ABSTRACT

Title of thesis: WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT SELF-EFFICACY:
A SCALE VALIDATION STUDY

Kelly D. Hennessy, Masters of Arts, 2005

Thesis directed by: Dr. Robert W. Lent
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

The Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (WFC-SES) (Cinamon, 2003) was designed to measure an individual's beliefs in her or his ability to manage work-family and family-work conflict. The current study examines the factor structure, reliability, and validity estimates for the WFC-SES. In a sample of 159 working mothers, results showed evidence of satisfactory estimates of internal and external validity. Exploratory analysis suggests that work/family conflict self-efficacy may mediate the relationship between work/family conflict and outcomes such as work and family satisfaction and work stress. The WFC-SES may be used to better understand the role that self-efficacy can play in the relationship between conflict and negative outcomes.

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT SELF-EFFICACY:
A SCALE VALIDATION STUDY

by

Kelly D. Hennessy

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts
2005

Advisory committee:

      Dr. Robert W. Lent
      Dr. Karen M. O'Brien
      Dr. Linda Tipton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

Balancing multiple roles can increase the interpersonal and intrapersonal conflict experienced by women and men who simultaneously maintain professional and personal responsibilities. Work and family are central components in people's lives and thus demand a great deal of time and energy spent managing multiple responsibilities. In addition, work and family roles can have a meaningful impact on psychological well-being and satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996).

Work-family conflict and family-work conflict are defined as "forms of friction in which role pressures from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respects" (Cinamon & Rich, 2002, p. 212). Researchers suggested that work-family conflict and family-work conflict are distinct but related forms of role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Work-family conflict is defined as conflict that arises due to work responsibilities interfering with family responsibilities; family-work conflict is defined as conflict that arises due to family responsibilities interfering with work responsibilities. Netemeyer et al. (1996) discussed the importance of accurately assessing work-family and family-work conflict. They described work-family conflict as "a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities" (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401). Similarly, family-work conflict is described as "a form of interrole conflict in which general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities" (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401).

Consistent with the literature on this topic, I will use the term "work-family conflict" when referring to the conflict that results from work related responsibilities interfering with family life. When describing the type of conflict that results from family responsibilities interfering with work I will use the term "family-work conflict." It is helpful to think of work-family conflict and family-work conflict as work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, respectively. I will use the term "work/family conflict" when referring to the broader construct that includes both types of conflict.

Work-family conflict can arise as a result of demands at work making it more difficult to accomplish tasks associated with one's family. Tasks related to family can include childcare, the care of an aging parent, household responsibilities, as well as additional responsibilities that may arise as a result of one's role within the family. Work related tasks encompass hours of paid work, and can additionally include overtime work, work related travel, and work obligations that are fulfilled at home. Work-family conflict can also be thought of as a form of conflict in which, "role pressures associated with membership in one organization are in conflict with pressures stemming from membership in other groups" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 20). From a work-family perspective, this type of conflict reflects the degree to which work demands interfere with family responsibilities.

Similar to work-family conflict, family-work conflict occurs when responsibilities associated with one's family roles interfere with work related demands. The demands of a role can be thought of as the responsibilities, requirements, expectations, duties, and commitments associated with the given role. In the case of family-work conflict, demands associated with family, such as childcare or the care of an aging parent, interfere

2

with work demands. Conflict results in an incompatibility between role demands in both work and family domains. In other words, "participation in the family (work) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the work (family) role" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77).

Researchers have shown that conflict occurring as a result of demands from work and family can lead to a decrease in satisfaction, including life satisfaction, marital satisfaction, and job satisfaction (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Work-family conflict and family-work conflict are a result of strain created by incompatible roles and have been linked to stressful situations and negative outcomes. Specifically, work-family conflict has been shown to have a negative impact on the quality of family life, while family-work conflict has been linked to lower job satisfaction. Additionally, Williams and Alliger (1994) noted a spill-over of negative moods from work to family and from family to work as a result of work/family conflict. In the last two decades, a great deal of attention has focused on learning more about work/family conflict and its influence on a variety of outcomes (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999).

Much of the research on work/family conflict has focused on several negative outcomes that can occur as a result of this conflict, such as a decrease in work and family well-being and life and job satisfaction, and an increase in occupational burnout or turnover (Burke, 1988; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus, 1988; Pleck et al., 1980). Current research has produced several measures used to assess work-family and family-work conflict (Gutek et al., 1991; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Each measure is used to assess participants' perceptions of both work-family conflict and family-work conflict. However, there has been a paucity of research looking at factors that might influence the

relationship between the conflict that arises when balancing personal and professional responsibilities and potential outcomes.

The Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (WFC-SES) (Cinamon, 2003) was designed to measure an individual's beliefs in her or his ability to manage work-family and family-work conflict. The objective of the current study was to examine the factor structure, reliability, and validity estimates for the WFC-SES (Cinamon, 2003). The WFC-SES may be used to better understand the role that self-efficacy can play in the relationship between conflict and negative outcomes.

Bandura (1986) suggested that perceptions of and reactions to stress can be reduced or increased by an individual's self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as, "people's judgments in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance" (p. 391). Self-efficacy is a construct that has been applied to a variety of domains, and has been used as a way to better understand an individual's expectations in managing various tasks. Bandura (1977) described self-efficacy as a key determinant of psychological change, choice of settings and activities, quality of performance in a specific domain, and level of persistence when one meets adverse or negative experiences. These functions of self-efficacy are applicable to work/family conflict.

Previous research has linked self-efficacy to multiple-role management. For example, it is hypothesized that a woman's self-efficacy beliefs regarding her work and family responsibilities can help to reduce the role conflict and role overload she may experience (Erdwins et al., 2001). In other words, an individual's self-efficacy in a specific domain can provide information about how that individual will perceive and

cope with challenges in that domain. In the case of managing the conflict that inevitably arises between personal and occupational responsibilities, assessing work/family conflict self-efficacy can provide a unique perspective on what might ultimately help to reduce the negative outcomes (e.g. decrease in life and job satisfaction) that are associated with work/family conflict. By providing information regarding an individual's self-efficacy in managing work/family conflict, it may be possible to lessen work/family conflict and the negative outcomes with which it has been associated. Understanding how self-efficacy functions in the relationship between work/family conflict and outcomes could have meaningful therapeutic implications for women experiencing work/family conflict.

Extant research has yet to address work/family conflict self-efficacy as a unique construct, yet related research certainly suggests its relevance. Self-efficacy in a particular domain has been indirectly and directly linked to outcomes in that domain. For example, Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) suggested that self-efficacy promotes academic and vocational outcomes, such as interest, choice, and performance. A model linking self-efficacy to affective outcomes in work and non-work domains has also recently been proposed (Lent, 2004). Related research has found relationships between self-efficacy beliefs and such relevant outcomes as performance tasks (Pajares & Miller, 1995), work-related behaviors (Sadri & Robertson, 1993), and the career counseling behavior of counseling trainees (O'Brien, Heppner, Flores, & Bikos, 1997). Given such evidence, it seems reasonable to further explore the relationship of self-efficacy to cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes in other domains, such as the work/family interface.

To gain a better understanding of how individuals perceive and manage work/family conflict, it seems important to explore the links between work/family conflict and self-efficacy. In the current study, work/family self-efficacy was explored both as a potential source of work/family conflict and as a moderator of the relationship of work/family conflict to domain-specific (i.e. work, family) satisfaction and stress outcomes. More specifically, it can be hypothesized that an individual's self-efficacy beliefs regarding the ability to manage work/family conflict would (a) predict the level of work/family conflict that one experiences and (b) affect the strength of the relationship of work/family conflict to satisfaction and stress. In this way, assessing work/family conflict self-efficacy can help to further understand the relationship between work/family conflict, negative outcomes, and satisfaction.

Problem Statement

There has been little attempt to study the links between work/family conflict and self-efficacy. The Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (WFC-SES; Cinamon, 2003) is the first attempt to link self-efficacy and work/family conflict. Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as a person's own judgment of their abilities to complete a given task or course of action. Self-efficacy lends itself to work/family conflict in that an individual's self-efficacy beliefs can influence the way in which conflict is perceived and managed.

The WFC-SES (Cinamon, 2003) was developed in Hebrew and originally tested in Israel. The measure was later translated into English, but it has yet to be tested in this form. The central purposes of this study are to examine the factor structure and reliability estimates of the WFC-SES (Cinamon, 2003). Specifically, both internal consistency and

test-retest reliability were explored. The validity of this scale was also examined. The WFC-SES measures beliefs about self-efficacy in managing work-family conflict and family-work conflict. To assess self-efficacy, the measure focuses on behaviors associated with the demands that stem from work/family conflict. For example, the measure assesses, "How confident are you that you could fulfill all of your work responsibilities despite going through a trying and demanding period during your family life?" (Cinamon, 2003).

By focusing on perceived confidence in accomplishing certain behavioral demands, the measure taps into self-efficacy as defined by Bandura (1986) and operationalized in subsequent research (e.g. Lent et al., 1994; O'Brien et al., 1997; Pajares & Miller, 1995; Sadri & Robertson, 1993). Initial internal consistency reliability estimates of the original (Hebrew) version were promising, but this measure has yet to be tested in its translated English version.

In this study, participants included female, full time workers, who are married or living with a partner and have a child who is under the age of 18, living at home. To more accurately assess work/family conflict self-efficacy, the participant pool included women who are actually in the process of balancing multiple roles. Including women who are more likely to be experiencing conflict related to their work and family responsibilities increases the chances that the target measure, the WFC-SES, taps into a salient construct for the participants. Initial factor analysis of the Hebrew version supported a two-factor structure consisting of work-family conflict self efficacy and family-work conflict self-efficacy. The current study examined the factor structure of theEnglish -version WFC-SES.

Another objective of this study was to examine the validity of the Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (Cinamon, 2003). Specifically, I explored the measure's convergent validity by looking at how the WFC-SES compared to a scale of multiple role self-efficacyDiscriminant validity was examined relative to social desirability. In addition, criterion related validity was assessed by examining the relationship between the WFC-SES and several domain-relevant outcome variables: work-family and family-work conflict, work and family satisfaction, and work and family stress.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

In this review, I will first discuss the prevalence of women who manage multiple roles, serving in both occupational, work-related roles and personal, family-related roles. I will discuss the term conflict as it relates to work and family responsibilities, and present research examining the antecedents and consequences of role conflict. Next, I will focus on self-efficacy and discuss the body of literature that addresses the role of self-efficacy in relation to domain specific performance and outcomes, particularly in the framework of work-family conflict. Finally, I will present a framework that aims to provide additional validation for the Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (Cinamon, 2003). The research and background information surrounding multiple role management is meant to provide a context for the study of work-family conflict. The literature included in the sections regarding work-family conflict, satisfaction, and self-efficacy represents a selected review of the massive literature in each of these areas. Studies were selected for inclusion based on their relevance to this project's aim of providing reliability and validity estimates for Cinamon's (2003) Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale.

Multiple Role Management

In the past 50 years, the role of work in women's lives has changed dramatically, with an increased emphasis on the importance of professional roles (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). These changes are seen in higher education, where women are entering and graduating from professional schools at rates that are equal to or greater than men (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). White and Rogers (2000) report that the

9

modal American family is a dual-earner family and women can expect to spend at least 30 years in the paid workforce. Despite changes in this realm of women's lives, equal advances in traditional gender roles in the home have not seen such brisk changes. Rooted in the doctrine of middle class white America in the 1950's, a woman's place was widely felt to be in the home while a man's place was in the workforce (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Parsons (1949) presented a classic functionalist theory, claiming that a women's biological functioning predisposed her to familial and household responsibilities. Parsons and his colleagues attributed unequal marital roles to the biological fact that women bear children, and should thus remain in the home to provide childcare. Meanwhile men could not bear children, and thus found their place in the workforce (Parsons & Bales, 1955).

In the decades since Parsons' functionalist theory, although there have been substantial changes in the roles men and women fulfill at home, asymmetrical marital roles remain dominant (Oppenheimer, 1994). Bond et al. (1998) reported that the number of household tasks completed and time spent caring for children continues to differ between men and women, with women spending more time managing family related tasks than men. Given the combination of the professional advances made in the past 50 years and the fact that women continue to be responsible for a disproportionate amount of work within the home, including childcare responsibilities, there has been an upsurge in the percentage of women who manage multiple roles. Research shows that in heterosexual relationships women experience more multiple role demands than do men (Fassinger, 2000).

Another early view on the development of traditional gender roles can be found in the psychoanalytic work of Sigmund Freud in the early 20th century. Freud's ideas focused on the early experiences of both men and women. One tenet of his theory was that girls experience an incomplete feeling when they realize they do not have a penis like their male counterparts. To feel complete, the young girl must marry and have a child, similar to the young girl's primary identification figure, her mother. Women thereby become unequally responsible for family duties. Although such ideas have been modified significantly by the influence of feminist writers such as Chodorow (1978) and Gilligan (1982), Freud's views surrounding the roles of men and women survive today (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). While women are entering the workforce in greater numbers, they continue to be held responsible for the majority of family responsibilities. Research regarding a woman's experience of managing multiple roles is therefore greatly needed.

Gilbert (1998) described three relatively distinct stages in the history of multiple role research. Early research focused on the changing roles of women as they began to enter the workforce, challenging traditional gender roles that consistently held women responsible for the majority of household and family duties. During this early research, a great deal of attention was placed on the potential negative consequences of women entering the workforce. Women's changing roles, marked by an increased participation in occupational work, led multiple role research to focus on how women could "do it all" and still maintain traditional responsibilities, caring for their husbands and children at home. This phase of research has clear connections to the early functionalist and psychoanalytic theories, in which women were seen as better suited to fulfill family

responsibilities, and were going outside their appropriate domain by entering the workforce (Gilbert, 1998).

The second phase of multiple role research continued to be guided by an essentialist approach, which framed the experience of multiple role management as a result of the psychological make-up of women. During this stage there was an increased focus on comparisons of women and men and how women continued to work more hours in the home while men worked longer hours on the job. Research in this phase continued to be influenced by the early foundation of traditional gender roles and responsibilities as previously discussed (e.g. Parson's functionalist theory and Freud's psychoanalytic approach).

The third, more contemporary phase of multiple role research is characterized by a contextual approach to multiple roles, specifically focused on gender construction, the important role gender plays in our society, and how women managing multiple roles are influenced by societal messages regarding gender roles. Gilbert (1998) described gender construction as an active process that gets activated each day in both family and work settings. An example of a societal factor that influences women's management of multiple roles is the view that men and women do not have overlapping attributes and abilities. In this view women are seen as natural nurturers, while men are seen as the family's breadwinner. By looking at multiple roles in a broad, more contextually based approach, we can better understand the complexity that is involved in multiple roles.

In the past decade, multiple role research has established a clear connection between multiple roles and issues of role strain and role overload. Barnett and Baruch (1985) defined role overload as a feeling of having so many roles that the individual feels

unable to perform them all adequately. Research shows that working women are most vulnerable to role overload (Crosby, 1991) and suggests that women are often unequally responsible for household and family obligations while at the same time attending to work responsibilities. These multiple roles contribute to an overall sense of role overload. Gutek et al. (1991) identified role overload as being distinctly different from role conflict. In a study of 423 male and female psychologists, Gutek et al. (1991) measured role overload by looking at the number of hours spent in a given role. To look at the difference between role overload and work/family conflict, the study included only professionals who reported having a family role, which was defined as being married, living with a partner, or having a child living at home. To compare role overload and work/family conflict, the researchers compared the number of hours spent in paid employment and the number of hours spent taking care of household responsibilities for both men and women. They found that although women reported spending a greater number of hours working in the home than men indicated, they did not experience a greater amount of work-family conflict. Gutek et al. (1991) concluded that role overload does not necessarily translate into role conflict. They described role conflict as consisting of two factors, work interfering with family and family interfering with work. Role conflict, specifically work/family conflict, will be discussed in further detail.

Work/Family Conflict

The changing face of the workforce has increased the amount of research looking at how people manage the demands of both work and family. With both professional and personal responsibilities, women in particular are faced with a significant challenge when reconciling these demands. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined work/family conflict as

13

"a form of friction in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respects" (p. 77). Research suggests that people will spend more time engaged in roles that are most important to them, therefore leaving less time for other roles, which increases the opportunity for the person to experience role conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) completed a comprehensive review of extant work/family conflict research. In the review they described three different types of work/family conflict: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict occurs because "time spent on activities within one role generally cannot be devoted to activities within another role" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Time-based work/family conflict can take two forms. One form of time-based work/family conflict occurs when time obligations from one role make it physically impossible to fulfill expectations from another role. For example, a scheduled responsibility at work would make it physically impossible for an employee to stay home to care for a child who is home sick from school. By the simple fact that people cannot be in two places at once, fulfilling work responsibilities may not allow for the flexibility needed to meet family role expectations. Another form of time-based work/family conflict occurs when pressures from one role create a preoccupation with that role, making it more difficult to meet the demands of another role. In this form of conflict, a person may be physically able to complete responsibilities stemming from multiple roles, but an emotional or mental preoccupation makes this more challenging. This type of time-based work/family conflict can take many forms, depending on the work and family variables involved. For example, an employee may be preoccupied during a work

meeting because of a discipline problem a son or daughter is having at school. In this case, the time based strain materializes because of a mental preoccupation from one role, making it more difficult to complete the responsibilities of another role.

A second form of work/family conflict is strain-based conflict. Strain-based work/family conflict is when "roles are incompatible in the sense that the strain created by one makes it difficult to comply with the demands of another" (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985, p. 80). Work/family conflict that results from strain from a given role exists when this strain affects one's performance in another role. For example, a stressful day at work may make it more difficult to sit patiently with a child struggling with homework, or increased family responsibilities may make it more difficult to complete a work obligation on time. In this way, strain from one role, which can include stress, tension, anxiety, irritability, and fatigue, makes it more challenging to fulfill obligations from another, competing role.

The final type of work/family conflict defined by Greenhaus and Buetall (1985) is behavior-based conflict, in which "specific patterns of in-role behaviors may be incompatible with expectations regarding behavior in another role" (p. 81). For example, a male managerial business executive might be expected to be aggressive and objective on the job, but his family members may have different expectations of him. While at work certain behaviors are expected; while at home, interacting with his family, other behaviors are expected.

Antecedents and Consequences of Work/Family Conflict

Research has identified several variables that influence the level of work/family conflict. In the case of both time-based and strain-based work/family conflict, variables

such as the size of family, the age of children, the number of hours worked outside the home, the level of control one has over one's work hours, how flexible or inflexible work hours are, and the level of social support impact the experience of work/family conflict (Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Keith & Schafer, 1980; Pleck et al., 1980).

While the aforementioned variables have been conceptualized as antecedents of work/family conflict, it is also important to consider the consequences that are assumed to result from work/family conflict. Several researchers have addressed the relationship between work/family conflict and psychological distress and well-being. For example, Schwartzberg and Dytell (1996) addressed the impact of work and family stress relative to psychological well-being. Acknowledging the importance of work and family roles in people's lives, Schwartzberg and Dytell (1996) looked at the consequences of work-family interference, which they defined as "one area of responsibility interfering with the other" (p. 212). Participants in their study included 94 mothers and 48 fathers, all of whom were employed, living with a spouse, and had a child in either second, third, or fourth-grade. Questionnaires were distributed in three elementary schools in a suburban school system. Mothers were deliberately oversampled so that research questions concerned with gender difference could also be addressed. Previous research had indicated that women show higher levels of distress related to multiple role management (Cleary, 1987).

Participants completed measures of work stress, family stress, and job-home interference. The job-home interference scale was used to measure the extent to which participants experienced conflict between responsibilities at home and at work. The researcher's conceptualization of job-home interference was very similar to the

16

work/family conflict construct that is addressed throughout this project. Results supported the hypothesis that higher levels of job-home interference were associated with lower self-esteem and higher rates of depression. These results support the relationship between work/family conflict and negative outcomes, such as lower self-esteem and increased depression.

Frone, Russell, and Cooper (1997) also attempted to understand the relationship between work/family conflict and certain health outcomes. In a longitudinal study, involving 267 employed parents over a four year span, they found significant relationships between work/family conflict and adverse health-related outcomes. Consistent with extant research, Frone et al. (1997) looked at work-family conflict and family-work conflict as distinct constructs. More specifically, the researchers were interested in the relationship between work/family conflict and depression, overall physical health, heavy alcohol use, and hypertension.

Interestingly, results indicated that work-family conflict and family-work conflict were related to different outcomes. At the beginning of the four year span of the longitudinal study, the researchers recorded baseline scores for each outcome variable as well as work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Frone et al. (1997) found that family-work conflict was positively related to both depression and poor physical health. Additionally, work-family conflict, which is when work conflicts with family demands, was related to elevated levels of alcohol consumption.

In another study, Frone, Barnes, and Farrell (1994) found that work-family conflict was significantly related to increased cigarette use and heavy drinking. They also identified negative affect as a mediator of the relationship between work-family conflict

17

and substance use. Researchers in both studies suggest that future research should explore

mediators of the relationship between work/family conflict and health-related outcomes.

Work/Family Conflict and Satisfaction

A small amount of research has attempted to explain the relationship between

work/family conflict and lowered job and work satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998;

Netemeyer et al., 1996). Conflict occurring between one's work and family

responsibilities has been shown to be bidirectional, indicating that one could experience

work-to-family conflict, while at the same time experiencing family-to- work conflict.

Both work-family conflict and family-work conflict have been linked to decreased

satisfaction in the particular domain in which the interference is experienced (Adams et

al., 1996). For example, work-family conflict decreases marital satisfaction while family-

work conflict decreases work satisfaction.

Bedeian, Burke, and Moffett (1988) evaluated the relationship between

work/family conflict and satisfaction. Specifically, they were interested in looking at the

process by which work stress and family demands interact and subsequently influence

work satisfaction, marital satisfaction, and overall life satisfaction. In a sample of 432

male and 335 female accounting professionals, Bedeian et al., (1988) predicted that

conflict within each role would be directly related to satisfaction within that role. That is

to say that work-related role stress would directly influence work satisfaction while

family-related role stress would influence marital satisfaction. The researchers also

predicted an indirect relationship between work-related role stress and parental demands

and satisfaction (work, marital, and life), through work-family conflict. Participants, all

of whom were married and employed full-time, completed measures of work-related role

stress, parental demands, work/family conflict, job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Results suggested that work/family conflict was related to domain specific satisfaction as well as overall life satisfaction. Results also supported a direct relationship between work-related role stress and work/family conflict. Bedeian et al. (1988) also found that as work-related role stress increases, life satisfaction decreased because of subsequent increases in work/family conflict, providing evidence of work/family conflict as a mediating variable.

More recently, Perrewe, Hochwarter, and Kiewitz (1999) investigated the role of value attainment as a mediator in the relationship between work/family conflict and job and work satisfaction. Value attainment was broadly defined as the ability to attain one's values. It was hypothesized that work/family conflict has a negative effect on job and life satisfaction because the conflict has a negative impact on value attainment. Participants included 267 hotel managers, all of whom completed a series of questionnaires assessing work/family conflict, value attainment, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Results suggested that value attainment does function as a partial mediator of the relationship between work/family conflict and job and life satisfaction. Specifically, work/family conflict was found to be negatively related to job and life satisfaction. However, the magnitude of this relationship was lessened once the effects of value attainment had been controlled. Little other research has attempted to better understand the relationship between work/family conflict and satisfaction. Perrewe et al. (1999) suggest that value attainment is certainly not the only variable that helps explain the complicated relationship between work/family conflict and job and life satisfaction. Further investigation to learn more about mediating variables with regards to work/family

19

conflict and outcomes would be critical to the understanding of work/family conflict and potential outcomes (Perrewe et al. 1999). Additionally, Allen et al. (2000) found differential results across studies in the relationship between work-family conflict and life satisfaction which suggests that undetected moderator variables may be involved as well.

The Role of Self-Efficacy

Although very few studies have looked at the relationship between self-efficacy and work/family conflict (e.g. Kahn & Long, 1988; Matsui & Onglatco, 1992), Erdwins et al. (2001) noted that "it seems logical that a relationship may exist between these two constructs" (p. 231). Erdwins et al. (2001) examined the relationship of social support, role satisfaction, and self-efficacy to measures of work/family conflict and role overload. Participants included 129 married women, all of whom had at least one preschool-aged child. The researchers hypothesized that self-efficacy in work and family roles would be associated with work/family conflict, role overload, and maternal satisfaction. Role overload was measured by a single item asking, "How often do the things you do add up to being just too much?" (Erdwins et al., 2001). Of most interest to the current study, results indicated that self-efficacy in work and family is a significant predictor of women's work/family conflict. Results indicated a negative relationship between work/family conflict and self-efficacy in work and family, suggesting that a woman's level of work/family conflict decreases as self-efficacy in her work and family roles increases. However, Erdwins et al. (2001) used separate scales to measure parental self-efficacy and job self-efficacy. To study the relationship between self-efficacy and work/family conflict more carefully, it would seem important to employ a measure of work/family conflict self-efficacy (reflecting perceived capability to negotiate

work/family conflict), instead of separate measures of work self-efficacy and parental self-efficacy.

Few studies have looked at self-efficacy as a moderator. Brown, Lent, and Larkin (1989) explored self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship of scholastic aptitude to academic performance and persistence. In a sample of 105 students, all of whom were enrolled in a career planning course, the researchers found that self-efficacy for completing educational requirements moderated the relationship between scholastic aptitude and academic performance. That is, lower-aptitude students earned higher grades and persisted longer if they possessed high verses low self-efficacy beliefs.

Matsui and Onglatco (1992) examined career self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship between occupational stress and strain. With a sample of 435 full-time female employees at four Japanese companies, results suggested that career self-efficacy moderated the relationship between occupational stress and strain. Specifically, the relationship between occupational stress and strain was weaker when subjects possessed higher versus lower levels of career self-efficacy.

Framework of the Current Validation Study

The current study attempted to estimate the validity of the English language version of Cinamon's (2003) WFC-SES. The factor structure of the measure as well as its internal consistency and test-retest reliability were also explored. Relative to convergent validity, I examined the relationship of the WFC-SES to a measure of multiple role self-efficacy. Unfortunately, there are no alternative existing measures of work-family conflict self-efficacy against which the WFC-SES can be validated. Multiple role self-efficacy (the perceived ability to negotiate distinct work and family roles) represents a

theoretically different, yet related construct. It was therefore, assumed that the two measures will correlate positively and at least moderately, but not so highly as to suggest that they reflect the same underlying construct. Discriminant validity was examined using a measure of social desirability. It was expected that the WFC-SES will produce no more than a small correlation with social desirability, which would suggest that responses to the WFC-SES are not overly affected by the desire to make a good impression.

The following variables were used to estimate criterion-related validity: work-family conflict, family-work conflict, job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, work stress, and family stress. It was expected that the work-to-family conflict (WFC)-SE scale (i.e., perceived ability to manage work-family conflicts) will correlate significantly with work-family conflict, family satisfaction, and family stress. Likewise, the FW-SE (i.e., family-to-work conflict self-efficacy) scale is expected to correlate significantly with family-work conflict, work satisfaction, and work stress. Additionally, it was hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship of work-family conflict and family stress, and thatfamily -work self efficacy will moderate the relationship of family-work conflict and work stress. It was also hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, and that family-work self efficacy will moderate the relationship of family-work conflict and work satisfaction. Landy (1986) noted the importance of hypothesis testing as a part of examining the validity of a new measure. Hypothesis testing can allow for an exploration of the validity of the conjectures made using the measure.

Hypotheses

To summarize, the current study is aimed at testing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Factor structure: The WFC-SE and FWC-SE subscales will form two separate but related latent factors.

Hypothesis 2: Reliability hypothesis: In this study, the internal consistency reliability and the test-retest reliability of the WFC-SES, the work family conflict self-efficacy subscale, and the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale were explored.

Hypothesis 2a: Internal reliability: The WFC-SES as well as the WFC-SE and FWC-SE subscales will produce adequate estimates of internal consistency reliability.

Hypothesis 2b: Test-retest reliability: The WFC-SES as well as the WFC-SE and FWC-SE subscales will produce adequate estimates of test-retest reliability. The correlation between scores on the WFC-SES at time one and time two was expected to indicate at least moderate short-term stability in the sample. The correlation between scores on the WFC-SE subscale and the FWC-SE subscale at time one and time two was also expected to indicate at least moderate short-term stability in the sample.

Hypothesis 3: Convergent validity: The WFC-SES will have a moderate, positive relationship with the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management Scale. A moderate positive relationship was predicted because the two measures are assumed to represent distinct, yet similar constructs.

Hypothesis 4: Discriminant validity: The WFC-SES will have a low correlation with the Social Desirability Scale. A low correlation would suggest that the WFC-SES reflects more than participants' desire to make a good impression.

Hypothesis 5: Criterion-related validity hypothesis: In this study, the criterion-related validity of the WFC-SES, the WFC-SE subscale, and the FWC-SE subscale was explored in relation to measures of domain-specific conflict, stress, and satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5a: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will be negatively related to work-family conflict. Erdwins et al. (2001) found that self-efficacy in work and family is a significant predictor of women's work/family conflict. In the current study, this relationship was explored further.

Hypothesis 5b: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will be negatively related to family-work conflict.

Hypothesis 5c: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will be positively related to family satisfaction. Previous research has found a relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and well-being (Bandura, 1986). Work-family conflict self efficacy was therefore expected to relate to domain-relevant satisfaction and stress outcomes.

Hypothesis 5d: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will be positively related to work satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5e: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will be negatively related to family stress.

Hypothesis 5f: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will be negatively related to work stress.

Hypothesis 6: Moderator hypothesis: Research exploring the role of self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship between other variables is limited. In this study, the

role of work/family conflict self-efficacy as a moderator of the relationship between work/family conflict and domain-specific satisfaction and stress was explored.

Hypothesis 6a: Moderator hypothesis: Work-family conflict self efficacy will moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, such that the negative relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction will be weaker for those who report higher work-family conflict self efficacy scores.

Hypothesis 6b: Moderator hypothesis: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction, such that the negative relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction will be weaker for those who report higher family-work conflict self-efficacy scores.

Hypothesis 6c: Moderator hypothesis: Work-family conflict self efficacy will moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress, such that the positive relationship between work-family conflict and family stress will be weaker for those who report higher work-family conflict self-efficacy scores.

Hypothesis 6d: Moderator hypothesis: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress, such that the positive relationship between family-work conflict and work stress will be weaker for those who report higher family-work conflict self-efficacy scores.

Chapter 3

Method

<u>Participants</u>

The sample of women in the current study was found at six childare centers in the vicinity of the University of Maryland. In an effort to locate women who were simultaneously managing work and family roles which include caring for a child, participants were recruited at daycare centers rather than among the population of university students. This recruitment strategy was designed to identify women who have a substantial involvement in both work and family roles and for whom work/family conflict is likely to be a salient life experience. Sampling university students, though more convenient, would not assure that participants have a commitment to the role of worker per se or an adequate fund of experience upon which to rate work/family conflict or self-efficacy. The responses of such a sample, might, therefore, be hypothetical and overly optimistic, rather than based on the actual challenges of negotiating multiple, competing work and family roles. Only married women who have a child under the age of 18 living at home were used in this study because the central interest was to examine conflict that arises due to work and family responsibilities. This participant selection strategy was consistent with past research in the area of work/family conflict (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Frone et al., 1992).

The sample was comprised of 159 female participants. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 51 years, with a mean age of 36.61 years (*SD*=4.77). One hundred and twenty-eight (80.5%) of the participants self-identified as Caucasian, 11 (6.9%) as Asian American, 10 (6.3%) as African American, six (3.8%) as Latina, 1 (.3%) as Native

American, and 3 (1.9%) as other. All participants were in a heterosexual marriage, with a mean relationship length of 11.17 years (SD=4.19). All participants had children. Eighty-one (50.9%) had one child, 67 (42.1%) had two children, 10 (6.2%) had three children, and 1 (.6%) had four children. The mean age of the children was 3.72 years, ranging from 1 month to 21 years.

All of the women in the sample participated in paid employment. One hundred and twenty (75.5%) were employed full-time and 39 (24.5%) were employed part-time. The number of hours spent in paid employment ranged from 10 to 80 hours per week, with a mean of 38.27 hours (SD=9.5). The median number of hours spent in paid employment was 40 hours; 57 (35.8%) women reported this figure. The participants reported the following levels of education: 58 (36.5%) master's degree, 30 (18.9%) bachelor of science, 22 (13.8%) bachelor of arts, 21 (13.2%) law degree, 14 (8.8%) Ph.D., 8 (5%) high school degree, 5 (3.1%) MD. One participant (.6%) did not report her highest level of education.

Participants indicated their immediate family's total, combined annual income as follows: 1 (.6%) between $20,001-30,000, three (1.9%) between $40,001-$50,000, 1 (.6%) between $50,001-$60,000, 10 (6.3%) between $60,001-$70,000, 17 (10.7%) between $80,001-100,000, and 124 (78%) reported a combined annual income of over $100,000. Three participants (1.9%) did not report their total combined annual income.

Participants were also asked a series of questions inquiring about levels of flexibility, control, and support at work with bosses and co-workers. They were also asked to report their perceived level of support from family and friends with regard to family responsibilities. On a scale of one (no control) to seven (complete control),

participants were asked to rate how much control they have over work responsibilities. The mean response was 5.11 (*SD* = 1.14). The most frequent responses were 5 (36.5%) and 6 (35.2%), suggesting a moderate to high level of perceived control over work responsibilities among the participants. The participants were also asked to rate the level of flexibility of their work hours. Using a 7-point Likert Scale (1 = no flexibility and 7 = complete flexibility), the mean response was 4.81 (SD = 1.30), suggesting a moderate level of perceived flexibility in work hours.

Participants were asked to describe the level of support they feel from their partner with regard to conflict that arises as a result of work interfering with family and conflict occurring when family interferes with work. The women reported a mean score of 5.93 (*SD* = 1.23) on a scale of 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support) assessing the support they feel from their partner with regard to conflict that arises when work interferes with family responsibilities. Using the same 7-point scale, a similar result was found when women were asked about the level of support they feel from their partner with regard to conflict that arises when family responsibilities interfere with work (mean = 5.83, *SD* = 1.28). When asked to rate the level of support they feel from their family members and friends with regard to work to family conflict and family to work conflict, participants indicated a mean score of 5.14 (*SD* = 1.39) and 5.33 (*SD* = 1.42), respectively.

Finally, participants were asked to rate the level of support they feel from their bosses/supervisors when dealing with work to family conflict and family to work conflict. On a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), the participants indicated a mean score of 5.29 (*SD* = 1.42) when asked to describe the

support they feel from their bosses/supervisors when dealing with conflict that arises

when work interferes with family responsibilities. When describing the level of support

they feel from their bosses/supervisors with regards to conflict that arises when family

responsibilities interfere with work responsibilities, participants indicated a mean score of

5.41 ($SD = 1.41$). In sum, the sample might be described as fairly privileged in terms of

educational level, economic status, job flexibility and control, and perceived supports for

managing work/family conflicts.

Measures

Data were gathered through a variety of measures including: a demographic

questionnaire; a work/family conflict self-efficacy scale (WFC-SES; Cinamon, 2003); a

work-family conflict scale and a family-work conflict scale (Netemeyer et al., 1996); a

measure of multiple role self-efficacy (Lefcourt & Harmon, 1993, 1995; Lefcourt, 1995);

a social desirability scale (Marlowe-Crown, 1960); a family satisfaction measure

(Brayfield & Rothe, 1951); a work satisfaction measure (Hackman & Oldham, 1975); a

measure of work stress (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, and Pinneau, 1975); and a

measure of family stress (Reeder, Chapman, & Coulson, 1968). The measure of multiple

role self-efficacy (Lefcourt & Harmon, 1993) was used to establish convergent validity

for the target measure, the WFC-SES. The Social Desirability Scale was used to establish

discriminant validity for the WFC-SES. The remaining measures were used to establish

criterion-related validity.

Demographic Questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire, developed for this

study, was completed by all participants (see Appendix E). The questionnaire asked

participants to answer questions regarding their race/ethnicity, age, marital status,

whether they have children and the age of each child, whether they are employed full-time or part-time, number of hours in paid work, the job title, socioeconomic status, level of control over work responsibilities, degree of flexibility in work hours, and level of perceived support for work/family conflict. Questions regarding employment status, marital status, and whether or not the participant has children were used as a screening device to ensure that all participants met the criteria for inclusion in this study.

Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy. Work/family conflict self-efficacy was assessed with the Work-family Conflict Self Efficacy Scale (Cinamon, 2003) (see Appendix F). This scale measures the perceptions of self-efficacy to manage work-family conflict and family-work conflict. The original measure was developed in Hebrew and later translated into English by two American born psychologists working at Israeli Universities. The 10-item scale consists of two subscales, work-family conflict self-efficacy and family-work conflict self-efficacy, each of which is measured with five items. In the original measure, items 1, 3, 6, 9, and 10 assess work-family conflict self-efficacy (WFC-SE), while items 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 assess family-work conflict self-efficacy (FWC-SE).

Using a 10-point Likert scale, participants are asked to rate how confident they are in handling a given situation. The responses range from 0 (complete lack of confidence) to 9 (total confidence). High scores on each subscale are indicative of high levels of work/family conflict self-efficacy expectations, while low scores indicate low levels of work/family conflict self-efficacy expectations. A sample item from the work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale is: "How confident are you that you could fulfill your job responsibilities without letting them interfere with your family responsibilities?"

30

A sample item from the family-work conflict self-efficacy scale is: "How confident are you that you could focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive?"

The scale was originally tested using a sample of 362 Israeli university students, ranging in age from 18-31. With this sample, Cinamon (2003) found reliability coefficients of .83 and .84 respectively, for work-to-family conflict self efficacy and family-to-work conflict self-efficacy. Exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation using 240 students produced two factors, which corresponded appropriately with the 5 item subscales. The two factors were highly correlated ($r = .63$; $p<.01$). In the same sample of 240 students, the work-family conflict self efficacy subscale was negatively correlated with work-to-family conflict expectations ($r=-.30$; $p<.01$). The family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale was negatively correlated with family-to-work conflict expectations ($r=-.20$; $p<.01$) (Cinamon, 2003).

Instructions included in the packet of questionnaires instructed participants to define work as those hours spent at paid employment. Participants were asked to define family as including the various aspects of family life which may include being a spouse, being a parent, and managing household responsibilities.

Work-Family Conflict. Work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict were assessed using two scales (see Appendix G and H). Netemeyer et al. (1996) developed and validated separate scales of work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC). Prior to the development of these scales, the literature regarding work-family conflict was without sound measures to assess this construct. They defined work-family conflict as "a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time

31

devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related

responsibilities" (Netemeyer et al., 1996, p. 401). Family-work conflict is defined as "a

form of interrole conflict in which general demands of, time devoted to, and strain

created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities" (Netemeyer

et al., 1996, p. 401).

During the construction and validation of the measure to assess work/family

conflict, Netemeyer et al. (1996) created a large group of items that assessed general

WFC and FWC, time-based WFC and FWC, and strain-based WFC and FWC. From this

initial pool of 110 items, a group of four faculty members rated each item in terms of

whether it was very representative, somewhat representative, or not representative of the

definitions of WFC and FWC. Netemeyer et al. retained only those items that were rated

as somewhat representative or very representative by all four judges, which yielded a

pool of 43 items.

After narrowing the pool of items down from 110 to 43, Netemeyer et al. used

three samples to continue the construction and validation of the scale. The first sample

was comprised of 182 elementary and high school teachers and administrators, the

second sample consisted of 162 small business owners, and the third sample included 186

real estate salespeople. The factor structure of the 43-item scale was examined using

these three groups. Two-factors emerged, which was made up of a 22-item WFC scale

and a 21-item FWC scale. Netemeyer et al. (1996) deleted items based on several criteria.

For example, items that had completely standardized factor loadings of <.60 were

deleted. Items that were highly redundant in terms of wording with other items were also

deleted. The final WFC and FWC scales each consist of five items. The WFC subscale

had coefficient alpha reliability estimates of .88, .89, and .88 across the three groups describe above, while the FWC subscale had alpha coefficients of .86, .83, and .89 across the same three samples.

Netemeyer et al. (1996) tested construct validity for the WFC and FWC scales by making predictions regarding their relationships to various on-job and off-job constructs. The researchers explored the relationships of WFC and FWC to 16 constructs such as life satisfaction, job satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity. Life satisfaction and job satisfaction were negatively related to WFC and FWC, while role conflict and role ambiguity were positively related to WFC and FWC. Additionally, the intercorrelation between WFC and FWC was .33, suggesting that WFC and FWC are distinct but related constructs.

Using a 7-point Likert scale, participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with each item. The responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores indicate high levels of work/family conflict, while low scores indicate low levels of work/family conflict. A sample item from the work-family conflict scale is: "Things I want to do at home do not get done because of demands my job puts on me." A sample item from the family-work conflict scale is: "My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime."

In the current study, the coefficient alpha for the WFC scale was .91, while the alpha for the FWC scale was .88. The intercorrelation between the WFC scale and the FWC scale was .50 in the present sample.

Multiple Role Self-Efficacy. Multiple role self-efficacy was assessed using the Self-efficacy Expectations for Role Management Measure (SEERM) (see Appendix I) (Lefcourt & Harmon, 1993). The original SEERM consisted of 150 items that assessed self-efficacy expectations for seven factors including: parent role, spouse/partner role, worker role, self role, worker and home caretaker roles, worker and family member roles, and worker and spouse/partner roles. Lefcourt and Harmon (1993) used a sample of 134 female graduate students to establish internal consistency. The internal consistency for the seven factors ranged from .76 to .92. Using the same sample, test-retest reliability coefficients for a two week period ranged from .70 to .81 ($p<.01$) for the seven scales. Later, a sample of 292 career women was used to establish validity for the 150-item scale (Lefcourt & Harmon, 1995). The four factors that were identified were: employee, spouse/partner, parent, and self. Three of the original seven factors (worker and home caretaker, worker and family member, and worker and spouse/partner) were not identified and the SEERM was revised to a 48-item scale consisting of four factors (Lefcourt, 1995; Lefcourt & Harmon, 1995).

Lefcourt and Harmon (1995) found evidence for the construct validity of the SEERM. They found significant relationships of the SEERM subscales for employee, spouse/partner, parent, and self to reported conflict with corresponding life roles (-.21 to -.35). A positive significant relationship was found between self-efficacy expectations on each scale and self-esteem scores, which provides further evidence of construct validity.

Using a 10-point Likert scale, participants are asked to indicate to what extent they agree with each item. The responses range from 0 (no confidence) to 9 (complete confidence). High scores indicate high self-efficacy expectations, while low scores

indicate low self-efficacy expectations. Sample items from the SEERM include: "How much confidence do you have that you could establish and meet personal deadlines on major home related tasks, such as spring cleaning and redecorating, should the occasion arise?;" "How much confidence do you have that you could manage time spent working on tasks within your work role, should the occasion arise?;" and "How much confidence do you have that you could be a good listener and be objective in times of conflict with your children, should the occasion arise?" Two items on the SEERM were slightly modified in order to refer only to female participants who have male spouses. The coefficient alpha for the SEERM total scale in the current study was .95.

Social Desirability. Social desirability was used to establish discriminant validity for the target measure, the Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale. A 20-item shortened version of the original 33-item Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was used in this study (see Appendix J). The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960) was developed to measure one form of response bias in self report measures. Response bias in self report measures can result in invalid data, which can affect the overall outcome of a research study. Social desirability, a form of response bias, can be thought of as "faking good." That is, participants may answer questions based on what they think is the socially desirable response or what they think the researcher is looking for in the study.

Marlowe and Crown (1960) developed a 33-item measure to assess social desirability. Over the years, many researchers have developed shortened versions of this scale and have examined the reliability and validity of the shortened scales with many different populations. Strahan and Gerbasi (1972) developed a 20-item shortened form of

the original Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Sample items include: "I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble" and "There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things." The 20-item form follows the same true-false format as the original scale. Strahan and Gerbasi (1972) used a principal components analysis combined with item total correlations to develop the 20-item scale with a sample of 361 university students. Subsequent studies have confirmed that several of the shortened versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale were significant improvements to the original scale. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was found to be .68 for the 20-item form (Fischer & Fick, 1993). Validity of the 20-item form was assumed from validity estimates with the original 33-item form.

In the current sample, the coefficient alpha for the Social Desirability Scale was .68 for the 20-item scale. However, further analysis revealed that when item 5 was deleted from the scale, the alpha coefficient for the scale improved to .72. While entering data, it was observed that there was a typographical error in item 5 of the Social Desirability Scale. The correct item is, "There have been several times have I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right." However, the item in the survey packet that was distributed read, "There have been times when I felt like reveling people in authority even though I knew they were right." Several of the participants indicated their confusion with this item by placing a question mark or a comment indicating that they were unsure of the item's meaning next to this item on their returned survey packet. If the error caused confusion for some of the participants and therefore impacted they way in which they answered the question, it is assumed that other

participants might also have been confused by this error. Therefore, this item was deleted from the scale for all further analyses in the current project.

Family Satisfaction. Family satisfaction was assessed using a shortened 5-item version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale (see Appendix K). For this study, a modified version in which the word "work" has been replaced with the term "family life" was used. Extant work-family research has used measure modification of this nature (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999; Kopelman et al., 1983). Aryee et al. (1999) found a reliability coefficient of .84 for the modified measure of family satisfaction that was used in this study.

To test the construct validity of the shortened Brayfield and Rothe family satisfaction measure, Aryee et al. (1999) made predictions in regard to the relationships between this measure of family satisfaction and life satisfaction and spousal support. This measure of family satisfaction was positively related to life satisfaction ($r = .38$, $p<.01$) and spousal support ($r = .33$, $p < .01$).

Using a 5-point Likert scale, participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they are satisfied with the five family satisfaction items. Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). High scores indicate a high level of family satisfaction, while low scores indicate a low level of family satisfaction. Item #5 was reversed scored. An example of a family satisfaction item is, "I find real enjoyment in my family life." In the present study, the coefficient alpha for the Family Satisfaction scale was .82. The correlation between family satisfaction and family stress was -.41.

Work Satisfaction. Work satisfaction was assessed using the 3-item General Job Satisfaction subscale, which is part of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman &

Oldham, 1975) (See Appendix L). The 3-item General Job Satisfaction subscale of the

JDS measures the extent to which an employee is satisfied and happy with the job

(Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Wiley (1987) reported a reliability coefficient for the 3-

item General Job Satisfaction subscale of .86 (Wiley, 1987). To test the subscales's

validity, Wiley (1987) explored the relationships between the subscale and global life

satisfaction and job involvement. Both global life satisfaction and job involvement were

positively correlated with the three-item work satisfaction measure ($r= .41$, $p <.05$ and $r =$

$.54$, $p < .05$, respectively).

Using a 7-point Likert scale, participants are asked to indicate the extent to which

they agree with the three work satisfaction items. Responses range from 1 (strongly

disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). High scores indicate a high level of work satisfaction,

while low scores indicate a low level of work satisfaction. Item 2 was reversed scored.

An example of a work satisfaction item is, "I am generally satisfied with the kind of work

I do in my job." Instructions for this study asked participants to define work as the

activities they participate in while engaged in paid employment. In the present study, the

coefficient alpha for the work satisfaction scale was .78. The correlation between work

satisfaction and work stress was -.33.

Work Stress. Work stress was assessed using a modified version of the State

Anxiety Inventory (SAI) (Speilberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1969) (see Appendix M).

The SAI, a subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Speilberger et al., 1969), is a

self-report measure of feelings of apprehension and heightened autonomic nervous

system activity. These feelings may vary over time for a given participant. The original 5-

item scale was modified by adding the words "at work" to each item. The original version

of the SAI produced an alpha coefficient estimate of .88 (O'Neil, Spielberger, & Hansen, 1969). Validity for the SAI was established by comparing the measure to participants' blood pressure. In a study of 29 students, O'Neil et al. found that participants' scores on the SAI and blood pressure both increased when working on difficult learning material. Likewise, the students' blood pressure and scores on the SAI both decreased when they were given easy learning material. Additionally, the SAI was used to explore the relationship between state anxiety and performance on computer tasks. O'Neil et al., (1969) found that subjects who scored higher on the SAI made twice as many errors on computer tasks than those subjects who were classified as scoring low on the SAI.

Using a 5-point Likert scale, participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they experience particular feelings. Responses range from 1 (never) to 5 (always). High scores indicate a high level of situational stress, while low scores indicate a low level of stress. Three items are reversed scored. Examples of modified items include, "I feel tense at work" and "I feel jittery at work" (O'Neil et al., 1969). The coefficient alpha for the work stress scale was .83 in the present sample.

Family Stress. Family stress was assessed using a modified version of the Reeder Stress Inventory (RSI) (Reeder et al., 1968) (see Appendix N). The RSI is a self-report measure of overall life stress. However, for the purposes of this study the words "at home" or "your family responsibilities" were added to the items. Extant work-family research has used measure modification of this nature (Aryee, et al., 1999; Kopelman et al., 1983).

The original form of the RSI was constructed to assess four areas of stress, including: (a) tension or nervousness, (b) nervous strain, (c) fatigue, and (d) level of

challenge. Each area of stress is measured with one item. The coefficient alpha reliability

estimate for the 4-item measure was .72. The researchers found evidence of construct

validity for the RSI through hypothesized relationships with measures of depression and

anxiety ($r = .46$ and. 62, respectively). Additionally, criterion-related validity was

established by exploring the relationship of scores on the RSI and smoking behaviors. In

a sample of 1,717 employed individuals, higher levels of stress, as measured by the RSI,

were associated with smoking a greater number of cigarettes.

The RSI asks participants to indicate the extent to which the statement in each

item describes their experience. Responses choices include: exactly, to some extent, not

very accurate, and not at all. Each response is assigned a numerical value according to the

Coulson scoring system described in detail by the authors of the instrument. High scores

indicate a high level of family stress, while low scores indicate a low level of family

stress. An example of a modified family stress item is, "My daily activities at home are

extremely trying and stressful." The coefficient alpha reliability estimate for the 4-item

measure was .75 in the present sample.

Procedure

Data were collected through a packet of questionnaires distributed at local child

care centers. The order of the questionnaires within each packet was counter-balanced.

After contacting individual centers, permission was granted for the distribution of

questionnaires at each center. Questionnaires were placed in each family's mailbox at

each center. A detailed cover letter was attached to the packet of questionnaires (see

Appendix A). The criteria for participation were outlined in the cover letter to ensure that

each woman who took the time to complete the packet of questionnaires would be

included in the study. When each center's director was contacted for permission to use their facility to collect data, the criteria for participation were discussed and informally assessed. Directors stated that an overwhelming majority of the women who bring their children to each center would indeed fit the criteria for this study. Additionally, the cover letter indicated that some participants were going to be asked to complete one of the brief measures a second time four weeks after the initial distribution.

To increase the response rate, the questionnaire distribution procedure involved follow-up contact with participants. All participants received a packet including the cover letter, the packet of questionnaires, and specific details for returning completed packets. Collection of survey packets varied by location. Many locations had a collection box in a visible spot near the entrance of the center. Other locations had specific times when many parents gather, at which point surveys were collected. Participants who did not completed the survey one week after the initial distribution received a personalized reminder note in their mailbox (see Appendix B) and an additional copy of the packet. Two weeks after the initial distribution, another reminder note and copy of the questionnaire packet was placed in the mailboxes of those women who had not yet returned the survey (see Appendix C). Once the questionnaires had been returned, a random sample of 120 participants was asked to complete the WFC-SES a second time to establish test-retest reliability for the measure. Of the 120 participants who received a follow-up administration of the WFC SES, 95 returned the questionnaire, resulting in a return rate of 76%.

All questionnaire packets were assigned a code number for identification purposes. To ensure confidentiality, the participants' names were not on the

41

questionnaire. Identification code numbers were matched with participants' names before

distribution for the purpose of monitoring response rates and identifying those women

who received a follow-up reminder note. Code numbers were also linked to the follow-up

copy of the WFC-SES used to establish test-retest reliability. The list of participants'

names matched with code numbers are kept separate from the returned questionnaires, in

a locked file cabinet. Additionally, all returned questionnaires are kept in a locked space.

Once the data were entered into a computer, the files were password protected to ensure

confidentiality and the security of the data.

As an incentive to participate in the study, participants had the opportunity to be

entered into a lottery drawing for the chance to win one of five gift certificates of $20

each. These gift certificates were for shopping centers in the local area. Participants were

asked if they would like to be entered into the lottery drawing on a separate lottery

drawing form (see Appendix D). Participants interested in entering the lottery checked a

box indicating their interest and provided contact information. After the final deadline for

the return of survey packets, the five gift certificates were purchased and mailed to the

winners, who were randomly selected from the sample. On the same form, participants

also indicated if they were interested in receiving the results of the study when available.

Participants who expressed an interest in receiving the results of the study will be mailed

a summary of the results, as soon as this is available.

A total of 515 questionnaire packets were distributed at seven different child care

center locations. One of the seven child care centers, where 50 packets had been

delivered, failed to return any questionnaire packets throughout the duration of the data

collection. Several attempts were made to follow-up with the director of this day care

center, but were unsuccessful. It is assumed that the survey packets were never distributed to the mailboxes at the center and, therefore, the number of packets delivered to this child care center were dropped from estimates of the overall return rate. A total of 159 out of 465 survey packets were returned from the other centers, resulting in a return rate of 34%.

For this study, the instructions included in the packet of questionnaires instructed participants to define work as those hours spent at paid employment. Participants were also asked to define family as the various aspects of family life which may include being a spouse, being a parent, and managing household responsibilities.

Data Analysis

The current study used a correlational research design. More specifically, it used descriptive statistics, reliability analyses, correlational analyses, and exploratory factor analysis. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and frequencies) were used to describe characteristics of the sample such as age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, employment status (part- or full-time), and number of children. Exploratory factor analysis was used to examine the factor structure of the WFC-SES. Estimates of convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity were calculated using correlational analyses. Correlational analysis was also used to estimate the test-retest reliability of the WFC-SES. Multiple regression was used to test the moderator hypotheses. All hypothesized bivariate relationships were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Chapter 4

Results

The Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (WFC-SES; Cinamon, 2003) was

designed to measure an individual's belief in her or his ability to manage work-family

conflict and family-work conflict. Hypotheses 1-2 were used to explore the psychometric

properties and factor structure of the WFC-SES. Hypotheses 3-6 were used to test the

convergent, discriminant, and criterion related validity of the WFC-SES.

Hypothesis 1: Factor structure: The WFC-SE and FWC-SE subscales will form

two separate but related latent factors. Principal axis factoring was used to explore the

factor structure of the WFC-SES. Using an oblimin rotation, chosen based on the

assumption that the factors would correlate, the factor analysis revealed two highly

related, yet somewhat distinct factors. In exploratory factor analysis, items should load

above a specific criterion (often .40) on a given factor in order to be retained (Gorsuch,

1997). All items of the 10-item WFC-SES loaded above .50 on at least one factor.

Initial, analysis of the WFC-SES favored a two-factor solution. To determine the

appropriate factor structure of the WFC-SES, eigenvalues, the scree plot, and percentage

of variance criteria were used. There were two eigenvalues greater than one and the scree

plot also suggested a two-factor structure. The two-factor structure accounted for 74% of

the total variance. The factors were labeled (a) Work to Family Conflict Self-Efficacy

(Factor 1) and (b) Family to Work Conflict Self-Efficacy (Factor 2). Factor 1 accounted

for 62.27% of the variance, while Factor 2 accounted for 11.65% of the variance. It is

preferable that each item load highly on only one factor. However, in the case of the

WFC-SES all items loaded highly on both factors. Seven of the ten items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,

and 9) loaded more highly on the Work to Family Conflict Self-Efficacy factor, while three items (7, 8, and 10) loaded more highly on the Family to Work Conflict Self-Efficacy subscale. In order to assign items to factors, a criterion was adopted whereby retained items needed to show a difference of >.10 between the factor on which they loaded most highly and the alternative factor. Such a cross-loading criterion is often used in exploratory factor analysis research (e.g., Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). Item loadings are shown in Table 1.

Two items (2 and 5) were hypothesized to measure family-work conflict self-efficacy, and therefore should have loaded more highly on Factor 2 than on Factor 1, particularly given the nature of their content. However, they loaded more highly on the first factor. They were therefore dropped from the subscale to be derived from Factor 2, given their anomalous loading pattern. However, because they loaded highly on both factors – and to retain comparability with earlier uses of the WFC-SES (Cinamon, 2003; Treistman, 2004) – these two items were retained in calculating total scale scores over all 10 items. In sum, three scale scores were computed: a 10-item total score, a 5-item work to family conflict self-efficacy subscale (including items 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9), and a 3-item family to work conflict self-efficacy subscale (containing items 7, 8, and 10).

The 10-item total score is useful to report and use in further analyses because all items cross-loaded on both factors. Despite evidence favoring a two-factor structure, the two factors were highly related to one another ($r = .63$). In supplementary multiple regression analyses, both subscales were found to explain unique variance in predicting half of the criterion variables, even though only one of the two predictors (the one that matches the criterion in terms of domain-specificity) would have been expected to do so.

45

Table 1

Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Items and Factor Loadings

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
1. How confident are you that you could fulfill your job responsibility without letting it interfere with your family responsibilities?	.78	.51
2. How confident are you that you could attend to your family obligations without it affecting your ability to complete pressing tasks at work?	.81	.50
3. How confident are you that you could manage incidents in which work life interferes with family life?	.79	.43
4. How confident are you that you could fulfill your family responsibilities despite going through a trying and demanding period in your work?	.86	.58
5. How confident are you that you could manage incidents in which family life interferes with work life?	.80	.50
6. How confident are you that you could fulfill your family role effectively after a long and demanding day at work?	.80	.57
7. How confident are you that you could invest in your job even when under heavy pressure due to family responsibilities?	.76	.88
8. How confident are you that you could succeed in your role at work although there are many difficulties in your family?	.52	.80
9. How confident are you that you could invest in your family role even when under heavy pressure due to work responsibilities?	.77	.59
10. How confident are you that you could focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive?	.52	.88

Note: $N = 159$. Factor loadings were obtained with the structure matrix of the oblimin rotation. A two-factor structure accounted for 74% of the total variance. The factors were labeled (a) Work to Family Conflict Self-Efficacy (Factor 1) and (b) Family to Work Conflict Self-Efficacy (Factor 2). Factor 1 accounted for 62.27% of the variance, and Factor 2 accounted for 11.65% of the variance.

For example, it was expected that only work to family conflict self-efficacy would account for a significant amount of variation in family stress. However, family to work conflict self-efficacy accounted for unique variance (above and beyond work to family conflict self-efficacy) in family stress. These results suggest that it may be advantageous to operationalize work/family conflict self-efficacy with the 10-item total WFC-SES, thus suggesting a one-factor solution. In testing the following hypotheses, both total and subscale scores will be reported, but the total scale will be considered the primary index of self-efficacy in this study.

Hypothesis 2a: Internal reliability: The WFC-SE and FWC-SE subscales will each produce adequate estimates of internal consistency reliability. The reliability coefficient for the overall 10-item WFC-SES was .93. The reliability estimate for the 5-item work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale was .90. The 3-item family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale produced a reliability coefficient of .89. All coefficients suggest that the estimated internal reliability of the WFC-SES was adequate. Therefore, Hypothesis 2a was supported.

Hypothesis 2b: Test-retest reliability: The WFC-SES will produce an adequate estimate of test-retest reliability. All participants completed the WFC-SES as part of the initial data collection. Two weeks after participants returned the initial packet of questionnaires, a random sample of 120 participants was selected to complete the WFC-SES for a second time. Of the 120 participants who received the second administration of the WFC-SES, 95 completed and returned the follow-up measure. The correlation between the WFC-SES at the initial time of testing and the follow-up assessment was $r = .62$ for the 10-item measure. Corresponding test-retest reliability estimates for the

subscale scores were $r = .66$ for the work-family conflict self efficacy subscale and $r = .60$ for the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscales. This level of correlation between time 1 and time 2 scores on the WFC-SES indicates that the total and subscale scores are moderately stable over a two-week period.   Thus, Hypothesis 2b was supported.

Table 2 presents the correlations, means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients of the predictor and dependent variables. The correlations in Table 2 were used to test Hypotheses 3-5f.

Hypothesis 3: Convergent validity: The WFC SES will have a moderate, positive relationship with the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management Scale. As shown in Table 1, the correlation between the WFC-SES and the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management Scale in this sample was .50 (10-item WFC-SES). It was hypothesized that the two measures would have a moderate, positive relationship because, conceptually, they represent distinct, yet overlapping constructs. Although the two measures are highly correlated (.50), the extent of their overlap (25% common variance) does not suggest that they are measuring the very same construct. The correlation between the SEERM and the subscales of the WFC-SES were also positive and moderate to high in magnitude ($r = . 53$ for the work-family conflict self efficacy scale and $r = . 36$ for the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale.) Thus, there is support for Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4: Discriminant validity: The WFC-SES will have a low correlation with the Social Desirability Scale. The WFC-SES (10-item) and the Social Desirability Scale were found to have a low correlation ($r = .26$), suggesting that the WFC-SES does not simply reflect participants' desire to make a good impression. Although this

magnitude of correlation suggests support for Hypothesis 4, the correlation does indicate

roughly 7% shared variance with social desirability, which is not trivial. Therefore, it

may be inferred that the WFC-SES is confounded to a slight degree with the desire to

make a good impression. The correlation between the Social Desirability Scale and the

subscales of the WFC-SES was $r = .26$ for the work-family conflict self efficacy scale

and $r = .23$ for the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale. This suggests that the

WFC-SES subscales may also be slightly confounded with the desire to make a good

impression.

Hypothesis 5: For all correlation statistics involved in Hypothesis 5, the

correlation between the criterion variable and both the total WFC-SES scores and the

domain-specific subscale scores will be reported. Correlations greater than .5 are reported

as highly correlated.

Hypothesis 5a: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will

be negatively related to work-family conflict. The correlation between work-family

conflict and the work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale was $r = -.55$, indicating that

work-family conflict self-efficacy and work-family conflict are highly negatively related.

(The corresponding correlation for the total WFC-SE score was -.52.) Therefore,

Hypothesis 5a was supported.

Hypothesis 5b: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will

be negatively related to family-work conflict. Results indicate a moderate negative

relationship between family-work conflict and both the family-work conflict self-efficacy

subscale and the total WFC-SE score (rs = -.30 and -.44, respectively). Thus, there is

support for Hypothesis 5b.

Hypothesis 5c: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will be positively related to family satisfaction. As hypothesized, work-family conflict self-efficacy was found to have a positive relationship with family satisfaction ($r = .49$ for the work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale and $r = .45$ for the total WFC-SES).

Hypothesis 5d: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will be positively related to work satisfaction. The correlation between work satisfaction and the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale was .31; the corresponding correlation for the total WFC-SE score was .32. Therefore, Hypothesis 5d was supported.

Hypothesis 5e: Criterion-related validity: Work-family conflict self efficacy will be negatively related to family stress. The work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale and the total WFC-SES were each found to be negatively related to family stress (rs $= -.29$ and -.23, respectively). Thus, Hypothesis 5e was supported.

Hypothesis 5f: Criterion-related validity: Family-work conflict self-efficacy will be negatively related to work stress. Results indicate a negative relationship between work stress and both the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale and total WFC-SES (rs $= -.17$ and -.36, respectively). Thus, there is support for Hypothesis 5f.

Table 2

Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients of the Predictors and Dependent Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. WFC-SES	–											
2. W to F-SE	.96[a]	–										
3. F to W-SE	.83	.66	–									
4. SEERM	.50	.53	.36	–								
5. Social Des.	.26	.26	.23	.17	–							
6. WFC	-.52	-.55	-.30	-.42	-.16	–						
7. FWC	-.44	-.45	-.30	-.50	-.22	.50	–					
8. Work Sat.	.32	.30	.31	.14	.06	-.29	-.20	–				
9. Family Sat.	.45	.49	.26	.48	.13	-.27	-.26	.24	–			
10. Work Stress	-.36	-.40	-.17	-.38	-.08	.51	.33	-.33	-.17	–		
11. Family Stress	-.23	-.29	-.06	-.46	-.26	.24	.37	-.09	-.41	.27	–	
M	5.93	5.90	5.71	6.48	1.54	3.77	3.51	5.20	4.30	2.52	2.08	
SD	1.50	1.52	1.68	1.04	.18	1.56	1.45	1.36	.64	.72	.57	
α	.92	.90	.80	.95	.72	.91	.88	.78	.82	.83	.75	

Note: This table reflects the 10-item version of the WFC-SES and the 3-item version of the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale. WFC-SES = Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale Time 1 administration; W to F-SE = Work to Family Self-Efficacy subscale; F to W-SE = Family to Work Conflict Self-Efficacy subscale; SEERM = Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management Scale; Social Des. = Social Desirability Scale; WFC = Work-Family Conflict Scale; FWC = Family-Work Conflict Scale; Work Sat. = Work Satisfaction Scale; Family Sat. = Family Satisfaction; Work Stress = Work Stress Scale; Family Stress = Family Stress Scale.

[a]Correlations ≥ .16 are significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). Correlations ≥ .22 (positive or negative) are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 6a: Moderator hypothesis: Work/family conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, such that the negative relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction will be weaker for those who report higher work/family conflict self efficacy scores. To test whether or not work/family conflict self-efficacy was a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. First, the family satisfaction, work-family conflict, and the total WFC-SES scores were centered, and a product term crossing work-family conflict and work/family conflict self-efficacy was created. (Centering involved subtracting the mean of each scale from each participants' score on that scale.) The purpose of this procedure is to reduce multicollinearity between main effects terms and the interaction (i.e., product) terms from which they are derived (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Next, family satisfaction was predicted in a regression equation in which work-family conflict and the WFC-SES were entered at the first step, and the interaction term was entered in the second step of the equation. In regression terms, a moderator can be thought of as an interaction between two key independent variables that accounts for unique variance in the dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

The first step, which contained each separate predictor (or main effect) variable, produced an R^2 value of .20 ($p < .05$). However, the second step, containing the interaction term, did not account for additional significant variation in family satisfaction (change in $R^2 = .00$). See Table 3 for the regression results used in Hypothesis 6a. These results suggest that work/family conflict self-efficacy does not act as a moderator in the

52

relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction. Therefore, Hypothesis 6a was not supported.

The regression analysis strategy described in Hypothesis 6a was also used to test Hypotheses 6b-6d.

Hypothesis 6b: Moderator hypothesis: Work/family conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction, such that the negative relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction will be weaker for those who report higher work/family conflict self-efficacy scores. Work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a moderator of the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction, using hierarchical regression analysis. The first step of the regression, which contained each main effect variable, produced an R^2 value of .11 ($p < .05$). The second step, containing the interaction term, did not account for additional significant variation in work satisfaction (change in $R^2 = .00$; see Table 4 for Hypothesis 6b results). These results suggest that work/family conflict self-efficacy does not act as a moderator in the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction. Thus, Hypothesis 6b was not supported.

Hypothesis 6c: Moderator hypothesis: Work/family conflict self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress, such that the positive relationship between work-family conflict and family stress will be weaker for those who report higher work/family conflict self-efficacy scores. Using a hierarchical regression analysis, work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress. The first step of the regression, containing each main effect variable, produced an R^2 value of .07 ($p < .05$).

53

The interaction term, which was entered in the second step of the regression, did not

account for additional significant variation in family stress (change in R^2 = .00). See

Table 5 for the regression results used in Hypothesis 6c. These results suggest that work-

family conflict self-efficacy does not act as a moderator in the relationship between

work-family conflict and family stress. Therefore, Hypothesis 6c was not supported.

Hypothesis 6d: Moderator hypothesis: Work/family conflict self-efficacy will

moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress, such that the

positive relationship between family-work conflict and work stress will be weaker for

those who report higher work/family conflict self-efficacy scores. Work/family conflict

self-efficacy was tested as a moderator of the relationship between family-work conflict

and work stress, using hierarchical regression analysis. The first step of the regression,

which contained each main effect variable, produced an R^2 value of .16 ($p < .05$). The

interaction term was entered into the second step of the regression and did not account for

additional significant variation in work stress (change in R^2 = .01; see Table 6),

suggesting that family-work conflict self-efficacy does not act as a moderator in the

relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction. Support was not found

for Hypothesis 6d.

Additional analyses were conducted on the regression equations tested in

Hypotheses 6a-6d to explore the role of social desirability. The correlation between the

WFC-SES and the Social Desirability Scale was somewhat higher than had been

hypothesized ($r = .26$), suggesting that the WFC-SES is confounded to a slight degree

with social desirability. Therefore, each regression equation included in hypotheses 6a-6d

were re-run, including social desirability as a covariate in Step 1 of the regression

equation. Including social desirability in each regression equation did not alter the

significant WFC-SES beta weights. The shift in beta weights was slight (e.g. .42 to .41,

.29 to .30), suggesting that WFC-SES-criterion relations are minimally confounded by

social desirability.

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy as a Moderator between Work-Family Conflict and Family Satisfaction

	Predictors	R	ΔR^2	df	ΔF	β
Step 1	WFC-SE	.49	.20	2, 156	19.59**	.42**
	WFC					-.06
Step 2	WFC-SE by WFC Interaction	.45	.00	1, 155	.32	.04

Note: WFC-SE = Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy; WFC = Work to Family Conflict.
** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy as a Moderator between Family-Work Conflict and Work Satisfaction

	Predictors	R	ΔR^2	Df	ΔF	β
Step 1	WFC-SE	.33	.11	2, 156	9.46**	.29**
	FWC					-.07
Step 2	WFC-SE by FWC Interaction	.33	.00	1, 155	.00	.00

Note: WFC-SE = Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy; FWC = Family to Work Conflict.
** $p < .01$.

57

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy as a Moderator between Work-Family Conflict and Family Stress

	Predictors	R	ΔR^2	Df	ΔF	β
Step 1	WFC-SE	.27	.07	2, 156	5.93**	-.14
	WFC					.16
Step 2	WFC-SE by WFC Interaction	.27	.00	1, 155	.01	.01

Note: WFC-SE = Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy; WFC = Work to Family Conflict.
** $p < .01$.

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Testing Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy as a Moderator between Family-Work Conflict and Work Stress

	Predictors	R	ΔR^2	Df	ΔF	β
Step 1	WFC-SE	.41	.16	2, 156	15.29**	-.26**
	FWC					.22**
Step 2	WFC-SE by FWC Interaction	.41	.01	1, 155	1.08	.08

Note: WFC-SE = Work/Family Conflict Self-Efficacy; FWC = Family to Work Conflict.
** $p < .01$.

59

Supplemental Analyses

It was hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction and between work-family conflict and family stress. It was also hypothesized that family-work conflict self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction and work stress. Data in the present study did not support these moderator hypotheses. Supplemental analyses were performed to explore another possibility regarding the nature of the relationships between work/family conflict self-efficacy, work/family conflict, and the stress and satisfaction outcome variables. Specifically, it is possible that work/family conflict self-efficacy serves as a mediator of the relationships between work-family conflict and each of the satisfaction and stress outcome variables.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a variable is considered to mediate a relationship: (a) when there is a significant relationship between the independent variable and the hypothesized mediating variable, (b) when there is a significant relationship between the mediating variable and the dependent variable, and (c) when controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the independent and dependent variable is no longer significant and begins to approach 0.

Hierarchical regression analysis and the criteria outlined by Baron & Kenny (1986) were used to test four supplemental research questions.

Supplemental Analysis: Exploratory Question 1: Does work/family conflict self-efficacy mediate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction?

Work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a mediator of the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, using hierarchical r egression analysis. The same regression procedure that was used to test Hypotheses 6a-6d was used for all supplemental analyses, only the beta weights for the self-efficacy and conflict variables were examined at step 1 of the equation (prior to the entry of the interaction term). To assess whether or not work/family conflict self-efficacy mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction, the correlations between the independent and dependent variables were examined. The bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and work-family conflict is significant ($r = -.52$, $p < .01$) as is the bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self efficacy and family satisfaction ($r = .45$, $p < .01$). The bivariate relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction is also significant ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$). When work/family conflict self-efficacy is controlled for, however, the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction is no longer significant ($\beta = -.06$). These findings support the possibility that work/family conflict self-efficacy mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction.

Supplemental Analysis: Exploratory Question 2: Does work/family conflict self-efficacy mediate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction? Work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a mediator of the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction, using hierarchical regression analysis. The bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and family-work conflict is significant ($r = -.44$, $p < .01$) as is the bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and work satisfaction ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). The bivariate

relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction is also significant ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$). When family-work conflict self-efficacy is controlled for, the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction is no longer significant ($\beta = -.07$). Thus, there is evidence that work/family conflict self-efficacy may mediate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction.

Supplemental Analysis: Exploratory Question 3: Does work/family conflict self-efficacy mediate the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress? Work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a mediator of the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress, using hierarchical regression analysis. To assess whether or not work/family conflict self-efficacy mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress, the correlations between the independent and dependent variables were examined. The bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and work-family conflict is significant ($r = -.52$, $p < .01$) as is the bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self efficacy and family stress ($r = -.23$, $p < .01$). The bivariate relationship between work-family conflict and family stress is also significant ($r = .24$, $p < .01$). When work-family conflict self efficacy is controlled for, the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress is no longer significant ($\beta = .16$). Thus, there is evidence that work-family conflict self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and family stress.

Supplemental Analysis: Exploratory Question 4: Does work/family conflict self-efficacy mediate the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress? Work/family conflict self-efficacy was tested as a mediator of the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress, using hierarchical regression analysis. The

bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and family-work conflict is significant ($r = -.44$, $p < .01$) as is the bivariate relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and work stress ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$). The bivariate relationship between family-work conflict and work stress is also significant ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). However, when work/family conflict self-efficacy is controlled for, the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress remains significant ($\beta = .22$) and is only slightly diminished. This suggests that work/family conflict self-efficacy does not mediate the relationship between family-work conflict and work stress.

Additionally, supplemental analyses were performed to explore the relationship between work/family conflict and perceived social support.

Supplemental Analysis: Exploratory Question 5: Is there a relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and perceived social support? Given the relationship between self-efficacy and social support documented in self-efficacy theory, it seems logical to explore the relationship between scores on the WFC-SES and items measuring perceived social support. In the demographic form, all participants were asked to rate the level of support they felt they received for managing both work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Sources of this support included their partner, their boss, and their family and friends. Six items, all using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = no support, 7 = complete support) were used to assess the level of support participants' felt for managing work-family conflict and family-work conflict. The mean response for all six items was 5.49 ($SD = .96$). The reliability coefficient for the derived support variable was .80.

The six support items were totaled in order to explore the relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and support. The total support variable also had a moderate positive correlation with the WFC-SES ($r = .34$).

Chapter 5

Discussion

This study was to designed to examine the factor structure, reliability, and validity estimates of the Work-Family Conflict Self-Efficacy Scale (WFC-SES, Cinamon, 2003). In terms of valditity, the convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity estimates of the WFC-SES were examined. The WFC-SES was also used in hypothesis testing as a part of the examination of its validity.

It was hypothesized that the WFC-SES would favor a two-factor structure It was hypothesized that the two factors of the WFC-SES, labeled as work-family conflict self-efficacy and family-work conflict self-efficacy, would be related to one another. In fact, the two factors were highly related to one another ($r = .63$). However, further analysis suggested that a one-factor structure would be a more favorable way to operationalize work-family conflict self-efficacy. The use of a one-factor structure is consistent with Treistman's (2004) study of U.S. graduate student women which found support for a single factor. In the current study, two items that were hypothesized to measure family-work conflict self-efficacy loaded more highly on the work-family conflict self-efficacy factor. These items were dropped from the FWC-SE, resulting in a 3-item subscale; the WFC-SE subscale was 5 items. All original 10 items were used in calculating the total scale score.

A single factor structure for the work/family conflict self-efficacy scale is interesting because work-family conflict and family-work conflict are conceptualized as distinct variables and assessed with different measures in the literature. One reason for the different factor structures might be the format in which each construct is measured. In the literature work-family conflict and family-work conflict are assessed using two different measures. However, in this research study, work/family conflict self-efficacy was assessed using a single 10-item measure, with items assessing work-family conflict self-efficacy intermixed with items measuring family-work conflict self-efficacy. There may be a methodological impact on the resulting factor structure of the work/family conflict self-efficacy scale which could be explored in future research.

It was hypothesized that the WFC-SES would produce adequate estimates of internal consistency reliability. The reliability coefficient for the overall 10-item WFC-SES was .93, indicating adequate internal reliability in the current sample. It was also hypothesized that the work-family conflict self-efficacy as well as the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale would produce adequate estimates of internal consistency reliability. The reliability estimate for the 5-item work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale was .90; it was .89 for the 3-item family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale. All coefficients suggest adequate internal reliability for the WFC-SES.

As hypothesized, the WFC-SES produced adequate estimates of test-retest reliability. The correlation between the WFC-SES at the initial testing and the 2-week follow-up assessment was $r = .62$ for the 10-item measure. The correlation between scores on the WFC-SES at time 1 and time 2 indicates moderate short-term stability in the current sample. This short-term stability suggests that the WFC-SES does not simply

reflect transient situational considerations, but ratherreflects a moderately stable perception of self-efficacy in managing conflicts that arise between work and family responsibilities.

One of the purposes of this study was to examine the convergent validity of the WFC-SES. It was hypothesized that the WFC-SES and the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management Scale would have a moderate, positive relationship because, conceptually, they represent distinct yet overlapping constructs. The correlation between the two measures was $r = .50$ in this sample, suggesting evidence of convergent validity for the WFC-SES.

It was also hypothesized that the WFC-SES would have a low correlation with the Social Desirability Scale. The correlation between these two measures was $r = .26$ in the current sample. Although this correlation suggests support for this hypothesis, it also indicates that the WFC-SES has approximately 7% shared variance with social desirability. Therefore, the WFC-SES appears to be slightly confounded with the desire to make a good impression. Despite this shared variance, it appears that the WFC-SES reflects more than just participants' desire to provide the socially desirable response, supporting discriminant validity for the WFC-SES.

Several variables were used to estimate the criterion related validity for the WFC-SES. It was hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy would be negatively related to work-family conflict. The correlation between work-family conflict and the work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale was $r = -.55$ ($r = -.52$ for the 10-item WFC-SES) in the current sample, indicating these two variables are highly negatively related. Extant research suggests that an individual's self-efficacy in a specific domain can

provide information about how that individual will perceive and cope with difficulties in that domain (Lent et al., 1994; O'Brien et al., 1997). More specifically, self-efficacy has been linked to multiple role management. It is hypothesized that a women's self-efficacy regarding her work and family responsibilities can help reduce her experience of role conflict and role overload. Results in the current study are consistent with past research that have found negative relationships between self-efficacy and work/family conflict (Erdwins et al., 2001). Results suggest that women who have higher self-efficacy beliefs in managing conflict that arises when work interferes with family responsibilities are likely to experience less work-family conflict.

Similar results were found when analyzing the relationship between family-work conflict self-efficacy and family-work conflict. It was hypothesized that there would be a moderate negative relationship between family-work conflict and family-work conflict self-efficacy. As hypothesized, the correlation was moderate ($r = -.30$) for the 10-item WFC-SES and for the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale ($r = -.44$). This finding suggests that women who have higher self-efficacy beliefs in managing conflict that arises when family interferes with work responsibilities are likely to experience less family-work conflict.

As hypothesized work-family conflict self-efficacy was found to have a positive relationship with family satisfaction. The total WFC-SES and the work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale were each found to be positively related to family satisfaction ($r = .45$, and $r = .49$, respectively). This result suggests that women with higher levels of work-family conflict self-efficacy are more likely to experience higher levels of family satisfaction. Similarly, the hypothesized relationship between family-work conflict self-

efficacy and work satisfaction was supported. Results indicate that there is a positive relationship between family-work conflict self-efficacy and work satisfaction ($r = .31$ for the family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale and $r = .32$ for the total WFC-SES). Thus, women who have higher self-efficacy beliefs about managing family-work conflict are more likely to have higher perceived work satisfaction than women who have lower self-efficacy beliefs.

It was hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy would be negatively related to family stress. The work-family conflict self-efficacy subscale and the total WFC-SES were each found to be negatively related to family stress ($rs = -.29$ and $-.23$ respectively). This suggests that women who have higher self-efficacy beliefs regarding work-family conflict self-efficacy are more likely to experience lower family stress than women who have lower levels of work-family conflict self-efficacy. It was also hypothesized that family-work conflict self-efficacy would be negatively related to work stress. The family-work conflict self-efficacy subscale and the total WFC-SES were each found to be negatively related to work stress ($r = -.17$ and $r = -.36$, respectively). This result suggests that women with higher self-efficacy beliefs in managing conflict that arises when family interferes with work experience lower levels of work stress.

Past research has explored the relationship between work/family conflict and psychological distress and well-being (Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996). More specifically, work/family conflict has been linked to work and family stress. Schwartzberg and Dytell (1996) found that higher levels of job-home interference were associated with lower self-esteem and higher rates of depression. Bedeian, Burke, and Moffett (1989) linked work/family conflict with satisfaction. In a study of over 700 professionals they found

that work/family conflict was related to domain specific satisfaction as well as overall life satisfaction. Using the word "stress" to indicate conflict occurring within a specific domain, they supported the hypothesis that work-related stress was directly related to work satisfaction, while family-related stress was directly related to marital satisfaction. These relationships suggest that increased levels of conflict or stress decrease satisfaction in that domain. Such results support the use of outcome variables such as stress and satisfaction in an attempt to estimate the criterion related validity of the WFC-SES. Support was found for Hypothesis 3-5, suggesting that the WFC-SES has adequate estimates of convergent, discriminant, and criterion related validity.

Landy (1986) noted the importance of using hypothesis testing as part of a validation study as a way to explore the validity of the speculations made using the measure. In the present study, it was hypothesized that work-family conflict self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction. This moderating relationship would suggest that the negative relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction would be weaker for those who report higher work-family conflict self-efficacy scores. Similarly, it was hypothesized that family-work conflict self-efficacy would moderate the relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction, such that the negative relationship between family-work conflict and work satisfaction would be weaker for those women who reported higher family-work conflict self-efficacy scores. Support was not found for these hypotheses, indicating that work/family conflict self-efficacy does not act as a moderator of the relationship between conflict and satisfaction in either family or work domains. Work/family conflict self-

efficacy also was not found to moderate the relationship between conflict and stress in either domain.

Supplemental analyses were used to test the possibility that work/family conflict self-efficacy *mediates,* rather than moderates, conflict criterion relations. For example, when work-family conflict self efficacy was controlled, the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction was substantially reduced. This suggests that work-family conflict mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and family satisfaction. Baron & Kenny (1986) noted that, "moderator variables specify when certain effects will hold, [while] mediators speak to how or why such effects occur" (p. 1176). In the present instance, work-family conflict may lessen self-efficacy, which may, in turn, diminish family satisfaction. Support for a mediational effect of self-efficacy was also found with respect to conflict/work satisfaction and conflict/family stress relations. However, the relation of conflict to work stress did not appear to be mediated by self-efficacy.

Past research has linked several variables to work family conflict, such as stress and satisfaction. However, little attention has been focused on the relationship between self-efficacy and work/family conflict (Kahn & Long, 1988; Matsui & Onglatco, 1992). Results regarding hypotheses 1-5 in the present study suggest that the WFC-SES is a valid and reliable measure that can be used to assess a woman's self-efficacy beliefs in managing conflict that arises as a result of balancing work and family responsibilities. However, the role of self-efficacy relative to conflict-criterion relations was different than what had been anticipated. Rather than moderating these relations, the findings of the supplemental analyses suggest that work/family conflict self-efficacymay play a

70

mediating role in the relationship between work/family conflict and subsequent

outcomes. Although self-efficacy had initially been conceptualized as an antecedent of

work/family conflict (e.g., possessing lower self-efficacy might predispose one to greater

conflict), the present findings allow for the possibility that self-efficacy and conflict are

related to one another bidirectionally (e.g., lower self-efficacy leads to greater conflict

and greater conflict reduces self-efficacy).

Supplemental analysis also provided information about the relationship between

work/family conflict self-efficacy and perceived social support for managing work-

family conflict and family-work conflict. Results indicated a moderate, positive

relationship ($r = .34$) between work/family conflict self-efficacy and perceived support

for managing conflict that arises as a result of managing multiple roles. This finding

suggests that perceived social support is an important correlate of work/family conflict

self-efficacy, which carries implications for future research and practice.

Limitations

There were some limitations of the present study that should be discussed. In

terms of external validity, it should be noted that the sample was predominantly White

(80.5%) and economically advantaged (78% reported a combined annual family income

of over $100,000). Data were collected at child care centers and, due to the rising cost of

child care, the data collection procedures could have impacted the economic diversity

found in the sample. The relatively high income levels of the participants might also have

enabled them to afford extra assistance with work and family-related responsibilities

(e.g., babysitters, housekeepers), potentially reducing the conflicts and stresses associated

with balancing multiple roles.

Additionally, all of the survey packets were distributed at child care centers in a county that is a suburb of a large mid-Atlantic citythat is known for its affluence. Although many child care centers that are located in more economically diverse areas were contacted for participation in the present study, none of these centers agreed to participate. It is important to note that staffing at many of the centers that did not agree to participate seemed to have higher ratios of children to staff members than at those centers that participated in the study, suggesting an economic difference in the centers that participated and those that did not. Moreover, the respondents, on average, perceived that they enjoyed relatively high levels of job flexibility, control, and support for managing the work/family interface. Thus, the findings may not be applicable to women of color, those at lower SES levels, those with less favorable job environments or family support systems, or women in other regions of the U.S. The generalizability of the present results may also be limited to women who self-identify as being in a heterosexual marriage.

Perhaps the most significant limitation of the present study is the return rate and the implications thereof. Of the 465 survey packets that were distributed to mailboxes at six child care centers, 159 were returned, resulting in a return rate of 34%. This return rate was lower than had been expected, suggesting that the results of this study should be interpreted with caution. Although similar return rates were found at each childcare center, the 159 women who completed the survey may in some way be different than the 306 who did not complete the survey. Some of the individuals who completed the survey may have a stronger interest in the topic than those who did not complete the survey. Additionally, those who completed the survey may have higher levels of work/family conflict self-efficacy, lower levels of work/family conflict, or stronger support systems

than those who did not participate, which is suggested by that fact that the participants were able to find the time to complete the survey while balancing work and family responsibilities. Finally, it should be noted that this study used correlational and cross-sectional methods and, therefore, cannot support causal inferences.

<u>Directions for Future Research</u>

There is a growing body of literature addressing the conflict that individuals experience as a result of work responsibilities interfering with family responsibilities and vice versa. When conflict arises, it can be increasingly difficult for individuals to accomplish tasks associated with each domain. For example, staying at work late to finish a project under deadline pressure may interfere with family responsibilities that an individual might otherwise have accomplished if she had not stayed late at work. Such an experience is an example of work-family conflict, and such an experience can impact an individuals' perception of stress and satisfaction in the family domain. Correlational analysis in the present study suggests that work/family conflict is domain specific, meaning that work-family conflict is related to family domain outcomes, while family-work conflict is linked to work domain outcomes.

The validity of the WFC-SES was examined in order to begin to address the knowledge gaps that exist regarding the relationships between work/family conflict, self-efficacy, and outcome variables, such as stress and satisfaction. Self-efficacy is a construct that has been applied to a variety of domains and has been used as a way to better understand an individual's expectations in managing various tasks. Past research has linked self-efficacy beliefs to relevant outcomes, such as performance tasks (Pajares & Miller, 1995), work-related behaviors (Sadri & Robertson, 1993), and the career

73

counseling behaviors of counselors in training (O'Brien et al., 1997). Given extant findings regarding self-efficacy, it seems reasonable to further explore the relationship between self-efficacy and outcomes in the work/family domains.

More research is needed that applies self-efficacy to the experiences of work/family conflict in the lives of women. It would be helpful to further explore the relationship between work/family conflict self-efficacy and other variables such as social support, work flexibility, and level of control over work and family responsibilities. Examining women who are simultaneously managing both work and family roles affords researchers the opportunity to assess the experience of work/family conflict from those individuals who are actually experiencing this type of conflict. However, it would also be helpful for future research to look at men's experience of work/family conflict.

Much of the research looking at work/family conflict and multiple role management has focused on women and, by doing so, continues to perpetuate the view that work/family conflict is only a woman's problem. Research indicates that in heterosexual relationships women experience more multiple role demands than men (Fassinger, 2000). However, extant work/family conflict research suggests that men may also experience conflict that arises from balancing work and family responsibilities, roles, and tasks (Greenhaus & Buetall, 1985). Further research is needed that looks at men's experience of work/family conflict. Additional research is also needed that looks at how men's and women's experiences may differ with regard to work/family conflict. It could be helpful to further explore the variables that may differentially impact men and women's experience of work/family conflict.

It would also be valuable to examine the sources of work/family conflict self-efficacy. That is, how do women and men develop and maintain a sense of self-efficacy regarding their ability to manage and cope with conflicts between their work and family roles? By using the WFC-SES to examine the paths that lead to and from work/family conflict self-efficacy, it may be possible to design better, theory-based interventions to help people prepare for the inevitable challenges posed by multiple role involvement – and also help them to reduce the stresses and increase the satisfactions that come with such involvement.

Finally, the nature of the relationship between work/family conflict and work/family conflict self-efficacy deserves special attention in future research. Although the present findings suggest that self-efficacy may mediate the effect of conflict on satisfaction and stress outcomes, longitudinal and experimental research are needed to further examine plausible causal alternatives – for example, that self-efficacy is simply a stronger predictor of domain-specific outcomes than is work-family conflict and that, after controlling for self-efficacy, conflict may not explain much unique predictive variance. In other words, it is possible that conflict is largely a by-product of low self-efficacy, without a large unique role to play relative to more distal outcomes. However, it is also possible that the roles and relative importance of self-efficacy and conflict may depend on the particular outcome variable under consideration (e.g., conflict did explain unique variance in the prediction of work stress). Building and testing alternative models of conflict/self-efficacy relations may help to advance understanding of this topic.

Implications for Practice

Although they must be offered tentatively, the findings from the present study may have useful practical implications. Counselors and workplace managers and supervisors can use relevant data to influence and inform interactions with those who experience work/family conflict. In the present study, it was found that women who reported higher self-efficacy scores also reported lower levels of conflict and stress, and higher levels of satisfaction. While this finding is not causal in nature, it does suggest that self-efficacy is an important variable in relation to the work/family conflict topic. Bandura (1977) described self-efficacy, among other things, as a key determinant of psychological change and level of persistence when one meets adverse experiences. These functions of self-efficacy are relevant to work/family conflict.

Counselors can use the findings of the present research study as a way to assess an individual's self-efficacy beliefs with regard to managing work/family conflict. A counselor could, for example, work with a woman to identify particular areas of work and family life that increase her experience of work/family conflict. The WFC-SES could be used as an initial assessment of her self-efficacy beliefs and could provide valuable information for future therapeutic work. It could be helpful for a counselor to explore with this client how realistic or unrealistic her beliefs and expectations are and how these perceptions are influencing her goals and behaviors.

By understanding the importance of self-efficacy beliefs regarding work/family conflict, a counselor could help a client dealing with work/family conflict identify and negotiate areas of particular concern. For example, a client could be having difficulty setting limits on her work hours and find that the hours spent at work are frequently interfering with family responsibilities. In an individual counseling session, the counselor

could help the client explore options that might help to boost work/family conflict self-efficacy. Bandura (1986) identified four contributing factors in developing self-efficacy beliefs: (a) performance accomplishments, (b) vicarious learning, (c) verbal persuasion, and (d) physiological and affective states and reactions.

In order to boost work/family conflict self-efficacy, it could be helpful to focus on past performance accomplishments and vicarious learning. In the example of the client who has difficulty setting limits on work hours, it may be helpful for the counselor to work with the client to identify and practice ways to balance work and family roles. Modeling successful multiple role management strategies can also help to develop self-efficacy beliefs. Perhaps a counselor could work with a client to identify role models who are also managing work and family responsibilities. Being exposed to successful experiences (both directly and vicariously) in managing work/family conflict might increase self-efficacy beliefs. The present findings also suggest that social support (a form of verbal persuasion) may also have a useful role to play in efficacy-boosting interventions.

Findings of the present study, suggesting that self-efficacy may play an important role in the relationship between work/family conflict and outcomes, such as stress and satisfaction, could also be used by managers and supervisors in the workplace. Practices such as a mentoring program pairing new employees who are balancing work and family responsibilities with more experienced employees who are balancing similar roles could help increase the self-efficacy beliefs of the newcomers regarding work/family conflict. As noted by Bandura (1986), verbal persuasion can help increase self-efficacy beliefs. Managers and supervisors in the workplace can help to increase self-efficacy beliefs by

communicating directly and indirectly a supportive attitude towards dealing with the

conflicting demands of work and family responsibilities. If employees feel as though the

workplace climate supports a successful balance of work and family responsibilities, they

may experience a boost in their self-efficacy beliefs regarding their competing work and

family responsibilities. Use of relaxation and exercise strategies may also be used to

boost self-efficacy by helping to reduce the negative affective states that can accompany

multiple role involvement.

In sum, research suggests that the work and family roles can have a noteworthy

impact on psychological well-being and satisfaction (Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996;

Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). The WFC-SES was designed to measure an individual's beliefs

in her or his ability to manage work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Findings in

the present study support the internal consistency reliability of the WFC-SES, as well as

the convergent, discriminant, and criterion related validity of the measure. Thus, the

WFC-SES can be used in future research and practice to better understand the roles of

self-efficacy and conflict relative to work and family well-being outcomes.

Appendix A

Cover Letter

Date

Dear [name of participant],

My name is Kelly Hennessy, and I am doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at the University of Maryland. I am conducting a study of women who are managing multiple roles. I am interested in learning more about the experiences of these women. For the purpose of this study, I will be focusing on women who are in a heterosexual marriage, have at least one child under the age of 18 living at home, and are employed either part-time or full-time.

Your participation will make an important contribution to research regarding women just like you, who are managing multiple roles. Your participation can also help inform counselors, educators, and employers in their interactions with women who are managing multiple roles.

Attached is a packet of questionnaires that should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. All of the information you provide will be kept completely confidential. All of the questionnaires have been labeled with a code number that will be used to keep track of returned questionnaires. Your name will only be matched with your packet for this purpose. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Upon receiving your completed survey, I will assume that you have given consent to participate in the study. Four weeks from now some participants will be asked to complete one of the very brief measures to complete for a second time. This will only take an additional 3-5 minutes to complete.

I truly appreciate your time and effort in participating in my study. As a way to express my personal gratitude, a lottery drawing for one of five **$20 cash prizes** will be held

when the study has been completed. If you are interested in being entered in the lottery drawing please indicate this interest on the Lottery Drawing Form. Additionally, if you are interested in receiving a summary of the results of this study upon its completion, please indicate this interest on the same form.

Please complete the packet of questionnaires included and return the packet to the drop-box at the front desk of [name of specific child care center]. If you feel as though this study does not apply to you, or you do not fit the criteria outlined in the first paragraph of this letter, please write "N/A" on the front of the packet and return it to the drop-box. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at kellydae@wam.umd.edu. I would be more than happy to answer any questions you might have and further discuss the study. Thank you in advance for your participation. I am extremely appreciative for you time and effort.

Sincerely,

Kelly Hennessy   Robert Lent, PhD
Doctoral Student   Professor and Co-Director
Counseling and Personnel Services   Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland   University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742   College Park, MD 20742

Appendix B

One-week Reminder Note

Date

Dear [name of participant],

Last week, you received a packet of questionnaires as part of a study I am conducting on women who are managing multiple roles. For the purpose of this study, I will be focusing on women who are in a heterosexual marriage, have at least one child under the age of 18 living at home, and are employed either part-time or full-time.

If you have already completed and returned the survey, thank you very much for your time! If not, I would greatly appreciate your taking the time to complete and return the survey. If you need an additional copy of the survey, please ask for one at the front desk.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the survey, please do not hesitate to email me at kellydae@wam.umd.edu.

Thank you again for your time, effort, and meaningful contribution!

Sincerely,

Kelly Hennessy
Doctoral Student
Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland

Appendix C

Two-week Reminder Note

Date

Dear [name of participant],

Two weeks ago, you received a packet of questionnaires as part of a study I am conducting on women who are managing multiple roles. For the purpose of this study, I will be focusing on women who are in a heterosexual marriage, have at least one child under the age of 18 living at home, and are employed either part-time or full-time.

If you have already completed and returned the survey, thank you very much for your time! If not, I would greatly appreciate your taking the time to complete and return the survey. If you need an additional copy of the survey, please ask for one at the front desk.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the survey, please do not hesitate to email me at kellydae@wam.umd.edu.

Thank you again for your time, effort, and meaningful contribution!

Sincerely,

Kelly Hennessy
Doctoral Student
Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland

Appendix D

Lottery Drawing Form and Notification of Results

To show my personal appreciation for your time and effort in completing the survey, a lottery drawing of five $20 cash prizes will be held upon completion of this study.

_____ YES, I am interested in being entered into the lottery drawing for a chance to win one of five $20 cash prizes. If I win one of these prizes, please send the cash prize to:

      Name:_____

      Address:_____

           _____

_____ NO, I am not interested in being entered into this lottery drawing.

If you are interested in receiving a summary of the results from this study, please provide your name and the address where you would like to have the results sent below:

Name:_____

Address:_____

        _____

☺ Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study. I am truly thankful for your time and effort! To ensure confidentiality, this form will be removed from your completed questionnaire and kept in a separate location.

Appendix E

Demographic Form

1) Age _____

2) Sex: Female_____   Male_____

3) Ethnicity: _____African American
                _____Native American
                _____Asian Amerian
                _____Latina
                _____Caucasian
                _____Other (please specify)_____

4) Are you currently involved in a relationship with a member of the opposite sex?
                _____Yes
                _____No
                If yes, for how long have you been in this relationship? _____ (in months)

5) Marital Status: _____Single
                    _____Married
                    _____Separated
                    _____Divorced
                    _____Widowed

6) 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?_____

7) Highest level of education completed: _____High School Degree
                                          _____College Degree, B.A.
                                          _____College Degree, B.S.
                                          _____Masters Degree

_____Law Degree
_____M.D.
_____Ph.D.
_____Other (please specify) _____

8) Are you employed _____part-time or _____full-time?

9) Approximate number of hours spent in paid employment, per week:_____

10) Job Title: _____

11) Brief job description (i.e. managerial, customer service): _____

12) Check the category that includes your immediate family's total, combined annual income:

> _____Under $10,000
> _____$10,001 - $20,000
> _____$20,001 - $30,000
> _____$30,001 - $40,000
> _____$40,001 - $50,000
> _____$50,001 - $60,000
> _____$60,001 - $80,000
> _____$80,001 - $100,000
> _____Over $100,001

13) On a scale from 1 (no control) to 7 (complete control), how much control do you have over your work responsibilities?

> 1   2   3   4   5   6   7
> no control   complete control

14) On a scale from 1 (no flexibility) to 7 (complete flexibility), how would you describe your work hours?

> 1   2   3   4   5   6   7
> no flexibility   complete flexibility

15) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your partner for conflict that arises as a result of work interfering with family responsibilities?

> 1   2   3   4   5   6   7
> no support   complete support

16) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your partner for conflict that arises as a result of family responsibilities interfering with work?

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
no support   complete support

17) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your family members and friends for conflict that arises as a result of work interfering with family responsibilities?

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
no support   complete support

18) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your family member and friends for conflict that arises as a result of family responsibilities interfering with work?

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
no support   complete support

19) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your boss/supervisor for conflict that arises as a result of work interfering with family responsibilities?

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
no support   complete support

20) On a scale from 1 (no support) to 7 (complete support), how would you describe the level of support you feel from your boss/supervisor for conflict that arises as a result of family responsibilities interfering with work?

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
no support   complete support

Appendix F

Work-Family Conflict Self-efficacy Scale

Cinamon (2003)

Please rate your confidence (0 complete lack of confidence – 9 complete confidence) in your ability to perform the following behaviors successfully by circling the appropriate number. The words "work" and "job" refer to all work-related activities that you do as part of your paid employment. The word "family" refers to the following domains of family life that pertain to you including being a parent, being a spouse/partner, and overall homelife.

How confident are you that you could....   No Confidence   Complete Confidence

1.Fulfill your job responsibility without letting it interfere with your family responsibilities.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2.Attend to your family obligations without it affecting your ability to complete pressing tasks at work.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3.Manage incidents in which work life interferes with family life.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

4.Fulfill all your family responsibilities despite going through a trying and demanding period in your work.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5.Manage incidents in which family life interferes with work life.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

6.Fulfill your family role effectively after a long and demanding day at work.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

7.Invest in your job even when under heavy pressure due to family responsibilities.

0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

8.Succeed in your role at work although there are many difficulties in your family

0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

How confident are you that you could….   No Confidence   Complete Confidence

9.Invest in your family role even when under heavy pressure due to work responsibilities.

0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

10.Focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive.

0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Appendix G

Work-to-Family Conflict Scale

Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian (1996)

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by circling the appropriate number. The words "work" and "job" refer to all work-related activities that you do as part of your paid employment. The word "family" refers to the following family roles that pertain to you including being a parent, being a spouse/partner, and overall homelife.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

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

　　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7

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

　　　　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.

　　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7

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

　　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7

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

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Appendix H

Family-to-Work Conflict Scale

Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian (1996)

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by circling the appropriate number. The words "work" and "job" refer to all work-related activities that you do as part of your paid employment. The word "family" refers to the following family roles that pertain to you including being a parent, being a spouse/partner, and overall homelife.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

1. _____ The demands of my family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. _____ I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. _____ Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner.

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. _____ My home life interferes with my responsibilities at work such as getting to work on time, accomplishing daily tasks, and working overtime.

          1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. _____ Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties.

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

<div align="center">Appendix I</div>

<div align="center">Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management</div>

<div align="center">Lefcourt & Harmon (1993, 1995)</div>

Instructions:
The following statements involve situations or tasks you have either encountered or will encounter at some time in your life. Although some statements seem similar they are all different. Please try to give a response to all of the items.

Please read each statement carefully and indicate how much confidence you have that you could accomplish each of these tasks, should the occasion arise, by marking your answer according to the following 10 point continuum. Place a number from 0-9 on the blank marked CONFIDENCE.

Claryifying Definitions:
1) Spouse/partner is equivalent to husband.

2) The term children is used to represent either one or more children.

3) The term work encompasses past, current and future paid employment.

HOW MUCH CONFIDENCE DO I HAVE THAT I COULD……..SHOULD THE OCCASION ARISE?

No Confidence	Very Little Confidence	Some Confidence	Much Confidence	Complete Confidence
0	**1** **2** **3**	**4** **5**	**6** **7**	**8** **9**

                                                                          0-9___
                                                                       Confidence

1)   Assert my need for privacy to my spouse/partner and/or children.   _____

2)   Make time to sort through magazines, newspapers, and mail.   _____

3)   Prepare for the holidays and buy birthday and holiday gifts.   _____

<div align="center">91</div>

4) Initiate a conversation with my spouse/partner, when I am
upset with him.   _____

5) Remain calm and objective during sibling squabbles.   _____

6) Discuss resentment which may arise over unequal division of tasks
because my spouse/partner refuses to do some home chores.   _____

**HOW MUCH CONFIDENCE DO I HAVE THAT I COULD……..SHOULD THE
OCCASION ARISE?**

No Confidence		Very Little Confidence		Some Confidence		Much Confidence		Complete Confidence	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

0-9___
Confidence

7) Defer professional goals in order to devote more time to parenting
responsibilities.   _____

8) Establish and meet personal deadlines on major home related tasks,
such as spring cleaning and redecorating.   _____

9) Deal with conflicts caused by different values, customs, lifestyles,
and goals between my spouse/partner and myself.   _____

10) Be a good listener and be objective in times of conflict with my
children.   _____

11) Deal with my children competing for attention, talking at the
same time, competing for help, or disagreeing on family activities
or meals.   _____

12) Manage time spent working on tasks within my work role.   _____

13) Negotiate financial problems with my spouse/partner.   _____

14) Handle unexpected tasks and interruptions at work, so that they
cause only minimum disruptions or stress.   _____

15) Negotiate expectations of my spouse/partner to make sacrifices
for my career and for me to make sacrifices for his career.   _____

16) Devote time each week for personal relaxation or leisure activities.   _____

17) Be nurturing and available to my children when they need me.   _____

18) Fulfill goals I set and personal expectations at work. _____

19) Cancel plans I have with my spouse/partner, when I have to work late. _____

20) Find a way to get my kids ready for school or day care and get ready for work at roughly the same time. _____

HOW MUCH CONFIDENCE DO I HAVE THAT I COULD……..SHOULD THE OCCASION ARISE?

No Confidence	Very Little Confidence	Some Confidence	Much Confidence	Complete Confidence
0 1	2 3	4 5	6 7	8 9

___0-9___
Confidence

21) Cope with my children's demands on days when I am tired and stressed. _____

22) Get my spouse/ partner to attend important social engagements which are associated with my career. _____

23) Get involved with my children's school activities. _____

24) Maintain a good relationship with my spouse/partner. _____

25) Get work tasks done at home, but give full attention to my children when they need it. _____

26) Get my spouse/partner to understand and accept my job demands. _____

27) Be successful in my career. _____

28) Foster my children's hobbies, activities, and social life. _____

29) Find ways to give my children equal attention and not show preferences. _____

30) Meet my own personal needs each week. _____

31) Discuss feelings of competitions I might have with my spouse/partner over career prestige, position, or salary. _____

32) Refuse unreasonable requests from my spouse/partner. _____

33) Make time to shop for myself or get my hair cut. _____

34) Get my children to follow through with their chores and
responsibilities while I am at work. _____

35) Talk with my supervisor if I feel that I deserve a promotion and
am passed over for a male colleague who I feel is less qualified. _____

HOW MUCH CONFIDENCE DO I HAVE THAT I COULD……..SHOULD THE OCCASION ARISE?

No Confidence		**Very Little Confidence**		**Some Confidence**		**Much Confidence**		**Complete Confidence**	
0	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**

                                                                  0-9
                                                              Confidence

36) Focus attention and effort on work related tasks, rather than home
related tasks and problems when I am at work. _____

37) Make time to spend with friends instead of staying home with
my spouse/partner and/or children. _____

38) Spend time on the weekend completing work tasks instead of
spending it with my children. _____

39) Handle work responsibilities given to me, when not given the
resources to complete them adequately. _____

40) Set realistic goals concerning the amount and kind of tasks to be
completed at work each day. _____

41) Shift from my occupational role to my role of parent when my child
calls me at work. _____

42) Deal with repair people who are late or doctors who are behind
schedule, when make appointments on my lunch hour or before
work. _____

43) Raise my children to live successful lives. _____

44) Determine what work tasks to do myself and which ones to delegate
to others. _____

45) Deal with conflicts with another colleague. _____

46) Discuss the importance of my career with my spouse/partner. _____

47) Deal with conflicting deadlines at work, from two or more people. _____

48) Make arrangements for deliveries or repair people when I have to
work. _____

Appendix J

Social Desirability Scale

Marlowe & Crowne (1960

**Please answer the true/false statements as accurately as possible by circling the "T"
for true or the "F" for false.**

1) T   F   I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

2) T   F   I have never intensely disliked anyone.

3) T   F   I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

4) T   F   I like to gossip at times.

5) T   F   There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in
authority even though I knew they were right.

6) T   F   I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

7) T   F   There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

8) T   F   I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

9) T   F   I always try to practice what I preach.

10) T   F   I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

11) T   F   When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

12) T   F   I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

13) T   F   At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

95

14) T F   There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

15) T F   I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings.

16) T F   I never resent being asked to return a favor.

17) T F   I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

18) T F   There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

19) T F   I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

20) T F   I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Appendix K

Family Satisfaction

Brayfield & Rothe (1951)

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 5 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by circling the appropriate number. The word "family" refers to the following family roles that pertain to you including being a parent, being a spouse/partner, and overall homelife.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree
5 = strongly agree

1. ____ Most days I am enthusiastic about my family life.
          1   2   3   4   5

2. ____ I feel fairly well satisfied with my family life.
          1   2   3   4   5

3. ____ I find real enjoyment in my family life.
          1   2   3   4   5

4. ____ I like my family life better than the average person does.
          1   2   3   4   5

5. ____ I am often bored with my family life. (Reversed scored)
          1   2   3   4   5

Appendix L

Work Satisfaction

Hackman & Oldham (1975)

Below are three statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by circling the appropriate number. The words "work" and "job" refer to all paid employment activities.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = neither agree nor disagree
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

1. Generally speaking, I am very happy with my work.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. I frequently think of leaving this job (Reversed scored)
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Appendix M

State Anxiety Inventory

O'Neil, Speilberger, & Hansen (1969)

Below are several feelings that you may have experienced at work. Using the 1 – 5 scale below, indicate the frequency with which you have experienced each feeling. The word "work" refers to all paid employment activities.

1 = never
2 = occasionally
3 = sometimes
4 = frequently
5 = always

1. I feel tense at work.
      1   2   3   4   5

2. I feel calm at work. (R)
      1   2   3   4   5

3. I feel relaxed at work. (R)
      1   2   3   4   5

4. I feel jittery at work.
      1   2   3   4   5

5. I feel at ease at work. (R)
      1   2   3   4   5

Appendix N

Family Stress

Reeder, Chapman, & Coulson (1968)

Below are four statements that deal with your family responsibilities and your experiences at home. Please indicate by checking the appropriate box in each of the following sections which description suits you best. The words "family life" and "home" refer to all unpaid activities in the home that relate to family responsibilities.

1. In general, I am usually tense or nervous at home. This describes me:

☐ Exactly   ☐ To some extent   ☐ Not very accurately   ☐ Not at all

2. There is a great deal of nervous strain connected with my daily activities at home. This describes my situation:

☐ Exactly   ☐ To some extent   ☐ Not very accurately   ☐ Not at all

3. At the end of the day I am completely exhausted by my family responsibilities. This describes me:

☐ Exactly   ☐ To some extent   ☐ Not very accurately   ☐ Not at all

4. My daily activities at home are extremely trying and stressful. This describes my activities:

☐ Exactly   ☐ To some extent   ☐ Not very accurately   ☐ Not at all

References

Adams, A.G, King, L.A., & King, D.W. (1996). Relationships of job and family

     involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life

     satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*, 411-420.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences

     associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research.

     Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5, 278-308.

Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, interrole conflict, and

     well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors

     among employed parents in hong kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 259-

     278.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change.

     Psychology Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:

     Prentice Hall.

Barnett, C.R. & Hyde, J.S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist

     theory. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 781-796.

Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in

social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 6 1173-1182.

Bedeian, A.G., Burke, B.G., & Moffett, R.G. (1989). Outcomes of work-family conflict Among married male and female professionals. *Journal of Management, 14,*(3), 475-491.

Bohen, H.C. & Viveros-Long, A. Balancing jobs and family life: Do flexible work schedules help? Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bond, J.T., Galinsky, E. & Swanberg, J.E. (1998). New York: Families and Work Institute.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35,* 307-311.

Brown, S. D., Lent. R. W., & Larkin, K. C. (1989). Self-efficacy as a moderator of scholastic aptitude-academic performance relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35,* 64-75.

Bulger, C.A., & Mellor, S. (1997). Self-efficacy as a mediator of the relationship between perceived union barriers and women's participation in union activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 935-944.

Burke, R.J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3*, 287-302.

Carlson, D.S. & Perrewe, P.L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor – strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management, 25* (4), 513-541.

Chodorow, N. (1978). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cleary, P.D. (1987). Gender differences in stress-related disorders. In R.C. Barnett, L. Beiner, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.) *Gender and Stress*. New York: Free Press.

Cinamon, G. R. (2003). Work-family conflict self-efficacy and career plans of young adults. In press.

Cinamon, R. G. & Rich, Y. (2002). Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their importance for the work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49* (2), 212-220.

Crosby, F.J. (1991). New York: Free Press.

Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E., & Smith, H.L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 276-302.

Erdwins, C.J., Buffardi, L.C., Casper, W.J., O'Brien, A.S., (2001). The relationship of women's role strain to social support, role satisfaction, and self-efficacy. *Family Relations, 50* (3), 230-239.

Fassinger, R. E. (2000). Gender and sexuality in human development: Implications for prevention and advocacy in counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), Handbook of counseling psychology (3rd ed.) (pp. 346-378). New York: Wiley.

Fava, J.L. & Velicer, W.F. (1992). The effects of overextraction on factor and component analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 27*, 387-415.

Fave, J.L., Ruggiero, L., & Grimley, D.M. (1998). The development and structural confirmation of the Rhode Island stress and coping inventory. *Journal of*

Behavioral Medicine, 21,(6), 601-613.

Fischer, D.G. & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring social desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53,* 417-424.

Frone, M.R., Barnes, G.M., & Farrell, M.P. (1994). Relationship of work-family conflict to substance use among employed mothers: The role of negative affect. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 1019-1030.

Frone, M.R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M.L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 65-78.

Frone, M.R., Russell, M. & Cooper, M.L. (1997). Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: A four-year longitudinal study of employed parents. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*, 325-335.

George, J. & Jones, G. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 318-325.

Gilbert, L.A. (1998). Current perspectives on women's multiple roles. *Journal of Career Assessment, 6*(4), 433-448.

Gilligan, C. (1982). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1997). Exploratory factor analysis: Its role in item analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 68,* 3, 532-560.

Greenhaus, J.H. (1988). The intersection of work-family roles: Individual, interpersonal, and organizational issues. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3,* 23-44.

Greenhaus, J.H. & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family

roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10* (1), 76-88.

Gutek, B.A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for

work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76* (4), 560-568.

Hackett, G. (1995). Role of mathematics self-efficacy in the choice of math-related

majors of college women and men: A path analysis. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 32, 47-56.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.

Hackett, G., & Betz, N.E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of

women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18,* 326-339.

Hamel, K. & Bracken, D. (1986). Factor structure of the job stress questionnaire (JSQ) in

three occupational groups. *Educational and Pscyhological Measurement, 46*, 777-

787.

Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., & Snoek, J.D. (1964). *Organizational stress:*

*Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Kahn, R.L. & Long, B.C. (1988). Work-related stress, self-efficacy, and well-being of

female clerical workers. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 1*, 145-153.

Keith, P.M. & Schafer, R.B. Role strain and depression in two job families. *Family*

Relations, 29, 483-488.

Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family,

and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational, Behavior,*

and Human Performance, 32, 198-215.

Kossek, E.E. & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life

   satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior –

   human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83* (2), 139-149.

Lefcourt, L. A. (1995). The self-efficacy expectations for role management measure

   (SEERM) and its relationship with self-concept constructs and efficacy sources

   for career women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois,

   Urbana-Champaign.

Lefcourt, L. A., & Harmon, L. W. (1993, August). Self-efficacy expectations for role

    management (SEERM): Measure development. Paper presented at the 101st

   Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Lefcourt, L. A., & Harmon, L. W. (1995). Self-efficacy expectations for role

    management measure (SEERM) for career women: Validity study. Unpublished

   manuscript.

Lent, R.W. (2004). Toward a unifying theoretical and practical perspective on well-being

   and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, (4), 482-

   509.

Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive

   theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of

   Vocational Behavior, 45*, 79-122.

Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D., & Larkin, K.D. (1984). Relation of self-efficacy expectations to

   academic achievement and persistence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,*

   356-362.

Lent, R.W., Hill, C.E., & Hoffman, M.A. (2003). Development and validation of the
counselor activity self-efficacy scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 1,
97-108.

Matsui, T. & Onglatco, M.L. (1992). Career self-efficacy as a moderator of the relation
between occupational stress and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41*, 79-
88.

Matthews, L.S., Conger, R.D., & Wickrama, K.A.S. (1996). Work-family conflict and
marital quality: Mediating processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*(1), 62-79.

Metcalfe, C., Smith, G.D., Wadsworth, E., Sterne, J.A.C., Heslop, P., Macleod, J., Smith,
A. (2003). A contemporary validation of the Reeder Stress Inventory. *British
Journal of Health Psychology, 8,* 83-94.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). Postsecondary education. In *Digest of
Education Statistics*, 1999. Washington, DC.

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of
work – family conflict and family – work conflict scales, *Journal of Applied
Psychology, 81* (4), 400-410.

O'Brien, K.M., Heppner, M.J., Flores, L.Y., & Bikos, L.H. (1997). The career counseling
self-efficacy scale: Instrument development and training applications. *Journal of
Counseling Psychology, 44* (1), 20-31.

O'Neil, H.F., Spielberger, C.D., & Hansen, D.N. (1969). Effects of state anxiety and task
Difficulty on computer-assisted learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 60,*
(5), 343-350.

Oppenheimer, V.K. (1994). Women's rising employment and the future of the family in

industrial societies. *Population and Development Review, 20*, 293-341.

Ozer, E. M. (1995). The impact of childcare responsibilities and self-efficacy on the

psychological health of professional working mothers. *Psychology of Women*

Quarterly, 19, 315-335.

Pajares, F., & Miller, M.D. (1995). Mathematics self-efficacy and mathematics

performances: The need for specificity of assessment. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 42, 190-198.

Parsons, T. (1949). The social structure of the family. In R.N. Anshen (Ed.), *The family:*

Its function and destiny. New York: Harper.

Parsons, T. & Bales, R.F. (1955). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Perrewe, P.L., Hochwarter, W.A., & Kiewitz, C. (1999). Value attainment: An

explanation for the negative effects of work-family conflict on job and life

satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*(4), 318-326.

Pleck, J.H., Staines, G.L., & Lang, L. (1980). Conflicts between work and family life.

Monthly Labor Review, 103, 29-32.

Reeder, L.G., Chapman, J.M., & Coulson, A.H. (1968). Socioenvironmental stress,

tranquilizers, and cardiovascular disease. *Proceedings of the Excerpta Medica*

International Congress Series, 182, 226-238.

Reskin, B.F. & Padavic, I. (1994). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Sadri, G., & Robertson, I.T. (1993). Self-efficacy and work-related behavior: A review

and meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 42*, 139-152.

Schwartzberg, N.S. & Dytell, R.S. (1996). Dual-earner families: The importance of work stress and family stress for psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1* (2), 211-223.

Speilberger, C.D., Gorsuch, R., & Lushen, R. (1969). State-trait anxiety inventory, preliminary test manual. *Counseling Psychologists Press.*

Strahan, R. & Gerbasi, K.C. (1972). Short, homogeneous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28*, 191-193.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). Using multivariate statistics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wiley, D. L. (1987). The relationship between work/nonwork role conflict and job-related outcomes: Some unanticipated findings. *Journal of Management, 13,* 467-472.

Williams, J.K., & Alliger, M.G. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 837-868.