



**SLOAN WORK AND FAMILY
RESEARCH NETWORK**
BOSTON COLLEGE

Work-Family Curriculum Guide

Module 3: Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives

A Teaching Module Developed by the
Curriculum Task Force of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network

www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Ellen Ernst Kossek, Michigan State University
Carrie Leana, University of Pittsburgh
Shelley MacDermid, Purdue University
Marcie Pitt-Catsoupes, Boston College
Patricia Raskin, Teachers College at Columbia University
Mary Secret, Virginia Commonwealth University
Stephen Sweet, Ithaca College

2006

Prepared with the help of Judi C. Casey, Christina Matz-Costa, and Karen Corday
of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network





**Module 3:
Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives**

Table of Contents

	Page
Section I: Goals and Learning Objectives	3
• <i>Goals and Focus</i>	3
• <i>Student Learning Objectives</i>	3
Section II: Class Sessions	5
• <i>Introduction</i>	5
• <i>Class 1: The Dual Perspective and Competing Tensions of Work-Family Policies</i>	5
▪ Class Lecture Topics.	5
▪ Key Concepts.	6
▪ Teaching Notes	6
• <i>Class 2: Implementing Policies, Practices and Culture to Support Organizational Effectiveness and Work-Family Relationships</i>	12
▪ Class Lecture Topics.	12
▪ Key Concepts.	13
▪ <i>Class 3: Work Life Strategy Game and/or Policy Adoption Case Studies</i>	18
▪ Class Lecture Topics.	18
Section III: Module Summary	21
Section IV: Suggested Readings	21
• <i>Online References</i>	21
• <i>Publications</i>	22

Note: This module should be used in conjunction with:

- 1) The Dual Perspective and Competing Tensions of Work-Family Policies (PowerPoint);
- 2) Implementing Policies, Practices and Culture to Support Organizational Effectiveness and Work-Family Relationships (PowerPoint);
- 3) Work Life Strategy Game and/or Policy Adoption Case Studies (PowerPoint);
- 4) Work-Life Game (Word Document), and
- 5) Gameboard image 1 (jpeg image) and
- 6) Gameboard image 2 (jpeg image).



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Module 3
Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives

Section I: Goals and Learning Objectives

Goals and Focus

The contents of this module have been prepared to address some of challenges associated with teaching about work-family issues from a human resource management and employment perspective.

The goals of this module are:

1. To develop an understanding that work-family policies are part of a human resource management system and the employment relationship.
2. To explain how work-family policies can be understood from both the individual employee and the organizational perspectives, which sometimes have competing tensions.
3. To develop an understanding of how the implementation of work-family policies, practices and culture link to support organizational effectiveness.
4. To promote familiarity with the different ways that employing organizations can support the work family relationship and different rationale for doing so.

The **topics** covered in this module include:

- Employer-sponsored work-family policies and programs
- Impact of work-family conflicts and supports on work outcomes
- Workplace culture
- Relationships with supervisors and co-workers
- Workplace flexibility
- Business cases for employer response to work-family issues
- Private versus public approaches for work and family supports

Student Learning Objectives

Students will:

- ▶ Understand how work-family issues can be viewed as business issues and part of the social employment relationship.



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

- ▶ Become familiar with different types of employer responses to the work-life issues experienced by their employees.
- ▶ Understand different explanations/rationales for why businesses adopt work-life policies and programs.
- ▶ Understand that work-life programs emerge and develop in the workplace over time.
- ▶ Understand that the concept of a “responsive workplace” goes beyond the adoption of family-friendly policies and programs to include culture and supervisor support.
- ▶ Be able to operationalize workplace flexibility and think thoughtfully about policy implementation.
- ▶ Understand that the U.S. approach to work and family is but one of many approaches across cultures.

Although the contents of this module have been developed for graduate level courses in professional schools, faculty members could adapt different sections of the module for undergraduate classes.

As prepared, the content of this module could be covered in three, 1 ½ or 2 hour class sessions. The assignment(s) could be completed after the completion of the module.



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Module 3
Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives

Section II: Class Sessions

Introduction

The content of this module has been divided into 3 class sessions.

Class 1 presents:

- insights about the competing tensions between employee and employer for time and energy;
- explanations of how work-family policies can be understood from both the individual employee and the organizational perspectives;
- types of work-life policies/programs; and
- rationale for and illustrations of how work and family policies are part of a human resource management system and the employment relationship.

Class 2 presents:

- understandings of how the implementation of work-family policies, practices and culture link to support organizational effectiveness; and
- examples of the different ways that employing organizations can support the work family relationship and different rationale for doing so.

Class 3 helps students apply and use the concepts from Class 1 and 2 in 'real world' settings:

- The Work Life Policy Business Case Exercise helps students learn to make the business case for adopting policies at their college and learn the challenges of doing so.
- The Work-Life Strategy Game helps students develop a work life strategy that fits their industry and workforce and gain familiarity with policies as well as managing work-life issues that fit with their strategy.

Class 1: The Dual Perspective and Competing Tensions of Work-Family Policies

▲ **Class Lecture Topics**

The topics covered in Class 1 include:

1. The employer-employee collision course over time and energy
2. Types of work-life policies and programs
3. Human Resources response to and support for work and family life balance



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

▲ **Key Concepts:**

- Overwork
- Time/energy imbalance
- Work-family conflict
- Workplace flexibility
- Support for dependent care responsibilities
- Organizational culture vs. national culture

▲ **Teaching Notes**

Note: The content of the lectures outlined below correspond to PowerPoint slides: **The Dual Perspective and Competing Tensions of Work-Family Policies.**

Employer-employee collision course

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p><u>Growing Employer Productivity Pressures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing global competition • Developed countries less competitive on labor costs (e.g., recent stats show decline in labor utilization for European Union) • Economic power shifts to China & India as global labor standard • 24-7 work day around world <p><u>Growing Family Pressures On Workers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in labor participation rate of mothers with children at home (1960 - 20%; 2000 - 75%) • 50% of labor force in Dual Earner Families with both moms & dads • 50% of children spend time in single parent home • 15% sandwiched with elder & child care responsibilities 	<p><u>Examples</u></p> <p>Daimler Chrysler: Employees agreed to work a longer work week for the same pay in return for 7 years job security.</p> <p>Ericsson: Workers faced a choice of agreeing to work more hours for same pay per week or leave.</p> <p>Siemens: Employees told to work more hours for same pay or risk move of some work to Hungary.</p> <p>Economic rules for competitiveness production costs set around world: Chinese workers make 1/20th pay of Japanese</p> <p>Volkswagen's Auto 5000 plant in Germany: where they give jobs to the unemployed, have agreed 40-hour</p>



Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
	work weeks with unpaid overtime to correct their errors, concentrate on quality, and new ways of working on cars. (German car workers normally have 35-hour work weeks.)
<p><u>Growing Pressures to Have Time –Energy Imbalance Between Work and Personal Life</u></p> <p>Factors contributing to the pressures to overwork:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New workplace technology makes it easier to bring work home • Global interactions require 24 hour communications • Competitive pressures to continually show that you add value to company 	
<p><u>The Time/Energy Imbalance: Putting Work Above Everything Else</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational evaluation and rewards- early stages must show high potential • Emphasis on work in western culture • Polarization of work and family roles • Role overload • Love of work • Employers reward long hours and imbalance 	<p>Faculty might find it helpful to have students think about “The Ideal Worker”</p> <p>Ask students to take a moment to jot down a list characteristics of the ideal worker from the employer view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists of work attitudes • Work behaviors • Personal and non-work demands <p>Have them turn to a partner to compare lists.</p>
<p><u>Linking Mechanisms Between Work & Family</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Work-family conflict</i> or interference • Type of inter-role conflict in which the role demands stemming from one domain (work or family) are incompatible with role demands stemming from another domain (family or work) • Work to family conflict • Family to work conflict • Work-family enrichment (values, skills, mood enhance the other realm) 	<p>See the following Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia Entries:</p> <p><i>Work-Family Linkages</i>, Authors: Jeffrey H. Greenhaus, Ph.D., Drexel University, and Romila Singh, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Date: 2/25/03</p> <p><i>Work-Family Role Conflict</i>, Authors: Leslie Hammer, Ph.D., Portland State University, and Cynthia Thompson, Ph.D., Zicklin School of Business, Baruch College, CUNY; Date: 5/12/03</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Time</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When role pressures stemming from the two different domains compete for the 	<p>Following this presentation, faculty might want to have students discuss employers response to these conflicts.</p>



Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p>individual's time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strain</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When the strain experienced in one role domain interferes with effective performance of role behaviors in the other domain. • <i>Behavior</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stemming from incompatible behaviors demanded by competing roles • Energy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When energy devoted to one domain depletes the energy one is able to give to the other. • New overlapping form: <i>Place based</i> conflict: portable work- work you can take with you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have students name several reasons why employers might benefit from helping employees with work and family/personal life • Have students name several reasons why they might be reluctant to do so

Types of work-life policies and programs

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p>A. Flexibility of Working Time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reduced-Hours or Part time work</i>: Working less than full-time with a commensurate decrease in salary or load. • <i>Flex-time</i>: Employees vary their beginning and ending times (within a given flex range and established core hours), but generally work full time. • <i>Compressed work-week</i>: Employees work extra hours on some days of the week in order to have part of the day or a whole day off at another time. • <i>Job-sharing</i>: Two employees share one full-time job. • <i>Compensatory time</i>: Employees working long hours get subsequent time off in order to recoup. • <i>Leaves of absence</i>: Employees get time off for maternity, paternity, military service, education, elder and child care, and other life pursuits and are able to return to their jobs or a similar job. 	<p>Faculty can find more complete definitions of the types of work-life policies and programs in:</p> <p>Kossek, E.E. & Friede, A. (2006). The Business Case: Managerial Perspectives on Work and the Family. In M. Pitt-Catsoupes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), <i>The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods and approaches</i> (pp. 73-99). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers</p>
<p>B. Flexibility of Working Place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Telework</i>: Employees work part or all of the time at an off-site location and use technology (e.g., email, 	



Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
fax, mobile phone) in order to communicate with others.	
<p>C. Support with Care Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child/elder care: Employees have access to employer provided care for children or elders either at their work site or in communities. • Child/elder care provider referral service: Employees can call/email a service which will assist them in finding regular child/eldercare providers. • Financial support for dependent care: Employees receive financial help in the form of either flexible spending accounts that use pretax dollars for to help pay for care, direct subsidies or discounts. • Emergency/sick child/elder care: Employee has access to child/elder care for unexpected situations. • Concierge and life services: Support services assisting with household errands or chores, legal, homework, meals, banking, dry cleaning, adoption, college application help; Can be subsidized or located near work site. 	
<p>D. Informational and Social Supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support hotlines</i>: employees can call a number to receive emotional support for dealing with work-life issues. • <i>Support groups</i>: employees can join a support or networking group for informational and psychological support 	

The employment relationship

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family-friendly HR policies have been linked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lower work-family conflict, turnover, depression; Higher loyalty, commitment, job satisfaction, performance, organizational citizenship • However, such policies may be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ineffective ○ under-utilized; not support by culture ○ not well linked to work design and processes 	<p>See:</p> <p>Eby, L. Casper, W., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C. & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>, 66(1), 124-197.</p> <p>Kossek, E.E., Coilquitt, A., & Noe, R. (2001). Caregiving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider</p>



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
	<p>as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 44(1) 29-44</p> <p>Thompson, C., Beauvais, L.L., & Allen, T.D. (2006). Work and family from an industrial/organizational psychology perspective. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), <i>The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods and approaches</i> (pp. 73-99). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers</p>
<p>Definition: Employer Support of Work and Family/ Life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Official policies and practices related to work and life integration B. General employment conditions such as pay, work schedules, benefits, job design C. Organizational culture and norms regarding the primacy and separation of work and nonwork 	<p>See:</p> <p>Kossek, E. E., In Press, 2005. Workplace policies and practices to support work and families: Gaps in implementation and linkages to individual and organizational effectiveness, To appear in S. Bianchi, L. Casper, R. King (Eds.), <i>Workforce/Workplace Mismatch? Work, Family, Health, and Well-Being</i>. LEA Press.</p> <p>Thompson, C., Beauvais, L.L., & Allen, T.D. (2006). Work and family from an industrial/organizational psychology perspective. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), <i>The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods and approaches</i> (pp. 73-99). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers</p>
<p>A. Formal Employer Work-Life Human Resource Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Time</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flexibility in work time, hours, load or career (flextime, part time work, leaves of absence (paid and unpaid) • <i>Information</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. college search advice, support groups, resource & referral for care • <i>Money</i> 	



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pretax flexible spending accounts for caregiving, health care, (use it or lose it) • <i>Direct Services</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On site or near site child and elder care, sick care, concierge services 	
<p>B. General Employment Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay • Health care & other benefits such as paid vacations, time off for sick care for self or family • Work scheduling, e.g. overtime (being able to turn down long hours) as well as undertime (getting enough regular work hours each week to be able to provide for family); regularity of work schedule • Job design and working conditions (e.g., stress, night jobs etc.) 	
<p>C. Organizational Work –Family Culture, Climate & Norms</p> <p>The...“shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the degree to which the organization supports and values work-family integration” (Kossek, Noe, & Colquitt, 2001).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primacy of work compared to nonwork demands in employee’s time • Whether one can share concerns about family at work • Whether one must sacrifice one’s family time to do well on the job • The degree to which work and family should be separated from each other • Whether work-life issues are an individual or collective concern 	<p>Kossek, E. E., Noe, R., & Colquitt, J. (2001). Caregiving decisions, well-being and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 44 (1) 29-44.</p>
<p><u>Language as Culture: Work-Family or Work- Life</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work-family is a phrase that tends to focus employer support only on those with visible caregiving needs (families) • Work-life suggests that all employees, even those without a family, can have stress in meshing work and personal life 	
<p><u>Organizational Culture vs. National Culture on Work-Family Policies</u></p>	



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty																																																																																																																														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational culture is distinct from national culture but in global firms powerful national cultures can influence work cultures The U.S. tends to place greater emphasis on private employer support of work and family whereas many other developed nations tend to emphasize public support. 																																																																																																																															
<p>Paid Family Leaves for New Parents: Comparison between US and Europe</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Leave w/ Wage Replace (weeks)</th> <th>Basic Pay Provisions (% wages)</th> <th>Available to Mothers Only (weeks)</th> <th>Available to Fathers Only (weeks)</th> <th>Additional Unpaid or Low Benefit Leave (weeks)</th> <th>Incentives for Father's Use: Weeks Lost if Father Doesn't Use</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Nordic Countries</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Norway</td> <td>52</td> <td>80%</td> <td>9</td> <td>4</td> <td>-</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sweden</td> <td>52</td> <td>80%</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>13</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Denmark</td> <td>30</td> <td>100%</td> <td>18</td> <td>2</td> <td>52</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finland</td> <td>44</td> <td>66%</td> <td>18</td> <td>3</td> <td>108</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Continental Countries</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>France</td> <td>18</td> <td>100%</td> <td>16</td> <td>2</td> <td>156</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Luxembourg</td> <td>16</td> <td>100%</td> <td>16</td> <td>2 days</td> <td>52</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Netherlands</td> <td>16</td> <td>100%</td> <td>16</td> <td>2 days</td> <td>26</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Germany</td> <td>14</td> <td>100%</td> <td>14</td> <td>0</td> <td>156</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Belgium</td> <td>15</td> <td>75%</td> <td>15</td> <td>3-4 days</td> <td>26</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Austria</td> <td>16</td> <td>100%</td> <td>16</td> <td>0</td> <td>104</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Italy</td> <td>26</td> <td>80%</td> <td>26</td> <td>0</td> <td>24</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>English-Speaking Countries</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Canada</td> <td>50</td> <td>55%</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>U.K.</td> <td>26</td> <td>90%</td> <td>26</td> <td>0</td> <td>26</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>U.S.*</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>24</td> <td>12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Sources: Gornick & Meyers (2003), Kamerman & Gatenio (2002), Waldfogel (2001).*</p>		Leave w/ Wage Replace (weeks)	Basic Pay Provisions (% wages)	Available to Mothers Only (weeks)	Available to Fathers Only (weeks)	Additional Unpaid or Low Benefit Leave (weeks)	Incentives for Father's Use: Weeks Lost if Father Doesn't Use	<i>Nordic Countries</i>							Norway	52	80%	9	4	-	4	Sweden	52	80%	0	2	13	4	Denmark	30	100%	18	2	52	26	Finland	44	66%	18	3	108	-	<i>Continental Countries</i>							France	18	100%	16	2	156	-	Luxembourg	16	100%	16	2 days	52	26	Netherlands	16	100%	16	2 days	26	13	Germany	14	100%	14	0	156	-	Belgium	15	75%	15	3-4 days	26	13	Austria	16	100%	16	0	104	-	Italy	26	80%	26	0	24	-	<i>English-Speaking Countries</i>							Canada	50	55%	15	0	-	-	U.K.	26	90%	26	0	26	13	U.S.*	0	-	0	0	24	12	<p>Reproduced from:</p> <p>Kelly, E.L. (2006). Work-family policies: The United States in International Perspective. In M. Pitt-Catsouphes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), <i>The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods and approaches</i> (pp. 73-99). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers</p>
	Leave w/ Wage Replace (weeks)	Basic Pay Provisions (% wages)	Available to Mothers Only (weeks)	Available to Fathers Only (weeks)	Additional Unpaid or Low Benefit Leave (weeks)	Incentives for Father's Use: Weeks Lost if Father Doesn't Use																																																																																																																									
<i>Nordic Countries</i>																																																																																																																															
Norway	52	80%	9	4	-	4																																																																																																																									
Sweden	52	80%	0	2	13	4																																																																																																																									
Denmark	30	100%	18	2	52	26																																																																																																																									
Finland	44	66%	18	3	108	-																																																																																																																									
<i>Continental Countries</i>																																																																																																																															
France	18	100%	16	2	156	-																																																																																																																									
Luxembourg	16	100%	16	2 days	52	26																																																																																																																									
Netherlands	16	100%	16	2 days	26	13																																																																																																																									
Germany	14	100%	14	0	156	-																																																																																																																									
Belgium	15	75%	15	3-4 days	26	13																																																																																																																									
Austria	16	100%	16	0	104	-																																																																																																																									
Italy	26	80%	26	0	24	-																																																																																																																									
<i>English-Speaking Countries</i>																																																																																																																															
Canada	50	55%	15	0	-	-																																																																																																																									
U.K.	26	90%	26	0	26	13																																																																																																																									
U.S.*	0	-	0	0	24	12																																																																																																																									
<p>Gap Between Rhetoric and Reality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many firms have cultures where using work/life policies is seen as benefiting the individual far more than the firm. Meeting employee's personal needs are not yet seen as meeting customers' needs Work/life policies are still largely programmatic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimal link to other HR policies nominal focus on informal cultural issues glass ceiling effect 																																																																																																																															

Class 2: Implementing work-family policies, practices and culture as a link to support organizational effectiveness and work-family relationships

▲ **Class Lecture Topics**

The topics covered in Class 2 include:



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

1. linking work-life policies, practices and culture to organizational effectiveness; and
- 2 ways that employing organizations can support the work family relationship

▲ **Key Concepts:**

- Managerial Concerns
- Family-Friendly Index
- Strategic HRM /Productivity
- Employer of Choice/ Diversity Views
- Reciprocity
- Trade-Off
- Dual Agenda - Collaborative Interactive Action Research (CIAR)

Note: The content of the lectures outlined below correspond to PowerPoint slides: **Implementing Policies, Practices and Culture to Support Organizational Effectiveness and Work-Family Relationships**

Linking work-life policies, practices, and culture to organizational effectiveness

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p>Managerial Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labor costs • Turnover • Quality and customer service • Absenteeism 	<p>Faculty might ask students to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How might these vary among employers for different types of workers? • How might employers in different industries have different views?
<p>Factors affecting use of work-life policies/practices</p>	<p>See the following publications or Sloan</p>



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corporate culture 2. Organizational approach to managing change 3. Supervisor support 4. Individual characteristics 5. Job content factors 6. Work-group factors 	<p>encyclopedia entries for more information on these factors.</p> <p>Kossek, E.E., Barber, A., & Winters, D. (1999). Using flexible schedules in the managerial world: The power of peers. <i>Human Resource Management, 38</i>(1), 33-46.</p> <p>Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T.D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. <i>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11</i>(2), 169-181.</p> <p>Lee, M. D., MacDermid, S. & Buck, M. (2000). Organizational paradigms of reduced-load work: Accommodation, elaboration, and transformation. <i>Academy of Management Journal, 43</i>, 1211-1226.</p> <p>Secret, M. (2000). Identifying the family, job, and workplace characteristics of employees who use work-family benefits. <i>Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 49</i>(2), 217-225.</p> <p>Pitt-Catsoupes, M. (2002). <i>Family-Friendly Workplace, a Work-Family Encyclopedia entry</i>. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from the Sloan Work and Family Research Network web site: http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=232&area=All.</p> <p>Allen, T. (2003). <i>Organizational Barriers, a Work-Family Encyclopedia entry</i>. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from the Sloan Work and Family Network web site: http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=247&area=All.</p>



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points | **Suggestions for Faculty**

Work-life policies and practices are not distributed evenly across industry or position.

Table 22. Percent of workers with access to quality of life benefits, by selected characteristics, private industry, National Compensation Survey, March 2004

Characteristic	Employee assistance for children								
	Total	Employee provided funds	Circle K and other child care	Child care expenses and referral services	Adoptive members	Long term care insurance	Flexible work plans	Employee provided from PC	Subsidized mentoring
All workers	53	3	6	10	9	11	4	3	6
Worker characteristics									
White-collar occupations	59	3	7	13	14	17	7	4	7
Blue-collar occupations	46	2	4	6	3	4	1	1	2
Service occupations	48	2	5	8	7	10	3	2	4
Full time	52	4	6	10	11	13	5	3	6
Part time	48	1	3	6	4	7	2	1	3
Male	49	3	7	10	10	10	2	2	6
Female	54	2	4	8	8	11	4	3	5
Average wages less than \$10 per hour	49	2	3	6	6	7	2	1	2
Average wage \$10 per hour or higher	57	3	6	10	10	16	7	5	8
Establishment characteristics									
Goods-producing	52	3	6	10	10	10	4	4	4
Service-providing	51	3	6	10	9	12	3	3	6
1-99 workers	46	1	3	3	3	4	1	1	2
100 workers or more	56	6	9	16	11	21	5	4	10
Geographic areas									
Metropolitan areas	50	3	6	10	10	12	4	3	6
Nonmetropolitan areas	47	2	3	3	3	6	1	1	1
West	50	3	7	12	12	12	3	2	6
Midwest	49	4	6	10	11	12	3	3	7
South	48	2	7	10	10	11	3	2	4
North	51	3	6	9	9	12	3	3	5
West South Central	45	4	6	7	6	7	2	2	3
West North Central	49	3	7	10	10	12	3	3	4
South Atlantic	47	3	6	9	9	10	3	2	3
West South Central	45	4	6	7	6	7	2	2	3
West North Central	49	3	7	10	10	12	3	3	4
Midatlantic	50	4	6	10	10	11	4	3	7
Pacific	47	2	3	3	3	6	1	1	1

¹ The total is less than the sum of individual children programs because many employees have access to more than one of the benefits. NOTE: Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals. Where applicable, each indicator is expressed as a percentage of respondents in the category.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), in the National Compensation Survey (NCS), reports on the percent of full and part-time employees in industry and state and local governments who have access to selected work-family programs by worker characteristics, establishment characteristics, and geographic location.

Faculty can find the full reports of these resources at:

<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ebs/sp/ebsm0002.pdf>

<http://familiesandwork.org/eproducts/2005nse.pdf>

“Family-Friendly Index” is a benchmarking tool for offering work-family policies and programs. Twenty-eight family-friendly policies are scored based on:

- the **impact** of the policy on reducing work-family conflict;
- the amount of **coverage**, in terms of numbers of employees who have access to the policy;
- **institutionalization**—meaning whether or not the policy is formalized;
- **commitment**, which reflects the amount of resources, in terms of money, people, time, etc, needed to provide the policy;
- **level of effort**, which reflects how complex or difficult the policy is to implement; and
- **innovativeness**, which is the degree to which the policy or program has been implemented in the past.

Galinsky, Freidman & Hernandez (1991). *The Corporate Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs*. Families and Work Institute: New York.

Families and Work Institute Family-Friendly Index

Flexible Work Arrangements	Corporate Giving/Community Service	Management Change
Flextime	Corporate giving to community/national work-family initiatives	Work-family management train
Part-time work		Work-family coordinators
Job sharing		Work-family handbooks
Flex-pace	Funds to benefit employees	Other management change
Other flexible arrangements	Other corporate giving/community service programs	
Subtotal	Subtotal	Subtotal
105	60	90
Leavees		
Child care or family leave	Dependent Care Services	Work-Family Stress Management
Other leaves	Child care resource and referral	Employee assistance program
	Elder care consultation and referral	Wellness/health promotion
Subtotal	On- or near-site child care centers	Relocation services
40	Commuter child care centers	Work-family seminars
Financial Assistance		
Employee assistance spending accounts	Sick/long-term care programs	Work-family support groups
Dependent care	After-school programs	Work-family newsletters
Dependent care	Summer camps	Other work-family stress management programs
Child care accounts	Car-pooling plans	
Vouchers	Other dependent care services	Subtotal
Other financial assistance		80
Subtotal	Subtotal	Total
80	140	615

Stages in Organizational Development on Work and Family

See the following Sloan Work and Family



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1: Employer adopts a few work family policies on paper, but they are not integrated into the culture. • Stage 2: Many policies and practices exist for different work –life needs, work-family professionals hired. • Stage 3: Work family issues have strong cultural acceptance, managerial support, and work is designed with consideration for family life. 	<p>Encyclopedia entry for more detail: Pitt-Catsoupes, M. (2002). <i>Family-Friendly Workplace, a Work-Family Encyclopedia entry</i>. Retrieved April 20, 2007, from the Sloan Work and Family Research Network web site: http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=232&area=All.</p> <p>See also: Galinsky, E., Freidman, D.E., & Hernandez, C.A. (1991). <i>The Corporate Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs</i>. Families and Work Institute: New York.</p> <p>The Families and Work Institute identifies “three discernable stages” as a workplace organization recognizes and then responds to the work-family needs of employees.</p>

Ways that organizations support the work-family relationship

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p><u>Making the Business Case: Strategies of Selling</u></p> <p>Management philosophies over support of work-life can vary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic HRM /productivity 2. Employer of choice/ diversity views 3. Reciprocity 4. Trade-off 5. Dual agenda 	
<p><u>Strategic HRM Views of Business Case</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is economic performance of firms that provide work-life balance? • Do the firms that provide the best work-life balance do better in the marketplace? • Are they more profitable? • Are employees of those firms more productive? • Do these policies have a return on investment? 	



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p><u>Employer of Choice View</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Best employers” typically receive twice as many job applications per position as other firms • Example: Job applications received by Edward Jones & Company, named by <i>Fortune</i> as the #1 best employer to work for in 2002, 2003, up from 40,000 to 400,000 after on list • Best practice: Marketing work life as best employer competency 	<p>See examples of employers of choice in: Cascio, W., & Young, C. (2005). Work-family balance: Does the market reward firms that respect it? In D.F. Halpern & S.G. Murphy (Eds.) <i>Changing the metaphor: From work-family balance to work-family integration</i> (pp. 49-63). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock performance of <i>Working Mother</i> 100 Best companies is consistently higher. • Why? 35 % of analyst’s ‘investment decision’ is determined by non-financial information. • “Ability to attract & retain people”. • Workforce is increasingly diverse; want talent of all backgrounds to want to work for you.
<p><u>Tradeoff View</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity pitted against leisure • Outdated traditional paradigms: Worker time for money; Work vs. family • Best practice: How to redesign jobs for mutual benefits for managing work- life 	
<p><u>Reciprocity Managerial View</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workers will give more discretionary performance when the employer is supportive. • Example: Employees who rated work life benefits useful are significantly more likely to make voluntary workplace improvement suggestions. • Best practice: Implementing work-family benefits that workers value. 	<p>See:</p> <p>Lambert, S. (2000). Added benefits: The link between work-life benefits and organizational citizenship behavior. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 43(5), 801-815.</p>
<p><u>Collaborative Interactive Action Research (CIAR): Three Pronged Approach Dual Agenda</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement at the workplace level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Employers, employees • Engagement at the associational level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Unions, professional organizations, trade associations, community groups 	<p>Bailyn, L., Bookman, A., Harrianton, M. & Kochan, T. (2006). Work-family interventions and experiments: Workplaces, communities, and society. In M. Pitt-Catsoupes, E. E. Kossek, & S. Sweet (Eds.), <i>The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods and approaches</i> (pp. 73-99). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence</p>



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement at the state level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Government officials 	Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
<p><u>Guiding assumption of CIAR: Life difficulties negatively affect work performance: Redesign for Dual Agenda</u></p> <p><i>Strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge assumptions that impede gender equity and work-life integration (micro-interventions) • Redesign work practices to integrate work with family lives and enhance work effectiveness • Couple research with workplace redesign <p><i>Approach</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate - engage workers and managers in the research process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Fluid expertise ◦ Honoring resistance ◦ Feminist methodology • Focus individuals on the dual agenda • Develop institutionalized mechanisms for dissemination 	

Class 3: Work Life Strategy Game and/or Policy Adoption Case Studies

▲ **Class Lecture Topics**

This class session helps students apply and use the concepts from Class 1 and 2 in ‘real world’ settings:

- The Work Life Policy Business Case Exercise helps students learn to make business case for adopting policies at their college and learn the challenges of doing so.
- The Work-Life Strategy Game helps students develop a work life strategy that fits their industry and workforce and gain familiarity with policies and managing work-life issues.

Note: The content of the lectures outlined below correspond to PowerPoint: **Work Life Strategy Game and/or Policy Adoption Case Studies**; Word document: **Work-Life Game**; and jpeg images: **Gameboard Images 1 and 2**.

Work-Life Policy Business Case Exercise



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Key Points	Suggestions for Faculty
<p><u>Business Case Assignment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify a work-family policy that could have an impact on business practices at your college/university • Identify two articles on this policy and its implementation at other workplaces. • Make a business case for its implementation • Outline the shape of the policy • Who could be eligible (and who can't be) • Costs and implications (returns on investments) • Outline how you would go about creating the organizational change....or if a business case can not be made what are your thoughts on how this issue should be addressed? 	
<p>ROI - Returns on Investments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost estimates – what should be considered? • Outcomes benefits – what should be considered? • Does the company need loyal workers (all workers or just some? Does that influence how the policy is constructed?) • How is productivity measured? Hours vs. quantity and quality of production? 	
<p>Work Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members in each group pose the policy you want to advance and then all collectively consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the types of information needed to make a business case? ○ Which of these items are “knowable” in advance? ○ What is the best avenue for making a business case and selling the policy to the organization? ○ Is it the feasible to make this policy available to all workers or contingents of workers at the college? 	



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Work-life strategy game

Support of work-life integration: Cultural issues facing the employer

WORK/LIFE STRATEGY GAME

This game is used with permission from Towers Perrin. Joanne Harney is thanked for her efforts in helping Professor Kossek get approval to use the game in the book: *Managing Human Resources in the 21st Century: From Core Concepts to Strategic Choices*, edited by Ellen Kossek and Richard Block. South-Western College Publishing, 2000.

OBJECTIVE

To accumulate the highest monetary value by the end of the Game. Value is accrued by answering WORK/LIFE and MANAGEMENT questions correctly and purchasing work/life programs most related to the organization's business needs and strategy, as well as by chance, as revealed in NEWSFLASH and MEMO cards. Dollars not invested by the end of play contribute to total value.



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

Module 3
Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives

Section II: Module Summary

This module has introduced students to:

- Employer-sponsored work-family policies and programs
- Impact of work-family conflicts and supports on work outcomes
- Workplace culture
- Relationships with supervisors and co-workers
- Workplace flexibility
- Business cases for employer response to work-family issues
- Private versus public approaches for work and family supports

Faculty and students interested in exploring these and other work-family issues in more depth might consider other teaching modules prepared by the Curriculum Task Force of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network.

Module 3
Workplace Policy, Practice and Culture: Employer and Employee Perspectives

Section II: Suggested Readings

Online References

There are several online resources that could be of assistance. As appropriate, each of the Work-Family Curriculum Modules suggests specific online resources. In addition, we recommend that you consider using the resources posted on the website of the Sloan Work and Family Research Network (www.bc.edu/wfnetwork).

- **Database of academic work-family literature.** Citations for over 8,500 work-family publications are in this database. You (and your students) can get access to full-text articles published in some of the journals that often publish work-family manuscripts. (Contact the Sloan Network at wfnet@bc.edu for a password to access full texts of articles). The Network's database of work-family literature can be accessed at: http://library.bc.edu/F?func=find-b-O&local_base=BCL_WF.



www.bc.edu/wfnetwork

- **Class activities.** Academics around the country have developed a wide variety of teaching activities and assignments that you can use. The list of these activities is available at: <http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/activities.php>.
- **Work-Family Encyclopedia.** Scholars from around the world have written nearly 60 articles which have been accepted to the peer-reviewed *Work-Family Encyclopedia*. The entries present overviews for a wide range of topics. The contents of the *Encyclopedia* can be accessed at: <http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia.php?mode=nav>.
- **Sample course syllabi.** A number of faculty members have kindly shared their course syllabi. These can be accessed at: <http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/template.php?name=syllabi>.

Publications

In addition to the publications suggested in the Work-Family Curriculum Modules, the following publications can be used as teaching reference materials.

- **Teaching Reference Publications.** The following work-family references that are particularly appropriate for teaching are available in hard-copy.
 1. Friedman, S., DeGroot, J., & Christensen, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Integrating work and life. The Wharton Resource Guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer. [The Wharton Resource Guide contains information appropriate for a range of work-family topics. Ideas for exercises are included.]
 2. Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Kossek, E., & Sweet, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers. [This handbook provides an overview of different disciplinary perspectives about work and family issues, includes chapters on a range of methodological approaches to the study of work and family experiences, and considers the implications of linking scholarship, practice, and policy.]
 3. Stebbins, L.F. (2001). *Work and family in America*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc. [As noted by the publishers, "... *Work and Family in America* examines the changing cultures of the workplace, family, and home. This extensive overview of this burgeoning field includes everything from a detailed history and statistics comparing trends in the United States and abroad to key legislation and legal cases."]