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Abstract

This capstone project provides a critical synthesis of literature examining family-friendly workplace policies with a focus on Canada and the U.S. The review covers the caregiving context, health, stress and well-being, job satisfaction of family caregivers, and the effects of these policies on the organizational structure of the workplace. The literature is assessed against the backdrop of a feminist political economy framework. A number of policy issues are identified and critically reviewed, and several recommendations that could potentially benefit both the caregiver and the employer are discussed. These include: reducing organizational barriers for the adoption of family-friendly policies, enhancing flexibility in the work lives of caregivers, increasing government funding of work-life balance policies, and supporting technological innovation. Future research is needed to better understand the barriers to policy adoption, best practices in family-friendly approaches, as well as comprehensive evaluation of the intended and unintended consequences of current and emerging policies.
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Chapter 1.

Introduction

1.1. Background

With a rapidly aging population, and a health care model that turns to the family members of the ill for support, the role played by informal caregivers is becoming increasingly important. It was recently estimated that informal caregivers provide over 80% of care to community-dwelling older adults (Canadian Caregiver Coalition, 2008), and the number of seniors requiring care is projected to double between 2012 and 2031 (Sinha, 2013). The number of informal caregivers who balance their caregiving roles with paid employment roles, currently around 35% of the workforce (Sinha, 2013), is only expected to increase (Aumann, Galinsky, Sakai, Brown, & Bond, 2010). As the number of working caregivers increases, employers will need to adapt and accommodate their needs. These accommodations may vary depending on industry, the position of the employee, and the scope and nature of their caregiving tasks.

Studies show that informal caregivers make a variety of short- and long-term adaptations to balance their employment and caregiving roles, such as taking leave of absences, or choosing to leave the work force entirely (Fast, Lero, Duncan, Dunlop, Eales, Keating, & Yoshino, 2011; Fast & Dosman, 2014). In addition, there is significant evidence that women are more likely to incur employment consequences due to caregiving responsibilities (Fast et al. 2011; Enright, 1991; Austen & Ong, 2010; MetLife Mature Market Institute, 2006; Keefe & Medjuck, 1997; Fast, Eales, & Keating, 2001; Franklin, Ames, & King, 1994). This will have a far-reaching impact on Canada’s caregivers, workforce, and economy as a whole, and these impacts have been explored in the literature. However, the findings need to be communicated to the organizations and employees who can benefit from family friendly policies. This research needs to be
accessible beyond academic circles, and to contribute to this knowledge translation, this project will address a research gap. It will consolidate existing literature that assesses the impact of family-friendly policies on both caregivers as well as their employers and analyze this impact through a feminist political economy theoretical framework.

This project will examine literature on family-friendly workplace policies in Canada and the United States of America, in order to ascertain the extent to which they support caregiving employees and benefit the employer. The following research question will be explored through the analysis of existing literature:

1. How effectively do family-friendly workplace policies benefit the employees and/or the employer?

1.1.1. Key Terminology

This research project adopts a broad definition of informal caregiver that is used in many surveys: A caregiver is “a member of the immediate or extended family, a friend or a neighbour who provides support, care and assistance, without pay, to an adult or child who is in need of support due to a disability, mental or chronic illness, life-threatening illness or temporary difficulty” (Keefe, 2011, 4). This definition excludes paid, formal caregivers such as home care or nursing staff.

Family-friendly policies describe a variety of employee benefits designed in response to increasingly conflicting demands of work, family, and personal time in the modern work environment (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; Roberts, Gianakis, McCue, & Wang, 2004). Throughout this project, the term family-friendly policy will be used as an umbrella term to synthesize research on multiple types of benefits. When specific types of policies are discussed in the research, such as telecommuting, flexible scheduling, or subsidized childcare, they will be identified. This term does not refer to government policies unless otherwise specified, as the focus of this review is to examine policies in the workplace.
1.2. Rationale

The following section will provide a rationale for this research. Specifically, it will explore how the changing workforce is contributing to the increasing overlap between market and domestic tasks, and identify how this overlap is impacting working caregivers and their employers. These impacts identify avenues through which interventions, such as family-friendly policies, may support both working caregivers and their employers.

1.2.1. The Changing Workforce

As the demographics of the labour force change, people are increasingly finding themselves experiencing work-life conflict. Saltzstein, Ting, and Saltzstein (2001) argued that traditionally rigid and demanding workplace requirements do not allow for balance with family demands, and attributed this to a male-dominated work environment, which is complemented by a female-dominated home environment. This dichotomy has eroded as women increasingly enter the workforce, creating a rising number of dual-career couples. According to the 2011 National Household Survey, women make up just under half of the Canadian labour force (Statistics Canada, 2011). These dual-earner families are more likely to struggle to balance conflicting role demands of work and family, because people are becoming less likely to have a partner at home to tend solely to domestic demands.

In addition to the growing number of working women, the workforce is aging. The same survey found that 18.7% of workers are aged 55 years or older, up from 15.5% in the 2006 Census (Statistics Canada, 2011). People are working later in life, meaning they may have different health care and caregiving needs than their younger counterparts. In particular, they may be caring for elderly parents, or even dependent spouses. The changing workforce demographics, delays in retirement, aging population, and increasing family complexities in the modern workforce has made issues pertaining to work-family or work-life balance more important than ever, and this will only become more significant with time. Expectations regarding work-life balance are changing, and employers are being encouraged to implement workplace policies that can satisfy the needs of this changing workforce.
1.2.2. Challenges Facing Employed Caregivers

The changing workplace demographics are contributing to a high number of people providing care to loved ones while still participating in the labour force. Unfortunately, informal caregiving brings with it a host of physical and psychological consequences, called caregiver burden (Bialon & Coke, 2012). This burden is associated with stress and depression (Capistrant, Berkman, & Glymour, 2014; Pinquart & Sörensen, 2003; Marquez, Bustamante, Kozey-Keadle, Kraemer, & Carrion, 2012), reduced self-perceived health (Black, Gauthier, Dalziel, Keren, Correia, Hew, & Binder, 2010), weight changes, sleep issues, and sedentary behaviours (Bialon & Coke, 2012; Vitaliano, Scanlan, Zhang, Savage, Hirsch, & Siegler, 2002), and more. Informal caregivers who are also balancing paid work obligations are faced with role conflict that can increase their stress levels and impact their physical and mental health (Pearlin, Mullan, Semple, & Skaff, 1990).

In addition to research on caregiver burden, there is a growing body of literature that demonstrates that family caregivers make sacrifices in their labour force participation in order to accommodate their caregiving responsibilities. This includes absenteeism (missing full or part days of paid work), reducing work hours, taking short or long-term leaves, and losing one’s job, quitting, or retiring early (Fast & Dosman, 2014). Not only does this lead to a loss of income (Evandrou & Glaser, 2003; Fast & Dosman, 2014; Franklin, et al., 1994), it also leads to some employees losing valuable medical coverage and pension plans (Keefe & Medjuck, 1997; Houser & Gibson, 2008; Evandrou & Glaser, 2003). Further research shows that many caregivers take on additional financial expenses in their caregiving roles (Decima Research, 2002), and experience other economic costs associated with caregiving labour, including lost income and increased health care costs (Keating, Lero, Fast, Lucas, & Eales, 2013). This myriad of financial, health, and time costs faced by caregivers demonstrates an area that needs further attention, and a number of potential outcomes that could potentially be addressed by the employers of working caregivers.
1.2.3. Employer Challenges in Supporting Caregivers

Unfortunately, the burden of informal care hurts not only the caregivers but their employers as well. Canada is facing a future of delayed retirement, skilled labour shortages, and an aging work force. A systematic review identified three types of economic costs incurred by employers of informal caregivers, including: 1) direct costs, 2) indirect costs, and 3) discretionary costs (Fast, Lero, Keating, Eales, & Duncan, 2014).

First, direct costs are more measurable than other costs, and are associated with the presence and performance of employees, such as absenteeism, turnover, and health-related benefit costs. In assessing these costs, Fast and colleagues (2014) found that replacing an employee who left their job to provide care cost Canadian employers at least $3.8 billion in 2007. Among employed caregivers aged 45 and over, 520,000 missed an average of three full workdays per month to provide care (Fast et al., 2014). Missed work hours due to absenteeism, and reduced hours of employment due to caregiving, combine to equal 157,000 full time employees annually, which is a significant loss to employers and the Canadian economy (Fast et al., 2014).

Second, indirect costs reduce productivity, and are less quantifiable but no less costly than direct costs. These include negative impacts on co-workers and supervisors, strained relationships with clients, lost productivity, and a lower return on investment in employees, as reflected by the caregiving employee’s refusal of promotions or job tasks (Fast et al., 2014).

Finally, discretionary costs are workplace “best practices” that aim to minimize direct and indirect costs. Examples of discretionary costs are flexible start/leave times, giving employees the ability to take short leave during the work day, providing employees with control over their break times, and the option to work off-site or at home (Fast et al., 2014). Overall, employees have more access to short-term than long-term leave, and more childcare than eldercare options.

Adopting family-friendly policies is an example of a discretionary cost, but although this reflects an upfront cost, the research in this review identifies positive
impacts on both direct and indirect costs. Employers who seek to hire talented and qualified employees cannot simply avoid hiring caregivers. First, this would be discriminatory. Second, the number of working caregivers is only rising, which would limit the available pool of people from which to hire. Thus, employers will benefit by findings ways to help their employees balance caregiving and employment.

1.3. Types of Family-Friendly Workplace Policies

There are a large variety of family-friendly policies which all serve different purposes in supporting employees who seek work-life or work-family balance. It is important to note that not all of these policies pertain to eldercare, but instead serve the purpose of creating a workplace culture that allows caregiving employees of all types to continue their labour force participation. The majority of policies fall into one of two categories: policies that remove impediments to work through the creation of flexibility, and policies that support caregivers in fulfilling their family and personal needs.

Flexible work scheduling allows employees more control over their own work schedules, with variation in start and stop times, or compressed scheduling to free up one or two days per week for family obligations (Newman & Mathews, 1999). This can also come in the form of telecommuting, or telework, which is an arrangement where an employee performs their official work duties at home or at more geographically convenient worksites (Ko, Hur, & Smith-Walter, 2013). This type of intervention allows employees to better balance the competing demands of work and family by empowering them and increasing their workplace autonomy.

Dependent care programs are workplace policies that help employees care for their parents, spouses, children, or other loved ones. This includes on-site childcare, subsidized childcare or eldercare, resource and referral services, and paid or unpaid family, medical, or personal leave (Ko et al., 2013; Hoyman & Duer, 2004). These programs are designed specifically for those with care obligations, whereas flexible work scheduling can be utilized by a broader range of employees.
1.4. Legislation Supporting Informal Caregivers

In addition to the variety of workplace policies that are adopted to support informal caregivers of older persons, governmental policies have also been implemented. Family-friendly policies may be able to fill a gap and provide caregivers with few government supports much-needed resources, particularly for eldercare. This section will focus on policies pertaining to eldercare, although some of these policies may also be used in other caregiving circumstances. These policies will be briefly covered to provide context for the types of resources that are available to informal caregivers, and to demonstrate how much the level of support may vary depending on geographic, economic, and other variables. First, caregiver legislature in both Canada and the United States will be reviewed. Second, issues of accessibility will be discussed.

1.4.1. Canada: Federal and Provincial Policies

Federal

There are a number of federal policies in Canada that support persons engaged in eldercare. The Compassionate Care Benefit provides employment insurance for up to 26 weeks to Canadians who need to care for a dying family member (Government of Canada, 2016). These 26 weeks can be split with other family members. Additionally, respite care is available through the Veterans Independence Program and the First Nations Adult Care Program, which offer respite and palliative care for veterans and First Nations seniors (Canadian Healthcare Association, 2012).

Canadians can also apply for a variety of tax credits, depending on their circumstances. The caregiver amount tax credit is available if a person is housing a parent or grandparent over the age of 65, and is valued at a maximum of $4,608 for 2015 (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016a). In addition, the family caregiver amount of $2,093 can be claimed when the person is supporting an infirm dependent (Canada Revenue Agency, 2015). If a person did not claim the spousal amount tax credit for supporting a spouse whose income lies below $11,474 (TaxTips, 2016), they may claim an eligible dependant amount of $11,474 for supporting a parent or grandparent by blood, marriage, common-law partnership, or adoption (TaxTips, 2016). Additionally, if
the care receiver is dependent on the caregiver for all or some of the basic necessities of life (food, shelter, or clothing), and the dependent is not claiming any or all of their disability tax credit, this credit of up to $7,899 can be transferred to the caregiver (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016b; Canada Revenue Agency, 2016c). Finally, caregivers who pay for medical expenses of a care receiver can claim 15% of any expenses that exceed 3% of their income, or $2,208, whichever is less (Tax Planning Guide, 2015).

**Provincial**

To complement the federal policies, there is some provincial legislation to support Canadian caregivers. For instance, the Nova Scotia caregiver allowance grants $400 per week to caregivers who provide over 20 hours of care per week to someone with high needs (Government of Nova Scotia, 2016). The Ontario family caregiver leave protects one’s job for up to eight weeks of unpaid leave for employees to care for a family member with a serious medical condition (Torjman, 2015). The British Columba family responsibility law entitles an employee up to five unpaid days off per year to care for an immediate family member (Canadian Centre for Elder Law, 2010a).

In addition, all Canadian provinces and territories offer respite care for caregivers, which gives them a break from their caregiving duties so that they can engage in self-care or spend time with their support network. Respite care ranges from in-home to facility-based programs (Canadian Healthcare Association, 2012). For the respite to be subsidized, the care receiver typically needs to qualify by demonstrating a certain level of financial need, and some provinces practice income testing (Canadian Healthcare Association, 2012). Quebec offers a credit equal to 30% of expenses related to caregiver respite, up to a credit of $1,560 (Revenu Quebec, 2016b).

Finally, with the exception of Quebec, every Canadian province offers a caregiver, eligible dependant, and infirm dependant tax credit that mirror the eligibility requirements of federal deductions (Canada Revenue Agency, 2016d). Manitoba has an additional primary caregiver tax credit, which is available to caregivers whether they live with the dependant or not, valued up to $1,400 a year for up to three dependents (Manitoba Finance, 2016). Quebec offers a tax credit of $925 for caregivers housing a dependent relative for 12 or more consecutive months (Revenu Quebec, 2016a).
In summary, there are a variety of federal and provincial policies in Canada to support informal caregivers of older persons, largely in the form of tax deductions. However, as will be discussed below, there can be issues with accessing said policies.

1.4.2. United States: Federal and State Policies

Federal

The United States offers federal and state support for people with eldercare obligations. Comparable to the Canada’s Compassionate Care Benefit is the Family and Medical Leave Act which was created to protect the jobs of employees who need to take unpaid leave from their work for family and medical reasons for up to 12 workweeks per year (United States Department of Labor, 2015). Respite care is covered by Medicare, but only as part of hospice care for older adults who are terminally ill (Medicare, n.d.). Medicaid, which is only available to low-income persons, covers the use of state-licensed adult day centers (Yamin-Garone, n.d.), and other types of respite support that varies by each state. U.S. veterans can apply for veterans benefits, which can cover adult day services and respite care to help caregivers (Jong, n.d.).

In addition to respite care, there are tax credits that caregivers can claim, such as a dependent care tax credit for up to two dependent family members, valued in 2015 at up to $1,050 per care receiver (IRS, 2015b). Any medical expenses to care for a senior dependent that exceed 7.5% of the caregiver’s income can also be claimed (IRS, 2015a), although following 2016 this will be raised to 10% (Senior Living, 2013).

State

There is federal funding granted to each state, called the national family caregiver support program. These grants are intended to fund supports for informal caregivers, such as information, education, counselling, supplemental services, and respite care (Administration on Aging, 2012).

Unfortunately, there is a wide variance in caregiver support among the various states, some with extensive support policies and others with very few (Keefe, White, & Fancey, 2005). Given the scope of this project, these differences cannot be explored in
detail, but there is a need for a level of standardized support for caregivers living throughout the country. Those living in states with few government caregiver supports may be at greater risk of workplace consequences due to their caregiving roles.

1.4.3. Accessibility of Caregiver Support Legislation

The Canadian Centre for Elder Law (2010b) criticized existing caregiver tax credits in BC and Canada, noting that these tax credits tend to provide greater benefit to higher income earners. Although the majority of caregivers are women, the Caregiver Tax Credit is claimed primarily by men and is completely inaccessible to low income caregivers (Canadian Centre for Elder Law, 2010b). These benefits narrowly define family to only include biological and conjugal relations, and often have a cohabitation requirement, which further restricts the number of people who are eligible to apply (Canadian Centre for Elder Law, 2010b). Furthermore, the strict nature of the Compassionate Care Benefit does not take account of the duration of most care relationships and many non-terminal chronic illnesses, which can last months or years (Fast et al., 2001). Ultimately, it appears that caregiving Canadians are not receiving sufficient support through legislation at both the federal and provincial level.

In a review of economic support for caregivers on an international scale, Keefe, White, and Fancey (2005) note that, similar to Canada, support in the United States is largely limited to tax relief. Restrictive income levels limit who benefits from these programs. However, strength lies in the state-level programs that are funded by the federal government, which may increase caregivers’ access to support. Keefe and colleagues (2005) note that this funding strategy has relevance for Canada, as the Canadian federal government could provide stipulations to the provinces and make them responsible for administering appropriate programs.

This project seeks to explore whether workplace policies can address the needs of these caregivers and fill any gaps in available government support. By cultivating a family-friendly work environment, managers may be able to empower their caregiving employees to better care for their loved ones as well as themselves, while remaining productive members of the labour force.
Chapter 2.

Theoretical Framework

This chapter will present a feminist political economy framework that provides an approach through which to critically examine the existing structures surrounding work, care, and gender. Existing literature adopts a variety of theoretical approaches in assessing the outcomes of family-friendly policies, such as the stress spillover model (Estes, 2005), social exchange theory’s norm of reciprocity (Ko et al., 2013; Lambert, 2000; Lee & Hong, 2011), the efficiency compensation theory (Meyer, Mukerjee, & Sestero, 2001), and more. Other authors developed a conceptual model to explain the relationship between family-friendly policies and positive employee outcomes (Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999; Hughes, Galinsky, & Moms, 1991; Kossek & Nichol, 1992). This project seeks to apply a feminist political economy lens, which has not been explicitly applied to this topic area in the literature, due to its relevance to the research question of this project, and its critical – as opposed to descriptive – natures.

Feminist political economy is a holistic, interdisciplinary framework through which gender is the central axis of analysis. In contrast to other economic theories, feminist political economy focuses more holistically on economics, exploring the lived experiences of men, women, and their families, and investigating the role that economic and political variables play in influencing people’s quality of life (Inter Pares, 2004). It judges the health of an economy based on the extent to which it provides “adequate, sustainable livelihoods for its citizens” (Riley, 2008, p. 2). In the context of this research project, feminist political economy provides an avenue through which to link the public (market) and private (domestic) spheres, and provide understanding of social, political, and economic problems that face caregiving employees (Hanna, 1998). A political economy approach has been used in Gerontological research by feminists such as Meredith-Minkler and Carol Estes (1991), who explore topics relevant to this project, such as caregiving and its long-term effects on older women, or the influence of race,
gender, and socioeconomic status on the experience of aging. This project seeks to further apply this theoretical lens to issues facing caregivers in the modern workforce.

Political economy theories identify the role played by the economy in creating structural inequalities, and characterize nations by the allocation of care responsibilities between state, market, and family (Silverstein & Giarrusso, 2010). This approach examines the relationship between social relations and the economic system of production (Clement & Drache, 1978). This concept posits that an individual’s power over their own health is influenced by the social, organizational, and structural powers around them (Donahue & McGuire, 1995).

Gender inequality is characterized as socially and culturally constructed (Allen & Jaramillo-Sierra, 2015). Gender can be defined as a structure that establishes patterns of expected behaviours, which is rooted in the gendered division of labour in society, with (male) market work hierarchically arranged above (female) domestic work (Mennino, Rubin, & Brayfield, 2005). These public and private spheres of work are ideologically separate and unequal, regardless of the gender of the role occupants. Research shows that engaging in behaviours that are culturally associated with masculinity, such as prioritizing market work over domestic work (Martin, 2003) improves a person’s ability to achieve higher workplace success (Wajcman, 1999). Undertaking care roles, a traditionally feminine task, can hurt someone’s participation in the labour force, which is a traditionally masculine task.

During analysis of current literature, attention will be paid to issues of accessibility, equality, and power. Discussion on gender roles, and the role played by the concepts of femininity and masculinity will contextualize the review of literature on family-friendly policies.
Chapter 3.

Methodology

This project aims to systematically review and critically examine literature on family-friendly workplace policies. The review was guided by a research question and a specific set of search criteria. As detailed in the introduction, the following research question guided this research project: How effectively do family-friendly workplace policies benefit the employees and/or the employer?

The following databases were selected to identify multidisciplinary and diverse literature: Ageline, PsycINFO, EconLit, Business Source Complete, Academic Search Complete, and Social Sciences Full Text. A list of suitable search terms was created to identify relevant articles that answered the research question. All searches used the terms “family-friendly” or “work-family” paired with the terms “policy,” “initiative,” “intervention,” or “workplace.” Additionally, the terms “outcome,” “benefit,” or “impact” were added to identify research that explores the outcomes of said policies, instead of research that simply identifies a need for them.

Exclusion criteria were applied to the review, to maintain an appropriate and achievable scope, and to ensure that only relevant articles were included. Studies included in analysis were restricted to peer-reviewed, English language publications conducted in Canada or the United States of America, published between 1990 and 2016. Non-academic articles such as policy briefs or business reports – which constitutes the majority of articles found in Business Source Complete – were also not included in the review, in order to ensure that the reviewed articles are empirical and academic in nature.

Studies selected for the review were journal articles examining the effects of family-friendly workplace policies on either employees or employers. Research exploring
any type of family-friendly policy was included, with some projects focusing on specific policies and others using the umbrella term of “family-friendly policies” to describe a variety of administrative practices.

The selected terms and criteria yielded varying results within the chosen databases. Ageline, the only database to focus on issues pertaining to seniors and their families, yielded the fewest results, indicating a gap in research on eldercare in the workforce. Business Source Complete and Academic Search Complete produced the largest number of results, but EconLit yielded the highest number of relevant results.

Forty sources were included in the review. Of these sources, six were retrieved from EconLit, four from PsycINFO, four from Social Sciences Full Text, two from Academic Search Complete, two from Business Source Complete, one from Ageline, and 21 were retrieved from existing articles. Only three sources were Canadian. Summaries of the reviewed sources can be found in the Appendix titled Summary Review Table. Once identified, the forty articles were read carefully to ascertain the effects of family-friendly policies, and also analyzed more comprehensively to look for trends in the literature, and relationships or incongruity between multiple articles. The review process utilized to identify these sources is detailed below:
Chapter 4.

Findings

The following chapter will detail the findings from the review. The literature describes a number of outcomes that can be categorized into seven groups, which will be described in the following order so as to answer the research question. Outcomes that affect the employee are (a) employee attitudes, (b) health and well-being, and (c) family outcomes. Outcomes that affect the employer are (d) company performance and productivity, (e) reduced costs, (f) absenteeism, and (g) recruitment and retention. These policies help shape the workplace culture through which upper-level management can support their caregiving employees.

4.1. Effects of Family-Friendly Policies on the Employees

Family-friendly workplace policies are implemented to address the needs of an organization’s employees. This review identified literature that explores whether these policies influence employees' attitudes toward their employer, improve employees’ quality of life, or help employees fulfill their family obligations. Said literature will be outlined below.

4.1.1. Employee Attitudes

Employers often aim to improve attitudes and satisfaction among their employees, either as an end unto itself or as a means of achieving positive individual or organizational performance by increasing loyalty, retention, and productivity (Saltzstein et al., 2001). The following section will detail literature that explores the impact of family-friendly policies on employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee morale, and job self-efficacy. Additionally, some sources explore
the role played by workplace environment in influencing employee attitudes. Workplace environment both influences and is influenced by family-friendly policies, which will be explored further in the following chapter.

Intuitively, job satisfaction can be defined as one’s satisfaction with his or her job, and it tends to be measured in the literature using a Likert-type self-report scale. This variable was one of the more commonly explored outcomes found in the literature, and findings tended to reflect a positive relationship between family-friendly policies and job satisfaction.

The majority of research on job satisfaction supports the implementation of family-friendly workplace policies. Job satisfaction has been found to be enhanced through access to alternative or flexible scheduling (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, & Colton, 2005; Rothausen, 1994; Moen, Kelly, Fan, Lee, Almeida, Kossek, & Buxton, 2016; Ko, Hur, & Smith-Walter, 2013; Saltzstein et al., 2001; Behson, 2005) dependent care programs (Ko et al., 2013; Hammer et al., 2005; Saltzstein et al., 2001), and working from home (Saltzstein et al., 2001). For example, a quantitative study conducted by Rothausen (1994) among a sample of 144 employees in a large retail company found that satisfaction with flexibility of job scheduling was negatively related to turnover for both parents and non-parents. However, this association was significantly stronger among parents. Other research does not specify the policy type, but instead finds a link between job satisfaction, and access to family-friendly workplace policies in general (Durst, 1999).

The research on job satisfaction is not entirely consistent. Although the majority of research has found that family-friendly policies can improve job satisfaction (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Hammer et al., 2005; Rothausen, 1994; Moen et al., 2016; Ko et al., 2013; Durst, 1999), others have found unintentional consequences. For example, Saltzstein, Ting, and Saltzstein (2001) found that job satisfaction was negatively associated with access to flexible scheduling. Anderson, Birkeland, and Giddings (2009) found that 25% of their respondents viewed family-life challenges as outside the responsibility of the employer, instead identifying this responsibility as landing solely on the individual employees. This view negatively impacted employees’ job satisfaction and attitude toward their employer (Anderson, Birkeland, & Giddings, 2009). Thus, these
policies may unintentionally hurt one subgroup of employees while benefitting another, and it is important for the employer to work to provide policies that cater to the needs of all their employees. However, there appears to be agreement within the literature, showing that the effects of family-friendly workplace policies on job satisfaction tend to be positive.

Many researchers also look to the role played by workplace environment in facilitating high levels of job satisfaction. A supportive supervisor, who is understanding of the varying needs of the staff that they oversee, has been found to improve scores of job satisfaction (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Moen et al., 2016). Saltzstein, Ting, and Saltzstein (2001) found that supportive management and organizational understanding had a stronger impact on job satisfaction than family-friendly policies did, a finding that is also seen in Behson’s (2005) research. Finally, among employees who feel that family-life challenges are outside the responsibility of the employer, supervisor and coworker support was found to moderate the negative effects on employee attitude, but not job satisfaction (Anderson, Birkeland, & Giddings, 2009).

In addition to job satisfaction, organizational commitment is an employee attitude that is repeatedly explored in the literature. Mulvaney (2011) defines organizational commitment as “a work-place attitude that describes the psychological attachment between the individual employee and their employing organization” (p. 62). It emphasizes human interaction and behaviour, and it accounts for the motivational aspects of job performance (Bandura, 1991). It is a variable that should be of particular interest to employers due to its association with lower turnover (Jaros, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

The literature shows a positive association between family-friendly workplace policies and organizational commitment. Availability of flexible scheduling is shown to be associated with organizational commitment (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Halpern, 2005; Mulvaney, 2011), and this association was found to be strengthened among employees who were eligible to benefit from such policies (Grover & Crooker, 1995). Dependent care programs were also shown to be significantly correlated with organizational commitment (Mulvaney, 2011). Among a sample of 276 alumni of 3 graduate business programs, Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999) found that the greater number of
family-friendly policies available to an employee, and the more supportive the work
culture, the more likely they were to report high levels of organizational commitment.
However, two studies included in the review found no significant association between
organizational commitment and formal or informal work-family policies (Eaton, 2003;
Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999). Eaton (2003) did find that organizational commitment was
significantly associated with usability of such policies. Thus, although the avenues
through which family-friendly policies impact organizational commitment may not be
entirely clear, it is evident that a relationship exists, and the findings from existing
research support the implementation of family-friendly policies to positively influence this
employee attitude.

In addition to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, other measures of
employee attitudes have been linked to family-friendly workplace policies in the
literature. Durst (1999) found that family-friendly policies were reported to improve
employee morale, and Mulvaney (2011) found that professionals who had access to
dependent care supports were more likely to report high levels of job self-efficacy,
whereas job self-efficacy was not influenced by flexible work arrangements.

In sum, the relationship between family-friendly policies and employee attitudes
is complicated and not yet fully understood. Although a number of studies demonstrate
positive outcomes, some others yield no associations, or even negative associations,
with employee job satisfaction (Saltzstein et al., 2001; Anderson et al., 2009),
organizational commitment (Eaton, 2003), or job self-efficacy (Mulvaney, 2011).
However, the findings trend towards positive outcomes, and more research is needed in
order to further explore these relationships.

4.1.2. Health and Well-Being

As previously described, the caregiver burden brings with it a host of physical
and psychological health consequences. If family-friendly policies can reduce strain and
burden imposed on working caregivers, it stands to reason that they may see a decline
in its associated negative health consequences. Family-friendly policies can minimize
role conflict that occurs when an employee has both family and employment obligations,
and research shows that work-family conflict is associated with poorer health
Additionally, family friendly policies may improve health by increasing the employee’s control over their work, with greater levels of control also linked to better health outcomes (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). This section will explore literature that identifies health-related outcomes as a result of family-friendly policies. The majority of this research explores variables that pertain to stress and strain, but a number of studies also explore outcomes such as diet, exercise, depression, and more.

Prolonged exposure to stress can cause negative health consequences for workers, including a higher susceptibility to a wide variety of illnesses and worsened mental health (Halpern, 2005). Stress causes the release of hormones that continue to affect a person long after the stressor has been removed, thus, interventions that seek to prevent the occurrence of stress will best address stress-related health issues (Halpern, 2005). In addition to employee health consequences, it has been found that 40% of Canadian workplaces had employees who took stress leave related to caregiving duties (Fast et al., 2014), so this is an outcome that impacts both the employee and their workplace. In the literature, stress is typically measured in a self-report scale that aims to measure how often a person feels anxious, tense, or depressed (Butler, Grzywacz, Ettner, & Liu, 2009).

Research on the effects of family-friendly workplace policies on stress shows mixed results. A number of studies link workplace flexibility with lower stress and strain (Butler, et al., 2009; Halpern, 2005; Pedersen, 2015; Tombari & Spinks, 1999). For example, a randomized field trial conducted by Moen and colleagues (2016) found that a family-friendly intervention that increased schedule control and supervisor support caused a significant reduction in emotional exhaustion, psychological distress, and perceived stress. Some studies saw a stronger association between family-friendly policies and stress among women than men (Pedersen, 2015; Moen et al., 2016).

Conversely, Pavalko and Henderson’s (2006) analysis of longitudinal data on a sample of 2,021 women showed that access to family-friendly policies improved labour force participation among caregiving employees, but had no impact on their psychological distress. With the exception of unpaid family leave, they found that family-friendly policies provided no additional protection against distress to caregivers (Pavalko
Galinsky and colleagues (1996) found that parents with dependent children under the age of 18 demonstrated poorer quality of life outcomes, such as higher stress, higher work-family conflict, and poorer overall coping skills. However, these outcomes were only slightly improved among parents with access to family-friendly policies. Behson (2005) found that stress was only predicted by informal supports, and was not influenced by family-friendly policies, among a sample of employed caregivers.

Research has also considered variables that extend beyond stress and strain. Flexible scheduling has been linked in the literature to positive outcomes regarding exercise, diet, and energy levels (Pedersen, 2015), self-reported health (Butler et al., 2009), and cholesterol levels, depression, and somatic complaints (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). No association was found between flexible scheduling and health care utilization (Butler et al., 2009). It is difficult to appropriately compare and summarize findings when a large number of health-related outcomes are explored.

Overall, the outcomes of family-friendly work policies seem to have an unclear impact on employee stress, and there are not enough studies measuring other health outcomes to note any significant trends.

4.1.3. Family Outcomes

Family-friendly workplace policies are often designed to address role conflict that occurs when an employee has both family and employment obligations. It therefore comes as no surprise that family-friendly policies can shape and influence family-related outcomes. The following section details literature that explores family outcomes as consequences of such policies, such as work-family conflict, parental abilities, and family satisfaction.

Conceptualized as the psychological intersection between work and family roles, work-family conflict is a construct of interest in the work-family field (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1996). It is defined by Voydanoff (1988) as an interrole conflict, in which the demands of one role interfere with the fulfillment of the demands of another. Employers might be interested to know that work-family conflict is significantly related to turnover.
intentions (Batt & Valcour, 2003), which may motivate them to seek avenues through which to minimize said conflict. There is significant research that explores variables associated with role conflict as an outcome of family-friendly policies.

Work-family conflict, or balancing work and family obligations, is something that is repeatedly measured in the literature. Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, and Beutell (1996) found that business owners with more flexible schedules and high workplace autonomy reported less work-family conflict. They noted that women are increasingly starting their own businesses, seeking greater freedom and flexibility in order to balance an active career with family roles. Other research found that access to flexible work arrangements improved employees’ effectiveness in managing their work and family responsibilities (Tombari & Spinks, 1999), and higher availability of family-friendly policies predicted lower work-family conflict (Thompson et al., 1999).

However, a number of studies found no association between work-family conflict and family-friendly workplace policies (Batt & Valcour, 2003; Hughes et al., 1991; Mennino et al., 2005; Behson, 2005). Contrary to the other findings, Hammer, Neal, Newsom, Brockwood, and Colton (2005) found that using family-friendly policies actually predicted work-family conflict among working women, and had no impact on work-family conflict among working men. Wallace and Young (2008) note that women use their lighter workload or flexible schedules to take on more childcare and domestic tasks, which could explain their higher levels of strain in the context of Hammer et al.’s (2005) findings.

Some research considers the impact of workplace culture on work-family conflict, noting that a supportive work-family culture is associated with less work-family conflict (Mennino et al., 2005; Thompson et al., 1999; Behson, 2005; Saltzstein et al., 2001). It is possible that a supportive workplace culture is a necessary part of the equation when it comes to implementing and benefitting from family-friendly workplace policies. This may explain the discrepancies in the literature.

Finally, a number of other family-related variables are explored in the literature. For example, Estes (2005) conducted a mixed-methods study on working mother’s parental involvement. Qualitative interviews revealed that mothers almost uniformly
reported that using family-friendly policies enhanced their parental abilities. Quantitative analysis of parental behaviours showed that behaviours such as sharing meals or sharing more mother/child activities were predicted by utilizing different family-friendly policies (Estes, 2005). Satisfaction with work-life balance has been positively associated with part-time employment (Saltzstein et al., 2001) and flexible scheduling among women only (Duncan & Pettigrew, 2012), and negatively associated with working at home (Saltzstein et al., 2001). Finally, flexible schedules were found to predict higher levels of family satisfaction (Parasuraman et al., 1996) but have no significant influence on marital quality (Hughes et al., 1991).

The literature on family-related outcomes seems to be divided, and the avenues through which family-friendly policies impact employees in the domestic realm are unclear. More focus is needed on the role played by workplace culture in fostering an environment that encourages employees to take advantage of available benefits.

4.2. Effects of Family-Friendly Policies on the Organization

Family-friendly workplace policies can also facilitate positive outcomes at the organizational level (Lee & Hong, 2011). The literature shows that these policies may yield improvements in outcomes related to productivity or profit, facilitate long-term economic benefits, and improve other organizational variables such as retention or turnover. Research that explores these outcomes is detailed in the following sections.

4.2.1. Company Performance and Productivity

The motivations behind implementing family-friendly policies are not explored in the reviewed literature. However, in the corporate world there is a need to satisfy investors and outperform the competition. Therefore, it stands to reason that an improvement in performance would be a significant motivator for the implementation of family-friendly policies, in addition to the positive employee-related outcomes explored in the previous section. The findings of research that explores the impact of family-friendly policies on company performance indicators will be summarized in the following section.
A number of studies identify positive relationships between family-friendly policies and company performance. Some literature has found that performance indicators are positively associated with satisfaction with family-friendly policies (Ko et al., 2013; Tombari & Spinks, 1999; Eaton, 2003). For example, Perry-Smith and Blum (2000) found that firms with more family-friendly policies had higher levels of perceived organizational performance, perceived market performance, and profit-sales growth, relative to their competitors. Within their sample of 527 firms, those that were older and that employed a greater proportion of women showed a stronger relationship between family-friendly policies and profit-sales growth than newer or more male-dominated firms (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). Konrad and Mangel (2000) also found that firms with a higher proportion of skilled professionals, and a higher proportion of women, saw a stronger relationship between work-life programs and productivity. Shepard, Clifton, and Kruse (1996) explored the influence of flexible work on productivity in 36 pharmaceutical companies, finding that companies that adopted flex-time showed an increase in productivity of approximately 10 percent, and Lambert (2000) found that employees who perceived their work-life benefits to be useful were more likely to demonstrate positive citizenship behaviours, which are things people do that are beneficial to the organization but that the individuals are not mandated to do, such as providing interpersonal help to their colleagues.

Other research has yielded mixed results. Lee and Hong (2011) found that childcare subsidies and alternative work schedules were found to be significantly positively associated with agency performance, whereas telecommuting significantly reduced performance (Lee & Hong, 2011). They posit that telecommuting may yield unintentional consequences such as employee isolation, troubles with self-discipline, and poor access to an adequate workspace. On the other hand, Noonan and Glass (2012) found that telecommuting was associated with more work hours per week, with many telecommuting hours occurring as overtime work, indicating an increase in productivity. They found that access to telecommuting blurred the line between home and work, making employees accessible for longer hours each day. Meyer, Mukerjee, and Sestero (2001) found that job sharing and subsidized onsite child care actually reduced productivity and profit, which contradicts the findings from Lee and Hong (2011). However, working from home, paid sick leave for care of family members, and
access to adoption assistance increased profits, and they found that the very presence of these programs indirectly increased productivity through improving their labour market reputation and therefore attracting better employees (Meyer et al., 2001). Finally, a sample of 670 Canadian lawyers showed that family-friendly work environments actually reduced productivity of fathers, and did not have any impact on the productivity of mothers. (Wallace & Young, 2008). Further analysis found that women with a lighter workload, supportive culture, and flexible schedule tended to devote more time to childcare, whereas men tended to use this time to pursue leisure activities. The gendered societal expectations that may influence these behaviours are explored in the conceptual integration section of the following chapter.

It is evident that the relationship between family-friendly workplace policies and company performance or productivity is not a linear one. This relationship may depend on the type of organization or the demographics of the employees. When implementing work-family interventions, an employer needs to consider potential consequences. For example, an employer may be happy to learn that telecommuting increases an employee’s hours worked per week. However, this may negatively impact other elements of their life, such as time dedicated to exercise, hobbies, or their family.

4.2.2. Reduced Costs

Although the implementation of family-friendly policies typically represents an upfront cost to the organization, this investment may pay off through reduced costs in other areas. A number of studies explored cost savings as a result of family-friendly policies, through a variety of different avenues. For example, Giddings, Anderson, and Birkeland (2013) weighed the implicit and explicit costs of offering paid leave against the cost of hiring a new employee, in the context of a law firm. They found that it was more profitable to the firm to offer paid leave for employees who have clearly defined schedules and duties, and for employees who are at a lower level of the occupational hierarchy. This is likely because these employees work fewer hours due to their defined schedules, and they generate less business. In the case of an employee who is high in the occupational hierarchy, it is worth it for the firm to invest in hiring a replacement due to the significant amount of business they will generate. Family-friendly policies were
also found to reduce an employer's costs by improving employee productivity (Halpern, 2005) and actually allowing the employer to offer lower entry-level salaries incoming employees (Baughman, DiNardi, & Holtz-Eakin, 2003).

Finally, Arthur and Cook (2004) analyzed shareholder return among organizations that announce work-family initiatives. They found that shareholder return increased among organizations who announce work-family initiatives, and that this return was larger among organizations that announced these policies before their competitors, and that the first announcement increased the stock price more than additional initiatives by the same firm.

The literature shows positive financial outcomes from offering family-friendly workplace policies. However, very few studies focused on this outcome, and only one study measured the costs of implementing family-friendly policies in relation to any cost reduction (Giddings et al., 2013). Without comparing them, it is impossible to conclusively state whether an employer's savings will outweigh their costs when implementing family-friendly policies. However, these findings support the notion that organizations can experience monetary benefits from said policies, as opposed to simply viewing them as a major investment.

### 4.2.3. Absenteeism

Informal caregiving can create demands on one’s time that are incompatible with one’s employment obligations. CCH Incorporated (2007) conducted a study on workplace absenteeism in the USA and found that 22% of employees using sick time are in fact using their sick days to attend to family issues, and 13% are absent due to stress. In Canada, it was estimated that absenteeism and reduced work hours due to caregiving obligations led to 1.48 million collectively missed workdays per month, which is a significant loss of productivity (Fast et al., 2014). Employers may implement family-friendly workplace policies in an attempt to minimize this schedule incompatibility and role strain by supporting their employees in managing their work and family obligations, reducing absenteeism in the process. However, the literature in this review does not show this outcome.
Behson’s (2005) analysis of data from the National Study of the Changing Workforce found that neither a family-friendly workplace culture nor family-friendly workplace policies significantly predicted absenteeism among a sample of employees who were part of a dual-earning couple, with both a dependent child and eldercare obligations (n=2,248). Research on a variety of formal and informal work-family policies also showed no significant relationship with absenteeism (Baughman, DiNardi, & Holtz-Eakin, 2003; Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Behson, 2005). However, a retrospective analysis of work-family initiatives in a major Canadian bank saw a reduction in absenteeism (Tombari & Spinks, 1999).

Although one study found a decrease in absenteeism, the majority of literature has found no significant relationship between absenteeism and family-friendly workplace policies. One significant difference is the country of study, with the Canadian study yielding positive outcomes (Tombari & Spinks, 1999). More research is needed to compare outcomes between Canada and the USA, and to better understand predictors of performance indicators. Interesting is the fact that other performance variables remain positive – the relationship between absenteeism and organizational or employee performance should also be further explored.

4.2.4. Recruitment and Retention

Research that explores outcomes pertaining to recruitment and retention will be summarized in the following section. These outcomes include turnover intention, actual employee turnover, a firm’s ability to recruit effectively, and an employee’s likelihood to refer their employer to a friend. These variables are significant, because a successful firm needs to recruit and retain qualified, talented professionals. However, the social stigma surrounding a change of employers has all but disappeared, increasing employees’ willingness to abandon their job when it is economically beneficial, and permanently changing the concept of employee loyalty (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000). Losing experienced and productive employees, and hiring replacements, is costly for organizations in every sector (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000). Thus, it is in an organization’s best interest to foster an environment that both attracts the best candidates, and minimizes their likelihood of leaving.
Turnover intention, which is intuitively defined as an intention to leave one’s employment, is repeatedly explored in the literature. It has been found to be negatively associated with telecommuting (Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999), parental leave and child care information (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Baughman, DiNardi, & Holtz-Eakin, 2003), child care subsidies (Lee & Hong, 2011), on-site child care (Kossek & Nichol, 1992), and flexible policies (Batt & Valcour, 2003; Rothausen, 1994; Baughman et al., 2003). Some studies lumped family-friendly policies together, finding that access to family-friendly policies in general was significantly associated with lower turnover intentions (Kim, 2012; Kim & Wiggins, 2011; Behson, 2005; Tombari & Spinks, 1999; Thompson et al., 1999; Galinsky et al., 1996; Pavalko & Henderson, 2006). Some noted differences depending on employee demographics. For example, Rothausen (1994) found that flexibility of job scheduling is negatively related to turnover for parent workers, significantly more so than nonparent workers. Other studies showed stronger associations between family-friendly policies and turnover intentions among women (Galinsky et al., 1996; Kim & Wiggins, 2011; Kim, 2012), as well as managerial employees or those with higher salaries (Kim & Wiggins, 2011). Alternately, Batt and Valcour (2003) found that flexible policies were associated with lower turnover intentions for men only, whereas supervisor support was associated with lower turnover intentions for women only.

Finally, a few studies found a lack of evidence for support of family-friendly policies and turnover intention. Lee and Hong (2011) found that family care leave, telework, and alternative schedules had no significant effect on turnover intention, and Pavalko and Henderson (2006) found that, with the exception of unpaid family leave, access to family-friendly policies did not provide any protection against leaving the labour force among female caregivers.

A small number of studies looked at a firm’s ability to recruit talented employees as a result of family-friendly policies. For example, Durst (1999) found that agencies that offered more family-friendly policies were also more likely to report a greater ability to recruit effectively. Access to on-site childcare was cited as a reason for referring one’s employer to a friend among a sample of hospital employees with children (Kosseks & Nichol, 1992), and 59% of working parents reported that the presence of family-friendly policies was one of the reasons they chose their present job, in a study conducted by
Galinsky and colleagues (1996). Although the number of studies measuring this outcome is small, there appears to be a positive association.

Family-friendly policies appear to yield positive outcomes regarding both turnover intention and the recruitment of quality employees. As this is an outcome that can cause significant cost savings for a firm, and improve other variables of productivity, this lends strong support for the implementation of such policies. Additionally, other positive outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, can predict lower turnover among organizations with family-friendly policies (Rothausen, 1994).

4.3. Conclusion

Overall, there are some inconsistencies in the literature, but a number of themes and trends are apparent regarding family-friendly policies’ impact on both the employee and the organization. These findings provide support for the implementation of these policies, and detail a variety of avenues through which they benefit both the employee and the organization. The literature points to beneficial outcomes between family-friendly policies and job satisfaction (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Hammer et al., 2005; Rothausen, 1994; Moen et al., 2016; Ko, et al., 2013; Saltzstein, et al., 2001; Behson, 2005), as well as positive associations with organizational commitment (Grover & Crooker, 1995; Halpern, 2005; Mulvaney, 2011; Thompson et al., 1999). The literature also indicates that offering family-friendly policies may reduce an employer’s costs (Giddings et al., 2013; Halpern, 2005; Baughman et al., 2003; Arthur & Cook, 2004), be protective against employee turnover (Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Baughman et al., 2003; Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Lee & Hong, 2011; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Rothausen, 1994), and improve an organization’s ability to recruit talented staff (Galinsky et al., 1996; Durst, 1999; Kossek & Nichol, 1992). Finally, there appears to be no significant relationship between family-friendly policies and absenteeism (Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Baughman et al., 2003; Behson, 2005).

In particular, flexible scheduling and dependent care supports are largely studied, and appear to be associated with more positive outcomes. Benefits from flexible scheduling this could be associated with an increase in employee autonomy or control,
which is also associated with positive outcomes (Parasuraman et al., 1996; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Kossek et al., 2006; Eaton, 2003).

Other outcomes appear favourably in the literature, such as employee morale (Durst, 1999), job self-efficacy (Mulvaney, 2011), self-reported health (Butler et al., 2009), and parental involvement (Estes, 2005), but are represented in too few studies to support discussion on literature trends. Further research is needed on these variables to either support or refute existing findings.

Finally, a number of other variables yield inconsistent results. For example, there appears to be an unclear relationship between family-friendly policies and stress (Butler et al., 2009; Halpern, 2005; Pedersen, 2015; Pavalko & Henderson; Behson, 2005) as well as work-family conflict (Parasuraman et al., 1996; Tombari & Spinks, 1999; Batt & Valcour, 2003). Additionally, the findings regarding productivity are obscured behind a large variety of measured outcomes and interventions. Some studies measure multiple family-friendly policies together (Perry-Smith & Blum, Konrad & Mangel, 2000), and a variety of measures of productivity are seen, such as perceived organizational and market performance (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; Ko et al., 2013), positive citizenship behaviours (Lambert, 2000), agency performance (Lee & Hong, 2011), or billable hours (Wallace & Young, 2008). In regard to productivity, findings concerning telecommuting are particularly mixed.

Extending beyond a focus solely on family-friendly policies, a number of studies demonstrate the role of a supportive workplace environment or supportive supervisor in facilitating positive outcomes associated with family-friendly policies, in regard to job satisfaction (Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Moen et al., 2016; Saltzstein et al., 2001), organizational commitment (Thomas & Ganster, 1995) work-family conflict (Mennino et al., 2005; Thompson et al., 1999; Behson, 2005; Saltzstein et al., 2001), and productivity (Wallace & Young, 2008), with some demonstrating that these variables are even more important than formal work-family policies.
Chapter 5.

Critical Assessment of the Literature

5.1. Conceptual Integration

Family caregiving disproportionately affects women – it is estimated that 54% of informal caregivers are women, and they have been found to spend more hours per week on caregiving activities than their male counterparts (Sinha, 2013; Fast et al., 2011). Women are also much more likely to incur employment consequences because of their caregiving responsibilities (Fast et al., 2011), a finding that is reflected throughout the literature on employed caregivers (Enright, 1991; Austen & Ong, 2010; Metlife Mature Market Institute, 2006; Keefe & Medjuck, 1997; Fast et al., 2001; Franklin et al., 1994). Using longitudinal data from 2006 to 2010, Lee, Tang, Kim, and Albert (2015) explored the relationship between labour force participation and caregiving obligations. They found male caregivers' (n=1,441) labour force participation reduced the likelihood of assuming caregiving roles, and caregiving obligations did not negatively impact their labour force participation. In contrast, the female caregivers (n=3,543) experienced a significant decline in labour force participation, and were more likely to take on additional caregiving duties, regardless of employment status. These implications highlight the need for policies that support all employees in fulfillment of both their caregiving and employment roles, and demonstrate that this is undoubtedly a gendered issue.

Feminist political economy seeks to dissect social and cultural power imbalances. Of the 40 reviewed articles, 26 adopted a conceptual framework, or rooted hypotheses within a theory, but no articles explicitly utilized a feminist political economy lens. However, other research that did not meet the inclusion criteria of this review has viewed caregiving issues through a critical feminist lens. This includes studies that
utilized a gender lens to compare employment and economic consequences of informal caregiving (Fast & Dosman, 2014; Fast et al., 2011; Keating et al., 2013), a feminist critique of the USA’s Family and Medical Leave Act (Prohaska & Zipp, 2011), and more (Shafi, 2014; McGraw & Walker, 2004; Bonnar, 2006). However, a feminist political economy lens has not been applied to a review of US or Canadian research on family-friendly workplace policies in supporting working caregivers. This review seeks to address this gap by providing critical discussion on the research findings through the perspective of feminist political economy. The role played by socially constructed gender roles, and how they are reflected in the literature, will be discussed. Implications of the research findings will be conceptualized while looking at how both individual and economic outcomes are influenced by gender, industry, and economy.

**Gender Roles**

The consequences of traditional gender roles emerged in a number of the studies in the review. Our gendered society prioritizes (masculine) market work, over (feminine) domestic work, regardless of the gender of the person engaging in said work. However, due to social learning and gendered social structures, men tend to prioritize the market domain, and women the domestic.

Mennino and colleagues (2005) found that both male and female employees experienced greater job-to-home spillover than home-to-job spillover, meaning their work was interfering with their family. Regardless of the gender of the employee, market work tended to take primacy over domestic work by rewarding commitment to one’s job. Both male and female employees were adjusting their family needs around their formal employment, which is a symptom of the social structure of gender. Among a sample of lawyers, having children reduced the working hours among mothers, but increased the working hours among fathers (Wallace & Young, 2008). This further plays into traditional gender roles of a nurturing mother, and a breadwinner father. In this study, women without children were found to work the most hours out of every group, demonstrating the higher standards that working women must fulfill to be successful in their careers. Additionally, family-friendly workplace cultures were found to have no impact on women’s productivity, because they used their lighter workload, supportive workplace culture, and flexible schedule to devote more time to childcare, whereas men's
productivity declined because they used this time to pursue leisure activities (Wallace & Young, 2008). Hammer and colleagues (2005) had similar findings; use of family-friendly policies actually predicted work-family conflict among women, and they speculated that the availability of family-friendly policies encourage working women to take on even more family care responsibilities, and therefore experience higher stress levels. However, Pedersen (2015) found that job flexibility improved preventive and subjective health outcomes such as a healthy diet, feeling overwhelmed, or feeling healthy and energetic, among working mothers but not fathers.

Accompanying discussion on the implications of gender roles is the research that explored gender differences between employees. Although some projects found no gender differences in satisfaction with or utilization of family-friendly policies (Ko et al., 2013; Grover & Crooker, 1995; Halpern, 2005; Eaton, 2003), others noted that male and female employees respond differently to family-friendly policies. Kim (2012) found that family-friendly policies were the most significant factor affecting female IT employees’ turnover intentions, whereas male IT employees’ turnover intentions were more significantly associated with opportunities for advancement and promotion. This supports the notion that women, even those who are working, have more care responsibilities in most families. Kim and Wiggins (2011) found that female workers were more satisfied with work-life programs and alternative work schedules than men, but less satisfied with child care, which could indicate that the offered child care was not meeting their needs. It was found that access to family-friendly policies reduced psychological distress for women more than men (Eaton, 2003), but they scored similarly on other outcomes of well-being.

The feminist movement campaigns for social change, supporting greater equity in the gendered division of unpaid care by recruiting men to assist with caregiving tasks and seeking recognition of the value of caring for others (Abel & Nelson, 1990). Thus, understanding the interpersonal dynamics that occur within a family when deciding how to manage care obligations and negotiate the sharing of domestic tasks will give greater insight into how caregiving impacts both male and female employees. Fostering a supportive work environment that recognizes the importance of family and supports the choices that women make in the domestic sphere has demonstrated benefits in the literature in both individual- and organization-level outcomes.
The current health care systems in both Canada and the USA depend on family members to shoulder a large burden of the day-to-day needs of the senior population, and yet most health care delivery models neglect to engage, educate, and support family caregivers (Gillick, 2013; Wolff & Roter, 2008). These informal caregivers, largely women, are not given resources to adequately manage their care obligations, and are not being empowered to advocate for their own needs. Providing resources to informal caregivers, particularly those engaged in eldercare, could not only support them but could also reduce government health care costs by minimizing rates of hospitalization or institutionalization (Singer, Biegel, & Ethridge, 2010). A feminist political economy lens leaves room to acknowledge that, although cost reduction is undoubtedly a federal priority, there should also be a goal of providing high quality support to seniors, children, disabled persons, and their families. There is a call to recognize the basic civil rights of frail and disabled people, who are too often segregated and institutionalized (Singer et al., 2010). Both workplace and federal policies should be expanded to include eldercare if they do not already, such as the Family Medical Leave Act in the USA, which does not permit leave to care for one’s grandparents.

In addition to addressing the importance of protecting the rights of both caregivers and care receivers, feminist political economy would frame quality of life as a valid and valuable measurement of an intervention’s success. With the literature showing a link between family-friendly policies and employee well-being, such as morale (Durst, 1999), stress or health (Butler et al., 2009; Halpern, 2005; Pedersen, 2015), these outcomes are argued to be valuable independently from their impact on performance-related indicators. Research that focuses on the costs of caregiving to the organization, while ignoring the impact on the caregiving employees, is argued to discount the lived experiences of women and instead value them based on their levels of productivity (Medjuck, Keefe, & Fancey, 1998). Informal caregiving is a burden that disproportionally exploits women and does not recognize the value of their labour (Medjuck, O’Brien, & Tozer, 1992). Instead, an employer should aim to treat their employees like human beings, and foster an environment in which people can thrive and achieve a fulfilling life, both within and outside of their professional domain.
However, it is still important to acknowledge the economic drivers that influence motivation, at both the individual and organizational level. In a capitalistic society, where focus is on the bottom line, both people and their employers make decisions that they hope will bring them economic profit. This review contributes to the discussion by including variables that benefit the employer, such as profit, productivity, or turnover. It also sees trends of sacrifice in the domestic realm, where individuals make choices to preserve their status in the labour force, at the sacrifice of time spent with their family (Mennino et al., 2005). From a feminist political economy framework, it is necessary to consider these economic motivators.

**The Role of the Industry or Organization**

One factor to consider in assessing employees' decisions to utilize family-friendly policies, and outcomes associated with said policies, is the nature of work in the organization, as well as the employee's occupation. For example, nurses working in a large hospital with twenty-four hour staffing may find it easier to trade shifts with one another to accommodate dependent care responsibilities, whereas nurses working in smaller, private organizations may not have the same luxuries (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Kim and Wiggins (2011) found that people with higher positions and higher salaries were more satisfied with family-friendly workplace policies, possibly because they simply had better access to them. This identifies an accessibility issue, because the people who are earning less and who are less skilled likely need the support more, but cannot access it. Additionally, a study conducted by Glauber and Young (2015) found that working women who lived in rural areas reported significantly less access to family-friendly benefits. Through a feminist political economy lens, these issues with accessibility are linked to societal power and class structures; those with lower economical or political power, such as those with lower positions within their organization, or those who cannot afford to live in the city, are being excluded from valuable interventions.

Within the reviewed literature, larger organizations were found to be more likely to have a high number of family-friendly policies (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Arthur & Cook, 2004), possibly because such organizations are more well-established and because economies of scale can produce a bigger return on their investment when
implementing family-friendly initiatives. Firms that employed more women (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Durst, 1999) and more skilled professionals (Konrad & Mangel, 2000) were more likely to have family-friendly policies, and they often experienced greater benefits from these policies than less skilled or more male dominated firms (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). These firms may have been facing more pressure from their workforce to adopt family-friendly initiatives.

5.2. Limitations

There are a number of concerns in the literature that may explain why the review yielded inconsistent results. The main issues are methodological in nature. The majority of reviewed studies were cross-sectional (see Batt & Valcour, 2003; Behson, 2005; Duncan & Pettigrew, 2012; Eaton, 2003; Ko et al., 2013; Saltzstein et al., 2001), which impedes the ability to infer causality, and makes them susceptible to common method bias. Additionally, many studies use subjective, self-reported measures (Butler et al., 2009; Durst, 1999; Kim, 2012; Pedersen, 2015; Thomas & Ganster, 1995), which creates potential for a response bias, such as overestimating one’s levels of health or productivity.

In addition to the methodological limitations found in a number of the individual studies, it is difficult to appropriately compare findings across studies due to a wide range in sample types. Some studies only sample parents (Kossek & Nichol, 1992; Pedersen, 2015), mothers (Estes, 2005), working caregivers (Hammer et al., 2005), or employees within a specific industry or organization (Moen et al., 2016; Lambert, 2000; Kim, 2012; Kim & Wiggins, 2011; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Wallace & Young, 2008), whereas others use diverse, national random samples of working adults (Galinsky et al., 1996; Halpern, 2005; Anderson et al., 2009), non-institutionalized persons (Noonan & Glass, 2012), and women (Pavalko & Henderson, 2006). In contrast to individual-level data, some studies sample the organizations themselves (Meyer et al., 2001 Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; Shepard et al., 1996). Due to the large variation in samples, it is difficult to make any definitive statements on the efficacy of family-friendly policies.
The limitations present within the literature demonstrate a lack of studies that utilize a longitudinal or a pre- and post-test intervention method to assess a causal link between family-friendly policies and their outcomes, and a need for the use of more measurable, objective outcomes.

In addition to limitations within the literature, this project has its own limitations. This review of the literature did not reach saturation, which extends beyond its scope. The findings reported previously are not assumed to represent all of the literature on the topic, and it is possible that studies exist which may either support or refute the conclusions presented in this project. This review was also limited to literature published in the English language. There may be non-English reports available that may give greater insight into employees of various cultural groups, or those working in Quebec, Canada. Finally, this review focused on the USA and Canada. There was a significant lack of available literature in Canada, and future research is needed to make recommendations that are relevant to this country. Furthermore, because some European countries have more comprehensive supports for informal caregivers, it could be beneficial to examine their adoption of family-friendly policies to explore potential benefits for North American organizations.

5.3. Recommendations

One goal of this project is to practice knowledge translation, which is the process through which information moves from research into practice (Oborn, Barrett, & Racko, 2013). The findings from academic research can contribute to discussion guides real-world improvements or changes. The following sections cover recommendations for appropriately adopting family-friendly policies, as well as guidance from exploring global interventions.

5.3.1. Barriers to Adopting and Utilizing Family-Friendly Policies

As evidenced by this review, there is significant research that has examined the positive impacts of family-friendly policies on caregiving employees as well as their employer. However, past research has shown that the availability of flexible scheduling
does not necessarily mean that employees are utilizing these benefits (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002; Mennino et al., 2005). Both male and female employees in industries with higher percentages of women are more likely to use flexible scheduling, and are less likely to view using this benefit as harmful to career trajectories (Minnotte, Cook, & Minnotte, 2010). This trend may continue, as women self-select into sectors that are more family friendly (Nielsen, Simonsen, & Verner, 2004).

It has been argued that this unclear relationship can be partially attributed to an unsupportive work culture, and fears held by employees that taking advantage of family-friendly policies may lead to negative career consequences (Ko et al., 2013). A supervisor who holds more traditional gender views, or who is wary of granting employees greater control over their own schedules and environments can be a significant barrier to the expansion of family-friendly policies (Kogan, 1996). A supportive workplace environment, shaped by managerial influence and organizational culture, is a key facilitator for utilizing family-friendly policies (Ko et al., 2013; Batt & Valcour, 2003; Mennino et al., 2005;). These findings suggest that simply offering family-friendly policies is not sufficient and will not guarantee positive outcomes for the organization or its members.

Barriers also exist regarding an organization’s decision to implement family-friendly policies. Some benefits may yield significant up-front costs, and may not show positive outcomes until they have been in effect for a number of years. For example, Baughman et al. (2003) found that childcare referral services only predicted significant turnover decreases after they had been in effect for 5 years or longer. This significant investment, and potentially delayed benefit, may deter some employers from implementing family-friendly policies, particularly small organizations that cannot benefit from economies of scale the same way that large ones can. To address this barrier, this review contributes discussion on economic benefits of family-friendly policies through improved employee productivity and organizational profits, and reduced costs and turnover.

Finally, there is increasing attention paid to employee dissatisfaction with family-friendly policies, with childless employees in particular feeling slighted or disadvantaged next to their parenting peers. This growing number of workers may feel resentful for
covering for their coworkers with young children (Poe, 2000), and they may believe that flexibility designed to help caregivers can hurt team dynamics and morale (Wells, 2007). Kim and Wiggins (2011) found that younger employees were less satisfied with family-friendly policies than their older coworkers. Employers must be cognizant of the interpersonal dynamics within their employee base, ensuring that the implementation of family-friendly policies does not yield unintentional consequences for certain groups. A movement away from family-friendly policies and toward a broader focus on work-life balance can better incorporate and consider the needs of single employees, and those who live in non-traditional family structures (Newman & Mathews, 1999). Every employee wants to achieve a fulfilling life, and is deserving of support regardless of their parent or caregiver status.

5.3.2. Implementing Family-Friendly Programs

This review shows that there is no one-size-fits-all solution to achieving work-family or work-life balance in an organization. A firm that is seeking to implement family-friendly policies would be wise to spend time conducting research and seeking feedback from the employees before executing any policy changes. For example, it is important to have an understanding of the demographics of the employees, as an employee base that is largely made up of young, unmarried, and childless persons will likely not see significant benefits from childcare policies, and an employee base that has a number of parents with young children may see negative outcomes from the implementation of telecommuting. Simple and inexpensive research methods such as the distribution of a survey, or hosting a number of focus groups would give better insight to the needs of the employees. This could also be a step toward the creation of a workplace culture that makes the employees feel respected and understood, which is empirically linked to positive outcomes. A small amount of due diligence will protect both the employer and the employee from unintentional negative outcomes.

Finally, a firm should implement family-friendly policies with the knowledge that it may take a number of years for positive effects to occur (Baughman et al., 2003). These interventions should be seen as a long-term investment, not a short-term fix to an issue with employee turnover or company performance.
5.3.3. Innovative Approaches

This research project focused on family-friendly workplace policies in the USA and Canada that appear in existing literature. The following section will expand the scope in order to discuss innovative policies that may not be represented in research, as well as policies that are implemented around the world.

Government support in the realization of family-friendly workplace benefits may encourage a higher number of firms to adopt family-friendly practices. Neither Canada nor the USA have established partnerships between the government and the workplace when it comes to implementing family-friendly policies, and government support may be necessary to expedite the move to change workplace cultures and address gender inequities in the workplace. The Canadian government did establish the Canadian Employers for Caregivers Plan in 2012, which involved writing a report that highlights best practices and practical suggestions for caregiver-friendly workplaces (Government of Canada, 2015). However, this does not include funding to support workplaces in implementing these policies. The United States also offers no federal subsidy for employers who offer family-friendly policies (O’Leary & Kornbluh, 2009). However, the British Government launched the Work-Life Balance Campaign in 2000. This campaign established guidelines for an organization to achieve work-life balance for its employees, and also created an employer-led alliance called Employers for Work-Life Balance. These employers aimed to encourage other firms by demonstrating the success of work-life initiatives within their own organizations. (O’Brien, 2012). The Department of Trade and Industry in Britain also established the Work-Life Balance Challenge Fund in 2000, which provided funding for organizations to hire a consultancy firm to help them appropriately implement work-life balance initiatives. This approach was evaluated, and found to have increased work-life balance awareness in the funded organizations, of which the majority developed flexible working practices (Nelson, 2004). The Canadian and United States governments could look to international policies for guidance on innovative ways to support their citizens.

Eldercare is not well represented in the literature on workplace policies, possibly because this type of employee support has only recently been recognized as important among employers. The USA’s National Alliance for Caregiving partnered with ReACT
and the Alzheimer’s Immunotherapy Program to sponsor a study that explored workplace trends that support employees who are engaged in eldercare (Wagner, Lindemer, Yokum, & DeFreest, 2012). They found a variety of approaches to supporting employees who have eldercare obligations, some of which were seen in the review such as telecommuting, paid time off, or resource and referral services, but many of which were not. For example, they found some employers offered eldercare services such as discounted back-up home care for emergency needs, geriatric care management services, and even help with insurance paperwork such as Medicare, Medicaid, and other insurance policies (Wagner et al., 2012). Employers who spearhead the movement toward supporting eldercare may see greater benefits than those who delay implementing these changes (Arthur & Cook, 2004), and more research is needed on the impact of these creative approaches to supporting caregiving employees.

In this rapidly changing workforce, where the employees’ needs may vary greatly between organizations, a little bit of creative thinking can go a long way. There are a number of unique approaches that are being used by some firms to help their employees achieve work-life balance. For example, some organizations will provide accommodations for breastfeeding mothers, such as providing designated spaces for nursing or pumping, providing breast pumps, and allowing breastfeeding mothers more schedule flexibility (Bai, Wunderlich, & Weinstock, 2012).

Some policies are being adopted that are not specifically designed to address family issues, but instead focus on work-life balance. This could reflect a changing culture toward more accessible work-life initiatives, instead of work-family initiatives that exclude certain members of the workforce. For example, pet-friendly workplaces are becoming increasingly common, and bringing one’s dog to work is reported to reduce stress and increase job satisfaction (Morris, 2014). Additionally, some companies such as Google, PwC, and Ben & Jerry’s have nap rooms, or have installed “nap pods,” and are encouraging their employees to take mid-day naps, with the intention of boosting concentration and productivity, and reducing anxiety (Henry, 2015). Finally, some firms invest in a corporate gym, or offer subsidies for fitness-related expenses, which can help the employees achieve a healthy lifestyle, and may also reduce the health-care costs of the employer (Case, 2015). Employers can further encourage fitness and health by hosting on-site flu immunization or blood donor clinics, offering smoking cessation
programs, and offering secure bicycle parking to encourage employees to cycle to work (HR Council, n.d.). Employers could also look into providing mental health services to their employees, to address issues of stress, depression, or burden.

These innovative approaches to supporting employees are reflective of an evolving workplace culture that is adapting to meet the changing needs and demands of the employees.

5.3.4. Use of Technology

Technology can sometimes be viewed as an obstacle in the pursuit of work-family balance. As seen in the study conducted by Noonan and Glass (2012), constantly being connected to your work through telecommuting can actually blur the distinction between work and home, causing one to work more hours. However, technology can do more than keep someone connected to their work; it can be used as an approach to support caregivers. The technology industry is rapidly expanding, often seeking innovative ways to address existing problems, and employers should consider including these novel solutions in their family-friendly initiatives.

Technological interventions can be adopted to help employed caregivers access information, tools, and support. For example, a web-based multimedia intervention in the USA called Caregiver’s Friend: Dealing with Dementia was developed to help employed caregivers of persons with dementia (Beauchamp, Irvine, Seeley, & Johnson, 2005). This intervention can be tailored based on the caregiver’s specific concerns and the severity of their loved one’s dementia. A randomized trial of 299 employed caregivers found that Caregiver’s Friend improved self-efficacy, intention to get support, and perceived positive aspects of caregiving among the intervention group (Beauchamp et al., 2005). Additionally, these caregivers experienced reduced stress, strain, anxiety, and depressive symptoms (Beauchamp et al., 2005).

Remote access technology will likely become an increasingly common aspect of senior care. Remote access technology allows someone to remotely gather information about a person or environment, ranging from something simple such as a step counter, to more complicated wearable sensors that allow the monitoring of vital signs (Law,
An example of remote access technology is smart home technology, which monitors data about an individual’s movement through their home, their sleeping habits, eating patterns, and more, to communicate information about their health status to their caregiver or health provider (Courney, Demiris, Rantz, & Skubic, 2008). This can improve the safety of the home by ensuring the stove is not left on, the fridge is full of food, and the doors are locked, and protect the safety of the older adult by monitoring for medical emergencies such as falls. Mahoney, Mutschler, Tarlow and Liss (2008) explored whether smart home technology can support working caregivers. Another intervention developed and tested in the USA is the Worker Interactive Networking (WIN) project, which uses smart home technology and online caregiver support groups to support employed caregivers of older persons during working hours (Mahoney et al., 2008). The caregivers are alerted when customized parameters are exceeded by the older adult. The WIN project was tested among 27 working family caregivers from 5 companies. After using it for 6 months, worker morale and productivity was improved, and caregiver stress was reduced (Mahoney et al., 2008). Caregivers reported that they would be willing to spend money on a similar system, but this is also something that an employer could consider investing in if they have a number of employees who are engaging in eldercare.

There is great potential for technology-based interventions such as Caregiver’s Friend or the WIN project to provide needed support for caregiving employees. Among employers who offer information or referral services, online resources could be included in these information packages to better educate informal caregivers, provide them with access to support groups, and facilitate efficient task management.

5.4. Future Research

This review highlights a number of directions for future research on family-friendly policies and informal caregiving, which will be covered in the following section. First, recommendations will be made on ways to address the methodological issues that were highlighted in the limitations section of this project. Subsequently, a number of research gaps will be identified that need further exploration.
Methodological Limitations

To address issues of causality between family-friendly policies and positive employee and organizational outcomes, longitudinal studies are needed. Existing research has explored these relationships largely through cross-sectional research, whereas longitudinal or pretest-posttest designs would give better insight to the mechanisms that create or prevent change, and identify causal relationships. As seen in the randomized field trial conducted by Moen and colleagues (2016), assessing variables before and after the implementation of a work-family program strengthens the findings associated with these interventions. In addition, utilizing a mixed-methods approach gathering both quantitative and qualitative data may give greater insight into motivators or barriers behind implementing or utilizing family-friendly policies.

In addition to issues of research design, future research should aim to measure outcomes that are applied and measurable. The literature will be stronger by minimizing response bias by measuring objective organizational measures such as actual turnover rates, sales, or number of customers, and objective employee measures such as health care utilization or absenteeism. Additionally, future research can look beyond family-domain variables and instead focus on life more holistically. For example, how much time do employees have to dedicate to their hobbies? How frequently do they exercise? Do they use their vacation days, and if so, do they use them to actually travel or are they taking time off due to burnout or other obligations? The literature should expand the scope of focus to include employees who do not have families, but who are still inherently deserving of an enjoyable life. Finally, research could utilize a strength-based approach that focuses on the key strengths that caregivers can bring to the workplace that other employees may not have. For example, someone who engages in eldercare may be better able to multitask, may have higher emotional intelligence and empathy, and may be more physically healthy. Current research focuses on the burden associated with employing family caregivers, as opposed to the benefits that they may bring to the organization they work for.

Key Research Gaps

At the organization level, there may be facets of an organization’s culture that influence the relationship between family-friendly policies, organizational culture, and
outcomes. Although some studies did explore organizational culture, these findings would be better contextualized if the studies included discussion and measurement on industry, organization, and individual variables. A culture change can take time, and measuring how established a family-friendly policy is in relation to positive outcomes (see Baughman et al., 2003) can guide real-world managers and firms who are hoping to implement these policies.

Furthermore, a significant gap that is lacking in the literature is the motivators behind implementing family-friendly policies. Better understanding how and why employers are seeking to change their culture to become more family-friendly will allow for the creation of strategies and interventions that will fit their needs. Are family-friendly interventions being adopted due to pressure from the employees? Is it rooted in a human desire for generativity? Are there external pressures, such as a fear of criticism from one’s clients or competition? Finding answers to these questions will support the development of a workforce that prioritizes the well-being of the employees instead of the financial success of the firms. In addition to exploring motivators, more research is needed that empirically examines the outcomes of family-friendly policies at the organizational level (Lee & Hong, 2011). Little is known about the mechanisms through which family-friendly workplace policies yield positive outcomes, and more research is needed comparing men and women, caregivers and non-caregivers, and other employee subgroups.

At the individual level, there is significant research on the implications of parenthood and childcare in the workforce. However, no articles in the review explicitly focused on eldercare, and many did not even address it. Seniors now outnumber children in Canada, and Statistics Canada (2015) predicts that this pattern will only continue as fertility declines and people continue to age. With these demographic changes, people will increasingly be engaging in eldercare, and childcare will become less prevalent. As people begin to work into their senior years, they are more likely to be caring for aging parents or ailing spouses. Unfortunately, a review of workplace policies caregivers of elderly kin in Canada (Medjuck et al., 1998) identified a number of issues with accessibility. They found gender bias in policy formation, with many family leave policies requiring that there is no one else in the home that can look after the elderly person. For example, a caregiving woman with an adult child at home could not take
family leave, despite this living arrangement not actually changing her caregiving responsibilities. They further identified a childcare bias, in that there was often a residency requirement. Children typically reside with their parents, but many elderly persons still live on their own, and in these cases, the employee would not qualify for the family leave (Medjuck et al., 1998). A greater focus on eldercare in future research will yield a better understanding on whether family-friendly policies actually address the needs of employees engaging in eldercare. In particular, research conducted in the early 1990’s may become less relevant as the workforce continues to change, and more recent projects are needed to gain an accurate understanding of employee needs.

The feminist political economy framework utilized in this project lead to the identification of a number of gendered issues that need further exploration. For example, future research should examine the significant life course decisions that women face in order to have a successful professional career, such as foregoing or delaying parenthood, or the negotiations that they make to account for their various caregiving responsibilities. In addition, gender differences in use of leisure time should be explored through a gender role lens, to better understand how to support both female and male employees. The domestic role of men could be further explored as a factor that could support their female partners in succeeding professionally. Furthermore, it would be valuable to explore the role of women in management in facilitating a family-friendly workplace culture. This framework also explores issues of assumption or bias. There is a hetero-normative bias apparent in the literature, which tends to classify a family as two heterosexual, white, middle-class people with children. There is significant lack of research exploring less traditional family relationships such as second marriages, LGBT couples, step- or adopted children, and care relationships such as caring for one’s parent-in-law, sibling, neighbour, or friend.

A number of variables are under-represented in the literature, such as exercise or depression, which makes it difficult to identify significant trends. Other variables yield particularly mixed results, such as the impact of telecommuting on productivity. In both cases, more research is needed to further clarify the relationship between family-friendly workplace policies and the measured outcomes. Furthermore, of the 40 articles reviewed, only three were Canadian. More research is needed to assess the Canadian
workplace context before findings can confidently be generalized to be applicable to Canada.

Additionally, more research is needed on technological innovations that can support working caregivers, their loved ones, and their employers. A Canadian research network called AGE-WELL conducts research on accessible technologies that can support older people and their caregivers (AGEWELL, n.d.). One AGEWELL project, spearheaded by Dr. Fast, is currently exploring the extent to which technologies can meet the needs of carers in employment and their employers. Research on this topic is valuable and will provide insight into novel ways to address the consequences associated with balancing work and caregiving obligations.

Overall, this review identified a number of trends in the literature on family-friendly policies and their employee- and organization-level outcomes. In addition, it has identified a number of areas that need further exploration. Future research can address these gaps and better clarify the relationship between these variables, while addressing changing demographic trends. Unfortunately, research tends to progress methodically and carefully, with a frequent delay between real-world changes and the representation of these changes in academic literature. It can be expected that academic exploration will soon catch up with the current workplace trends and begin to address the lacking research in this area.

5.5. Conclusion

There is an aging population, an increasing number of women in the workforce, and insufficient governmental policies supporting informal caregivers. More couples are dual-earning than ever before, meaning there are fewer people who stay home and dedicate their time solely to domestic tasks. Therefore, caregiving duties must be balanced with work obligations. People should be supported in fulfilling their conflicting role demands, and an employer has a unique opportunity to do so.

This review has identified the relationships between family-friendly policies and both individual and workplace outcomes to be complicated and contextual. However, it is
difficult to ignore the trends in the literature that identify positive outcomes and contribute to the feminist political economy ideologies of valuing employees as human beings, and establishing well-being as a goal that should be as prioritized as profit or productivity. The literature identifies trends that link family-friendly policies with higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, reduced costs and turnover, and improved recruitment. It also identifies a need for further clarification on the relationship between these policies and outcomes such as employee stress and organizational performance. These findings further show that workplace culture plays an important role in achieving positive outcomes from these interventions. Future studies should utilize longitudinal or pretest-posttest designs to address issues of causality in cross-sectional research, and should adopt objective measures to complement the subjective measures that show up more frequently in the literature. Further research is needed exploring caregiving employees who are part of non-traditional family structures, and more explicit focus is needed on eldercare, as this increasingly common type of caregiving is evidently unrepresented in the literature.

Furthermore, this project fills a conceptual gap in the literature, adopting a feminist political economy theoretical framework through which to critically examine the empirical findings. The impact of socially constructed gender roles is explored in the literature, showing that market work can often take precedence over undervalued domestic work, regardless of the employee’s gender. Family-friendly policies were found to impact men and women differently, with women using their flexible schedules to take on more domestic tasks, and therefore not seeing significant improvements in role conflict. Ultimately, a feminist political economist would acknowledge financial drivers as being key motivators for employees and for the firm, but would argue that the success of an economy can also be measured in the health and happiness of its populace.

Employers have an opportunity to improve the quality of life as well as the workplace performance of their employees by implementing family-friendly practices that are relevant to their industry and the needs of their employees. This particularly pertains to employees with caregiving obligations, but the literature is increasingly considering those who are not parents or caregivers, but who still seek a healthy work-life balance. Every employee has a right to an enjoyable and rich life, and an employer has a moral obligation to protect this right.
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Appendix.

Summary Review Table

Table A1. Acronyms within Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Canada</td>
<td>• CAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dependent Variable</td>
<td>• DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family-Friendly Policy</td>
<td>• FFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent Variable</td>
<td>• IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>• JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>• OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived Organizational Performance</td>
<td>• POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary Data Analysis</td>
<td>• SDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover Intention</td>
<td>• TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• United States of America</td>
<td>• USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work-Family</td>
<td>• WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Method and Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Birkeland, &amp; Giddings (2009)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (National Study of the Changing Workforce, 2002)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: representative sample of 2,451 waged and salaried US workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur &amp; Cook (2004)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: event study of every company that showed up on Fortune magazine’s Fortune 500 list between 1971-1996&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 1,153 Fortune 500 companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batt &amp; Valcour (2003)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (1998 Cornell Couples &amp; Careers Study)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 557 dual-earner white-collar employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Method and Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baughman, DiNardi &amp; Holtz-Eakin</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: phone interviews&lt;br&gt;• Sample: random selection from 120 organizations in upstate NY (n=120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behson</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (National Study of the Changing Workforce, 1997)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 2,248 employees with an employed spouse, a dependent child, and eldercare obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler et al.</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (The Health Risk Appraisal, 2004 &amp; 2005)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 2319 employees (2004) and 2976 employees (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan &amp; Pettigrew</td>
<td>• Country: CAN&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (General Social Survey, 1990 &amp; 2005)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: People aged 18-64 in dual-earner families (n=1,018 in 1998, and n=1,238 in 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Method and Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Durst (1999) | • Country: USA  
• Method: questionnaire  
• Sample: randomly selected federal, state, and local government agencies (n=103)                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | • IVs: organizational capacity, benefit demand, a variety of organizational variables, a variety of employee variables  
• DV: the number of FFPs offered (between 1 and 9)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • N/A                                                                 | • The most common FFPs were: flextime (77%), reduced hours (44%), telecommuting (42%), and job sharing (41%)  
• A higher # of FFPs was associated with a greater ability to recruit effectively, less involvement of high level administrators in designing FFPs, and a higher percent of female employees  
• FFPs improved morale and recruitment, and increased job satisfaction and retention                                                                                     |
| Eaton       | • Country: USA  
• Method: survey  
• Sample: representative sample of biotechnology firms. 1030 employees from these firms participated                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | • IV: formal (compressed weeks, family leave, flextime, etc) and informal (perceived availability of WF policies) flexible work practices  
• DVs: OC and perceived productivity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | • Conceptualization of flexibility; both formal and informal                                                              | • Usability of WF policies has a small positive effect on OC  
• Neither the presence of formal nor informal WF policies was related to OC  
• Employees who report higher levels of control also report higher OC and productivity  
• Formal, informal, and useable policies were all positively associated with productivity, as was control over one’s schedule  
• No gender differences found                                                                                                                                  |
| Estes (2005) | • Country: USA  
• Method: longitudinal, mixed-methods design. Data collected at prenatal, and 6mo, 12mo, and 7yrs post-partum.  
• Sample: 58 employed mothers, recruited during pregnancy.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | • IVs: flexible scheduling, flexible geography, part-time work, parental leave, and supervisor support  
• DVs: total time parenting, number of shared meals, mother/child activities, community activities, discipline style, and mother-child interaction types                                                                                                                                               | • The stress spillover model (stress in one role “spills over” to other roles)                                             | • Results of quantitative surveys:  
• Hours worked at home, working part-time, and having a supportive supervisor correlated with and shared meals  
• Hours worked at home correlated with time availability  
• Flexible scheduling associated with more mother/child activities  
• Geographic flexibility and regular hours worked at home predict warmer mother-child interactions  
• Results of qualitative questions:  
• Mothers felt that using FFPs enhanced their parental abilities  
• Mothers discussed activities that were not covered in the survey, and identified a trade-off between work and family                                                                                       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Method and Sample</th>
<th>Measured Variables</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Findings Relevant to Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galinsky et al. (1996)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (Mathematica Policy Research Inc, 1992)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: Nationally representative sample of employed adults (n=2,958)</td>
<td>• IVs: parent status, workplace policies and fringe benefits, job characteristics, and workplace environment characteristics&lt;br&gt;• DVs: WF conflict, stress, and coping</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Parent and nonparent employees were equally likely to have access to family friendly policies&lt;br&gt;• 59% of parents reported that the presence of FFPs was one of the reasons they chose their present job&lt;br&gt;• 38% reported that they would or might change jobs to gain access to flextime, particularly among mothers&lt;br&gt;• Parents were more likely to say they would trade off salary or other benefits for child care assistance&lt;br&gt;• Parents demonstrated higher stress, higher WF conflict, poorer coping; access to FFPs only slightly improved these outcomes&lt;br&gt;• Predictors of positive outcomes among parents: work autonomy, schedule control, few demands, security, a supportive culture, and opportunities for advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddings et al. (2013)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: Compared the costs of offering paid leave with the costs of hiring a new employee in hypothetical case studies&lt;br&gt;• Sample: organizational structure of a real Midwestern law firm</td>
<td>• IVs: employee variables (salary, seniority, productivity, etc)&lt;br&gt;• DV: profit</td>
<td>• Efficiency wage hypothesis</td>
<td>• More profitable for lower-level employees&lt;br&gt;• It is more profitable to offer paid leave for employees who (a) have clearly defined schedules and duties, and (b) are at a lower level of the occupational hierarchy (they generate less business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover &amp; Crooker, 1995</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (General Social Survey, 1991)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: random sample of non-institutionalized English-speaking people in USA (n=745)</td>
<td>• IVs: parental leave, flexible scheduling, child care information, subsidized day care&lt;br&gt;• DVs: OC and TI</td>
<td>• A variety of attachment and social justice theories are used to justify hypotheses</td>
<td>• FFPs were positively related to OC and negatively related to TI&lt;br&gt;• Parental leave and child care information predicted TI&lt;br&gt;• Flexible scheduling predicted OC&lt;br&gt;• Eligibility to benefit from childcare benefits was associated with higher OC&lt;br&gt;• Eligibility to benefit from FFPs did not influence TI&lt;br&gt;• No gender differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Method and Sample</td>
<td>Measured Variables</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Findings Relevant to Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halpern (2005)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Methods: SDA (National Study of the Changing Workforce, 1997)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: representative sample of working adults (n=3,552)</td>
<td>• IVs: number and nature of available flexible work policies&lt;br&gt;• DVs: OC, work-related stress, cost to organization</td>
<td>• Job demand control model</td>
<td>• More time-flexible policies predicted higher OC and lower stress.&lt;br&gt; • The higher commitment and lower stress predicts a lower employee cost to the organization (they mediate the relationship between number of time-flex policies and cost to organization)&lt;br&gt; • The relationship between OC and cost to organization is mediated by work-related stress (higher OC reduces cost)&lt;br&gt; • No gender differences in response to FFPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer et al. (2005)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: questionnaire&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 227 dual-earning couples (n=454) who were caring for both children and aging parents.</td>
<td>• IVs: Availability and utilization of alternative work arrangements (AWA) or dependent care supports (DCS)&lt;br&gt;• DVs: Work-family conflict and job satisfaction.</td>
<td>• Family systems theory</td>
<td>• Wives were more likely to use FFPs.&lt;br&gt; • Using FFPs predicted WF conflict among women.&lt;br&gt; • DCS associated with JS among men.&lt;br&gt; • AWA associated with JS for both genders&lt;br&gt; • No relationship between couples’ use of FFPs and WF conflict.&lt;br&gt; • Couples’ use of AWS improved JS for wives only.&lt;br&gt; • Couples’ use of DCS improved WF conflict for wives only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes et al. (1991)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: questionnaires distributed across 2 divisions of a large pharmaceutical company&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 552 married, white collar employees</td>
<td>• IVs: job characteristics and work-family interference&lt;br&gt;• DVs: marital quality (tension and companionship)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 522 white collar employees of a major pharmaceutical company</td>
<td>• They developed a conceptual model involving spillover and the work-family intersection</td>
<td>• Excessive hours, and demanding jobs (high pressure and low support) result in difficulty meeting family role demands.&lt;br&gt; • Negative affective states hurt marital interactions.&lt;br&gt; • After controlling for demographic variables (age, gender, education, parent status, etc.), workplace flexibility had no influence on tension or companionship (marital quality), nor did it influence any work-family interference variables.&lt;br&gt; • No gender differences found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igbaria &amp; Guimaraes (1999)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: Questionnaire randomly distributed to employees of a large US company.&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 225 employees (104 telecommuters, 121 non-telecommuters)</td>
<td>• IV: telecommuter status&lt;br&gt;• DVs: role stressors (role conflict and ambiguity), satisfaction, OC, TI</td>
<td>• They tested their own conceptual model of role conflict, job satisfaction, org. commitment and turnover intention</td>
<td>• Telecommuters reported less role ambiguity, role conflict, TI, and satisfaction with coworkers and promotions. They reported higher satisfaction with their work and supervisor. No significant difference in OC.&lt;br&gt; • Role conflict had more significant effects on satisfaction (work, supervisor, pay, and overall) among telecommuters, but role ambiguity had stronger negative effects on those variables among non-telecommuters.&lt;br&gt; • JS had a stronger effect on OC among telecommuters. OC significantly impacted TI for both groups, but more so among telecommuters. Role ambiguity and overall satisfaction significantly impacted TI in both groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Method and Sample</td>
<td>Measured Variables</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Findings Relevant to Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim (2012)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (2003 survey of government IT employees)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 789 IT employees from 38 state governments.</td>
<td>• IV: Opportunities for promotion/advancement, training and development, supervisory communications, pay and reward satisfaction, and family-friendly policies.</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• FFPs significantly associated with TI in both genders&lt;br&gt;• They were the most significant factor affecting female IT employees’ TI, whereas opportunities for advancement and promotion was more important for men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Wiggins (2011)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (2004 Federal Human Capital Survey)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 125,338 public employees across 20 federal agencies.</td>
<td>• IVs: employee satisfaction with FFPs, (child care, work-life programs, telecommuting, and alternative schedules), economic benefits, and demographic variables&lt;br&gt;• DV: employees’ turnover intentions</td>
<td>• Self-interest utility model (practical benefits of FFPs) and signaling theory model (belief that employer cares)</td>
<td>• FFPs and economic benefits both significantly influenced turnover intentions, but FFPs were more emphasized.&lt;br&gt;• Women were more satisfied with work-life programs and alternative work schedules, but less satisfied with childcare than men.&lt;br&gt;• People with higher positions in the organization were more satisfied (better access), as well as those with higher salaries.&lt;br&gt;• Racial minorities were more satisfied than white employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko et al. (2013)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 92,000 full-time permanent employees of organizations of various sizes.</td>
<td>• IVs: Workplace culture (supervisor support, managerial support, and performance-oriented management), and satisfaction with (a) flexible scheduling, or (b) dependent care programs&lt;br&gt;• DVs: JS and POP</td>
<td>• Social exchange theory (norm of reciprocity)</td>
<td>• Satisfaction with flexible work scheduling and dependent care programs was significantly associated with JS and POP&lt;br&gt;• A supportive workplace culture predicted JS and POP&lt;br&gt;• There is a moderating effect of managerial support between FFPs and JS/POP; in other words, FFPs yield most positive results when offered in a supportive work environment.&lt;br&gt;• No significant gender differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konrad &amp; Mangel (2000)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (survey conducted by Towers Perrin and the Hudson Institute, 1990)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 656 senior HR executives at large organizations</td>
<td>• IV: A work-life index (WLI), which was a sum of 19 different work-life activities/programs.&lt;br&gt;• DV: productivity (sales per employee)</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Larger firms with more skilled and female employees were more likely to have a high number of FFPs&lt;br&gt;• Career ladders (firms’ investment in firm-specific skills) were not a significant predictor of a high WLI, indicating that a career ladder may be a strong enough retention tool on its own, because it ties employees to the firm&lt;br&gt;• Firms employing more professionals and more women saw a stronger relationship between work-life programs and productivity.</td>
</tr>
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<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossek &amp; Nichol (1992)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: quasi-experimental posttest design&lt;br&gt;• Sample: Employees of two hospitals with on-site childcare. Participants with children enrolled (n=111), employees on the waiting list (n=44), and their supervisors (n=122)</td>
<td>• IV: using on-site childcare&lt;br&gt;• DVs: help from family, supervisor support, work-related attitudes, absenteeism, and performance</td>
<td>• A conceptual model on on-site child care, employee attitudes, and employee behaviours by Kossek (1990)</td>
<td>• Childcare users were more likely to cite on-site childcare as a reason for referring employer to a friend, and in deciding to stay employed at the firm&lt;br&gt;• Wait list employees viewed the center as less important to the organization, and less fair&lt;br&gt;• No direct significant association between center use and absenteeism, or between center use and performance&lt;br&gt;• Access to on-site child care did not significantly impact performance, but absenteeism due to child care commitments predicted lower performance ratings&lt;br&gt;• Wait list employees were more likely to report having problems with care, which was associated with holding negative employee attitudes about managing work and child care&lt;br&gt;• Holding negative employee attitudes was associated with a poor performance rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert (2000)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;• Sample: random sample of employees (n=428) at Fel-Pro Inc. (one of Working Mother’s most responsive companies)</td>
<td>• IV: perceived work-life benefit usefulness, perceived organizational support, interpersonal helping, submission of suggestions, and meeting attendance&lt;br&gt;• DVs: Organizational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>• Social exchange theory</td>
<td>• Employees were more likely to demonstrate organizational citizenship (such as submitting suggestions, attending quality assessment meetings, and providing interpersonal help) when they perceived that their work-life benefits were useful&lt;br&gt;• This perception predicted both organization- and interpersonal-level citizenship&lt;br&gt;• Perceived organizational support did not predict citizenship behaviour&lt;br&gt;• Actual benefit use was only slightly correlated with perceived usefulness of these benefits (one did not have to be using the benefits to perceive them to be useful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Hong, 2011</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (Federal Human Capital Surveys, and Performance and Accountability Reports)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: federal agencies (cabinet and independent)</td>
<td>• IVs: 4 types of FFPs (child care subsidies, paid family care leave, telework, and alternative schedules)&lt;br&gt;• DVs: employee turnover rate, and agency performance</td>
<td>• Social exchange theory</td>
<td>• Childcare subsidies significantly reduced turnover. No significant effect of other 3 policies&lt;br&gt;• Childcare subsidies and alternative work schedules were statistically and positively associated with agency performance&lt;br&gt;• Telecommuting significantly reduced performance, identifying unintentional consequences (isolation, inadequate work space, lack of self-discipline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
| Mennino et al. (2005) | • Country: USA  
  • Method: SDA (National Study of the Changing Workforce, 1997)  
  • Sample: Wage and salaried workers (n=2,334) who were not self-employed | • IVs: dependent care benefits, flextime, supportive supervisor, perception of a family-friendly workplace, and job security  
  • DVs: home-to-job (H-J) spillover, job-to-home (J-H) spillover | • Gender theory  
  • Neo-institutional theory | • Higher levels of J-H than H-J spillover overall  
  • Family policies had no effect on spillover  
  • A supportive supervisor lowered J-H spillover, and a supportive work environment lowered both spillover types  
  • Women reported higher levels of both spillover types. They reported more supportive workplace cultures, whereas men had more job autonomy and flextime availability. Equal scores on available dependent benefits and a supportive supervisor  
  • Job autonomy increases H-J spillover for men but not women. JS reduces spillover for both genders, having children increases it |
| Meyer et al. (2001)    | • Country: USA  
  • Method: SDA (Working Mother Magazine’s annual survey) and reduced form estimation (statistical modeling technique)  
  • Sample: “100 best companies for working mothers” 1991-1995 | • IVs: FFPs (paid sick/family leave, maternity leave, adoption assistance, child care, working at home, job sharing, flex-time, compressed work weeks, and part-time work)  
  • DV: productivity and profit | • Efficiency compensation theory | • Offering FFPs indirectly increased productivity (through attracting better employees, reducing stress, etc.)  
  • Job sharing and subsidized onsite childcare reduced productivity and profit  
  • Working from home, having the option to take time off to care for a sick family member, and access to adoption assistance increased profit  
  • Flex-time, part-time, and compressed workweeks neither increase nor decrease profit |
| Moen et al. (2016)      | • Country: USA  
  • Method: randomized field trial  
  • Sample: intervention delivered in the IT division of a fortune 500 company to a random sample of 701 employees (intervention and control) | • Intervention: workshop facilitating culture that that increases schedule control, improves perceptions of supervisor support, and focuses on results instead of “face time” | • Stress process theory, job strain theoretical model, fundamental cause theory, and the concept of social gradient | • The intervention group showed increased schedule control and time working at home, and decreased burnout and WF conflict  
  • The intervention group experienced significantly reduced emotional exhaustion, psychological distress, and perceived stress, and had increased job satisfaction  
  • Changes in schedule control partially mediates the relationship between intervention and job satisfaction, psychological distress, and burnout, and changes in work-family conflict mediate the effects on psychological distress and burnout  
  • The intervention reduced psychological distress for women more than men, but they score similarly on other outcomes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Method and Sample</th>
<th>Measured Variables</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Findings Relevant to Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mulvaney (2011)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: online survey&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 426 employees of the Illinois Parks and Recreation Dept</td>
<td>• IVs: 8 FFPs (4 types of dependent care supports, 4 types of flexible work arrangements)&lt;br&gt;• DVs: OC and job self-efficacy beliefs</td>
<td>• Social cognitive theory's reciprocal determinism</td>
<td>• Access to dependent care supports increased reports of high levels of job self-efficacy and OC&lt;br&gt;• After school and holiday programs were the strongest predictors of both outcomes&lt;br&gt;• Access to flexible work arrangements did not predict higher job self-efficacy, but did predict higher levels of OC&lt;br&gt;• Telecommuting was the strongest predictor of OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonan &amp; Glass (2012)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (National Longitudinal Study of Youth 1979-1994, and US Census Current Population 1997, 2001, 2004)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: A probability sample of youth (n=16,298) and a representative sample of the noninstitutional population (n=50,462)</td>
<td>• IV: telecommuting status&lt;br&gt;• DV: number of working hours per week</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Managers and supervisors were more likely to have access to telecommuting. Workers with caregiving duties (eg, dependent children) were not more likely than their peers to telecommute.&lt;br&gt;• Telecommuting was related to more work hours per week, with many telecommuting hours occurring as overtime work&lt;br&gt;• Blurring between home and work time; accessible via email during longer hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasuraman et al (1996)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: Questionnaire distributed to people enrolled in continuing professional education courses for small business owners&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 111 business owners working 20+h/week, and a member of a dual-career relationship</td>
<td>• IVs: Work variables (flexibility, autonomy, work-role overload, job involvement) and family variables (parental demands, instrumental support, informational/emotional support, and family involvement)&lt;br&gt;• DVs: Career satisfaction, family satisfaction, and life stress</td>
<td>• The “rational approach” and the “gender-role perspective”</td>
<td>• Inflexible schedules detracted from family satisfaction and played a role in increasing work-to-family conflict&lt;br&gt;• Autonomy had a negative effect on family-to-work conflict&lt;br&gt;• Women entrepreneurs devote more time to family than men, and men devote more time to work than women. This fulfills the gender-role perspective&lt;br&gt;• Gender had no effect on work-family conflict</td>
</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
| Pavalko & Henderson (2006) | • Country: USA  
• Method: SDA (National Longitudinal Study on Young Women, 1995-2001 waves)  
• Sample: nationally representative sample of women (n=2,021), surveyed every 1-2 years since 1968, aged was 41-52 in 1995, and 47-58 in 2001 | • IV: caregiving status, and whether they had access to FFPs (flexible hours, family leave, paid sick or vacation days)  
• DVs: employment status, hours worked per week, and psychological distress | • N/A | • Women who started care were more likely to stop employment and have increased psychological distress than women who did not start caregiving  
• Caregivers who remained employed did not tend to reduce their hours  
• Access to FFPs improved labour force participation (remaining employed, taking on more hours), but did not affect psychological distress  
• FFPs impacted all workers, but did not provide additional protection to caregivers, with the exception of access to unpaid family leave (which increased their likelihood of remaining in the workforce) |
| Pedersen (2015) | • Country: USA  
• Method: surveys  
• Sample: 144 married, employed parents with pre-school aged children | • IVs: work hours/week, work pressure, face time norms, job flexibility, and coworker support.  
• DVs: preventive health behaviours (sleep, exercise, diet, etc.) and subjective health | • N/A | • Job flexibility was associated with more exercise, more days with time to relax, a healthier diet (mothers only), fewer days feeling stressed, fewer days feeling overwhelmed (mothers only), and feeling healthy and energetic (mothers only)  
• Overall, flexible scheduling benefitted mothers more than fathers in preventive and subjective health outcomes. Coworker support benefitted fathers more than mothers on the same outcomes |
| Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000 | • Country: USA  
• Sample: 527 firms, proportionately representative of business services | • DVs: POP, perceived market performance, and profit and sales growth (relative to competitors)  
• IVs: 8 policies → On-site or subsidized day care, elder care assistance, information on community day care, paid and unpaid parental leave, mat or pat leave, and flexible scheduling | • Symbolic action perspective | • Firms with more work-family policies had higher levels of all 3 performance types  
• Firm size did not impact the relationship between FFPs and firm performance  
• Older firms, and firms employing greater proportions of women showed a stronger relationship between FFPs and profit. No difference in strength of relationship for organizational and market performance |
| Rothausen (1994) | • Country: USA  
• Method: questionnaires distributed in large retail company  
• Sample: 144 employees | • IVs: parenthood, workplace variables (relationships with coworkers/supervisor, flexibility, satisfaction with salary, etc.)  
• DVs: job satisfaction, TI | • Locke’s theory of job satisfaction | • No significant differences between parents and nonparents for correlations between flexibility and JS.  
• Satisfaction with flexibility of job scheduling is negatively related to TI for parents, significantly more so than nonparents.  
• Parenthood impacted how both work- and family- facets of satisfaction related to overall JS. |
<table>
<thead>
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</table>
| Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein (2001) | • Country: USA   
   • Sample: 32,103 full- and part-time federal white-collar employees | • IVs: job and family involvement, work and family demands, employee characteristics, available FFPs  
• DVs: satisfaction with WF balance, and JS | • N/A | • Flexible schedules were the most widely used FFP  
• JS was predicted by job demands and job involvement moreso than family involvement  
• Satisfaction with WF balance provided a positive effect on JS that equaled the negative effects of job demands and involvement  
• Organizational understanding had more impact on both DVs than any of the FFPs did  
• IVs associated with WF balance in most subgroups: part-time employment, working at home (negative effect)  
• IVs associated with JS in most subgroups: flexible schedules (negative effect), child care, working at home  
• Summary: different subgroups are affected differently, and JS is affected independently from satisfaction with WF balance |
| Shepard, Clifton, & Kruse (1996) | • Country: USA   
   • Method: SDA (Industrial COMPUSATAT and Le Moyne College’s Industrial Relations and HR Management Department, 1981-91)  
   • Sample: 36 pharmaceutical companies | • IV: flexible work schedules  
• DV: productivity | • No formal theory, but rooted in efficiency wage theory and concepts surrounding management, productivity, and turnover | • Flexible work hours were found to contribute to improved productivity across a variety of estimation techniques. These improvements were both statistically and economically significant  
• Companies that adopted flextime showed an increase in productivity of approximately 10% |
| Thomas & Ganster (1995) | • Country: USA   
   • Method: Survey  
   • Sample: 398 health care professionals from 45 institutions. Diverse sample of nurses (RNs, LPNs, nurse managers, nursing directors) | • IVs: the presence of FFPs and supervisor supportiveness, work and family role conflict, perceived control  
• DVs: indicants of strain (depression, JS, blood pressure, self-reported health, absenteeism) | • N/A | • Flexible scheduling and supervisor support indirectly increased JS, reduced depression, reduced somatic complaints, and improved cholesterol levels (through increasing control and reducing conflict)  
• Supervisor support directly increased JS. Flexible scheduling directly reduced somatic complaints  
• Information and referral services, and dependent-care services, had no significant effects on any outcomes  
• No significant effects for blood pressure or absenteeism |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Findings Relevant to Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Beauvais &amp; Lyness (1999)</td>
<td>• Country: USA&lt;br&gt;• Method: Survey&lt;br&gt;• Sample: Recent (15yr) alumni of 3 graduate business programs (n=276)</td>
<td>• IV: work-family culture, DVs: FFP availability, FFP utilization, organizational attachment, work-family conflict</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Utilization of FFPs was greater among women, married employees, those with children at home, and those who perceived a supportive WF culture&lt;br&gt;• Higher availability of FFPs and supportive WF culture were both associated with higher affective commitment, lower TI, and less WF conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombari &amp; Spinks (1999)</td>
<td>• Country: CAN&lt;br&gt;• Method: retrospective analysis of work-family initiatives in a major Canadian bank.&lt;br&gt;• A variety of data sources analyzed, from late 1980's to late 1990's</td>
<td>• Intervention: flexible work arrangements (FWAs)&lt;br&gt;• Outcome: performance indicators and employee attitudes</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• The majority of users (mostly female) reported reduced stress and increased effectiveness in managing WF responsibilities&lt;br&gt;• 36% said they would leave if FWAs were not available&lt;br&gt;• Performance indicators either remained the same or increased.&lt;br&gt;• Absenteeism was reduced&lt;br&gt;• FWAs showed no negative impact on organizational efficiency, employee commitment, and customer satisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Challenges: managers had more difficulty scheduling meetings around the more varying schedules, FWA users had to modify job tasks and manage changing expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace &amp; Young (2008)</td>
<td>• Country: CAN&lt;br&gt;• Method: SDA (Juggling It All Survey, 2000)&lt;br&gt;• Sample: 670 Albertan lawyers</td>
<td>• IVs: home and parental responsibilities, spousal support with these responsibilities, supportive WF culture, job flexibility, work-related variables&lt;br&gt;• DV: productivity (billable hours)</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Parenthood predicts fewer billable hours and more time on household tasks for women but not men&lt;br&gt;• Parents report more family demands, and are more likely to have regular paid help with household and childcare tasks&lt;br&gt;• Women with children under 12 produce fewer billable hours than women without children, because of their household and childcare tasks. Women with teenage children bill more hours than women without children. Fathers bill more hours than their non-father counterparts (breadwinner role), possibly because they are more likely to have a stay-at-home partner to handle domestic tasks&lt;br&gt;• Family-friendly variables did not predict women’s productivity, and they predicted lower productivity for fathers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>