested that since people usually have much less control over their work lives than their family lives, their family lives are often adjusted to accommodate their work lives. Following the logic of Staines and Pleck (1983), the present study found that as
the number of hours worked increased, the amount of WIF also increased.

In line with previous literature (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Maraist, 1999; Smith et al., 1999; Staines & Pleck, 1984), flexible work arrangements were negatively related to WIF (hypothesis 9). Flexible work schedules may serve to reduce the conflicting time demands experienced by employed elder-caregivers by allowing them to alter their schedule to suit their needs, thereby relieving some of the conflict they experience.

Supporting hypothesis 10, family related supervisor support was negatively related to WIF. In other words, as supervisor support increased, WIF decreased. This finding extends the literature in the area of supervisor support and work-family conflict by supporting the proposed relationship in an elder care population (previously cited literature was from the general work-family conflict and child care populations).

As proposed, supportive workplace culture was negatively related to WIF (hypothesis 11). Elder-caregivers who felt that their workplace was supportive of their commitment to their family responsibilities reported decreased WIF. The support for hypotheses 9, 10, and 11
provide evidence to the role that a worker's employment situation has on their family life. In particular, the strongest association existed between supervisor support and WIF, with a correlation of -0.28. By being supportive of the elder-caregiver's situation through supervisor support, flexible work arrangements, and workplace culture, the amount of WIF experienced by employed elder-caregivers can be reduced.

Work-Family Conflict

Supporting hypothesis 12, a positive relationship was found between WIF and FIW. In other words, increases in WIF were associated with increases in FIW. In a sense, the relationship between WIF and FIW is reciprocal (Frone et al., 1992). As the elder-caregiver's work life begins to interfere with their family life, their family life will turn around and interfere with their work life. Even though WIF and FIW are related, the factor analysis revealed that the two constructs are unique, as the definition of work-family conflict suggests. Although the bi-directional nature of work-family conflict is clear, many past researchers have only assessed work to family
conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The current investigation has added to the literature in this respect.

**Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict**

As predicted, WIF was positively related to intention to seek new employment (hypothesis 13). As the level of WIF increased for the employed elder-caregivers examined, intention to seek new employment also increased. Employees may seek alternate work settings that provide them with better work schedules or arrangements to reduce the nonwork demands and the potential for work-nonwork conflict (Cohen, 1997). In addition, workers are more likely to hold their organization responsible (and not their family) when they experience work-nonwork conflict (Cohen, 1997).

Although it is hard to assess the future behaviors of individuals, in particular, whether individuals who intend to seek new employment actually leave their present job for another, intention to seek new employment provides insight into the early stages of the turnover process. Mobley’s (1977) turnover model utilizes cognitions associated with the turnover process, specifically, thinking of quitting, intention to search, and intention to quit. In Mobley’s model, intention to quit directly precedes turnover. More
recently, however, Mobley’s (1977) model has been revised (Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984) and assessed (Sager, Griffeth, & Hom, 1998), placing “...intention to search as the primary precursor to turnover” (Sager et al., 1998, p.257). Regardless of the specific position of intention to search (named intention to seek new employment in this study), there is evidence to the relationship between turnover cognitions and actual turnover. Since intention to search is related to turnover, the finding that WIF and intention to seek new employment are positively related warrants attention by organizational decision makers seeking to reduce unwanted employee turnover, especially among elder-caregivers.

Contrary to expectation, FIW was not related to partial absence (hypothesis 14). Past research has documented the relationship between FIW and partial absence, causing the present result to be suspect. Because of an abundance of zeros reported in the partial absence variable (i.e., 247 respondents, or 65.34% of total respondents, did not report starting late or stopping early in the prior three month period), the variable was dichotomized as no days partially missed and one or more days partially missed. Thus, the lack of variability in
this population may be masking differences within another elder-caregiving population. In particular, a population where elder care responsibilities are new to the caregivers. Although the intention of this study was to assess a population new to caregiving, 100.00% of the respondents currently providing care, as mentioned before, reported the presence of elder-caregiving responsibilities in the past year. In addition, 35.57% of the elder-caregiving population reported taking time off or working fewer hours due to the elder care responsibilities that they had in the past year. Extending the information presented earlier, elder-caregivers may have adjusted to their elder care responsibilities and no longer need to adapt their employment behaviors, representing a closer approximation to their pre-elder care way of life.

In addition, the lack of a relationship between FIW and partial absence may have been the result of the way in which the variable was operationalized in the current research. Past researchers have included arriving late, leaving early, time spent on the phone, and expanded lunch hours as measures of partial absence, yet only starting late or stopping early could be assessed in the present investigation. Unfortunately, the secondary dataset used
in this analysis did not allow for the inclusion of other partial absence measures. Future researchers may which to include all the partial absence components in an attempt to explore their relationship with FIW.

Academic Implications

As evidenced by the abundance of research cited throughout this thesis from the general (no focus on caregivers), general caregiving, and child-caregiving domains, there is a need for more researchers, with specific focus on elder-caregivers, to examine the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict. This thesis was carried out to help meet that need.

In particular, by extending the general work-family domain in the present study, the professional literature has been strengthened by examining the relationship of marital status and family interference with work in an elder-caregiving population. Similar to the results found in the general work-family conflict literature (e.g., Maraist, 1999), no difference in FIW was reported for married and non-married elder-caregivers.

In terms of work-family conflict, the present research contributes to the literature by examining the bi-
directional nature of the measure, work interference with family and family interference with work. By separating WIF and FIW, it becomes possible to examine the antecedents and outcomes associated with each, going beyond previous literature that focused only on general work-family conflict or WIF. Although only the associations with WIF received support in the conceptual model, that does not lessen the importance of FIW. Both WIF and FIW are separate, although related, concepts that require future examination. In particular, it is important to examine the antecedents and outcomes associated with each.

As noted in the literature review, there is a limited amount of research examining intention to seek new employment in relation to work-family conflict, and specifically, in relation to work interference with family. The present study strengthens the elder care literature by examining this variable as an outcome of work interference with family.

Most elder care studies to date have focused either on individuals currently providing care (as this study did) or on individuals who have had elder care responsibilities in the past. The elder care providing population utilized in this study may be seen as providing insight into the
dynamic of long-term elder-caregiving by utilizing a sample of caregivers that have provided care in the past year as well as currently providing elder care.

In addition, many studies investigating the informal care system have:

...not been especially helpful in the development of new policy because the conclusions have been based on small, nonrepresentative samples of caregivers restricted to a particular geographic region, socioeconomic status, and living arrangement. (Stone et al., 1987, p.616)

With particular relevance to the present thesis, many studies of employed caregivers have only included participants from one organization. As cited above, studies of this kind are not as valuable to policy implementers as studies, such as this one, utilizing a national cross-section of the U.S. caregiving labor force, across many job categories and organizations.

Finally, the present study did not focus solely on the primary caregiver as many caregiving studies have (Stone et al., 1987). By assessing the work-family conflict in all employed persons contributing to the care of an elderly friend or family member, the literature is strengthened.
Thus providing policy makers and researchers alike evidence of the struggles and negative outcomes (i.e., withdrawal behaviors) associated with elder care experiences of all kinds.

In summary, the present research contributes to the professional caregiving and work-family conflict literatures in a variety of ways. Overall, by using a large national sample of employed elder-caregivers across many job categories, the present research adds strength and generalizability to the topics explored.

Applied Implications

Descriptive statistics indicated that 13.49% of the total NSCW population (388 of 2,877) identify themselves as current providers of care to someone at least 65 years of age. In addition, 41.19% of the NSCW population anticipates having to provide care in the future. These current data, along with the changing population demographics that indicate a shrinking labor force for the future, make issues pertaining to employed elder-caregivers of great importance to organizations.

Organizational decision makers should be aware that flexible work arrangements, supportive supervisors, and a
supportive workplace culture are related to decreased levels of WIF. Decreased WIF, in turn, is related to decreased intentions to seek new employment for employed elder-caregivers. By providing employees the opportunity to utilize flexible work arrangements and by training and hiring supportive supervisors, employers could avoid some of the high costs associated with caregiver turnover.

Although the present study did not support previous findings that FIW is related to partial absence, the way the construct was measured may have masked the existence of such a relationship in the present research. However, 36.68% of the entire sample (i.e., not only those currently providing care) who were responsible for elder care in the past year (see Appendix N), reported taking time off or working fewer hours due to elder care. Armed with this information and citing previous researchers, organizations may still want to consider absenteeism as an outcome of FIW.

Because partial absence is a social response to an environmental demand, attempts to control its occurrence are not appropriate. Instead, innovative responses from organizations that acknowledge employees' needs to cope with elder-
care responsibilities while not compromising attendance behaviors are now required. (Barling et al., 1994, p. 396)

In 1977, Kanter identified two types of responses that employers can have in relation to work-nonwork issues. The first response is based on the idea that an employee's work and nonwork lives should be separate. With this response, employers are only concerned with their employees' work lives, and expect them to leave everything else at the door. The second response held by employers is termed integration. When integration is involved, employers seek to acknowledge both the work and nonwork lives of their employees.

This response aims to close the work-nonwork gap, can reduce the conflict between work and nonwork domains, and should result in more favorable attitudes toward the organization. (Cohen, 1997, p. 1532)

In general, it is in the control of the organization as to which image they want to portray. But ultimately, the organization that fosters integration of their employees' work and family lives will have employees with less WIF and higher retention rates (i.e., their employees
will not seek new employment as frequently as an organization that is a proponent of separation). In addition, although this study did not focus on other organizational outcomes to work-family conflict, previous researchers have documented relationships between work-family conflict and job dissatisfaction, job burnout, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover (Ayree, 1992; Burke, 1988; Goff et al., 1990; Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Inevitably, there are a lot of factors that employers have control over in the workplace, such as work hours, schedule flexibility, supervision, and workplace culture. By acknowledging that workplace factors can interfere with their employees' family (non-work) lives, and vice versa, employers will be taking a proactive step in the right direction.

Limitations

The present investigation has several limitations that need to be mentioned. First, the use of cross-sectional data limits the inferences that can be drawn from the results. For example, assessing the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict for the same individuals
over time would have strengthened the present investigation by providing insight into the adjustment patterns of employed elder-caregivers. In addition, assessing respondents at different time periods would have allowed for an exploration of the relationship between intention to seek new employment and actual turnover.

The second limitation of this study concerns the self-report nature of the measures. "...Thus exposing the findings to interpretations from common method variance, response consistency effects, and the like" (Thomas & Ganster, 1995, p. 12). According to Thomas and Ganster (1995), this is a common criticism of work-family conflict literature, for the constructs often involve cognitions and sensitive topics (i.e., FIW, WIF, supervisor support, workplace culture, and intention to seek new employment).

Third, by utilizing a secondary dataset in the present investigation, the exploration of relationships was limited. Specifically, the present study was limited in relation to type of elder care provided and the withdrawal behaviors of full and partial absence. As mentioned earlier in this section, the investigation of gender differences and FIW was limited because the personal and other care variables were presented at the aggregate level.
only. It would have been much more insightful to analyze the data at the task level to identify the source of differences.

Unfortunately, for the present investigation, full absence questions were not asked of all respondents, rather, only those who were living with another person in the household. Since not all elder-caregivers were living with another person in the household, this construct could not be utilized in the analysis. In relation to partial absence, the item only assessed whether respondents had started late or left early over the past three months period. Since prior researchers have included arriving late, leaving early, time spent on the phone, and expanded lunch hours as measures of partial absence, the present study is limited in terms of comparability to other studies and the ability to detect a relationship between partial absence and FIW.

Fourth, conclusions drawn from the data analysis used in this study are limited because the numerous relationships depicted in the conceptual model were not tested simultaneously. Since the investigation was exploratory in nature, the relationships within the conceptual model were tested individually at the variable
level. Although this approach is appropriate for exploration, doing so limits the interpretability and increases the family-wise error involved in the analyses.

Fifth, examining the items utilized in the FIW and WIF scales, the items are behavioral in nature. By using a behaviorally based scale, the interpretation of the findings is lessened, for perceptions of FIW and WIF have not been assessed.

Future Research

Future researchers should seek to test the conceptual model simultaneously, possibly utilizing path analysis or structural equation modeling. In light of the results of the present investigation where the top half of the conceptual model, with proposed associations to FIW, was not supported, future research is needed in this area. In particular, the finding that total number of hours providing care per week was not related to FIW was unexpected in light of previous research. Future researchers may wish to utilize both the total number of hours providing care along with a measure such as family involvement where the involvement is central to the
respondent's self-concept to assess the different associations to FIW.

Since only the bottom half of the conceptual model, with associations to WIF, was supported, future research should seek to assess whether the results found in this study are specific to elder-caregivers or the population in general. Using a comparison non elder care group would achieve this goal and enable a direct comparison of the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict in an elder-caregiving and non elder-caregiving population. Although it is not within the scope of this project, future researchers using the NSCW dataset could compare the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict for employed elder-caregivers and employed child-caregivers to assess whether differences exist between the two caregiving groups.

In addition, although many of the correlational hypotheses were supported, the relationships were not particularly strong, with the absolute value of the correlations ranging from 0.17 to 0.36. A replication of the present study would serve to identify whether or not the correlations are truly this low in elder-caregiving populations or whether it was particular to this specific
study. Since there is evidence that the elder-caregivers in this sample are not only currently providing care, but have provided care in the previous year, future investigations may seek to separate and compare the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict experienced by these two populations.

As mentioned previously, using an expanded criterion for partial absence to include arriving late, leaving early, time spent on the phone, and expanded lunch hours would enable a more meaningful investigation of withdrawal behaviors. Similarly, full absence should be included in any future investigation of withdrawal behaviors to assess whether both, one, or neither partial and full absence are related to work-family conflict in addition to the relative strength of both associations.

In addition, the present analysis relied on self-report measures. Future researchers should seek to use objective measures when possible over self-report measures, for "this subjective approach may mean that the employment adaptations are either under- or over reported" (Franklin et al., 1994, p.40). For example, objective data could be collected in the area of absences through the use of employee personnel files or supervisor accounts.
Although the items used to assess work-family conflict in this study are comparable to the items used in other studies, no standard scale to assess the two types of work-family conflict currently exists. Because of this, the generalizability of information obtained across studies is limited. Future researchers may wish to standardize the items used to assess FIW and WIF.

Conclusions

A conceptual model of work-family conflict for employed elder-caregivers of a friend or relative 65 years and above was presented. Overall, the bottom half (work) of the conceptual model was supported while the top half (demographics) of the model, as presented in Appendix 0, was not.

Hours worked, supervisor support, flexible work arrangements, supportive workplace culture, and FIW were all associated with WIF. WIF, in turn, was associated with intention to seek new employment. Organizational decision makers should be aware that variables at work have the ability to affect the home lives of their employees. In addition, supporting the commitment of their employees to balance their work and family lives may have a number of
effects for their work force. In particular, employers have the ability to decrease the amount of turnover and the high costs associated with it for their organizations.
APPENDIX A:

A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE

WORK–FAMILY INTERFACE
Antecedents  

Family Variables  
- Time Spent Providing Elder Care
- Type of Care (0-Other Care 1-Personal Care)
- Marital Status (0-Un-Married 1-Married)
- Gender (0-Men 1-Women)

Work Variables  
- Hours Worked
- Flexible Work Arrangements
- Supervisor Support
- Supportive Workplace Culture

Outcomes
- FIW Partial Absence
- WIF Intention to Seek New Employment
APPENDIX B:

THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE WORK-FAMILY INTERFACE

WITH PROPOSED RELATIONSHIPS
Hypotheses not depicted:

- $H_5$: Women will spend more time providing personal care tasks than other care tasks.
- $H_6$: Men will spend less time providing personal care tasks than other care tasks.
- $H_7$: There will be an interaction between marital status and gender.

FIW: MW>UW>MM>UM.

---

### Antecedents

#### Family Variables

- Time Spent Providing Elder Care
  - $+ H_1$
- Type of Care (0-Other Care 1-Personal Care)
  - $+ H_2$
- Marital Status (0-Un-Married 1-Married)
  - $+ H_3$
- Gender (0-Men 1-Women)
  - $+ H_4$

#### Work Variables

- Hours Worked
  - $+ H_8$
- Flexible Work Arrangements
  - $- H_9$
- Supervisor Support
  - $- H_{10}$
- Supportive Workplace Culture
  - $- H_{11}$

#### Outcomes

- Partial Absence
  - $+ H_{14}$
- Intention to Seek New Employment
  - $+ H_{13}$
APPENDIX C:

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES
Hypothesis 1: The total time spent providing elder care per week will be positively related to family interference with work.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between time spent providing personal care and family interference with work will be stronger than the relationship between time spent providing other care and family interference with work.

Hypothesis 3: Married elder-caregivers will experience more family interference with work than non-married elder care givers.

Hypothesis 4: Women will report more work-family conflict (WIF and FIW) than men.

Hypothesis 5: Women will spend more time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks.

Hypothesis 6: Men will spend less time providing personal care tasks to elderly relatives and friends than other care tasks.

Hypothesis 7: There will be an interaction between marital status and gender, so that married women will report more FIW than un-married women who will report more FIW than married men who will report more FIW than un-married men.
Hypothesis 8: The number of hours worked per week will be positively related to work interference with family.

Hypothesis 9: Flexible work arrangements will be negatively related to work interference with family.

Hypothesis 10: Family-related supervisor support will be negatively related to work interference with family.

Hypothesis 11: Supportive workplace culture will be negatively related to work interference with family.

Hypothesis 12: A positive relationship will exist between WIF and FIW.

Hypothesis 13: Work interference with family will be positively related to intention to seek new employment.

Hypothesis 14: Family interference with work will be positively related to partial absence.
APPENDIX D:

ITEMS USED IN THE ANALYSIS
Time Spent Providing Elder Care

Personal Care

1. About how much time (in minutes or hours) do you spend per week providing care or assistance in Person— such as meal preparation, household work, physical care, transportation to medical services, etc.?

Other Care

1. About how much time (in minutes or hours) do you spend per week doing other things— such as calling on the telephone to see whether everything’s alright, arranging for services, handling finances, etc.?

Total Time Spent

Amount of time spent providing care in person plus the amount of time spent providing other care.

Marital Status

1. Are you presently married, living with someone as a couple, single and never married, divorced, widowed or separated?
Married
Living with someone as a couple
Single and never married
Divorced
Widowed
Separated
Don’t Know
Refused

Gender

Identified by interviewer.
Male
Female
Not sure
Hours Worked

1. All hours worked per week at all jobs (constructed from items 1A and 1B).

1A. All hours worked per week at main job (including overtime paid and unpaid).

1B. All hours worked per week at other jobs than main.

Flexible Work Arrangement Items

1. Are you allowed to choose your own starting and quitting times within some range of hours?
   Yes
   No

2. How hard is it for you to take time off during your workday to take care of personal or family matters?
   Not at all hard
   Not too hard
   Somewhat hard
   Very hard

3. I decide when I take breaks.
   Strongly Agree
   Somewhat Agree
   Somewhat Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

4. If presently part-time/full-time, could you arrange to work full-time/part-time in your current position?
   Yes
   Maybe
   No

5. Overall, how much control would you say you have in scheduling your work hours—complete control, a lot, some, very little, or none?
   Complete Control
   A Lot
   Some
   Very Little
   None
Family-Related Supervisor Support Items

The following questions contain the response scale:

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

1. My supervisor is fair and doesn’t show favoritism in responding to employees’ personal or family needs.

2. My supervisor accommodates me when I have family or personal business to take care of— for example, medical appointments, meeting with child’s teacher, etc.

3. My supervisor is understanding when I talk about personal or family issues that affect my work.

4. I feel comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with my supervisor.

5. My supervisor really cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal and family life.

Family Supportive Workplace Culture Items

1. There is an unwritten rule at my place of employment that you can’t take care of family needs on company time.

2. At my place of employment, employees who put their family or personal needs ahead of their jobs are not looked on favorably.

3. If you have a problem managing your work and family responsibilities, the attitude at my place of employment is: “You made you bed, now lie in it!”

4. At my place of employment, employees have to choose between advancing in their jobs or devoting attention to their family or personal lives.
Work-Family Conflict Items

The following questions contain the response scale:

Never
Rarely
Sometimes
Often
Very Often

Family Interference with Work

In the past three months,

1. How often has your family or personal life kept you from getting work done on time at your job?

2. How often has your family or personal life kept you from taking on extra work at your job?

3. How often has your family or personal life kept you from doing as good a job at work as you could?

4. How often has your family or personal life drained you of the energy you need to do your job?

5. How often has your family or personal life kept you from concentrating on your job?

Work Interference with Family

In the past three months,

1. How often have you not had enough time for yourself because of your job?

2. How often have you not had enough time for your family or other important people in your life because of your job?

3. How often have you not had the energy to do the things with your family or other important people in your life because of your job?
4. How often have you not been able to get everything done at home each day because of your job?

5. How often have you not been in as good a mood as you would like to be at home because of your job?

Intention to Seek New Employment

1. How likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer in the next year?
   Very likely
   Somewhat likely
   Not at all likely

Partial Absence

1. During the past three months, how many days did you start work late or stop early?
APPENDIX E:

STATISTICAL ANALYSES FOR HYPOTHESES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variable One</th>
<th>Variable Two</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time spent EC</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time PC, Time OC</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>t-test (for dependent r's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Independent sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>WIF, FIW</td>
<td>One Way MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gender: Women</td>
<td>Time PC, Time OC</td>
<td>Paired sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gender: Men</td>
<td>Time PC, Time OC</td>
<td>Paired sample t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marital Status, Gender</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>2 x 2 ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td># Hours Worked</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Flexible Work Arrangements</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Supportive Workplace Culture</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>Intention to Seek New Employment</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Partial Absence</td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F:

SKEWNESS AND KURTOSIS STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEFORE DELETION</th>
<th>AFTER DELETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours Per Week Personal Elder Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid 331</td>
<td>Valid 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 57</td>
<td>Missing 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours Per Week Other Elder Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid 290</td>
<td>Valid 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 98</td>
<td>Missing 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Time Providing Elder Care Per Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid 370</td>
<td>Valid 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 18</td>
<td>Missing 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hours Worked At All Jobs Per Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid 384</td>
<td>Valid 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 4</td>
<td>Missing 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Interference With Work (FIW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid 388</td>
<td>Valid 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 0</td>
<td>Missing 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G:

FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENT SCALE: 5 ITEMS
Scree Plot

Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_QBP34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QEB33</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWC9</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QBP21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QBP22A</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
APPENDIX H:

FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENT SCALE: 4 ITEMS
Scree Plot

Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_QEB33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWC9</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QBP21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QBP22A</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
1 component extracted.
APPENDIX I:

FAMILY SUPPORTIVE SUPERVISOR SUPPORT SCALE
Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_QSUP10</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QSUP11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QSUP12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QSUP13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QSUP14</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
1 component extracted.
APPENDIX J:

SUPPORTIVE WORKPLACE CULTURE SCALE
Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QWC17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWC19</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWC21</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWC22</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

1 components extracted.
APPENDIX K:

OVERALL WORK FAMILY CONFLICT SCALE: 10 ITEMS
Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF15</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF17</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
APPENDIX L:

FAMILY INTERFERENCE WITH WORK SCALE
Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 component extracted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF13</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF14</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF15</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF16</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_QWF17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M:

WORK INTERFERENCE WITH FAMILY SCALE
Component Matrix

Component

R_QWF8 0.85
R_QWF9 0.88
R_QWF10 0.83
R_QWF11 0.76

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
1 component extracted.
APPENDIX N:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>48.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>51.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT AGE IN YEARS</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE OF RESPONDENT [4 CAT]</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 yrs</td>
<td>613 21.31%</td>
<td>37 9.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>885 30.76%</td>
<td>89 22.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>751 26.10%</td>
<td>114 29.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ yrs</td>
<td>590 20.51%</td>
<td>143 36.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>38 1.32%</td>
<td>5 1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877 100.00%</td>
<td>388 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,279 79.21%</td>
<td>305 78.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American</td>
<td>328 11.40%</td>
<td>54 13.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Native</td>
<td>28 0.97%</td>
<td>5 1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Pacific Islander,</td>
<td>67 2.33%</td>
<td>5 1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Including Mixed</td>
<td>149 5.18%</td>
<td>17 4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26 0.90%</td>
<td>2 0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877 100.00%</td>
<td>388 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>Overall Sample</td>
<td>Elder Care Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/ Living As A Couple</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>60.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single And Never Married</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>20.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN &lt; 18 IN HOUSEHOLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN &lt; 18 IN HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>54.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>18.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL ATTAINEMENT</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; High School Diploma</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Or GED</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>25.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr College Degree</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>20.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Or Professional Degree</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Sample vs. Elder Care Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>88.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36,628.00</td>
<td>36,322.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>38,521.27</td>
<td>34,845.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Respondent Estimated Total Earnings for 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>87.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Respondent Occupation Main Job [7 CAT]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/Adm/Mgrs</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>15.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod/Oper/Repair</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>23.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>22.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcentral</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>17.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadbasket</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain West</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific West</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Past Year: Special Attn/Care to Someone 65 Yrs or Older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>74.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Elder Care Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDED EC IN THE PAST YR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOK TIME OFF/WORKED FEWER HRS DUE TO ELDER CARE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>63.19%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATION OF CARING FOR SOMEONE 65 OR OLDER IN NEXT 5 YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>41.19%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>57.39%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O:

THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE WORK–FAMILY INTERFACE

WITH SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS FLAGGED
Antecedents Outcomes

Family Variables

- Time Spent Providing Elder Care
- Type of Care (0-Other Care, 1-Personal Care)
- Marital Status (0-Un-Married, 1-Married)
- Gender (0-Men, 1-Women)

Work Variables

- Hours Worked
- Flexible Work Arrangements
- Supervisor Support
- Supportive Workplace Culture

FIW

Partial Absence

WIF

Intention to Seek New Employment

Hypotheses not depicted:

H_5 Women will spend more time providing personal care tasks than other care tasks.

H_6 Men will spend less time providing personal care tasks than other care tasks.

H_7 There will be an interaction between marital status and gender.

FIW: MW>UW>MM>UM.

* p < 0.01
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