# MONASH UNIVERSITY

## FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

**WORK/LIFE BALANCE STRATEGIES: PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN AUSTRALIAN ORGANIZATIONS**

**Helen De Cieri, Barbara Holmes, Jacqui Abbott & Trisha Pettit**

*Working Paper 58/02*
*November 2002*

## WORKING PAPER SERIES

**Abstract**

Work/life balance (WLB) is an issue increasingly recognised as of strategic importance to organizations and of significance to employees.  We argue that an organization's need to attract and retain valued employees in a highly competitive labour market is a strong motivating factor for increased organizational awareness and action with regard to implementation and management of WLB strategies. This article reports the findings of three surveys conducted from 1997 to 2000 of organizations in Australia.  We explore the range and usage of WLB strategies in Australian organizations, and identify the barriers to those strategies.  It is evident that, while some progress has been made over the years, there remain substantial challenges for the implementation and management of WLB strategies.

**D E P A R T M E N T   O F   M A N A G E M E N T**

# WORK/LIFE BALANCE STRATEGIES: PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN AUSTRALIAN ORGANIZATIONS

## INTRODUCTION

An organization's need to attract and retain valued employees in a highly competitive labour market is a strong motivating factor for increased organizational awareness and action with regard to human resource policies and practices that address work/life balance. Work/life balance (WLB) is an important area of human resource management that is receiving increasing attention from government, researchers, management and employee representatives and the popular media (Pocock, van Wanrooy, Strazzari & Bridge, 2001; Russell & Bowman, 2000).

WLB, from an employee perspective, is the maintenance of a balance between responsibilities at work and at home. Employees view the benefits or working conditions that they provide to help employees balance the family and work domains as work life benefits (Bardoel, Tharenou, & Moss, 1998; Russell & Bowman, 2000). WLB strategies in an organizational setting include policies covering flexible work arrangements, child and dependant care, and family and parental leave (Bardoel et al., 1998; Kramar, 1997).

In contrast, *work/life conflict* is defined as a form of inner role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and other life domains, such as family, are mutually incompatible in some respect, whereby participation in one role is made more difficult by the virtue of participation in the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Initially the concept of work/life conflict was focused on the impact of family demands on work. It now extends to the impact work has on individual stress, relationships and family well being (Russell & Bowman, 2000). Work/life conflict may be characterized by a lack of fit between employees and their life responsibilities, and the goals of the organization (Becker & Huselid, 1998; Erwin & Iverson, 1994; Lewis & Cooper, 1995). Work/life conflict may include issues such as difficulties faced related to child-rearing, other kinship responsibilities, or stressful life events (Hobson, Delunas & Kesic, 2001).

## WORK/LIFE BALANCE AS A STRATEGIC HRM CONCERN

WLB has emerged as a strategic issue for HRM and a key element of an organization's employee retention strategies (Cappelli, 2000; Lewis & Cooper, 1995). It has been argued that organizations need to be aware of the changing needs of employees and provide flexible WLB strategies[1] in order to retain their employees. Organizations that seek to increase employee morale, commitment and satisfaction, and reduce sources of stress and problems at work, will improve their ability to recruit and retain talented and valued employees (Cappelli, 2000). Whether the introduction of WLB strategies is effective in reducing work/family conflict is uncertain; it may simply improve employee attitudes towards the organization (Lambert 2000). In the context of a 'war' for skilled talent (Way, 2000), such outcomes may be significant.

## EMPLOYEES AS STAKEHOLDERS IN WORK/LIFE BALANCE

Organizations can be viewed as a network of constituencies or stakeholders (groups affected by the organization's practices) with views and demands regarding organizational effectiveness (Tsui & Milkovich, 1987). Organizations that do not meet stakeholders' needs may be unlikely to develop or sustain a competitive advantage (Berman, Wicks, Kotha & Jones, 1999). Although relationships with various stakeholders may vary, ignoring a stakeholder may affect future performance (Yeung & Berman, 1997).

---

1 In the HRM literature, such strategies may also be labeled policies and practices, or programs. These labels collectively refer to initiatives that are designed, usually by HRM professionals, to influence employees' behavior, attitudes, and performance.

In the last two decades there has been substantial debate and discussion amongst stakeholder theorists and researchers around notions such as the social responsiveness and social responsibility of corporations (cf. Freeman, 1984; Wartick & Cochran 1985). A plethora of perspectives and models has been offered [see various articles in *Academy of Management Review,* 1999, 42 (5)]. Recent debate has focused on issues such as stakeholder identification (how stakeholder groups may be identified and what differentiates them) and salience, (the nature and priority of possible relationships between an organisation and various stakeholders) (Mitchell, Agle & Wood 1997). Recently, efforts have been made to address the dearth of empirical research in this area (for example, Berman et al., 1999; Henriques and Sadorsky 1999). Our research aims to contribute to the development of this body of literature. Our study focuses on employees, as they are key stakeholders within organizations, with particular interest and influence in the success of WLB strategies.[2]

## THE CONTEXT FOR WORK/LIFE BALANCE STRATEGIES IN AUSTRALIAN ORGANIZATIONS

There is increasing awareness of the benefits of providing more flexible HR strategies (Grover & Crooker, 1995), reflecting increasing recognition of the fact that work and other life commitments cannot easily be separated. As organizations move towards more participative and flat structures where fewer employees are expected to manage increased workloads (Hall & Richter, 1988), the demands of the environment increase, and maintaining the balance between the demands of a career and life responsibilities becomes more difficult.

The importance of WLB has increased as a corollary of increasing workforce diversity (Bond, Galinsky & Swanberg, 1997). For example, the Australian population, as in most industrialized nations, is aging (Drucker, 2001; Patrickson & Hartmann, 1998). The number of employees with responsibilities for the care of family members will continue to increase. Also, the increasing participation of women in the workforce creates increasing pressure for diversity management and WLB strategies. Although work/life, and particularly work/family, conflict is well-recognized as an issue for both sexes, it continues to place additional responsibilities on working women, as they have tended to experience the major responsibility for domestic matters (Abbott, De Cieri & Iverson, 1998; Borrill & Kidd, 1994; Judge, Boudreau & Bretz, 1994; Konrad & Mangel, 2000).

We argue that there is a need for organizations in the current business environment to adopt HR strategies and policies that accommodate the work/life needs of a diverse workforce (Cox & Blake, 1991; Robinson & Dechant, 1997), and WLB strategies are a key element of this. Each form of diversity may present particular challenges for management and employees, and create an imperative for flexible and inclusive management strategies (Dass & Parker, 1999; De Cieri & Olekalns, 2001; Joplin & Daus, 1997).

The emergent challenge for Australian organizations is to develop the capability to attract, motivate and retain a highly skilled, flexible and adaptive workforce. This is particularly valuable at management and senior management levels, in order to develop the leadership skills necessary for organizations to survive. Any organization aiming to increase competitive advantage needs to develop an approach to HR and WLB strategies that cater for the diverse needs of the workforce.

Management strategies which endeavour to address the apparent lack of 'fit' between work demands and the new diversity of workforce characteristics are emerging, although progress has been somewhat piecemeal (Spearritt & Edgar, 1994). There is an increasing body of literature which documents that HR strategies are influenced by contextual influences such as those outlined above (eg., Jackson & Schuler, 1995). The interests of the employee have become more central to management concerns as managers seek to avoid the loss of potential creativity and commitment and threats of litigation from not addressing

---

[2] Other important stakeholders may include stockholders, who expect a return on their investment; customers, who want a high-quality product or service; and the community, which wants the organization to contribute to activities and projects and minimize damage to the environment, is also an important stakeholder. It is beyond the scope of the present study to include all of these stakeholder groups.

employees' needs (Doherty & Tyson, 2000). The HR manager has the opportunity to play a strategic role in the adoption of strategies which deal with a variety of demands and have potential for significant positive outcomes for the organization (Dowling & Fisher, 1997; Kossek et al., 1994, Yeung, Brockbank & Ulrich, 1996; Ulrich, 1997). WLB strategies may include flexible policies such as temporal flexibility, telecommuting, part-time and job-sharing employment, leave options (e.g. paid study or parental leave), as part of a strategic approach to managing HR.

In the context of such issues, our first set of research questions is:
*1a. Which WLB strategies are found in Australian organizations?*
*1b. To what extent are employees using the WLB strategies that are available in their organizations?*

## BARRIERS TO WORK/LIFE BALANCE STRATEGIES

In studies undertaken in Australia and overseas (Dessler, 1999; Edgar, 1988; Kirby & Krone, 2002; Morrison, 1992; Pringle & Tudhope, 1996; Smith, 1994; Wolcott & Glezer, 1995), several barriers have been identified as creating major difficulties for the development and implementation of WLB strategies. Barriers may be defined as obstacles or hindrances to the implementation and on-going effectiveness of WLB strategies. The focus in this paper is on barriers that are attributable to the organizational environment. The extant literature has identified such barriers as including:

- an organizational culture which emphasizes and rewards long hours and high organizational commitment (to the neglect of other life commitments);
- an isolated, hostile and unsupportive working environment for employees with life commitments external to the organization;
- attitudes and resistance of supervisors and middle management;
- preference of senior management involved in recruiting to dealing with people perceived as similar to themselves (homo-sociability); and
- lack of communication and education about WLB strategies.

Therefore, our second set of research questions is:
*2a. What are the barriers to implementation and maintenance of WLB strategies?*
*2b. Have these barriers changed over recent years (1997-2000)?*

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Sample

This study is based on three surveys, conducted in 1997, 1998 and 2000.[3] For each survey, questionnaires were distributed to approximately 1500 organizations operating in Australia. The sample sizes for responses were 111 in 1997, 456 in 1998 and 358 in 2000. Although the response rate in 1997 was not high, this is not unusual amongst mail-out voluntary surveys (Babbie, 2001). Respondents were HR managers or specialists with knowledge of WLB strategies in their respective organizations. The organizational characteristics for the three samples (Table 1) show that the respondents were representative of the target samples with regard to size and industry. To ensure anonymity and encourage openness and honesty in responses, individual companies were not identified in the survey responses. This did, however, prevent matching of the individual responses in the three samples and therefore prevented longitudinal analysis of the data.

-------------------------
Table 1 about here
-------------------------

### Measures

-------------------------

[3] No survey was conducted in 1999.

The surveys focused upon WLB strategies and related issues within the workplace. In 2000, the scope of the questionnaire was increased to include lifestyle issues in addition to work and family. Respondents were asked to identify the WLB strategies (or 'flexible work options') available to employees in their organization by responding to a 13-item scale developed for this study (1 = No; 2 = Yes). Items included part-time work, job sharing, telecommuting and career breaks. Respondents were then asked to indicate the percentage of employees currently using these work options offered within their organization.

Barriers to WLB were then explored using a 12-item scale measuring hindrances that impact upon WLB efforts within the organization. Items included ineffective implementation of WLB strategies, lack of middle management education, and lack of communication to staff. A five-point Likert scale was utilized with responses from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree).


## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The Context for WLB: Range and Usage of WLB Strategies

Our first set of research questions is:
*1a.  Which WLB strategies are found in Australian organizations?*
*1b.  To what extent are employees using the WLB strategies that are available in their organizations?*

Our surveys explored the various WLB strategies that have been implemented in organizations and are being used by employees. To address our first research question, Table 2 shows the per cent of respondents indicating that these WLB strategies have been implemented in their organizations, for at least some employees. The most frequently cited WLB strategies across all three survey years are (in order): part-time work, study leave, flexible starting and finishing times, working from home on an ad hoc basis and job sharing.

-------------------------
Table 2 about here
-------------------------

In 2000, this was further explored by asking respondents to indicate whether the options were available to none, some employees, most employees or all employees. Grouping the various WLB strategies together, it became evident that in over half (57.2 per cent) of the organizations, a range of WLB strategies are available to some employees. A substantial proportion (40.5 per cent) have fully implemented a range of WLB strategies for all employees. A very small proportion (2.3 per cent) of organizations have not implemented WLB strategies at all.

In the 2000 survey, we also explored the next research question (1b) *To what extent are employees using the WLB strategies that are available in their organizations?* As Table 3 shows, 50 per cent of organizations have less than 20 per cent of their employees using the WLB strategies that are available. At the other extreme, only 6 per cent of organizations have more than 80 per cent of their employees using WLB strategies. We conducted correlational analysis to examine the relationship between implementation of WLB strategies and employee usage. We found that the more WLB strategies available in an organization, the more likely it is that employees will utilise the options available ($r = .234$, $p < 0.001$). However, comparing employee usage with the amount of WLB strategies implemented in the organizations, the findings overall suggest that employee usage lags behind the implementation of WLB strategies; there appears to be some delay between an organization's efforts to introduce WLB strategies, and employees taking up the opportunity to utilise the available WLB initiatives. This interesting finding supports recent research by Kirby and Krone (2002), who found that an organizational culture that is unsupportive of WLB strategies may lead to employee reluctance to utilize benefits.

-------------------------
Table 3 about here
-------------------------

5

**Barriers to WLB Strategies**

Our second set of research questions is:
*2a.  What are the barriers to implementation and maintenance of WLB strategies?*
*2b.  Have these barriers changed over the three surveys (1997-2000)?*

Several factors have been identified as creating major difficulties for the development and implementation of WLB strategies.  To address research question 2a, the barriers reported by respondents are shown in Table 4.  It is evident that there were some persistent barriers to WLB strategies.  To examine these barriers over the years of data collection (research question 2b), we conducted ANOVA with post hoc Scheffé tests (see Table 4).  For example, the findings with regard to *'increased work demands over-shadow personal needs'* are interesting.  In each survey year, this item has the lowest mean score (2.00, 1.84 and 1.86 for 1997, 1998 and 2000 respectively), indicating that respondents are very likely to have experienced this item as a barrier to WLB strategies.  The ANOVA and post hoc Scheffé analyses show that this was consistent across the three survey years $[F(2, 900) = 1.652, \text{n.s.}]$.  This finding supports recent research showing difficulties faced by employees trying to balance excessive work and life responsibilities (Bond et al., 1997; Hobson et al., 2001).

------------------------
Table 4 about here
------------------------

Exploring changes in the barriers to WLB strategies over the years of data collection, the analyses showed significant differences between the responses on several items.  With regard to *'insufficient involvement of and communication with senior management'*, respondents in 1998 and 2000 were significantly more likely to agree that this is a barrier to WLB strategies than were the 1997 respondents $[F(2,888) = 5.794, p = .003]$.  This suggests that there is a growing need to improve the dialogue with senior management with regard to WLB strategies.  These results provide some support for calls for the HR function to develop the role of a strategic partner to senior management (Kossek et al., 1994; Ulrich, 1997).

Two other items also suggest an increase in difficulties encountered in implementing WLB strategies.  With regard to *'ineffective implementation'*, respondents in 1998 and 2000 were significantly more likely to agree that this is a barrier to WLB strategies than were the 1997 respondents $[F(2,860) = 6.972, p = .001]$.  Also, with regard to *'lack of communication to staff'*, respondents in 1998 and 2000 were significantly more likely to agree that this is a barrier to WLB strategies than were the 1997 respondents $[F(2,877) = 7.789, p = .000]$.  Considering that the respondents are likely to be directly involved in and perhaps responsible for the implementation and communication of WLB strategies, the recognition that these are major problem areas is noteworthy.  Communication is widely acknowledged as important for successful implementation of managerial initiatives such as WLB strategies (Kirby & Krone, 2002; Luthans & Stajkovic, 1999).  The results also suggest that *'failure to evaluate the impact of programs'* is an item emerging as a barrier, as respondents in 2000 were significantly more likely to agree that this is a barrier than were the 1997 respondents $[F(2,846) = 3.441, p = .032]$.  However, a puzzling finding was discovered with regard to having *'inadequate data to build the business case'*.  Respondents in 1997 and 2000 were significantly less likely to agree that having *'inadequate data to build the business case'* was a barrier than were the respondents in 1998 $[F(2,876) = 4.337, p = 0.13]$.  Overall, although monitoring and evaluation are critical to the implementation of HR endeavours (Johnson, 1995), the findings suggest that these internal organization processes are not providing consistent support for the implementation of WLB strategies.

To explore the barriers encountered by organizations further, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis using varimax rotation on the data collected in 2000.  Two factors emerged (see Table 5).  The strongest factor can be described as *organizational inaction*, as the items loading on this factor relate to a failure to act effectively to implement WLB strategies.  These items include lack of communication, support, involvement of senior and line management, and education.  The second factor can be described as *organizational values,* as the items loading onto this factor relate to less tangible aspects of the organizational environment, such as a focus on more functional aspects of work rather than strategic or cultural considerations.  This suggests a need to take a more strategic view of WLB and its place within

the organization.  Cronbach's alpha scores for the two scales showed good reliability ($\alpha$ = 0.87 and 0.79, for Factors 1 and 2 respectively).  Overall, these two factors support recent literature indicating that a negative culture, working environment and attitudes of supervisors create barriers to the implementation of WLB strategies (Dessler, 1999).

-------------------------
Table 5 about here
-------------------------


**CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE**

Our survey data, collected between 1997 and 2000, show that while there has been some progress in the implementation and management of WLB strategies, substantial barriers remain in Australian organizations.  Overall, we argue that implementation of WLB strategies needs to be considered as a process involving effective implementation and communication to managers and employees, culture change to eliminate barriers, and the development of a 'track record' of recent achievements, to encourage future management commitment to this area.

Employees, as important organizational stakeholders, expect their employers to be responsive to their need to balance work, and life commitments (Kossek et al., 1994).  Changes in current managerial attitudes to WLB strategies are requisite for innovative and inclusive behaviours and organizational cultures to be developed, to address the changing needs of the workforce and the pressures from multiple stakeholders which influence HR managers (Kossek et al., 1994).  Building on this study, it may be fruitful for future research to explore the area of WLB strategies from the perspectives of other stakeholders.  For example, we note that Voydanoff (2001) has recently provides an innovative framework for integrating community into the analysis of work and family.

An important area for future research relates to the evaluation and costing of WLB strategies within an organization.  Evaluation of WLB strategies could provide a comparison with the cost of turnover due to work/life conflict.  For example, Abbott et al. (1998) calculated a (conservative) cost of A$75,000 related to voluntary turnover of middle managers attributable to work/life conflict.  Perhaps future research could identify the costs associated with implementation and maintenance of WLB strategies that seek to address and minimise such turnover.  What are the costs of work/life conflict compared with the benefits of WLB strategies? The introduction and implementation of flexible policies will significantly change the culture of most organizations, but inevitably will involve long-term commitment by employers, and have associated costs.

The need to manage WLB has arisen out of the increasing diversity brought by changing demographics of the work force as well as changing social values and the globalisation of economies and markets (Jackson & Ruderman, 1995; Way, 1999).  Several writers have argued that effective management of diverse human resources will provide a key differentiator for successful organizations (Joplin & Daus, 1997; Lepak & Snell, 1999; Robinson & Dechant, 1997).  We suggest that the adoption of a wide range of WLB strategies, to deal with a variety of employee needs and demands, will have the potential for significant positive outcomes for the organization (Dowling & Fisher, 1997; Kossek et al., 1994, Yeung, Brockbank & Ulrich, 1996).

To retain competitive advantage employers are reliant on a committed and productive workforce (Pfeffer, 1994).  WLB strategies with regard to matters such as temporal flexibility, leave benefits, and interpersonal relationships have the potential to reduce or increase stress on workers with life responsibilities.  The provision of WLB strategies can provide a positive and direct impact on an employee's decision to remain with an employer (Macran, Joshi & Dex, 1996).

The formation of appropriate WLB and HR strategies overall will be integral to the creation of flexible workplaces conducive to the attraction, motivation and retention of highly-valued employees.  We argue that such strategies will enable employers and employees to meet the emerging challenges related to the need for balance between work and life.

**REFERENCES**

Abbott, J., H. De Cieri and R.D. Iverson. 1998. Costing turnover: Implications of work/family conflict at management level. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 36 (1): 25-43.

Babbie, E. 2001. *The practice of social research.* (9th edn.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Barclay, E. and A. Bass. 1994. Get the most from recruitment efforts. *HRMagazine* June: 70-72.

Bardoel, E., P. Tharenou and S. Moss. 1998. Organizational predictors of work-family practices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 36 (3): 31-49.

Becker, B. and M. Huselid. 1998. High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 16: 53 - 101.

Berman, S.L., A.C. Wicks, S. Kotha and T.M. Jones. 1999. Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 42 (5): 488-506.

Bond, J.T., E. Galinsky and J.E. Swanberg. 1997. *The 1997 national study of the changing workforce.* New York: Families and Work Institute.

Borrill, C. and J.M. Kidd. 1994. New parents at work: jobs, families and the psychological contract. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 22 (2): 219-231.

Briggs, S. and W. Keogh. 1999. Integrating human resource strategy and strategic planning to achieve business excellence. *Total Quality Management* 10 (4&5): 447-453.

Cappelli, P. 2000. A market-driven approach to retaining talent. *Harvard Business Review* 78 (1): 103-111.

Cascio, W. 1991. *Costing human resources.* Boston, MA: PWS-Kent.

Cook, M. 1995. Women in the work force: A business imperative. *Executive Speeches* February/March: 6-8.

Cox, T. and S. Blake. 1991. Managing cultural diversity: implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive* 5 (3): 45-56.

Dalton, D.R., W.D. Todor, and D.M. Krackhardt. 1982. Turnover overstated: The functional taxonomy. *Academy of Management Review* 7 (1): 117-123.

Dalton, D.R. and W.D. Todor. 1993. Turnover, transfer, absenteeism: An interdependent perspective. *Journal of Management* 19 (2): 193-219.

Dass, P. and B. Parker. 1999. Strategies for managing human resource diversity: from resistance to learning. *Academy of Management Executive* 13 (2): 68-80.

De Cieri, H. and M. Olekalns. 2001. Managing diversity in Australia. In *Managing Diversity in the Asia-Pacific*, eds. M. Patrickson and P. O'Brien, pp.21-36. Milton, Qld.: Jacaranda Wiley.

Deery, M.A. and R.D. Iverson. 1996. Enhancing productivity: intervention strategies for employee turnover. In *Productivity management in hospitality and tourism,* ed. N. Johns, 68-95. London, U.K.: Cassell.

Dessler, G. 1999. How to earn your employees' commitment. *Academy of Management Executive* 13 (2): 58-67.

DiMaggio, P. and W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 23: 111-136.

Doherty, N. and S. Tyson. 2000. HRM and employee well-being: raising the ethical stakes. *Ethical issues in contemporary human resource management.* London: Macmillan Business.

Dowling, P.J. and C, Fisher. 1997. The Australian HR professional: A 1995 profile. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 35 (1): 1-20.

Drucker, P. 2001. The next society?, *The Economist* Nov 3-9: 3-20.

Dyer, L. and T. Reeves. 1995. Human resource strategies and firm performance: what to we know and where do we need to go? *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 6 (3): 656-670.

Edgar, D. 1995. *Whose cost, Whose benefit?: Measuring the outcomes of work family change* (New Links Workplace Project working paper no.3, July, 1995), Melbourne: National Key Centre in Industrial Relations Monash University.

Edgar, D. 1988. Corporate responses to workers and families. *Family Matters* 22: 26-28.

Erwin, P.J. and R.D. Iverson. 1994. Strategies in absence management. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 32 (3): 13-32.

Freeman, R.E. 1984. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Boston, Pitman.

Friedman, D.E. 1990. Work and family: The new strategic plan. *Human Resource Planning* 13: 79-89.

Galinsky, E. and P.J.Stein. 1990. The impact of human resource policies on employees. *Journal of Family Issues* 11 (4): 368-383.

Gibson, C.B. 1997. Do you hear what I hear? A framework for reconciling intercultural communication difficulties arising from cognitive styles and cultural values. In *New perspectives on international and organizational psychology,* eds. P.C. Earley and M. Erez, pp. 335-362. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greenhaus, J. H. and Beutell, N.J. 1985. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 38 (3): 635-672.

Grover, S.L. and K.J. Crooker. 1995. Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology* 48 (2): 271-288.

Hall, D. and J. Richter. 1988. Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Executive* 11 (3): 213-223.

Henriques, I. and P. Sadorsky. 1999. The relationship between environmental commitment and managerial perceptions of stakeholder importance. *Academy of Management Journal* 42(1): 87-99.

Higham, J. and S. Libby. 1994. Business faces the challenge of advancing and retaining women. *Massachusetts CPA Review* Summer: 24-27.

Hobson, C.J., L. Delunas and D. Kesic. 2001. Compelling evidence of the need for corporate work/life balance initiatives: results from a national survey of stressful life-events. *Journal of Employment Counseling* 38(1): 38-44.

Hughes, D.L. and E. Galinsky. 1994. Gender, job and family conditions, and psychological symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18: 251-270.

Iverson, R., S. Deery, and P. Erwin. 1995. Absenteeism in the health services sector: A causal model and intervention strategies. *Industrial Relations Research Series* 18, February: 257-294.

Jackson, S.E. and M.N. Ruderman. 1995. *Diversity in work teams. Research paradigms for a changing workplace.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Jackson, S.E. and R.S. Schuler. 1995. Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environments. *Annual Review of Psychology* 46: 237-264.

Johnson, A.A. 1995. The business case for work-family programs. *Journal of Accountancy* 180 (2): 53-58.

Joplin, J.R.W. and C.S. Daus. 1997. Challenges of leading a diverse workforce. *Academy of Management Executive* 11 (3): 32-47.

Judge, T.A., J.W. Boudreau, and R.D. Jr Bretz. 1994. Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79 (5): 767-782.

Kanter, R. 1977. *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kingston, P.W. 1990. Illusions and ignorance about the family-responsive workplace. *Journal of Family Issues* 11 (4): 438-454.

Kirby, E.L. and K.J. Krone. 2002. "The policy exists but you can't really use it": Communication and the structuration of work-family policies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 30(1): 50-77.

Konrad, A.M. and R. Mangel. 2000. The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal* 21: 1225-1237.

Kossek, E., P. Dass, and B. DeMarr. 1994. The dominant logic of employer sponsored work and family initiatives: Human resource managers' institutional role. *Human Relations* 47 (9): 1121-1139.

Kramar, R. 1997. Developing and implementing work and family policies: the implications for human resource policies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 35 (3): 24-32.

Lambert, S. 2000. Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal* 43 (5): 801-815.

Lepak, D.P. and S. Snell. 1999. The human resource architecture: towards a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Journa*l 24 (1): 31-48.

Lewis, S. and C.L. & Cooper. 1995. Balancing the work/home interface: A European perspective. *Human Resource Management Review* 5 (4): 289-305.

Loscocco, K. 2000. Age integration as a solution to work-family conflict. *The Gerontologist* 40 (3): 292-300.

Luthans, F. and A. Stajkovic. 1999. Reinforce for performance: The need to go beyond pay and even rewards. *Academy of Management Executive* 13 (2): 49-57.

Macran, S., H. Joshi, and S. Dex. 1996. Employment after childbearing: a survival analysis. *Work, Employment & Society* 10 (2): 272-296.

Mathieu, J.E. and D.M. Zajac. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin* 108 (2): 171-194.

Mitchell, R. K., B. R. Agle, and D.J. Wood. 1997. Towards a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review* 22(4): 853-886.

Morrison, A. 1992. *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, A. M., R.P. White, and Van Velsor. 1987. *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporation?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Nkomo, S. and T.H. Cox. 1996. Diverse identities in organizations. In *Handbook of organization studies*, eds. S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord, 338-356. London: Sage.

Patrickson, M. and L. Hartmann. 1998. *Managing an aging workforce*, Sydney, Australia: Woodslane

Payne, E. 1997. Employer-sponsored child care. *Employee Relations Brief* 1 (11): 143-144.

Pfeffer, J. 1994. *Competitive advantage through people.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Porter, L.W., R.M. Steers, R.T. Mowday, and P.V. Boulian. 1974. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59: 603-609.

Price, J.L. 1977. *The study of turnover.* Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Pringle, J. and J. Tudhope. 1996. Family Friendly Policies: The Experiences of Three of Three New Zealand Companies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 34 (3): 77-89.

Robinson, G. and K. Dechant. 1997. Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive* 11 (3): 21-31.

Russell, G. and L. Bowman. 2000. *Work and family, Current thinking, research and practice*, prepared for the Department of Family and Community Services as a background paper for the National Families Strategy.

Shaw, J.B. and E. Barrett-Power. 1998. The effects of diversity on small work group processes and performance. *Human Relations* 51 (10): 1307-1325.

Sinclair, A. and F. Marriott. 1990. Women in management - advantage through adversity. *Asia Pacific Human Resource Management* 28 (2): 14-25.

Smith, C.R. 1994. *An investigation of organisational responses to dual-career employee status.* Working Paper 1/94, Faculty of Business, Edith Cowan University, Perth.

Smith, D. 1998. The business case for diversity. *Monash Mt Eliza Business Review* November: 72-81.

Spearritt, K. and D. Edgar. 1994. *The family-friendly front: A review of Australian and international work and family research.* National Key Centre in Industrial Relations, Monograph no. 5, Monash University, Australia.

Still, L.V., C.D. Guerin, and W. Chia. 1992. *Women in management revisited: Progress, regression or status quo?* Women in Management Series, Paper No 16, School of Business, Nepean College of Advanced Education, New South Wales.

Terborg, J.R. 1977. Women in management: A research review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62: 647-664.

Tharenou, P., S. Latimer, and D. Conroy. 1994. How do you make it to the top? An examination of influences on women's and men's managerial advancement. *Academy of Management Journal* 37 (4): 899-931.

Thomas, L.T. and D.C. Ganster. 1995. Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80 (1): 6-15.

Tsui, A.S. and G. Milkovich. 1987. Personnel department activities: Constituency perspectives and preferences. *Personnel Psychology* 40: 519-537.

Ulrich, 1997. *HR champions,* Boston MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Vanden Heuvel, A. 1993. *When roles overlap: Workers with family responsibilities.* Australian Institute of Family Studies Monograph no. 14, Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Voydanoff, P. 2001. Incorporating community into work and family research: A review of basic relationships. *Human Relations* 54 (12): 1609-1637.

Wartick, S. L. and P. L. Cochran. 1985. The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review* 10(4): 758-769.

Way, N. 2000. Talent war. *Business Review Weekly* August 18: 64.

Wolcott, I. and H. Glezer. 1995. *Work and family life.* Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Wooden, M. 1992. The cost of time off work in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 30 (3): 1-10.

Yeung, A. and B. Berman. 1997. Adding value through human resources: Reorienting human resource measurement to drive business performance. *Human Resource Management* 36 (3): 321-355.

Yeung, A., W. Brockbank, and D. Ulrich. 1996. Lower cost, higher value: Human resource function in transformation. *Human Resource Management* 19 (4): 1-16.

**Table 1: Organizational Characteristics for 1997, 1998 and 2000 Respondents**

| Organizational Characteristics | 1997 (%) n=111 | 1998 (%) n=456 | 2000 (%) n=358 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Organizational Size** | | | |
| 1-250 employees | 13.5 | 33.1 | 28.5 |
| 251-1000 employees | 27.9 | 30.3 | 30.2 |
| 1001+ employees | 57.5 | 35.7 | 41.1 |
| **Industry** | | | |
| Business/Finance/Legal | 27 | 20.6 | 17.6 |
| Chemicals | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Construction | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| Education | 0.0 | 5.7 | 7.5 |
| Health Care | 4.5 | 5.9 | 5.6 |
| Hospitality | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| Manufacturing | 12.6 | 12.3 | 12.8 |
| Media | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| Pharmaceuticals | 2.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Retail | 4.5 | 3.7 | 2.0 |
| Telecommunication | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.0 |
| Govt (Local/State/Federal) | 17.1 | 21.5 | 26.5 |
| Other | 22.5 | 20.2 | 15.2 |
| No response | 1.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 |

**Table 2: Per Cent of Organizations with Work/Life Balance Strategies Implemented**

| WLB Strategies | 1997 (%) n=111 | 1998 (%) n=456 | 2000 (%) n=358 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Part-time work | 95.6 | 89.2 | 96.9 |
| Study leave | 92.7 | 91.0 | 95.3 |
| Flexible starting and finishing times | 88.4 | 75.7 | 93.3 |
| Work from home on an ad hoc basis | 83.3 | 74.8 | 81.9 |
| Job Share | 75.0 | 72.1 | 81.6 |
| Rostered days off | 61.4 | 52.3 | 65.1 |
| Paid parental leave | 53.5 | 60.4 | 60.1 |
| Flexi-time | 50.9 | 45.0 | 55.3 |
| Use flex days or rostered days off as half days | 50.7 | 45.0 | 53.1 |
| Telecommuting | 48.7 | 45.0 | 52.7 |
| 48/52 Working year | 45.0 | 39.6 | 52.8 |
| Career Break | 37.9 | 35.1 | 45.5 |
| Compressed work week | 30.9 | 21.6 | 35.2 |

**Table 3: Per Cent of Employees using WLB Options (2000 survey only)**

| Employees using WLB Options | Frequency (n=358) | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| 0-20% of employees | 178 | 49.7 |
| 21-40% of employees | 60 | 16.8 |
| 41-60% of employees | 49 | 13.7 |
| 61-80% of employees | 39 | 10.9 |
| 81-100% of employees | 23 | 6.4 |

**Table 4:  Barriers to WLB Strategies (1997-2000): ANOVA and Post-hoc Scheffé Results**

| Barriers to WLB Strategies | 1997 Mean (s.d.) | 1998 Mean (s.d.) | 2000 Mean (s.d.) | F | df | sig. | Scheffé Results* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Increased work demands over-shadow personal needs | 2.00 (.98) | 1.84 (.79) | 1.86 (.84) | 1.652 | 2, 900 | .192 | n.s. |
| Focus on programs rather than on culture change | 2.63 (1.13) | 2.50 (.95) | 2.41 (.98) | 2.003 | 2, 876 | .135 | n.s. |
| Focus on programs rather than the way work is done | 2.76 (1.09) | 2.53 (.94) | 2.53 (.94) | 2.600 | 2, 874 | .075 | n.s. |
| Not getting the line managers involved | 2.72 (1.14) | 2.64 (.98) | 2.65 (1.00) | 0.276 | 2, 870 | .759 | n.s. |
| Insufficient involvement of and communication with senior management | 2.79 (1.23) | 2.38 (1.11) | 2.47 (1.13) | 5.794 | 2, 888 | .003 | 97 > 98, 00 |
| Inability to achieve flexibility | 2.84 (1.18) | 2.56 (1.08) | 2.71 (1.06) | 3.437 | 2, 889 | .033 | n.s. |
| Inadequate data to build the business case | 2.93 (1.15) | 2.69 (1.03) | 2.88 (1.03) | 4.337 | 2, 876 | .013 | 98 < 97, 00 |
| Ineffective implementation | 3.29 (.05) | 2.89 (1.00) | 2.94 (.99) | 6.972 | 2, 860 | .001 | 97 > 98, 00 |
| Lack of communication to staff | 3.21 (.99) | 2.77 (1.07) | 2.77 (1.09) | 7.789 | 2, 877 | .000 | 97 > 98, 00 |
| Failure to evaluate impact of programs | 2.89 (1.02) | 2.71 (.96) | 2.61 (.97) | 3.441 | 2, 846 | .032 | 97 > 00 |
| Lack of middle management education | 2.51 (1.07) | 2.48 (.95) | 2.43 (.94) | 0.380 | 2, 882 | .684 | n.s. |
| Re-structuring within the organization | 2.61 (1.17) | 2.45 (1.13) | 2.55 (1.14) | 1.147 | 2, 854 | .318 | n.s. |

* n.s. = no significant differences found between means for 1997, 1998, 2000;

Year X < Year Y  = mean score in Year X is significantly lower than mean score in Year Y;

Year X > Year Y  = mean score in Year X is significantly higher than mean score in Year Y;

Mean scores are calculated on a scale from 1 (Strongly agree) to 5 (Strongly disagree).

**Table 5: Factor Analysis of Barriers to WLB Strategies (2000 survey only)**

|  | Factor | |
|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 |
| Lack of communication to staff | **.778** | .000 |
| Ineffective implementation | **.741** | .192 |
| Failure to evaluate impact of programs | **.648** | .189 |
| Lack of middle management education | **.629** | .217 |
| Not getting the line managers involved | **.605** | .278 |
| Insufficient involvement of and communication with senior management | **.603** | .355 |
| Inadequate data to build the business case | **.602** | .116 |
| Inability to achieve flexibility | .476 | .387 |
| Focus on programs rather than on culture change | .135 | **.835** |
| Focus on programs rather than the way work is done | .198 | **.781** |
| Increased work demands over-shadow personal needs | .140 | **.671** |
| Re-structuring within the organization | .275 | .397 |
| *Eigenvalue* | 4.550 | 1.295 |
| *% of Variance* | 37.918 | 10.788 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 3 iterations. Items loading over 0.5 are in bold font.