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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to extend past and current literature in work-family conflict (WFC), perceived supervisor support (PSS), perceived organizational support (POS) and psychological contracts to Hispanic and African American women populations. Though eight hypotheses were proposed regarding the effects of WFC on PSS, POS and psychological contracts, only one showed significance. This study supported that PSS had significant mean differences based on psychological contracts. Relational demography was also considered in the study's hypotheses but did not have any significant effects on the outcomes. Additional analyses also revealed that education (high school, and above high school) and PSS had significant mean differences.

Data were collected from 97 participants with complete surveys. Surveys were self-reported in paper and pencil format and participants were recruited from a convenience sample. There were four measures used in this study along with demographic variables to test hypotheses. One of the measures (psychological contracts) was created specifically for this study and was forced choice. All measures used were reasonably reliable ranging between .70-.97 using Cronbach's alpha.
This study had several limitations the data were gathered from a convenience sample, data and surveys used were correlational and could not indicate causality, and bias among participants may have affected accuracy of the data. Future research would benefit from including ethnicities beyond the ones used in this study (Hispanic and African Americans) and including participants who are at or below the poverty level.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The subject of work-family conflict has been extensively researched, and there are new developments in this area everyday. As the work force continues to grow and diversify, many new constructs and new variables unfold. Many parents are dealing with the issue of balancing their responsibilities at work and their responsibilities with their families, particularly their children and spouses. A portion of this research examines methods that help reduce work-family conflict (WFC). One area that has been identified as strongly reducing WFC is supervisor support (Allen, 2001).

In addition to reducing WFC, supervisor support has been shown to reduce stress, negative attitudes regarding job satisfaction, and withdrawal behaviors (Brough & Frame, 2004). While there is much research in WFC, most researchers have assessed these relationships using a White middle class population. Researchers have done very little work representing demographically diverse populations. This paper addresses an area under researched in WFC, which is a minority women population. Included in this paper are important reasons why low-income minority
populations should be addressed and the effects they may have regarding their WFC. Last, this paper addresses the role of psychological contracts in work-family conflict and perceived support.

Work-Family Conflict and Negative Spillover

In general, work-family conflict has been defined as conflict that arises when stress and tension from work and family domains are incompatible. Some examples of when this occurs are (a) conflicting time restraints (time based conflict), (b) effort in one role makes it challenging to complete tasks for the other role (strain based conflict), and (c) particular behaviors required to do one role make it complicated to fulfill the demands of another role (behavior based conflict) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). As women increasingly join the work place, interests rise about what effect this may have on families. A common view is that attitudes from work become embedded and carried over into home life, affecting basic feelings one has towards family members. There are many issues that occur that create conflict between work and family responsibilities. Time based conflict is where time demanded by family competes with work activities. An example of this is taking time out of the work day to take
your child to the doctor’s office. Strain based conflict is where stress from one domain spills over into the other domain, and this is the most frequently addressed type in WFC literature (Halpern & Murphy, 2005). An example of this type is experiencing a particularly difficult and stressful day at work and returning home and having it affect family social interactions. Behavior based conflict is when a person is unable to adjust behaviors with the expectations of different roles. An example of this occurring is when a person’s job requires them to be aggressive, non-emotional, and stern at work, but behavior at home requires them to be warm and emotional (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Spillover is a concept frequently associated with WFC literature and can occur in two directions, work-to-family and family-to-work. Work-to-family conflict is considered “inter-role conflict” where the general demands of time devoted to completing work related tasks greatly interferes with being able to complete family obligations. Family-to-work conflict is the reverse, where the general demands of time devoted to complete family obligations greatly interferes with completing work related tasks (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Job conditions that promote negative spillover from work to home include: job
schedule, business travel, job insecurity, poor wages, job inflexibility, distance away from home, and type of food available at work or around work (Devine, Jastran, Jabs, Wethington, Farell, & Bisogni, 2007). These working conditions can affect both parents in the household.

It has been stated that women who are coming home from work are often so overwhelmed by their chores, children, and responsibilities that any joy that was experienced at work vanishes and is not transferred to the family (Hochschild, 1997). Research conducted by Repetti (1994) revealed that fathers who experienced negative spillover from work were more likely to yell and punish their children. A later study also revealed that working mothers behaved more aversely toward their children on days in which they reported more negative social contacts with co-workers and supervisors (Repetti & Wood, 1997). These are examples of work to family conflict. Work stress has been linked to parents having feelings of overload and strain, which has been shown to predict lower parent-child acceptance and higher conflict that in turn also affects children and adolescent adjustment (Crouter & Bumpus, 2001). It has also been found that mothers who feel overloaded by work showed less warmth toward their
children, and that lack of warmth resulted in increased problem behavior by children (Crouter & Bumpus, 2001).

In addition to parent-child relationships, negative reactions may also develop in marital relationships as a result of WFC. It has been demonstrated that both husbands and wives are more likely to be angry and withdrawn from marital interactions on days when they were stressed at work (Story & Repetti, 2006). There is also some research that suggests wives are the more likely culprit to misdirect their frustrations towards their husbands after busy days at work (Schulz, Cowan, Cowan, & Brennan, 2004).

Research also suggests that husbands and wives respond differently to negative spillover. Husbands tend to withdraw emotionally after distressing days, whereas wives tend to be more withdrawn after fast paced workdays (Schulz et al., 2004). Wives have reported greater marital anger and withdrawal on days they experienced a heavy workload. Both husbands and wives reported more marital fury and withdrawal on days they experienced more negative social interactions at work (Schulz et al., 2004). On a similar note, couples reporting high work pressure and emotional demands had the most trouble with combining work and family life, and they also reported higher levels of
exhaustion (Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005). The effects of WFC can also be seen in overall well being.

Negative spillover research also shows that work-to-family interference for men as rated by their wives was negatively related to their own life satisfaction and unrelated to exhaustion; on the other hand, work-to-family interference of women as rated by their husbands was positively related to their own feelings of fatigue at work and unrelated to life satisfaction. Overall this research shows that wives seem to be sensitive to the positive well being of their husbands, and they seem to view the life contentment of their partners as a determinant of their own satisfaction (Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005). Given the detrimental effects on individuals and their families, it is important to identify organizational factors that decrease work-family conflict. Much of the research presented above is based on a White middle class population. It is important to see if these effects hold true in other populations.

Perceived Organizational Support

An employee's perception of support may be one of these factors that decreases stress (Masterson, Lewis,
Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). Although there are several exchange relationships within and between organizations, all employees have at least two relationships at work, one with their immediate supervisor and the other with their organization. According to organizational support theory, employees develop perceived organizational support (POS) to meet their socioemotional needs and to determine the organization's willingness to reward increased efforts made on its behalf (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Research in POS indicates that employees develop an overall attitude about the degree to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being.

Eisenberger et al. (1986) also suggest that when the organization supplies needed support and resources, the subordinate will give in return his or her commitment and effort. On the basis of organizational support theory provided by Eisenberger et al. (1986), three forms of perceived favorable treatment received from the organization (fairness, supervisor support, and organizational rewards and job conditions) should increase POS. Therefore, organizational rewards and favorable job conditions, such as pay, promotions, job enrichment, and influence over organizational policies, contribute more to
POS if the employee believes that they result from the organization’s voluntary actions, as opposed to external constraints such as union negotiations or governmental health and safety regulations (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found a positive relationship between POS and extra-role behavior for managerial level employees and for lower level employees. Managers high in POS were more likely to help other employees, who had been absent, introduce new employees to their jobs, help others with increased workloads, and assist others with their duties. On a similar note Bell and Menguc (2002) reported that service employees with high POS when rated by their customers were more attentive, courteous, and concerned about customers’ best interests than were employees with low POS. Tepper and Taylor (2003) suggest that supervisors who perceive they were treated fairly by their organizations would reciprocate by treating subordinates more favorably. They also suggest that supervisors’ perceptions of fair treatment by their organizations was positively related to their subordinates’ ratings of extra-role behaviors shown by their supervisors, including helping with difficult assignments, showing respect, and facilitating skill building. Sluss, Klimchak, and Holmes (2008) found that
subordinates' perceived supervisor support (PSS) was positively associated with their POS, in-role performance, and extra-role performance.

Perceived Supervisor Support

Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) proposed that organizational commitment was a product of both organizational commitments to employees and to PSS. PSS is the outlook that employees have about the way their supervisors respond to their contributions and care about their overall well being (Eisenberg, Florence, Sucharski, Vadenberghe, & Rhoades, 2002). Research has generally shown that positive social relations with co-workers are associated with lower levels of anxiety and less depressive and physical illness (Carayon, 1995). However, it has also been shown that support from supervisors has a stronger impact on well-being than support from coworkers (Bromet, Dew, Parkinson, Cohen, & Schwartz, 1992). The role that a supervisor plays in an organization is very useful. Many organizations recognize that supervisors are vital in providing guidance to new employees, as well as acting as mentors to existing employees (Kidd & Smewing, 2001).
It has been identified that the more trust that is put into supervisors, the more likely that subordinates will follow the decisions that supervisors make, and the more likely they will be to accept the social flow of the organization (Anderson, 2005). Another important factor of supervisor support is the link with overall organizational commitment. Employees' commitment to an organization decreases both absenteeism and turnover (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Supervisor support has also been identified as an aid in decreasing physiological and psychological symptoms associated with work. Work and the career paths that people pursue are often accompanied by the physiological response of stress. Employees often experience stressful events that occur both in and outside of the work place.

Part of being an effective supervisor is addressing when these employees are experiencing high amounts of stress. This recognition is thought to supply both emotional and instrumental support. This support serves as a buffer in reducing the effects that job stressors may have on attitudes and outcomes related to the job (Kickul & Posig, 2001). In explaining the buffering hypothesis, it is said that when there are high levels of life changing events, social support helps in protecting the person from
harmful effects of stressful life events by mediating the process (Wilcox, 1981). Cohen and Hoberman (1983) explain that appraisal of support and having someone to talk to about problems is predictive of depression and psychological symptoms. Similarly Cassel (1974) has helped further explain this relationship by stating that in the relationship between psychological factors and stress, social supports serve as a buffer for the individual from the physiological or psychological consequences experienced when there is exposure to the stressful situation.

Physical and Psychological Symptoms Affected by Perceived Support

A study conducted by Wethington and Kessler (1986) found that the stress-buffering effect of social support was more strongly linked to the perception that supervisor support is present than to the effects of actual behaviors of supervisors. In a study by Lepore, Mata Allen, and Evans (1993), participants who experienced interactions with a nonsupportive confederate experienced the largest increase in blood pressure than the other two conditions of interacting alone or with a supportive confederate. Work stress is said to be the source of many physical and emotional ailments. Physiologic systems, such as the
immune, neuroendocrine, and cardiovascular systems, and their associations with disease risks are most responsive to social environmental influences such as those that can be found at work (Seeman, 1996). It has also been addressed that parental work stress affects the quality of family interaction, which affects children and adolescent adjustment (Crouter & Bumpus, 2001) creating a link between supervisor support and work-family interaction.

Stress appears to be one of the most common concerns from WFC. It is widely researched and has support and connections to negative spillover. Research shows that stress is one of the most expensive risk factors in terms of health care (Dolbier, Smith, & Steinhardt, 2007). This same research has identified that stress can be reduced through supervisor support, decreasing the amount that employers have to pay out in health insurance, as well as decreasing the amount of WFC experienced. Supervisors control many of the organizational resources that are available to employees and are seen as organizational agents (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002). Furthermore, employees understand that supervisors' evaluations of subordinates are often conveyed to upper management, furthering the contribution to an employees association of supervisor support with POS.
One issue that has been identified with supervisor support and employee relationships is the occurrence of mixed messages. When employees receive words of advice and comfort to fix their problems, but are then offered no actions from supervisors that can help remedy the situation, feelings of mixed messages arise, further complicating the emotions felt by the employees towards their supervisors (Kickul & Posig, 2001). Overall, it is essential that supervisors understand and recognize the importance of their role to the organization and to the employees who they are supervising. Additionally, support literature recognizes a specific link to stress. In one study, researchers found that supervisor support, as part of the overall category of organizational treatment, was the second most strongly associated with POS (Sluss, Malayka, & Holmes, 2008). Work-family support, such as supportive supervisors, explains more variance in employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, work-family conflict, and turnover intentions, than formal mechanisms do (Behson, 2005). Also, women are more likely to respond to social relationships and are more psychologically vulnerable to negative social interactions (Seeman, 1996).

Given the above information: Hypothesis (1) PSS is negatively related to WFC. Specifically, employees who
perceive that they have a supportive supervisor will indicate lower levels of WFC. Hypothesis (2) POS is negatively related to WFC. Specifically, employees who report higher POS will report lower WFC.

Extending Work-Family Conflict Literature and Supervisor Support to Minority Populations

Much of the work-family conflict literature and supervisor support literature addresses a White middle class population. One reason why it is important to extend research that includes minority populations and minority women is so that results can be generalized to these populations. It is also important to address these populations because their experiences with WFC may be quite different than that experienced by White middle class workers, and this may not be reflected in current research due to its limitations in population usage. Some of the historical events that have taken place in the United States might contribute to differences that potentially exist with Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black populations.

One reason for choosing these two populations is because these two groups are more likely than Whites, Asians, and Pacific Islanders to be below the poverty level (Halpern & Murphy, 2005). This reasoning also
applies when considering non-traditional types of households such as a female single income head of household. It has also been identified that more Hispanics and African American children are labeled “at risk” than Whites, Asians, and Pacific Islanders (Halpern & Murphy, 2005). Both of these points are relevant to WFC because due to past treatment of these populations, they may be more likely than others to be in a position that creates more WFC. These populations may also be more likely to work in blue collar jobs and more likely to work non-standard work hours contributing to increased perception of WFC, as well as affecting POS and PSS relationships.

There has been concern regarding the hours that parents work and the influence that it has on their children. Standard working hours are considered to be shifts that are from 8 a.m. - 6 p.m., and non-standard work hours are weekend, second or third shifts, or hours that fluctuate from week to week (Joshi & Bogen, 2007). Recently employers have added policies for flexible work hours in order to improve motivation and morale and to promote balance between their employees and work and family (Kush & Stroh, 1994).
Over the years there has been an increase in the amount of non-standard work hours. Some research has found that there are negative consequences of evening and night shifts on children’s cognitive outcomes (Joshi & Bogen, 2007). One explanation for this is that parents are not home to spend time with their children, and children who are in school are not receiving help with their homework. There is also research that supports that rotating shifts and non-standard work hours contribute to higher stress and negative emotional spillover from work to family (Fenwick & Tausig, 2001). Stress as discussed above has major effects on work production.

Research has revealed that blue collar workers are more likely to be working non-standard work hours than white collar workers (Beers, 2000). It is known that blue collar workers are likely to have little formal education, potentially causing negative affects with child behavior and school success, as well as their professions. This concept is related because many low-income minorities work in blue collar positions. Though shift work is seen as having some negative components, many low-income parents see it as a method to solve child care issues. While one parent is at work during the day, the other parent is taking care of the children, and when that parent returns
home, the other parent leaves for work (Perry-Jenkins, Goldberg, Pierce, & Sayer, 2007). This family-work structure can also lead to a decrease in marital interaction. One study found that fathers who had been married less than five years and who worked night shifts were six times more likely to separate or divorce, and mothers were three times more likely, when compared to those who did not work fixed night shifts (Presser, 2000). Thus, WFC is potentially increased. There has also been an increase in flexible schedules for workers, where current trends estimate that 29 percent of full time and salary employees have flexibility in their work schedules. Only for 11 percent of this type of schedule is it formal; the remainder is at the discretion of the manager (Halpern & Murphy, 2005).

However, employees who work hourly schedules are less likely to be provided with work-life options (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, & Prottas, 2002). As mentioned before, this is a trend that affects minorities more often because they are more likely than Whites to be working non-standard work hours. In a separate study, it was discovered that non-White employees felt less secure in their jobs than their White co-workers. This article also stated that non-White employees' supervisors were more
unfavorable of their efforts to balance work and non work concerns (Halpern & Murphy, 2005). It has been found that when employees had access to flexible work arrangements, they were more loyal and willing to work harder than required (Bond et al., 2002). This is why it is important for organizations to ensure flexibility for both white collar and blue collar workers.

Given the above information: Hypothesis (3) there are differences in work hours and WFC. Specifically, employees who report working non-standard work hours will also indicate higher levels of WFC.

Relational Demography

Relational demography theory examines how people use demographic variables such as race, sex, educational level, or socioeconomic status to assess how similar one individual is to another (Sacco, Scheu, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2003). Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) reported that demographic similarity is positively related to communication, the probability of remaining on the job, and job satisfaction. Demographic similarity has also been related to positive superior-subordinate and mentoring relationships, communication, and job satisfaction (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Similarly, Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) found that
differences in demographics (education, sex, and race) between members of supervisor-subordinate dyads were related to increased role ambiguity and unfavorable performance evaluations. Individuals who have similar demographic characteristics are thought to establish positive relationships more easily than individuals who differ in their demographic characteristics (Linnehan, Chrobot-Mason, & Konrad 2006).

It has been widely supported that women gain more from their supervisor's support, resulting in career development and psychological commitment to their organizations, when compared to men. This relationship has been shown to affect women's attitudes towards their careers and the organization (Kidd & Smewing, 2001). Research shows that WFC is reduced when there is supervisor support present and that perceived supervisor support increases job satisfaction, which negatively predicts burnout (Brough & Pears, 2004). Many workers rely on their supervisors for sensitivity and support of personal and family hardships (Hopkins, 2002).

In a separate study, results show a different type of link between work-family conflict and supervisor support. Similarity of work-family values between supervisor and subordinate contributed to the prediction of the
psychological outcomes of job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion (Thompson, Brough, & Schmidt, 2006). Research by Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, and Neale (1998) reports that racial similarity is frequently associated with greater liking, satisfaction, and communication behavior as well as reduced emotional conflict, intention of leaving the organization, and turnover.

Linnehan, Chrobot-Mason, and Konrad (2006) also found that for people of color with high ethnic identity achievement, having a supervisor of color is important for developing trust and rapport. Gerstein, Moore, Duffey, and Dainas (1993) found that female supervisors were more likely to refer female workers than male workers to employee assistance programs. Hopkins (2002) found that women were more likely than men to seek help with personal or family problems when their supervisors were women than when they were male. It has also been identified that African American professional women in same-race dyads received more psychosocial support than their counterparts in cross-race dyads (Thomas, 1990). Research by Ensher and Murphy (1997) found that protégés assigned to same-race mentors reported more instrumental support than protégés assigned to different-race mentors. In their study, Lau, Lam and Salamon (2008) found that demographic
dissimilarities have a more significant influence on perceptions of managerial trustworthiness than do similarities.

Women, especially minority women, show a different relationship regarding supervisor support when compared to men. One study has revealed that men are more likely than women to speak to their supervisors or co-workers for assistance with their problems (Van Der Pompe & Heus, 1993). White male supervisors have been found to see women and minority subordinates as performing less efficiently than their White male peers (Hopkins, 2002). These issues are especially problematic for minority populations, as the levels of supervisor support for women and minority women have not been widely studied (Hopkins, 2002). Even though there is not an extensive amount of research on these populations, there is still plenty of support that demonstrates women are not receiving adequate supervisor support. Many women have reported that they feel that their supervisors give less support and are less trustworthy than other means of support such as family and close friends (Harris & Fenell, 1988).

When compared with men, women employees are more likely to be single parents who are forced to handle all family issues on their own. Women are also more likely
than men to respond with higher rates of psychological distress from work stressors such as discrimination, lack of promotions, stereotyping, and negative work environments (Hopkins, 2002). When looking at the issues of minority women employees, several issues arise for both African American women and Hispanics. African American women have reported in several studies that they feel un-supported by their supervisors and often feel undermined (Gandy & Steiner, 1993). Hispanic women have reported reluctance to seek help from their supervisors due to cultural reasons regarding the privacy of problems in the home.

Taking into account what past literature has revealed about the relationship between minority women and supervisors: Hypothesis (4) when the ethnicity of the supervisor matches the subordinate, the subordinate will report higher levels of PSS compared to when there is no match in ethnicity. Hypothesis (5) when the gender of the supervisor matches the subordinate, the subordinate will report higher levels of PSS compared to when there is no match in gender.
Psychological Contracts

Psychological contract refers to a person's belief's about the terms and conditions of a mutual exchange agreement between that individual and another party. For a psychological contract to exist there has to be the idea that an explicit or implicit promise has been made and a consideration offered in exchange for it, binding the parties to mutual obligations (Rousseau, 1989). These promises do not need to be verbalized or written to indicate the intent of acting in a certain way in the future. Rousseau (2001) stated

Individuals can gather accurate information regarding another's intentions from an array of indirect as well as non-verbal sources (e.g. observation, history and interactions over time). Administrative signals are a common source of promissory messages. Benefits packages that expand as seniority increases implicitly suggest the promise of retention over time. Visible rewards given to a coworker prompt others to monitor what that person did that merited the reward, as well as assessment of what one might have to do to obtain the same payoff. (p. 526)

Psychological contracts in employment are important to consider, as are breaches of psychological contracts.
When an individual feels that his or her organization has not fulfilled its contractual obligations, this perceived breach has the potential to weaken assumptions of fairness that are known to motivate long-term employment relationships (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993). In situations where individuals believe that their organizations have failed in their obligations, research indicates that perceptions of breach can lead to a range of negative outcomes, which includes increased turnover, reduced job satisfaction, increased cynicism, and diminished organizational citizenship behavior and negative changes in mood (Conway & Briner, 2002). One study found that perceptions of a shared psychological contract breach were associated with higher absenteeism. They also found that employees who believed that their organization had not met its obligations to them and their fellow customer service workers were significantly less likely to trust their organization (Deery, Walsh, & Iverson, 2006). This is especially important for employees at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy. Employees at the bottom or entry level positions are dependant on senior management for pay raises and promotion opportunities (Kramer, 1996). A lack of supervisory support may also lead to perceptions of psychological
contract breach. Besides breach, there are also different types of contracts that can be held by employees.

Two types of psychological contracts are relational contracts and transactional contracts. Relational contracts are said to be open-ended, less specific agreements that establish and maintain a relationship, which is based in both emotional involvement and financial reward (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). Transactional contracts are specific to monetary exchanges such as pay for attendance between parties over a specific time frame (Miles & Snow, 1980). In transactional contracts, breaches of obligation may create perceptions of inequity in economical exchange and lead to feelings of reduced obligation to their employer (McFarlane Shore & Tetrick, 1994). Perceptions that employees have of their supervisors or their organization may have an influence on the type of psychological contract they hold.

Given the above information: Hypothesis (6) There will be differences between type of psychological contract and PSS. Specifically, those who report more PSS will also report a relational contract. Hypotheses (7) There will be differences between type of psychological contract and WFC. Specifically, those who report a relational contract will also report less WFC.
It has been suggested that women may develop different psychological contracts than men and that they may be more committed to their work when they believe that their organization offers policies that are offered to help balance work and family roles (Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Guzzo and Noonan (1994) suggest that human resource practices such as flextime work hours communicate that the organization is concerned about employee well-being. These practices have been considered part of the psychological contract offered to employees (Scandura & Lankau, 1997). In a separate study, Borrill and Kidd (1994) found that employers seemed to assume that role conflict is inevitable for women who had young families as opposed to men with young families, who were seen as being enriched by their multiple roles. Women in their study reported that their organization's official equal opportunities policy was being undermined by organizational practice, thus harming psychological contracts held by women. Just as there are differences between psychological contracts and gender, there are differences between minorities and their psychological contracts.

Blancero and Del Campo (2005) found that individuals' perceptions of discrimination were significant predictors of psychological contract fairness, as those individuals
who reported a fair psychological contract also reported a lack of perceived discrimination. In this same study, 38 percent of respondents agreed with the statement "At work, I sometimes feel that my ethnicity is a limitation," and 31 percent agreed with "At work, many people have stereotypes about my culture or ethnic group." In a separate study conducted by Blancero, DelCampo, and Marron, (2007), their examination of Hispanic professionals revealed that over two-thirds (67.7 percent) of respondents reported violation of the psychological contract. Robinson and Morrisson (2000) suggest that individual differences do in fact predict psychological contract violation.

Hypothesis (8) There is a positive relationship between demographic similarity in a supervisor-subordinate dyad and type of psychological contract. Specifically, those that report the same gender and ethnicity as their supervisor will also report more of a relational contract as compared to a transactional contract.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

Participants were gathered from a full-time working adult population primarily in Southern California. Participants who participated worked a minimum of 32 hours a week and had been employed with their organization for at least one year. This one-year time frame allowed employees to develop relationships with supervisors and perceptions of the organization.

In an attempt to extend work-family conflict literature beyond working White middle class populations, participants were recruited based on whether they self identified as minorities, specifically Hispanic/Latina or African American/Black. Participants were not restricted in terms of demographic variables such as family size, job level, tenure, marital status, or socio-economic status. The only requirements for participants were that they were currently working as full-time status, had at least one child (age was not restricted), were women, and read English.

There were 160 surveys handed out to prospective participants with a response rate of 63% (n = 101). Due to
missing data, only 97 of the 101 completed surveys were used, meeting the appropriate power requirement (2 predictors, medium effect size; Cohen Power Primer, 1992). Participants were all women; 25 were African American/Black (25.8 percent) and 72 were Hispanic/Latina (74.2 percent). There were 80 participants (82.5 percent) who reported working a standard shift and 17 participants that worked a non-standard shift (17.5 percent). Approximately 26 participants (26.60 percent) reported having one child, 40 (40.43 percent) reported having two children, 15 (15.96) percent reported having three children, 13 (13.83 percent) reported having 4 children), 1 (1.06 percent) reported having five children, and 2 (2.13 percent) reported having six children. Of the 97 participants, 19(19.6 percent) were single, 45 (46.4 percent) were married, 6 (6.2 percent) were separated, 17 (17.5 percent) were divorced, 2 (2.1 percent) were widowed, and 8 (8.2 percent) were living together or were in a domestic partnership. Participants also reported highest level of education completed with 31 (32 percent) reporting high school as their highest level of education completed, 15 (15.5 percent) had an Associates degree, 25 (28.9 percent) had a 4-year college degree, 9 (9.3 percent) had their Masters, and 14 (14.4 percent) reported
a different type of degree such as vocational training. Though socio-economic status was not restricted, total combined household income was requested. Of the participants 14 (14.4 percent) reported less than $24,000 annually, 25 (25.8 percent) were between $24,001-$35,999, 15 (15.5 percent) were between $36,000-$47,999, 11 (11.3 percent) were between $48,000-$59,999, 6 (6.2 percent) were between $60,000-$71,999, and 26 (26.2 percent) were more than $72,000.

Materials

The measures (self-report surveys) in the study were paper and pencil. Online surveys were intentionally left out in order to capture the full range of the population. Previous criticisms indicate that online surveys leave out specific populations, such as those who do not own a computer, those who do not know how to work a computer, those who do not have access to the internet, and those who do not know how the internet works. Included in each survey was a demographics section a work-family conflict measure, POS measure, PSS measure, and a psychological contract measure. The demographics section was used to measure relational demography.
The demographics portion of this survey included eight questions. The variables included were: sex, ethnicity, marital status, questions regarding whether the participant had any children, how many they have, and how many live with them, highest level of education completed, whether employment was part-time or full-time, a question of whether they have worked for their employer for at least a year, and annual household income.

Work-family conflict was measured using a 10-item work-family conflict scale developed by Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996). This measurement contained 5 items that measured work-to-family conflict (Cronbach’s alpha .94) and 5 items that measured family-to-work-conflict (Cronbach’s alpha .92). An example of a work-to-family conflict item is “The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.” An example of a family-to-work conflict item is “The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.” Participants were asked to answer the questions using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree.

Perceived organizational support was measured using 8 items (Cronbach’s alpha .93) developed by Bang (2008). This is a shortened version of Eisenberger et al. (1986).
An example of an item on this scale is “Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.” Participants were asked to answer the questions using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree.

Perceived supervisor support was measured using 16 items (Cronbach’s alpha .97) developed by Kottke and Sharafinski (1998). An example of an item on this scale is “My supervisor values my contributions to the well-being of our department.” Participants were asked to answer the questions using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree.

Psychological contracts were assessed using a dichotomous measure created by the researcher based on Rousseau’s (1990) contractual continuum (Cronbach’s alpha .70). Initially the measure contained 7 items with a Cronbach’s alpha of .58. However, in order to increase alpha two items were eliminated (1) “(a) My current job is a stepping stone to another career opportunity (transactional) and (b) My current job has potential for being a long term career (relational). The second item was “(a) Contributions made by me to my organization are obvious and can easily been seen (transactional) and (b) Contributions made by me to my organization are not
easily recognized but there is an understanding about what I contribute (relational).” Once these items were removed participants were asked to choose A or B from a total of 5 questions. If participants chose at least 3 out of 5 transactional questions they were labeled as having a transactional contract. If participants chose at least 3 out of 5 relational questions they were labeled as having a relational contract.

Questions were created based on focus, time frame, stability, scope, and tangibility, all which are thought to affect a person’s type of contract. Before handing out the psychological contract questionnaire to prospective participants it was emailed and handed out to 20 work colleagues who volunteered to take it. This was done so that one could be sure that the questions created lead to one type of psychological contract instead of an equal amount on both contracts. An example of a question found on this scale that measured a transactional contract is “I receive money in exchange for hard work.” An example of a question measuring relational contracts is “I receive job security in exchange for my loyalty to my organization.”

Psychological contracts were calculated two ways. For the hypothesis testing psychological contracts was calculated by summing the scores for transactional and
relational contracts. Relational contracts were coded 1 and transactional contracts were coded 0. Psychological contracts were also calculated by summing the responses for transactional and relational contracts. Meaning if a participant answered two transactional questions and three relational questions they were given a two for transactional and three for relational. The latter calculation did not significantly improve any hypotheses involving psychological contracts so results from this calculation are only seen in Table 2.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from personal and professional networks and were given surveys to complete by hand. They were contacted through face-to-face discussion, by phone, and by mail. Participants were gathered from professional working populations that specialized in the banking industry, mental health industry, dental industry, child care industry and other professional industries. They were given an informed consent with instructions along with the survey packet. Participants were asked to complete the survey in full. Each survey packet concluded with a debriefing statement, researcher’s contact information, and instructions that
stated "Thank you for participating in this study. Please take a few moments to look over the survey and make sure that all questions have been answered. If you have left any blank please answer them." To protect the confidentiality of the participants, they returned the survey to the researcher in a large manila envelope with no identifiers. Participants who returned their survey by mail did not include a return address to protect their identity. Participants who were recruited by phone mailed back their survey in the same fashion. At the end of the survey, they were asked if they knew anyone who would like to participate in the survey. When they answered yes, they were given an envelope to return the surveys. Survey participants were issued a statement that ensured confidentiality of all survey information.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

The results section will first present data cleaning and assumptions used in the analyses followed by the hypothesis testing results. The variables that were pertinent to this analysis include gender match, ethnicity, WFC (work-to-family and family-to-work) scale, POS scale, PSS scale, work hours, gender match, type of psychological contract, and ethnicity match. Correlations for these variables can be found in Table 2. There were 160 surveys handed out to prospective participants with a response rate of 63% (n = 101). Due to missing data only 97 of the 101 completed surveys were used meeting the appropriate power requirement of a minimum 96 participants (2 predictors, medium effect size; Cohen Power Primer, 1992).

Data Screening

Before running the data analysis, the scales (WFC, POS, and PSS) in the data set were examined for univariate and multivariate outliers, skewness, and kurtosis.

In screening the data a missing values analysis (MVA) was not needed because there was less than 1% missing data. A total of four people were missing values not
requiring a missing value analysis via t-tests. From this it can be assumed that the data is missing at random (MAR). In screening for univariate outliers frequencies were ran on the WFC scale, PSS scale and POS scale to evaluate outliers, skewness, and kurtosis; these values can be found in Table 1. In screening for multivariate outliers, SPSS was used by running a regression and calculating mahalanobis distance. A Chi Square value of 10.828 was used to determine the multivariate outlier. There were no univariate or multivariate outliers.

Regression residuals were analyzed for normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. A z-score of 3.3 p < .001 was used as the cut off criteria. Residuals by predicted value scatter plots were small, centered around zero, and symmetric. Therefore, assumptions for regression were met.

For hypothesis 3, assumptions of homogeneity of variance were met using Levene’s test of equality of error variance. Levene’s test revealed work-to-family conflict scale $F(1, 95) = .352, p > .001$ and family-to-work conflict scale $F(1, 95) = .010, p > .001$. Assumptions of homogeneity of variance are met because there was no significance using Levene’s test. For hypothesis 4 Levene’s test revealed PSS scale $F(1, 95) = .088, p > .001$. Homogeneity of variance is met because there was
no significance using Levene’s test. Homogeneity of variance for hypothesis 5 were met revealing PSS scale to be normally distributed across cells $F(1, 95) = .236, p > .001$. Homogeneity of variance for hypothesis 6 were met using Levene’s test which revealed PSS scale $F(1, 95) = 4.741, p > .001$. Homogeneity of variance for hypothesis 7 were met using Levene’s test which revealed work-to family conflict scale $F(1, 95) = 1.123, p > .001$ and family-to-work $F(1, 95) = 1.592, p > .001$.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses 1 and 2

Hypothesis 1 stated that PSS was negatively related to WFC. Specifically, employees who perceived that they had a supportive supervisor would indicate lower levels of WFC. The work-to-family conflict scale was used as the dependent variable and the perceived supervisor support scale was the independent variable. Hypothesis 2 stated that POS was negatively related to WFC. Specifically, employees who reported higher POS would report lower WFC. The work-to-family conflict scale was used as the dependant variable and the perceived organizational support scale was the independent variable.
Hypothesis 2 was supported using Pearson $r$ correlation. Where work-to-family conflict decreased as perceived organizational support increased. These results can be seen in Table 2.

As an extra provision both hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by evaluating the results from a standard multiple regression. This regression revealed a multiple $R$ of .214, $R$ square .046, adjusted $R$ square .025 and $F (2, 94) = 2.26, p > .05$. From this it was determined that work-to-family conflict cannot be significantly predicted from POS or PSS. Results from the regression can be seen in Table 3. Hypothesis 1 and 2 were also tested using the family-to-work conflict scale as the dependent variable and the PSS and POS scales as the independent variables. Both hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by evaluating the results from a standard multiple regression. This regression revealed a multiple $R$ of .187, $R$ square .035, adjusted $R$ square .015 and $F (2, 94) = 1.71, p > .05$. From this it was determined that family-to-work conflict can not be significantly predicted from POS or PSS. Results from the regression can be seen in Table 3.
Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that work hours (standard vs. non-standard) would show differences with WFC. Specifically, employees who report working non-standard work hours would also indicate higher levels of WFC. Work-to family conflict was used as the dependent variable and work hours (standard vs. non-standard) were used as the independent variable. Eighty of the participants reported working a standard shift while only 17 reported working a non-standard shift. A one-way analysis of variance was performed. Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in work-to-family conflict as a result of work hours $F (1, 95) = 1.15, p > .05$. Results from the univariate analysis can be seen in Table 4.

Family-to-work conflict was also used as the dependant variable and work hours (standard vs. non-standard) were used as the independent variable. A one-way analysis of variance was performed. Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in family-to-work conflict as a result of work hours $F (1, 95) = .962, p > .05$. Results from the univariate analysis can be seen in Table 4.
Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that when the ethnicity of the supervisor matches the subordinate, the subordinate will report higher levels of PSS compared to when there is no match in ethnicity. The dependent variable was the PSS scale and the independent variable was ethnicity (match vs. no match). Seventy-four participants reported no match in ethnicity and 23 reported a match in ethnicity. A one-way analysis of variance was performed. Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in PSS as a result of match in ethnicity $F(1, 95) = 1.30, p > .05$. Results from the univariate analyses can be seen in Table 4.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that when the gender of the supervisor matches the subordinate, the subordinate will report higher levels of PSS compared to when there is no match in gender. The dependent variable was the PSS scale and the independent variable was gender match (match vs. no match). Since all participants were women match indicates that the supervisor was a woman and no-match indicates that the supervisor was a man. Thirty-six participants reported that their supervisor was male and 61 participants indicated that they had a female
supervisor. A one-way analysis of variance was performed. Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in PSS as a result of gender match \( F (1, 95) = 0.05, p > .05 \). Results from the univariate analyses can be seen in Table 4.

**Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be a positive relationship between type of psychological contract (relational vs. transactional) and PSS. Specifically, those that report more PSS would also report a relational contract. The dependant variable was the PSS scale and the independent variable was type of psychological contract (relational vs. transactional). Forty-nine participants reported a transactional contract and 48 reported a relational contract. A one-way analysis of variance was performed.

Univariate analyses revealed that there were significant mean differences in PSS as a result of type of psychological contract \( F (1, 95) = 10.041, p < .05 \). There is a significant mean difference in PSS based on type of psychological contract (relational versus transactional). Those that report a relational contract report significantly more perceived supervisor support (\( M = 5.30 \)) than those that report a transactional contract.
(M = 4.37). 9.6% of variance in PSS is explained by type of psychological contract relational versus transactional. Results from the univariate analyses can be seen in table 4.

**Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 stated that there would be a negative relationship between type of psychological contract and WFC. Specifically, those who report a relational contract would also report less WFC. The dependant variable was the work-to-family conflict scale and the independent variable was type of psychological contract (transactional versus relational). A one-way analysis of variance was performed.

Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in work-to-family conflict as a result of psychological contract $F (1, 95) = 1.520$, $p > .05$. Results from the univariate analysis can be seen in Table 4. Hypothesis 7 was also tested using the family-to-work conflict scale as the dependent variable psychological contract (transactional versus relational) as the independent variable. A one-way analysis of variance was performed. Univariate analyses revealed that there were no significant mean differences in family-to-work conflict as a result of psychological
contract \( F (1, 95) = 1.12, p > .05 \). Results from the univariate analysis can be seen in Table 4.

**Hypothesis 8**

Hypothesis 8 stated that there would be a positive relationship between demographic similarity in a supervisor-subordinate dyad and type of psychological contract. Specifically, those who report the same gender and ethnicity as their supervisor would also report a relational contract. A chi square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between psychological contract and match in gender and ethnicity between supervisor and subordinate. Twenty-five participants indicated no match on gender or ethnicity, 60 reported match on either gender or ethnicity, and 12 reported match on both gender and ethnicity. The results between these variables did not show significant independence chi square \( (2, N = 97) = 3.630, p > .05 \). Results from the analysis can be seen in Table 5.

**Additional Analyses**

After testing hypotheses additional analyses were performed testing additional differences. An independent samples t-test was used to analyze potential differences between education: (0) high school and (1) above high school and POS, PSS, work-to-family and family-to-work and
psychological contracts. No significant mean differences were found for POS, work-to-family, family-to-work and psychological contracts. However, Education and PSS had significant mean differences. There were significant mean differences in PSS based on education, t (94) = -2.577, p < .05. Participants with above high school education (mean = 5.12) reported significantly more perceived supervisor support than those with a high school education (4.23). Results from additional analyses can be seen in Table 6.

Additionally, an independent samples t-test was used to analyze potential differences between education: (0) high school, associates degree, and vocational degree and (1) BA/BS, master's degree, law degree, M.D., and PhD and POS, PSS, work-to-family and family-to-work and psychological contracts. No significant mean differences were found for POS, PSS, work-to-family, family-to-work and psychological contracts. Furthermore, since number of children could affect perceptions of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, POS, PSS, and psychological contracts a variable was created to see if number of children would affect any of the proposed hypotheses. There were no significant differences in the proposed hypotheses as a result of number of children.
Table 1. Summary Statistics for Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Z-score skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Z-score Kurtosis</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>-.906</td>
<td>-1.867</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-Work</td>
<td>2.728</td>
<td>1.641</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>-.514</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS Scale</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.438</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS Scale</td>
<td>4.837</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>-2.375</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>-0.677</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W-to-F</th>
<th>F-to-W</th>
<th>POS Scale</th>
<th>PSS Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-Work</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS Scale</td>
<td>-.212*</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS Scale</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.727**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Contract (Relational)</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Contract (Transactional)</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.403**</td>
<td>-.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance *p < .05, **p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psych Contract</th>
<th>Psych Contract</th>
<th>Shift</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych Contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Multiple Regression for Hypothesis 1 and 2 for the Effects of Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work on Perceived Supervisor Support and Perceived Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-Family</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>-.412</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.POS), (.POS),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.PSS) (.PSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-Work</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.POS), (.POS),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.PSS) (.PSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance *p < .05, **p < .001
Table 4. Univariate Analyses of Variance for Hypothesis (3) Effects of Work-Family Conflict on Work Hours (Standard/Non-Standard), Hypothesis (4) Perceived Supervisor Support on Ethnicity (Match or No Match), (5) Perceived Supervisor Support on Gender (Match/No Match), (6) Perceived Supervisor Support on Psychological Contract (Relational versus Transactional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>df error</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial eta square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Work-to-Family</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Family-to-Work</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.209</td>
<td>10.041*</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Work-to-Family</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.478</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Family-to-Work</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Chi Square Test of Independence for Hypothesis 8 There is a Positive Relationship between Demographic Similarity in A Supervisor-Subordinate Dyad and Type of Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson chi square value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance *p < .05, **p < .001
Table 6. Additional Analyses T-Tests Education: (0) High School and (1) Above High School and Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Supervisor Support, Work-to-Family, Family-to-Work, and Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Mean High School</th>
<th>Mean Above High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-1.611</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-2.577*</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-to-family</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-to-work</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contracts</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High school N = 31; above high school N = 65. Equal variances not assumed.
* p < .05
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

The research in this thesis project has a lot of range. And while there is extensive support in work-family-conflict, perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support and psychological contract literature, they all lack the ability to be generalized to populations outside of the White race. Much of the research in these areas is based on using White middle class participants. This is not an issue if you fall under this category. However, when you don’t fit that race category one can not help but wonder if research findings would be different if other races were included.

As previously noted, employers have added policies for flexible work hours in order to improve motivation and morale and to promote balance between their employees and work and family (Kush & Stroh, 1994). Separately, there was already a struggle for organizations in implementing successful policies that draw, retain and support minority employees (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). The current research focused on combining what has been learned in these literatures and how it relates to minorities, since
it appears that it is imperative for organizations to be aware of these differences.

Though not all the hypotheses in this study were supported important considerations can be made. First, though hypotheses one and two were tested together in the final analysis initially they were tested separately. In the first analysis when the statement POS is negatively related to WFC was tested it was found to be significant, where 4.8% of variance in WFC was explained by POS. It was also supported when analyzed using a Pearson’s correlation. However when hypotheses 1 and 2 were ran together there was no significance. Indicating that POS and PSS were sharing the same variance with WFC. This may be explained by the significant correlation between the POS scale and the PSS scale at $r = .727$.

The third hypothesis in this study was related to work hours and WFC. It was believed that participants working non-standard work hours would also report more WFC. However, this was not supported. This could be due to the fact that out of the 97 participants only 17 reported working non-standard work hours. This result may have been different had there been better representation for those that work non-standard hours. It is possible that better representation of participants working non-standard hours
would have supported prior claims that blue collar workers are more likely to be working non-standard work hours than white collar workers (Beers, 2000). And that these same workers would have been making less money and reported more WFC as a result of blue collar workers being more likely to have little formal education.

Hypotheses four and five were related to relational demography and PSS, where it was believed that those who reported having the same gender or the same ethnicity as their supervisor would indicate more PSS. This was not supported. One possible reason is that only 23 of the 97 participants indicated that they were the same ethnicity as their supervisor. Results may have been different had more participants matched ethnicity with their supervisor. Gender on the other hand was better represented, where 61 of the 97 participants reported that they had a female supervisor. One possible reason that this was not supported is that gender does not play as big of a role in PSS as ethnicity may. As noted previously racial similarity is frequently associated with greater liking, satisfaction, and communication behavior as well as reduced emotional conflict, intention of leaving the organization, and turnover (Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998).
This project did however support hypothesis 6. Where it was revealed that there are significant differences in PSS as a result of type of psychological contract. This further highlights the importance of relationships among supervisors and subordinates in terms of psychological contracts. Relational contracts are deemed to be the more desirable of the two types of contracts because these types of contract holders tend to be more dedicated to their organization. Overall, this affects an organization’s bottom line. It has been identified that the more trust that is put into supervisors, the more likely that subordinates will follow the decisions that supervisors make, and the more likely they will be to accept the social flow of the organization (Anderson, 2005).

Hypothesis 7 did not reveal any statistical significance. Type of psychological contract was not affected by WFC. Participants in this study were well balanced in terms of psychological contracts where 49 participants reported a transactional contract and 48 reported a relational contract. In this instance education could be a factor. Thirty-one of the ninety-seven participants had a high school education and the rest were above high school. It is possible that more education led
to less perceived WFC. Possibly because their supervisor also received post high school education. As noted previously, demographic similarity such as amount of education has been related to positive superior-subordinate and mentoring relationships, communication, and job satisfaction (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Results may have been different had more subordinates reported less education.

Hypothesis 8 examined the relationship between supervisor’s and subordinates who shared the same ethnicity and gender and psychological contract. It was thought that demographic similarity would lead to a relational contract. However, this was not supported. One possible explanation is that only 12 of the 97 participants matched their supervisor in both gender and ethnicity. Results may have been different had there been more balance among those who matched their supervisor in both gender and ethnicity and those who did not.

It is always a little troublesome when hypotheses are not supported. However, the additional analyses done in this study showed some interesting findings. An independent t-test revealed a significant result in regards to PSS and education. Participants who had an above high school education indicated significantly more
PSS than participants with only a high school education, indicating that educational level may play a role in how support is perceived by a subordinate or how supportive a supervisor is to a less educated subordinate. Regardless of the direction either could have an effect on type of psychological contact which this study has showed is an important factor.

Last, a significant relationship was determined between work-to-family conflict and POS, where participants who report more POS also report less work-to-family conflict. This is an important finding for those organizations that strive to implement work balance options for their employees. Overall, it is possible that the notions used to develop hypotheses in this study were on target but the population used to test them was off.

Limitations

In all research there are limitations and room for development. This study is no exception. First, this study was an attempt to expand the research to under represented populations. It does so but at the expense of also limiting participation. Though it goes beyond White middle class populations to represent Hispanics and Blacks/African American's it is not representative of American
Indians, Asian Americans, Middle Eastern/Arab Americans or any other racial category. As with Hispanic's and African American's it is possible that these populations would report differences in WFC, PSS, POS, and psychological contracts. A second limitation involves participation recruitment. Participants were gathered from a convenience sample rather than the more desirable random sample. This limits how the results are generalized to populations outside the ones that were used in this study.

A third limitation involves socio-economic status (SES). This study originally was an attempt to tap into an under represented population of low-income minority participants. However because SES was not restricted 84.2% of the participants were above the poverty level. It is important that people at or below the poverty level are included in studies because overall they are under represented in research. This population may have very different views in regards to WFC, PSS, POS, and psychological contracts. A fourth limitation involves data collection. Participants filled out their surveys in paper and pencil format, leaving out any participants who could have completed the survey online. This could have allowed for broader participation had other methods of data collection been used.
A fifth limitation is that surveys were correlational thus identifying relationships but not indicating causality. A sixth limitation is that data collected regarding perception were only taken from participants. Leaving out perceptions from supervisors and the organization. It is important to include perceptions of all who are involved so that bias is limited as much as possible. Including additional perceptions also increases range of representation. A seventh limitation is that there was no White comparison group. Had there been a White comparison group the research presented could have more definitively indicated whether or not there were differences in populations. Finally, because the scales used in this study involved individual/ personal perception it is difficult to determine/ label perception accurately and without bias. It is possible that bias was the leading determinant in how questions were answered instead of genuine responses. It is always desired that the most accurate responses are recorded so that the results are reliable.

Implications and Future Research

No doubt that there is always room for development across the literatures involved in this study. In addition
to expanding participation beyond White middle class population and Hispanic and Black/African American populations used in this study the literature would greatly improve if it involved a more even distribution among racial categories. This would allow for greater generalizability of results. Second this study involved a relatively small sample size gathered from a convenience sample. Future research would benefit from using a larger sample size gathered from a random sample. Once again so that results could be extended to as many people as possible.

Third, future research would benefit from involving a range of participants who vary in SES. Specifically for more data to be gathered among participants below the poverty level. Regardless of race much of the populations that are used are gathered from an educated middle class population. Fourth, future research would benefit from expanding WFC, POS, PSS, and psychological contracts to telecommuters and international employees. These populations may report differences than White populations and populations used in this study. Fifth future research would benefit in using a measure with more reliability in terms of psychological contracts. The measure used in this study had a Cronbach's alpha of .700 using a measure with
an alpha above .85 would lead to a more reliable conclusion. Sixth, future research would also benefit from including men of all ethnicities and income levels. Men tend to have different views in terms of PSS, POS, and psychological contracts. They also tend to have different responsibilities in the family domain which may affect WFC differently than it does women. Lastly, future research would benefit from using immigrants and first generation participants where their experiences and perceptions may be different than those represented by the self-identified Americans used in this study.
Demographic For

1) Sex: Female _____
   Male _____

2) Ethnicity:
   _____ African American/Black
   _____ American Indian
   _____ Asian American
   _____ Latina/Hispanic
   _____ Caucasian/White
   _____ Middle Eastern/Arab American
   _____ Other (please specify) _____________________

3) Marital Status:
   _____ Single
   _____ Married
   _____ Separated
   _____ Divorced
   _____ Widowed
   _____ Living together or domestic partnership

4) Do you have children?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If yes, how many children do you have? _____
   If yes, what are the ages of all of your children? _____________________
   If yes, what are the ages of the children who live with you? ___________

5) Highest level of education completed:
   _____ High School Degree
   _____ Associates Degree
   _____ College Degree
   _____ Masters Degree
   _____ Law Degree
   _____ M.D.
   _____ Ph.D.
   _____ Other/ Vocational Degree/Certificates (please specify) ___________
6) Check the category that includes your immediate family's total, combined annual income:
   ____ Less than $24,000
   ____ $24,001 - $35,999
   ____ $36,000 - $47,999
   ____ $48,000 - $59,999
   ____ $60,000 - $71,999
   ____ More than $72,000

7) Are you employed _____ part-time or _____ full-time?

8) What shift do you work?
   ____ Standard (8 a.m.-5 p.m. or something similar and the same set days off)
   ____ Nonstandard (2nd shift, 3rd shift, or weekend and rotating shifts where your days off differ)

9) How many hours on average do you work per week_____?

10) Have you worked for your employer for at least one year _____yes or _____no?

11) Specifically, how long have you worked under your current supervisor _____?

12) What is the ethnicity of your supervisor ____________?

13) What is the gender of your supervisor ____________?
Work-Family Conflict Scale

Please indicate how much you (1) strongly disagree or (7) strongly agree with each statement listed below. Please select the number that you feel coordinates best with the way you feel.

1) The demands of my work interfere with my home and family life.

   Strongly Disagree    Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5        6  7

2) The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.

   Strongly Disagree    Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5        6  7

3) Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me.

   Strongly Disagree    Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5        6  7

4) My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.

   Strongly Disagree    Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5        6  7

5) Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities.

   Strongly Disagree    Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5        6  7
Family-Work Conflict Scale

1) The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.
   - Strongly Disagree: 1
   - Strongly Agree: 7

2) I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.
   - Strongly Disagree: 1
   - Strongly Agree: 7

3) Things I want to do at work don’t get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.
   - Strongly Disagree: 1
   - Strongly Agree: 7

4) My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.
   - Strongly Disagree: 1
   - Strongly Agree: 7

5) Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.
   - Strongly Disagree: 1
   - Strongly Agree: 7

Perceived organizational support

Please indicate how much you (1) strongly disagree or (7) strongly agree with each statement listed below. Please select the number that you feel coordinates best with the way you feel.

1) Even if I did my best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.*

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

2) The organization fails to appreciate and extra effort from me.*

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

3) The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

4) The organization values my contribution to its well-being.

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

5) The organization really cares about me well-being.

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

6) The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

7) The organization would ignore any complaint from me.*

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

8) The organization shows very little concern for me.*

   | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7    |

* Indicates that item is reversed coded

Perceived supervisor support

Please indicate how much you (1) strongly disagree or (7) strongly agree with each statement listed below. Please select the number that you feel coordinates best with the way you feel.

1) My supervisor values my contributions to the well-being of our department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would do so.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) My supervisor wanted to know if I have any complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) My supervisor takes my best interests into account when he/she makes decisions that affect me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) My supervisor really cares about me well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would be sure to notice.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

10) My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favor.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

11) My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

12) If given the opportunity my supervisor would take advantage of me.*

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

13) My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

14) My supervisor cares about my opinions.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

15) My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

16) My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

   Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

* Indicates item is reverse coded

Psychological Contracts

Please answer the following questions with the best answer that describes the way you feel. Circle either A or B for each response.

1) A. I receive money in exchange for hard work. (Transactional)
   B. I receive job security in exchange for my loyalty to my organization. (Relational)

2) A. My determination for working in my organization comes from the pure enjoyment I have in doing my job. (Relational)
   B. My determination for working in my organization comes from financial rewards that I receive from my organization. (Transactional)

3) A. There are a wide range of possibilities in my current organization. (Relational)
   B. The possibilities for me in my current organization are limited. (Transactional)

4) A. I stay with this organization because of things beyond pay, such as the pleasure I get from doing my job well. (Relational)
   B. I stay with this organization because of the pay and the benefits. (Transactional)

5) A. I feel that my work does not change and that I do the same things daily. (Transactional)
   B. I feel that my work changes often and that I am doing something new everyday. (Relational)
REFERENCES


